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ABSTRACT

Handling Marginality in Feminist Organizations: A Study of the Structural Choices and the Organizational Problems of Campus-Based Women's Centers

October 1983

Joan L. Sweeney, B.S., Massachusetts State College at Fitchburg
M.S., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor David M. Todd

The 1960s and the early 1970s saw the rise of a variety of organizations which were expressions of feminist and other social change values and political movements. While there have been some very general attempts at theorizing about these organizations, and a scattering of descriptive studies, we do not yet have either a broad conceptual framework or a solid empirical base for understanding them, comparing them with other organizations or improving their functioning. This study contributes to the development of an empirical base for such work, especially focusing on issues of organizational structure and administrative issues and practices for one type of feminist organization and draws some broad implications for further theorizing and action.

The data in this study come from a national survey of a particular type of feminist organization, campus-based women's centers, and are examined in the context of the experience of the researcher with these organizations. Conducted as part of a needs assessment effort, the survey was one component of a U.S. Office of Education (DHEW) project funded to design, develop and implement a training program for directors and staff of such organizations. The project developed training materials based on that program for national dissemination.
The survey instrument was developed to obtain data regarding the following four aspects of the centers:

1) descriptive information regarding their budget and its sources, types of programs offered, staffing pattern and length of time in existence;

2) training or assistance needs, particularly in regard to program planning and implementation;

3) organizational structure and problematic internal organizational issues; and

4) the nature of their relationship with campus administrators.

While the transitory nature of many of these organizations makes sampling estimates difficult to determine, relatively complete information was obtained for 100 centers, which is very roughly 22 percent of the known population, at the time of the study.

This study draws on the portion of the questionnaire which focused on the organizational structures and problematic internal organizational issues. It uses the survey data as basic descriptive points of reference which are then also elaborated on from the extensive experience of the investigator with the organizations. The purpose of the analysis is to describe and where possible to interrelate these characteristics. Descriptive data are presented and implications for organizational effectiveness are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The political and social change efforts of the 1960s and early 1970s not only affected the social fabric of this country, but also resulted in the development of a variety of new organizations, as well as organizational forms, aimed at operationalizing the social change goals advocated by various groups. Civil rights organizations, anti-poverty groups, anti-war groups and coalitions, alternative or "free" schools from nursery through university levels of the educational system, radical therapy collectives, alternative mental health centers, drug treatment clinics, feminist organizations, producer and consumer cooperatives, collectives and communes all represent the variety of organizations created in response to and to assist in implementing social change goals of that era. Their efforts to create "alternative" structural forms and to operate in a more democratic manner exemplify the range of efforts engaged in by hundreds of thousands of people during this period of recent social history.

Some researchers have contributed to our understanding of these times and the work of such organizations by providing analyses of those efforts which take the form of theories of social change as well as critical case studies (Goldenberg, 1971 and 1978; Sarason, 1971 and 1972; Holleb and Abrahams, 1975; Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, Volume 9, numbers 2/3, 1973 and JABS, Volume 10, number 3, 1974). Others have shaped or extended our understanding of how to effect the types of social changes advocated by providing "rules" and organizing tools (Alinsky, 1972; Voca-

Yet another group of researchers and writers has contributed to the body of knowledge available on those in organizations which, having particular social change goals as the focus of their efforts, also defined their task to include changes in the ways their organizations were structured and managed. The latter focus is reflected in the literature on organizations "alternatively" structured and engaged in participatory decision-making and democratic or self-management (Adizer, 1975; Benello and Roussopoulos, 1971; Bernstein, 1980; Garson and Smith, 1976; Herbst, 1976; Ingle, 1980; Vanek, 1975; and Zwerdling, 1978).

In some cases women's rights and concerns were embedded within both the efforts of these organizations and descriptions of their work. At other times they were not included in either the goals or the in-print recounts of the social and political change focuses of this period in history. The climate of the times, the experiences of women within civil rights and other social change organizations, a growing refusal on the part of women to have their needs any longer disregarded or relegated to secondary concerns, all combined to provide the impetus during the '60s for a second wave of feminist activity.

A variety of authors have provided theoretical perspectives, descriptive essays, critiques of the biases in various disciplines and chronicles of the range of feminist thought and activity which occurred as part of the political and social change movement of that time (Carden, 1974; Carsell, 1977; Deckard, 1978; Freeman, 1975; Millett, 1969; and Morgan, 1970).
The creation of numerous women's organizations which operated from various points on the political/social change continuum was both a visible manifestation of this second wave of feminist activity and a statement of the felt lack of inclusion of women's concerns and needs in the purpose and operation of other political organizations.

As feminist organizations with social change goals, women's centers' very existence as well as their program activities reflect a challenge to and are often in competition with the more mainstream social institutions with which they interact. Since that marginality has implications for both the existence and functioning of these organizations, as well as for the ways in which their circumstances and problems are understood, greater specificity regarding the types of marginality with which women's centers must contend may help to provide a useful context within which to discuss their structural choices and their organizational problems.

**Institutional Marginality**

As organizations created specifically to challenge the policies and practices of higher education institutions at which they exist, the women's centers studied represent efforts to create alternatives to both the nature and style of delivery of the institutions' services and to counter the sexism perceived and experienced in their practices. In doing so they typically are marginal in that they exist within these institutions but at their periphery or boundary. From that position they tend to have less access to mainstream activities, information channels, influence structures and resources.
Wooley (1981) confirmed the existence of such institutional marginality both in the perceptions of staff members of a women's center she studied, as well as in the administrators who funded that particular organization. That marginality was underscored by the staff of the organization she researched by their finding out (during the course of her study) that the women's center had been omitted from a divisional organizational chart constructed by the very administrator who funded the organization. It can be further noted that the particular women's center, which was the focus of her research, had one of the largest budgets of any center in the country, had been in existence for over five years at a major state university and that this center had received recognition as a "model" in several studies done on women's centers and programs at higher education institutions.

Such a marginal position--being simultaneously "inside" yet "outside"--would require some measure of openness to the exchanges and dealings with the institution at which the centers are situated, as well as a variety of trade-offs if the alternatives they are striving to create are to function. Kanter and Zurcher (1973) note that such "trade-offs" can be understood as power exchanges, but they also take care to indicate that to maintain the "alternativeness", the extent and the nature of such trade-offs need to be monitored and carefully controlled. The exchanges or trade-offs for the women's centers studied, existing as marginal entities or alternative organizations within higher education institutions would take the form of services or programs provided in "exchange" for financial and/or some other form of resources which contribute to the existence of the center. It should be noted
that the exchange could also be based on the provision of resources in return for non- or minimized confrontation of the institution, for not filing law suits, for not "sitting-in" or conducting large group protests. This is commonly known as "cooptation."

While choices made regarding structure, staffing patterns, the nature of programming and the handling of the boundary or relationship between the women's centers and the institutions constituting their immediate environment would all seem likely to effect the extent of the institutional marginality experienced, some degree of institutional marginality could be assumed to be the general circumstance for these organizations.

**Political Marginality**

As organizations created and operated by women, a social group largely outside the power and influence structures of this society, women's centers can be conceived of as politically marginal by definition. Their inception and reason for existence are also intimately linked with changing that situation; to questioning and countering the interpersonal social and political circumstances which necessitate their existence--circumstances in which women have been and continue to be disenfranchised and removed from decision making which both impacts on and often limits the options in their lives.

Adrienne Rich (1979) addressed the political and institutional marginality of women and exhorts women on the criticalness of being conscious of that political position and status. Forisha and Goldman
(1981) ground the broader political marginality of women in organizations, paying particular attention to the impact of women's marginal political status in larger society on their being able to gain and effectively use power in institutions or organizations. Lewin (1939) and Shutz (1977) identify the particular problems of "marginal man" and the outsider to any given social institution or situation. And Jean Baker Miller (1976) notes that the psychological characteristics of women, which she labels strengths, will remain "unreal" and unrealized if women do not have the power to put them into effective operation. She goes on to specify that to do so women will have to acquire economic, political and social power and authority, that presently women's status is a marginal one and that they wield virtually none of such power and authority.

All of these authors underscore or elaborate on the implications of the political marginality of a group for its efforts on its own behalf or well-being in specific institutional contexts. Women's centers can be seen not only as organizations totally comprised of individual "outsiders"--"marginal women" or members of a politically marginal or disenfranchised group--but, also, organizations that are largely outside of or marginal to the social power and influence structures which they wish to affect on their own behalf. Thus, the "trade-offs" or power exchanges referred to by Kanter and Zurcher that may be needed by these organizations and the individuals staffing them for the attainment of their organizational and social change goals are likely to be more "costly" and more difficult.
Economic or Fiscal Marginality

The economic or fiscal marginality of women's centers can be viewed both as a phenomenon in its own right, as well as a specific manifestation of the political and institutional marginality of women noted above. Rothschild-Whitt (1976), in describing another type of alternative organization or institution, noted that such institutions tend to operate with minimal funding and provide relatively low salaries for their staff. In her work, some of those circumstances were attributed to the tendency for the creators or founders (and subsequent staff) of such organizations to "choose" to be economically marginal (or "poor") rather than run the risk of having to change the programs, activities or structures of their organizations to accommodate a funding source. Polk (1974) addresses some similar issues but takes a different tack, one suggesting less "choice." She discusses the sources of male power and the various activities of the women's movement and its organizations in terms of their potential impact on those forms of male power. In reviewing and analyzing major perspectives on the contemporary social situation and conditions of women, she pays particular attention to the fact that men in our society have differential amounts of and access to money (as well as other forms of institutional power and normative power) and the ways in which women's life choices and the options for what they may create are affected by male control of those options through "reward power."

Outside of the literature on alternative and social change organizations, the personal or individual economic marginality of women,
as well as the barriers to women's economic independence have also been documented. The National Commission on Working Women (1978) and the U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau (1980) have provided extensive detail on the extent of women's historic, current and persistent occupational segregation and the precarious economic marginality which results. Deitch (1981) provides further detail on the gender-based inequality to the labor market experience of women and men in the United States and in particular the earnings differences over the last several years.

Women's businesses--enterprises or institutions which could be seen as less "marginal" in that they are generally neither explicitly social change organizations nor alternative institutions--still are economically marginal. According to a White House Task Force report (1978), women business owners stand at the fringes of the job force. Their businesses are small, struggling to survive and generally under-capitalized.

Thus, not only are women's centers, as alternative and social change organizations, economically marginal to the institutions in which they exist, but women individually have less access to economic resources and options and the businesses they have created to date also still tend to be economically marginal.

In other efforts to view or understand such organizations, some feminist writers have provided us with a general view of topics such as "structure vs. structurelessness," "the process/product debate," and leadership and power among women as they applied to the evolution of consciousness-raising groups into work settings within the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Bardwick, 1977; Bunch and Fisher,

However, to the extent that women's centers, as the type of feminist organizations with which this study deals, have been included in chronicles of these times or investigated, the focus has largely been on cataloguing their existence, identifying the various kinds and the nature of their work and in some cases providing descriptive information aimed at the kind of replication seen as necessary to build the women's movement.

With the exception of work such as that of Wooley (1981) on organizational climate dimensions, when women's centers as feminist organizations engaged in social change efforts have been studied and written about, the focus has not been on their organizational structures or the types of organizational issues and problems they experienced which could impact on their survival, effectiveness and development. With little written and shared regarding the known successes and failures to guide the continuing or recently begun efforts of women in these organizations, unless the informational gap is bridged, women engaged in such social change work could become caught in isolated variations of re-inventing the feminist organizational wheel.

The data on which this study is based came from the only national survey done to date on women's centers. That survey was done as part of a needs assessment effort and was one component of a U.S. Department of Education (WEEA) project co-designed and co-developed by the author. The project also involved implementing a training program for directors and staff of this type of feminist organization. Data from that survey research, combined with the extensive participant-observer experience
of the author with these organizations provide focal points and the interpretive context for this study. The survey instrument designed and used to gather the data is included in Appendix C.

Thus, this study was undertaken with the following general purposes in mind:

1) to provide data on the structures and organizational problems of feminist organizations by nationally surveying one type--campus-based women's centers;

2) to provide information which could assist both those working within, as well as with, such organizations in anticipating problem areas in operation, structure and the relationship between these, or at least not seeing their experiences as isolated phenomena.

Given these purposes, the question then arises of the significance or possible contribution of this effort.

It is the contention of this author that the feminist organizations created in the 1960s and 1970s are both a unique social phenomenon in the history of women and a unique organizational form. As such, their existence and operation deserve to be more fully documented than has currently been done. Further, as they continue and often struggle to exist as vehicles for social change, the opportunity for such organizations to have their work informed by the struggles of their foremothers is a valuable one. This study is intended to be an exploratory and descriptive contribution to such a process.

In reporting on the results of the national needs survey and the experience of the author, this study will focus on the portion of the data dealing with organizational issues (Part II of the questionnaire
in Appendix C), and seek to identify relationships which may exist between the various organizational structures of centers (Part IV of questionnaire) and the organizational issues with which the staffs have had difficulty. The specific questions to be addressed are:

1) What organizational problems are most prevalent for campus-based women's centers?

2) What are the structural characteristics of campus-based women's centers?

3) Is there a relationship between certain types of structures and kinds of organizational problems reported by campus-based women's centers?

A description of the design and methodology of the study on which this research is based and the type of data to be reported can be found in the next section of this thesis.
As noted in the Introduction of this thesis, feminist organizations constitute a particular social phenomenon and organizational form which evolved out of the political and social change climate and activities of the 1960s and 1970s. While their existence nationally has been documented and catalogued, little else is known regarding their operation, variations in their organizational structure, administrative problems, programs, etc. The task of conducting the type of exploratory, descriptive study which would begin to better define these organizations was brought to manageable dimensions by selection of one type of feminist organization to research—campus-based women's centers.

The focus of this study is on the reporting and analysis of a relevant portion of the data generated in a national survey of these organizations. The analysis of that data will be informed by, interpreted through and extended by the extensive and intensive experience of the author with the organizations being studied. The participatory as well as observational experience of the researcher with these organizations thus provided two dimensions which enriched this study: 1) context or experiential base which contributed to the development of the study and the survey questionnaire; and 2) a participant and observer perspective through which to understand and interpret the various data generated. Information on the design of the study follows.
The population of women's centers nationally was initially identified by researchers at the Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges in Washington, D.C. in 1974. At that time the known or identifiable population of campus-based centers numbered 215. From 1975, when their listing was published, to 1977 the number rose to 350. Given the size of the identified population and the fact that basic descriptive information was lacking and desired, the data collection method chosen was a survey questionnaire. The initial survey was one of two used in the sampling of the population and was conducted as part of a program funded by the U.S. Department of Education (DHEW) from 1976 to 1977 and 1978 to 1980. The second run of the survey occurred in 1978 under the auspices of the same grant-funded project. It is on the latter data that this study is based. Instrument development and sampling procedures regarding both are provided in the section which follows.

The purposes of the national survey were: 1) to contribute to the generation of a data base on this type of feminist organization and thus provide this and other researchers with information regarding these organizations; and 2) to provide information on the needs of these organizations which could be used in the design and development of a federally funded training program for women directing and staffing 'Women's Centers: Where Are They?', a report prepared by the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Washington, D.C., 1975 updates and expands a June 1974 listing informally distributed by the Project.

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.
these organizations.

Instrumentation

Four primary information sources were utilized to identify the particular topic areas to be addressed in the survey instrument:

1) Content analysis of letters to Everywoman's Center at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst from persons currently at other centers and programs for women or interested in establishing such an organization. Everywoman's Center received approximately 375 letters from institutions of higher education in the three years prior to the U.S. Department of Education's funding of the project. That correspondence included requests for assistance in areas such as: program development and planning, fiscal strategies, dealing with university administrators, how to start a women's center, administrative practices, creating hiring policies, etc.

2) A report entitled "Research Concerns of Women" which was produced by the Project on the Status and Education of Women.


4) The prior experience of the researcher and her co-director on the U.S. Department of Education grant as staff of a women's center. That combined experience reflected over five years of work as staff of Everywoman's Center, as well as extensive experience with other feminist groups and social justice and social change organizations.
The reports cited formed the identifiable written resources on this relatively new social phenomenon and type of organization. Thus, given the limited data available regarding these organizations, it was decided to try and obtain two types of information on the centers; descriptive data regarding their current characteristics and data which would document their perceived needs. Concerns or themes which emerged in reviewing the existing information from the four sources cited above are reflected in the topical focus of the objectives chosen. They were: level and sources of funding, staffing pattern, number and types of programs offered, client groups, organizational structure, organizational development issues and the relationship of the center to the higher education institution at which it was based. Specific objectives based on these issues were generated and are listed in Appendix A.

Criteria by which to screen the possible items developed for the survey instrument were then identified. The criteria were:

1) coverage of stated objectives (see Appendix A); 2) practical considerations of length, simplicity and interest; 3) balance between concreteness and generality; 4) clarity of wording and unbiased language; 5) easily codeable responses; and 6) psychological appeal.

Survey items were assembled, screened on the stated criteria by this author, the author's co-director for the project and the project evaluator and then shaped into a pilot survey form. The pilot instrument was circulated to Everywoman's Center staff for review and feedback regarding possible problems with the items themselves or the format in which they were presented. A second piloting of the initial instrument (Needs Survey I or NS I) to women's centers in the vicinity
of the university at which the research was being conducted (University of Massachusetts/Amherst) resulted in some minimal revisions, largely to do with clarity of wording and format. The survey development processes utilized were consistent with those described and recommended in Selltiz (1976) and Warwick and Lininger (1975). Following some item revisions and format changes based on reviewers' suggestions, the final NS I instrument was prepared for national distribution.

Sample and Procedure

The first questionnaire (NS I) was mailed to 386 centers, 21 surveys were returned as "undeliverable" bringing the total number of potential respondents to 348. Of these, a total of 131 or 34 percent were returned and provided usable data.

Based on the data collected through the Needs Survey I instrument and the resultant development of a week-long training program and its implementation with directors and staff from twenty-three (23) women's centers in 1976 and 1977, the Project was refunded by the U.S. Department of Education (DHEW) Women's Educational Equity Act Program in 1978 as the National Women's Centers Training Project and a second National Needs Survey (NS II) conducted in order to update the data base for the research component of the Project. The new data also provided program designers and trainers with more current information to assist them in identifying trends in responses within

---

3These centers were those at Smith College, Mt. Holyoke College, Hampshire College and Amherst College.
the different federal regions which could suggest modifications of the training program prior to, or during, its implementation nationally at the Project's regional training sites.

The survey instrument distributed in 1976 met the goals stated for the needs survey. Revision of the NS I instrument was minor. Changes were basically focused on format and style issues rather than content or item modification. It was also seen as desirable to change as few items as possible in order to provide comparative data on as many dimensions as possible. Both the NS I and NS II instruments are appended to this thesis.

In 1978 the NS II questionnaire was mailed to the then-known population of 479 campus-based women's centers. Ninety-nine (99) of the 479 surveys were returned in time to be included in the reporting of the data on which this study is based. Thus, the initial return rate was 21 percent. It should be noted that the mailing procedure used with NS II may have contributed to what appears to be a comparatively smaller return rate. Because of fiscal constraints, the 1978 surveys were sent via bulk mail. This meant that undeliverable surveys were not returned and thus the figure for centers actually receiving them could not be exactly determined or the population number adjusted. Moreover, sufficient duplication was later discovered when the listing was computerized to suggest that the real return rate may be higher than the 21 percent figure.

Data Analysis and Reporting

As was stated previously, this study is an exploratory and des-
criptive one. Its particular intent or focus was to determine what organizational problems are most prevalent for the feminist organizations being studied, what the structural characteristics or types of these organizations are and to explore possible relationships between the structural choices of these organizations and the nature and prevalence of problems experienced.

The responses of women's centers to the survey instrument used in the second National Needs Survey (NS II) form the data base for this study. The items of particular interest are those querying respondents about the problems experienced by their organizations, the type of formal structure and the formal decision-making arrangements in use. Data was generated and then analyzed in the following way:

a) in terms of the frequency distribution for each type of organizational problem (items 19 through 46 in the NS II survey instrument);
b) the responses of centers to questions regarding structure and decision-making were coded and centers then classified according to the categories in the typology created by the author (Figure 1, pages 36-37);
c) the frequency distribution of organizational problems for each category in the typology was tabulated; and d) additional descriptive data regarding the centers overall and by the categories in the typology was tabulated (i.e., size of budgets, etc.) and analyzed to provide a sense of the context in which the reported organizational problems were occurring.

Several points should be kept in mind by the reader. This work describes and discusses unique data from a self-selected sample or set of respondents, not a random sample. Further, by some standards that sample's size or the response rate makes it a weak one, so making
inferences regarding the population of women’s centers from this data should be done with caution. Statistical tests were used primarily to order the information and to assist the researcher in making some judgements regarding trends and focus for the discussion of results.

The reporting and analysis of the survey information was also informed and shaped by the author's participant-observer roles over the course of this study, making this primarily a qualitative rather than a quantitative study. Lofland's (1971) description of unknown and known observer status both apply as may be seen in the following characterizations of the types of involvement the author had with the organizations being studied. These involvements span the period from 1974 through 1981.

- Staff member at Everywoman's Center, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, for a two-year period; shared responsibility for general administrative and fiscal operation of the organization and fundraising.

- Co-Director and Co-Principal Investigator of USOE/DHEW grants supporting this research and in that capacity assisted in the development of the NS I instrument and supervised the revision of the NS II questionnaire.

- Co-designed and implemented the national model training program funded by the USOE grants; program was developed to address the identified needs of these feminist organizations. The author was directly involved in the first level of national dissemination and trained directors and/or staff of 70 campus-based women's centers in various parts of the country to conduct and continue the training.

- Co-authored manual entitled, *To Make a Difference: A Trainer's*
Guide for Working with Women's Centers, Feminist and Other Women's Organizations which was based on federally funded model training program created under the grants cited above.

- Seven years of experience consulting and providing technical assistance to women's centers, feminist and other alternatively structured and democratically managed organizations.

- Co-Designed and co-led the first National Conference on Women's Centers and Higher Education in 1979; funded by the U.S. Department of Education/DHEW.

Thus, the combination of a survey research technique which asked organizations to identify their own perceptions of their concerns and needs, as well as the experience of the author as staff of a number of feminist organizations, as consultant to a range of different campus and community-based feminist organizations and programs, and as trainer for staff and directors of over 70 women's centers nationally, provides several perspectives. Those were: quantifiable survey data from centers throughout the country and the varied personal experiences of the author with organizations being studied from internal as well as external vantage points. The following Chapter reports the results of the study and begins to elaborate a view of the circumstances of these organizations, which is extended in the Discussion section.
CHAPTER III
SURVEY RESULTS

The presentation and discussion of the survey results are arranged in the following manner. First, purposes of the study are reviewed and the specific research concerns to which the results relate are reiterated; second, the segments from the National Needs Survey (NSII) questionnaire on which the results are based are cited; third, descriptive data regarding the sample of organizations responding are provided; fourth, following this grounding of the data, the results are reported and commentary provided.

This study was undertaken with the following general purposes in mind: 1) to provide data on the dynamics and problems of feminist organizations, by nationally surveying one type--campus-based women's centers; and 2) to provide information which could assist both those working within, as well as with, such organizations in anticipating problem areas or at least in not viewing their experiences with such organizations as isolated phenomena. Data representing portions of the results of a National Needs Survey conducted in 1978 will be presented in order to address the following questions:

1) What organizational problems are experienced with the greatest frequency by the feminist organizations studied--campus-based women's centers?

2) What are the structural characteristics of campus-based women's centers?

3) Is there a relationship between certain types of structures
and the kind of organizational problems reported by the centers surveyed?

Part II of the survey instrument provided the following list of twenty-eight (28) organizational issues or problems these feminist organizations often experience. The items generated were based on a) participant-observer knowledge of this author and the project's co-director as staff and administrators of one such organization for a number of years; b) problems identified by participants in the piloting and initial implementation of a training program developed under an earlier phase of the grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Women's Educational Equity Act Program; and c) the results of the first National Needs Survey (NS I), conducted as part of the grant referenced in b.

Organizational Issues

- How to coordinate and divide the work
- Titles or status of positions within center
- Who is/who can be considered staff
- Commitment to the center as a whole vs. commitment to a single program
- Diversity or lack of it on the staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyles, economic status, etc.)
- Salaries—how much, who gets them, how these decisions are made
- Skills sharing
- Decision-making processes and responsibilities
- Structure of the center
- Tendency to overcommit time and energy
- Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy to the center
- Different personal allegiances (ie., community vs. college or university)
- Tension between needs of staff, program administration needs and needs of participation

- Methods for decision making
- Structure vs. structureless
- Integration of programs into mainstream of institution
- Fears of cooptation by institution
- Differences in amount and type of staff members' previous work experience

- Staff development
- Tendency for people to get "burned out" working at the center
- Defining, legitimizing and sharing leadership
- Staff members' differing personal expectations of center

(find new friends, develop professional skills)

- Clarifying the goals of the center
- Setting up accountability processes for staff members' work in center
- Determining central criteria for hiring volunteer or paid staff
- Dealing with termination/firing of staff members (paid or
volunteer)

- Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness, and/or skills and experience among staff

Demographic Characteristics

Part IV of the questionnaire sought data regarding various demographic characteristics of these organizations. For these purposes, the items of interest are those querying respondents about the structure and decision-making processes of their organizations (Questions 80 and 81, see Appendix C).

In order to contextualize results from these portions of the survey, some descriptive data on the population and on the organizations sampled is provided.

The National Needs Survey (NS II) was mailed to 479 centers throughout the country. At the time of this study, that was the known, identifiable population. Responses received in time for the data analysis totaled 99 or 21 percent initially. It should be noted that the comparatively small return rate may be explained in part by the mailing procedure used and by other circumstances of the organizations being studied. Fiscal constraints necessitated sending the surveys out by bulk-mail. Since that type of mailing does not provide for return of undeliverable surveys, it was impossible to adjust the N or the regional figures on centers actually receiving the survey. Further the marginal political and fiscal status of these organizations in the higher education institutions at which they are located has often meant a short lifespan for them.
While reports such as "Women's Centers: Where Are They?" (1975, 1978) document a growth in the size of the population of centers nationally, without a cross-referencing of lists from various reports, it is impossible to know whether the population sampled was one comprised of centers with some measure of longevity, one composed of relatively new organizations or what balance of either. Moreover, subsequent work on the mailing list for NS II revealed some duplication. Thus, the real return rate on which the reported results are based may actually be somewhat higher than the 21 percent.

Table 1 provides a sense of the geographical and regional distribution of the population and the sample obtained.

### Table 1

Regional Distribution of Population and Sample for Surveys Sent and Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL REGION</th>
<th>SURVEYS SENT (N = 479)</th>
<th>SURVEYS RETURNED (n = 99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England (Region I)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and New Jersey (Region II)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic States (Region III)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast (Region IV)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest (Region V)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (Region VI)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains States (Region VII)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mtn. States (Region VIII)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West and Hawaii (Region IX)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest and Alaska (Region X)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 provides an overview of the regional distribution of the population at the time of the study, of the self-selected sample which returned the questionnaire and of the return rate by region. Those organizations which responded and thus make up the sample can be further described and in so doing, a richer sense of the sample obtained. Such descriptive data follows.

Sample Characteristics

Two-thirds (66%) of those centers responding were located at public higher education institutions, while one-third (34%) were organizations based at private colleges or universities. There was a more even distribution to the sample in terms of the size of the institution at which the centers were located; thirty-six percent (36%) of the centers were at institutions with over 10,000 students, thirty-seven percent (37%) reported being at campuses with 4,000 to 10,000 students, while women's centers at colleges and universities with under 4,000 students accounted for twenty-seven percent (27%) of the sample. The majority of women’s centers were at urban campuses (54%), twenty-nine percent indicated they were based at campuses near an urban area (a suburban location), and rural areas were the location for eighteen percent. Of the centers comprising the sample, the overwhelming majority (90%) were at coeducational

---

Since the study was funded under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, federal regional breakdowns were chosen for the regional parameters.
colleges or universities, with only 10 percent being located at women's colleges. Table 2 summarizes these characteristics.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Campuses at which Centers Sampled Are Located
(n = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Characteristic</th>
<th>% of the Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institution</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institution</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large College/University (over 10,000)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Sized College/University (4,000 - 10,000)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small College/University (under 4,000)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a City</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near an Urban Area/Suburban</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational or Single Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational College/University</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's College</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample of centers responding to the survey seemed to heavily represent those which had been in existence for some time. While their average age was approximately five years, nearly 11 percent of these
organizations had been in existence for ten years or longer. The "grandmother" of the sample was a center established 22 years prior to the data collection in 1978.

Funding.

To further elaborate on the profile, the organizations responding offered on the average nine programs in 1978-79 and over half of them (56%) conducted that level of programming on budget allocations of less than $5,000 from campus sources. However, approximately 25 percent received $20,000 or more from their college or university. The median budget for the sample was $3,950. Table 3 more fully details the frequency distribution of the budgets for the centers forming the sample.

TABLE 3
Frequency Distribution of Centers' Budgets for 1978-79
(Campus-based Sources)
(n = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Centers Sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to $1,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $5,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $10,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $20,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $75,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $75,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some women's centers also received funds from non-campus sources, however, only 21 percent of the organizations indicated they had such revenues in 1978. When it existed, the median amount of these monies was approximately $10,000. Sources such as CETA, corporate foundations and federal grants (such as Department of Education's Women's Educational Equity Act Program) were the type of sources generally cited. It should be noted that while approximately a fifth of the centers did indicate access to non-campus funds, the overwhelming majority operate without such money and tend to have budgets in the amounts noted in Table 3.

**Staffing.**

Who conducts the average of nine programs these organizations offer with such levels of funding? Generally, the centers had a total of twelve staffwomen, only four of whom were paid for their work. Of those paid, only one tended to be a full-time employee. Table 4 provides more detail regarding the composition of staffs of the centers sampled.

Over three-fourths of the organizations (78%) indicated that they had at least one paid person working on staff, but it should be noted that only 45 percent of that number indicated that they had a full-time paid staff member. As Table 4 indicates, the majority of women working at campus-based women's centers in 1978-79 were doing so on a volunteer basis. These figures should also be read keeping in mind that one-third of the centers responding indicated that they did not currently have volunteers on the staff. However, of these same centers 27 out of
35 (77%) noted that they had used volunteers in the past.

**TABLE 4**

Average Number and Type of Staff Members
Working at Women's Centers
1978-79
(n = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>工作人员类型</th>
<th>平均人数</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>总工作人员</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>支付工作人员（总）</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>全职</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>非学生兼职</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>非学生兼职</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>志愿工作者（总）</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>学生</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>非学生</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An understanding of the nature of the fiscal and human resources available to these organizations is deepened when the responses to Question 74, "How many staff have worked at the center for more than one full year?", is added to the emerging profile of these organizations. Centers responding indicated that, on the average, approximately three people had been at their women's center for more than a full year: this is only 25 percent of the average size staff. Data presented later in this section may illuminate some of what may be the reason for this high staff turn-over and the impact that may have on these organizations.
Organizational Problems - Sample Overall

In seeking to understand how women's centers handle the political and fiscal marginality which tends to characterize their relationship to the institutions at which they are based, this study chose to focus on the structural choices made by these organizations and the organizational problems of these organizations. Data to assist in developing an understanding of some of the issues involved and their impact on these feminist organizations were provided in the segments of the survey which queried respondents about the organizational problems they experienced and the types of organizational structure by which the centers could be characterized.

As noted previously, the survey instrument listed 28 organizational issues with which women's centers might experience difficulty. Response options in the questionnaire (see Appendix C) for each of these issues were:

A) Has not come up because it is not a problem
B) Has never come up, but is a problem
C) Has come up but no satisfactory/lasting solution has been reached
D) Has come up and been resolved

The results reported in the following table (Table 5) represent those issues which centers overall indicated were problems and reflect a rank-ordering that combines responses to options B and C above: That is, issues which have never come up explicitly but are problems as well as those which have come up but for which no satisfactory solution has been reached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Issues</th>
<th>Percentage of Centers Which Experience It As A Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to overcommit time and energy</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of programs into the mainstream of institution</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency for people to get &quot;burned-out&quot; working at the center</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between the needs of staff, program administration needs, and needs of participants</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different personal allegiances (i.e., community vs. college or university)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fears of cooptation by institution</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining, legitimizing and sharing leadership</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness, skills and experience among staff</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to coordinate and divide work</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up accountability processes for hiring volunteer or paid staff</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How power is/should be distributed</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to center as a whole vs. commitment to a single program</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying the goals of the center</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity or lack of it on the staff (i.e., age, race, life-styles, economic status, etc.)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure vs. structurelessness</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
TABLE 5  
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff members' differing personal expectations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the center (find new friends, develop professional skills)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making processes and responsibilities</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for decision-making</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries--how much, who gets them, how these</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions are made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with termination/firing of staff members</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--paid or volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles or status of positions within center</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in amount and type of staff members'</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills sharing</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining central criteria for hiring volunteer</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or paid staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is/can be considered staff</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the occurrence of these organizational issues for women's centers in general, the question of what sort of organizational structures are in place within these organizations that might relate to the experiencing of such problems is the next set of results reported.

**Typology for Structure and Decision-Making**

In order to gather data on the nature of the organizational
structures and decision making approaches of the feminist organizations surveyed, respondents were asked in open-ended questions how their women's center was organized, how decisions were made at their center and who made them (question 80 and question 81 in survey instrument--see Appendix C). A typology was created based on patterns evidenced in the responses and the experience of the author with the range of structural and decision making arrangements which participants described in the "Organizational Issues" segment of the National Women's Centers Training Project (NWCTP).

The decision to create a typology, using the dimensions noted above and on Figure 1, rather than use an existing one was informed by a number of considerations. Litterer (1973) noted that there is no single 'correct' typology of organizations and further, that in selecting (or in this case creating) a typology the variable(s) chosen should be a set of important organizational variables and must lead to information or understanding important to the user. None of the existing typologies specifically addressed themselves to the two key dimensions of interest--nature of the formal structure and approach to decision making in a way which would have enabled a classification consistent with the types of feminist organizations being researched.

An integral element of the creation of these feminist organizations has been a conscious effort to address and challenge access to decision making and the interplay between formal organizational structures and access to opportunity, decision making and power. Thus, the typology reflects a combination of points on two continuua regarding degree of formal structure and degree of participation in decision making.
The responses to questions 80 and 81 for each center were coded and organizations assigned to one of the categories depicted by the typology in Figure 1. The percentage of the organizations so categorized in terms of structure and decision making for each of the models noted (A through F) is listed.

As Figure 1 indicates, the most frequent organizational type was a Consultative Hierarchy (Model B)—a structure which has a director who consults with an advisory group before making decisions, while the model occurring least often was E, in which there is no director and a sub-group makes all organizational and programmatic decisions. Since the least frequently occurring type of organization, Model E, was also representative of only 2 percent of the respondents, those cases have been excluded from the reporting of the results and discussion which follows.

The models that were most frequently reported and which account for over three-fourths of the centers could be described as clustering toward the middle of the continuua used in creating the typology.

While the coding of responses to the questions on organizational structure and decision making allowed placement of the organizations within the typology developed and enabled the author to determine the frequency of occurrence of the various models, it gives only a partial picture of these organizations. Also of interest was a determination of trends or patterns in the frequency distributions of the 28 organizational issues or problems (Part II of the survey instrument) both overall and by model. A further question was whether any of those problems occurred frequently enough so as to reach the .05 level of
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Question 80/STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
<th>Model D</th>
<th>Model E</th>
<th>Model F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td>CONSULTATIVE</td>
<td>MODIFIED</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY</td>
<td>HIERARCHY</td>
<td>HIERARCHY</td>
<td>HIERARCHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director who</td>
<td>Director who</td>
<td>Director or</td>
<td>Director in name</td>
<td>No director,</td>
<td>No director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes all</td>
<td>consults with an</td>
<td>Coordinator who</td>
<td>only--all staff</td>
<td>some sub-groups</td>
<td>--all mem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions</td>
<td>advisory board</td>
<td>makes some</td>
<td>members make all</td>
<td>make all</td>
<td>bers make all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding the</td>
<td>or admin. before</td>
<td>decisions but</td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td>organizational</td>
<td>decisions re-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization and</td>
<td>making decisions</td>
<td>decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>and program</td>
<td>garding or-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>also done by</td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td>ganization and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>different groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in center which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have autonomy/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>final decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 81/DECISION MAKING

CENTRALIZED ←→ SHARED ←→ DECENTRALIZED

(continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Centers</th>
<th>Model A CONVENTIONAL HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model B CONSULTATIVE HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model C MODIFIED HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model D COLLABORATIVE</th>
<th>Model E</th>
<th>Model F COLLECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
<th>Model D</th>
<th>Model E</th>
<th>Model F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significance.

The following section provides data on the occurrence of organizational issues by structural type and a summary of $X^2$ tests done for each organizational issue.

**Trends in Organizational Problems**

**by Organizational Type**

Those models which had the greatest overall reported frequencies of problems were Conventional Hierarchy (Model A) and Collective (Model F), with 50 percent or more of centers of each type citing 15 out of 28 items as problematic. This was in contrast to Consultative Hierarchy (Model B), the most frequently occurring organizational type, which was the type of center with the fewest items cited as problems by 50 percent or more of the centers (6 out of 28 items/issues). Modified Hierarchies (Model C) and Collaboratives (Model D) provided the mid-range with 9 out of 28 items and 12 out of 28 items respectively.

While these findings appeared interesting, $X^2$ tests of problems across types did not reveal significant differences in the number of problems across types.

**Levels of Significance for Organizational Problems**

For each of the organizational issues (items 19 through 46 on questionnaire in Appendix C), $X^2$ were computed. The following table (Table 6) details the findings of interest from that test of significance.
As can be seen, very few of the 28 organizational issues about which the women's centers were queried were significant at the .05 level. However, this is not basically an inferential study and, as the data analysis is largely descriptive, these data are reported less with the intent to encourage inference and more with an interest in providing full, descriptive data.

The following segment details the organizational problems by their frequency of occurrence for each model in the typology where 50 percent or more of the centers of a given type cited the item as a problem. Table 7 presents this data, specific to each type and ranks the frequency of occurrence for the problems listed. Table 8 then provides a different view of the data, presenting the responses in a format intended to facilitate comparison by type on each of the 28 organizational issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Organizational Issues Cited by 50% or More of Centers for Each Model, in Tier/Act - Rank Ordered within Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model A n=8 92/93</strong></td>
<td><strong>Model B n=25 222/93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33-Integration of Programs</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20-Staff. Devel.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32-Struct. Structureless</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31-Tension between needs</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31-Coordinating WA</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21-Titles/Status</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22-Disturb. of Power</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33-Commit. to Center v. Program</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29-Overcommit.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30-Guilt Feelings</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33-Dec. Making</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36-Fear of Comp.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#40-Leadership</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43-Accountability</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46-Dealing w/ Differences</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
15 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
6 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
9 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
12 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
10 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
5 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
8 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
7 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
10 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
14 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
11 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
16 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
18 of 28 Issues

# of Items
50% or more of Centers
20 of 28 Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Organizational Issue</th>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>How to coordinate &amp; divide the work</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Status or titles of positions within center</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Who is or can be considered staff</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>How power is or should be divided</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Commitment to center as whole vs. single program/project</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Diversity or lack of it regarding age, lifestyle, economic status, etc.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Salaries--how much, who gets, how decisions are made</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Skills sharing</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Organizational Issue</th>
<th>Model A CONVENTIONAL HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model B CONSULTATIVE HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model C MODIFIED HIERARCHY</th>
<th>Model D COLLABORATIVE</th>
<th>Model F COLLECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Decision making processes and responsibilities</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Structure of center</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tendency to overcommit time and energy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit allot of time and energy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Different personal allegiances (i.e., community vs. campus)</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tension between needs of staff, program administration, &amp; clients/participants</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Methods of decision making</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Structure vs. structurelessness</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Organizational Issue</th>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Integration of programs into mainstream of institution</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fears of cooptation by institution</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Differences in amount and type of staff members' previous work experience</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Tendency for people to get &quot;burned out&quot; working at center</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Defining, legitimizing and sharing leadership</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Staff members' different personal expectations of center (professional skills, new friends, etc.)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Clarifying goals of center</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Organizational Issue</th>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Setting up accountability processes for staff members' work</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Determining central criteria for hiring volunteers or paid staff</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Dealing with termination of staff-paid or volunteer</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness and/or skills &amp; expertise among staff</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% = 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rank among models 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [ ] item with $X^2$ at or under .05 level of significance
Thus far the percentage of centers reporting each organizational issue to be a problem has been detailed, the typology created to clarify centers described and presented, the trends in organizational problems by organizational type detailed and the results of $X^2$ tests done for each organizational problem reported. The following portion of the Results chapter provides in-depth, descriptive profiles of each of the types of women's centers which emerged when centers were classified using the typology, their particular organizational issues and other relevant data seen as impacting on their organizational circumstances.

Profiles by Model Type

To extend the understanding of the women's centers representative of each of the models, profiles were created to enable characterization of each type of center along a variety of dimensions. The following section provides descriptive profiles of the women's centers categorized under each type in terms of: organizational problems experienced by 50 percent or more of the centers of that type (Questions 19 through 46 in survey instrument--see Appendix C); responses to questions on organizing administrative tasks, having effective meetings and dealing with group conflict (Questions 16, 17 and 18); whether centers of that type get support for their programs and how they would characterize such support (Questions 49, 50 and 51); what would help organizations get the support they need (Question 52); also, what the respondents perceive as interfering with their women's centers' effective interaction with campus administrators (Question 54); changes in both the campus
and community environment which affect their organizations and whether they can keep up with them (Questions 56, 57, 58 and 59).

Details on programs offered by the women's centers are included to provide a view of the work of these organizations. Specifically, whether their effectiveness is reviewed regularly and if a regular procedure is used in decision making regarding program initiation, expansion, termination, etc. (Questions 60, 61 and 62).

Whether centers have their own space and if it is adequate for their needs (Questions 63 and 64); the nature of the clientele served by the organization (Questions 66 through 68); the level of funding for the organizations (Questions 77 and 78); and the type of college or university setting at which centers of a particular model tend to exist (Question 84) are also detailed to assist in further elaborating the view of these organizations.

The profiles of the organizational types will be presented in order of their frequency of occurrence, from most to least frequent. Where, and as seen appropriate, findings being reported will be commented on or elaborated on from the experience of the researcher with women's centers of that type.
Consultative Hierarchy--Model B

These are women's centers with structures which include a director who has programatic and organizational decision making authority, but who consults with an Advisory Board or administrator before making decisions. (Rank order #1, n=24 or 28% of centers responding).

Six out of a possible twenty-eight organizational issues were cited by 50% or more of these respondents as problematic, slightly lower than the average of seven for the sample overall. These are listed below in rank order and with the percentage of centers of this type which indicated the item was a concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question#/Problem</th>
<th>Rank among Problems Cited</th>
<th>% of Consultative Hierarchy Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Tendency to overcommit time and energy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Integration of programs into mainstream of institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Fears of cooptation by institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Tendency for people to get &quot;burned out&quot; working at center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy to center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Diversity or lack of it on the staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyle, economic status, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about whether their centers needed information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks, 71% of the centers
which were classified as a Consultative Hierarchy responded affirmatively. Seventy-four (74%) of those organizations said that having effective meetings (e.g., setting agendas, making decisions, completing tasks without alienating members, etc.) was a need for their center. Effective ways of dealing with group conflict was also an issue seen as problematic for 65 percent of the women's centers of this type.

Two-thirds (65.2%) of these organizations indicated they do get support from administrators on their campuses who have program and budget decision making authority or influence. Slightly over a fifth (21.7%) of the centers indicated that this question was not applicable to their situation as they got all of their funds through a student government or student association; this left only 13 percent of the centers who responded that either they got no administrative support or that the support they received was from administrators who were not in positions of program or budget decision making authority. Fifty-two percent of the organizations indicating that they received such support thought it could be characterized as recognition of the worth of their programs, 48 percent as helpful information; while 44 percent said they got advocacy for their programs, and 40 percent of the centers who got administrative support described it as making budget decisions in their favor. Table 9 compares the experiences reported by centers of this type with other models of centers.

When queried as to which of the items listed (see Question 52) might help them to get the support needed to develop and maintain their women's centers, of the nine possible types of support six
were noted by one-third or more of centers organized in this manner. They are found in Table 10 along with the percentage of centers overall which cited the item and the percentage of centers of other types.
TABLE 9

Administrative Support Received by Women's Centers
(n = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers which get support from administrators with program &amp; budget decision-making authority.</th>
<th>Conventional Hierarchy</th>
<th>Consultative Hierarchy</th>
<th>Modified Hierarchy</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Support Received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conventional Hierarchy</th>
<th>Consultative Hierarchy</th>
<th>Modified Hierarchy</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful information</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of worth of programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making budget decisions in your favor</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A-get no support from administrators with such authority.</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A-receive funds from student agencies.</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| n =                                                                 | 8                      | 24                     | 19                  | 22            | 13        |
| % =                                                               | 9%                     | 28%                    | 22%                 | 26%           | 14%       |
| rank =                                                           | 5                      | 1                      | 3                   | 2             | 4         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Information or Behavior</th>
<th>Conventional Hierarchy</th>
<th>Consultative Hierarchy</th>
<th>Modified Hierarchy</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for increasing support &amp; minimizing resistance to programs for women on college/university campus</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More skills in developing programs (from documenting needs to evaluating weaknesses)</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More knowledge of leadership issues in women's groups &amp; strategies for handling those needs</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the center to meet program goals</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the center to meet individual needs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving communication skills especially those related to situations where are dealing with people whose values, politics and rhetoric are different than your own.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating more on projects with faculty, students and administrators</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Information or Behavior</td>
<td>Conventional Hierarchy</td>
<td>Consultative Hierarchy</td>
<td>Modified Hierarchy</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in negotiating the college/university budget process</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on current political and administrative concerns on your campus</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 8  24  19  22  13  
Rank = 5  1  3  2  4  
% = 9%  28%  22%  26%  14%
Centers surveyed were also asked to indicate what interfered with their effective interaction with campus administrators who currently or potentially could support programs and budgets for their organizations. The most frequently cited of the response options provided (Question 54) were those related to factors external to their organization or personnel. The actual items and the percentage of the Consultative Hierarchies which saw the item as blocking their effective interaction are detailed in Table 11, along with the percentages for other structural types and the sample overall.

Several questions in the survey instrument asked respondents to indicate whether there had been changes on their campus or within the local women's or feminist community which had affected their organizations as well as whether their centers had been able to keep abreast of such changes. Slightly over half (54.4%) of these centers indicated that changes in the politics, policies, practices or finances of their campus had negatively affected them; such changes had positively impacted on 18.2 percent of these centers and 27.3 percent of the respondents said that no such changes had occurred. An overwhelming 95.7 percent of these centers indicated they had been able to stay on top of any such changes. While the same percentage of centers indicated there had been no changes in the feminist community which affected them (27.3%), positive impact of such changes was reported by 54.5 percent of the centers and slightly less than one-fifth (18.2%) said they were negatively affected by these same changes. Again, an overwhelming majority indicated they had kept current with such shifts (84%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>%22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>%22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>%26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>%28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II

Factors Blocking Organizational Effective Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\( n = 99 \))

Factors Related to Women's Centers as a Whole, etc.

- Goals, etc.
- Structure, etc.
- Interaction with administrators
- Interpersonal style, etc.

Factors Which Influence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Heretic</th>
<th>Heretic</th>
<th>Heretic</th>
<th>Heretic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic Courses</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Long Term Counseling</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rape Crisis Inter.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affirmative Action/</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support Groups Support Groups</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assertiveness Training</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traditional Women Programs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Re-entry &amp; Support Newsletter</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Short Term Counseling</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Speaker's Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reference Workshops</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Career Counseling or</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Percentage of Type of Offering

\[
(n = 99)
\]

Programs Offered by Women's Centers

TABLE 12
Question 60 in the survey asked respondents to indicate which of seventeen different programs their centers offered. For the twenty-four centers characterized as a Consultative Hierarchy, Table 12 reflects which percentage of these centers offer each type of programs, as well as the percentage of centers of all types.

The large majority of the centers (88%) indicated that they review the programs they offer on a regular basis (vs. 77% for sample as a whole); but only slightly less than half (40%) said they had a regular procedure and set of criteria for deciding when to end, expand, or initiate programs, a slightly higher percentage than the 32% for the sample overall.

Over three-quarters (83.3%) of these centers have their own space (vs. 92% in sample overall), but only 36% saw such space as adequate to their needs, in contrast to 41% of the centers responding.

Centers which fit this model (in terms of structure and decision making) saw on the average slightly over 3,800 clients a year and that figure ranks these centers first among the five types in the number of women who use their center. The average annual number of clients for centers overall was 2,362. For most of these centers undergraduate women, women in the community and university/college workers make up most of those who use the centers. Faculty and graduate students were less likely to be a large percentage of the clientele for whom services were provided. This is consistent with the overall pattern for centers and the nature of their clientele.

Generally, the staffs of these centers were diverse. Table 13 details the percentages of centers organized as a Conventional Hierarchy
which reported the presence of each type of woman on the staff, as well as comparative figures for the other organizational types and the sample overall.

Only half of the centers of this type had paid, non-student staff and when it existed the average number of such women was 2.5. Non-student volunteers were a source of womanpower for slightly less than half of these centers and on the average they numbered 7.5. The most frequently occurring type of staffer (for 87.5% of the centers) was a student paid via work-study monies or a stipend. The average number for an organization was two. Over half of this type of center relied heavily on student volunteers (an average of 11.5) to conduct their program activities.

The fiscal resources from campus sources generally available for centers which could be characterized as a Conventional Hierarchy would rank them third in size of budget among other types of centers. The average annual campus-based budget for these centers at the time of the study was $16,400. Most reported an average annual budget for the prior year of about $3,000 higher (or $19,400), but the average annual budget from campus sources for each of the three years prior to that averaged $17,000. Only slightly more than one-third (37.5%) of this type of center reported that they had sought funds from various campus sources, in contrast to 53% of the centers overall. Four of the twenty-four centers of this type indicated they had some non-campus funding when this research was done. The average amount of such funds for those four organizations was $22,400, that figure would rank centers of this type second among the other women's centers who had non-campus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Sample</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speaking</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Poor</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Recipients &amp; Blacks/Black Americans</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parents</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Women (over 40)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
<th>Percentage Having Group on Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Modelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Modelled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

\( n = 99 \)

Diversity of Staff for Various Organizational Models
sources of funds. More of the centers (7) reported having had funding from non-campus sources the previous year but during that period the average budget from such sources was $15,000.

The institutions at which women's centers of this type were based could be characterized as predominately public (71%), coed (88%), mostly urban (58%), both large (over 10,000 students) and medium sized (4,000 to 10,000 students) (42% each).

The second most frequently occurring type was what is represented in the typology in Figure 1 as Model D. A profile of the women's centers characterizing that type follows.

Collaborative--Model D

These are women's centers whose structure could be characterized as collaborative, having a director in name only in which all members make all decisions. (Rank order #2, n=22 or 26% of centers responding)

For centers representing this type, twelve of the twenty-eight organizational problems to which they were asked to respond were cited as problematic by 50% or more of the organizations. For the sample overall, the average number cited by centers was seven. Those responses are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question#/Problem</th>
<th>Rank among Problems Cited</th>
<th>% of Collaborative Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to overcommit time and energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency for people to get burned out</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32 Tension between needs of staff, program administration, and clients

35 Integration of programs into mainstream of institution

38 Staff development

19 How to coordinate and divide the work

30 Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy

40 Defining, legitimizing and sharing leadership

36 Fears of cooptation by the institution

41 Staff members different personal expectations of center (i.e., new friends, professional skills, etc.)

23 Commitment to center as a whole vs. to a single program

43 Setting up accountability processes for staff members' work

Questioning centers of this type as to whether they thought they needed information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks resulted in 59% responding 'yes.' Slightly over three-fourths (77%) indicated both that they needed help with having effective meetings (i.e., setting agendas, making decisions, completing tasks without alienating members, etc.) and with effective ways of dealing with group conflict.

Approximately two-thirds (65%) of the centers which fit this model said they do get support from campus administrators with budget
and programatic decision making authority or influence. Most frequently those centers characterized that assistance as coming in the form of helpful information (64%). Somewhat over half of the centers felt an element of their support was recognition of the worth of their programs (59%), as well as advocacy for programs (55%). Only 27% of the organizations of this type thought they got aid in the form of making budget decisions in their favor.

Question 52 in the survey instrument asked women's centers to indicate what of a number of possibilities might help them get the support they needed to develop and maintain their programs. Response options cited by one-third or more of the Model D centers are displayed in Table 9, along with the responses for the sample overall and proportion of centers of other types citing each factor.

Factors which influence their college/university as a whole and factors which related to administrators' attitudes, styles, skills or politics were both selected by 55% of these centers as interfering with their effective interaction with campus administrators who are or could be supportive of their organization's efforts. Factors which related to the liaison person's (s') effective relating to administrators were seen as hindrances by 27 percent of the centers, while 32 percent attributed support being blocked to factors which related to the center as a whole (i.e., politics, goals). Table 11 provides comparative data on these factors for the overall sample and other types of centers as well.

A total of 76 percent of these organizations thought there had been changes in their institutions' politics, policies, practices
or finances which had affected their center. The responses were evenly split (38% each) between those who saw such changes as positive ones and negative ones. Twenty-four percent of centers of this type felt no such changes had occurred. Two-thirds (67%) of the respondents said they were able to keep up with such changes on the campus. The same percent (67%) of the centers indicated they had been able to keep abreast with changes in the feminist community but those who thought changes in the women's community had affected the center totaled 63 percent--42 percent positively; 21 percent negatively. Thirty-seven percent of the centers cited no such change as having affected them.

The percent of centers of this type offering the various programs noted in the questionnaire is found in Table 12, along with comparative data on centers representing the other models.

Only slightly less than half of the centers (55%) indicated they reviewed their programs' effectiveness on a regular basis, compared to 75 percent for the sample overall. Thirty-three percent said they had a regular procedure or set of criteria to decide on terminating, expanding, or initiating a program; approximately the same proportion as of the overall sample (32%).

While 91 percent of these organizations said they had their own space, almost the same percentage as the sample overall (92%); 59 percent of them did not find it adequate for their centers' needs. That figure is higher than the 41 percent of the overall sample who indicated their space was insufficient for their centers' needs. Into their spaces came, on the average, 760 clients annually, placing centers fitting the Collaborative type fourth among the various
models in terms of how many women used their centers. The average number of clients for centers in the sample overall was 2,362 a year.

Overwhelmingly the largest portion of those clients tended to be undergraduate students, followed by women from the community with, on the average, about 30% of the clients being comprised of graduate students, faculty and university/college workers in about even proportions; a pattern consistent with that of the overall sample of centers.

For centers of this type, the staffs who conducted programs and provided services to these women were largely made up of students. Sixty-eight percent of the centers reported having student volunteers, with an average of 7 per organization. Sixty percent of the centers had student help paid for via work study monies. Only 36 percent or slightly more than one-third of the centers of this type had paid non-student help, and generally that totaled less than 1.5 persons per organization. The twenty-three percent of the responding centers who indicated they had non-student volunteers reported an average of 7.8 women.

Table 13 reflects the diversity of the staff of these centers along other dimensions, as well as providing a comparison to centers of other types. In comparison to centers overall, a somewhat higher proportion of these centers reported Native Americans, welfare recipients and other poor women and lesbians as part of their staff. Fewer centers of this kind indicated they had Black women on their staff than overall.

On the average money was scarce for centers of this type; suffi-
ciently scarce that they ranked fifth among the five models in terms of size of average budgets from campus sources. The average budget reported from such sources was $4,600; however, only 52% of these centers said they had sought funds from various campus sources. Only two women's centers of this type cited non-campus budget sources. Where such fiscal resources existed the average amount was $15,250.

Slightly less than two-thirds (64%) of these centers were at public higher education institutions; almost all were at coed campuses (91%). They were distributed among rural (23%), near urban (32%) and urban (45%) settings. While 55% were at colleges or universities of medium size (4,000 to 10,000 students), small institutions (under 4,000 students) housed 14% of the centers and large campuses (over 10,000 students) were the size institution at which 32% of the Model D women's centers existed.

Twenty-two percent of the respondents were centers characteristic of Model C in the typology (see Figure 1) and that percent served to rank this model third among five in its frequency of occurrence.

Modified Hierarchy--Model C

In these centers the director or coordinator makes some decisions but decision making is also done by different groups in the center which have autonomy/fiscal decision making authority regarding program decisions. (Rank order #3, n = 19 or 22% of the centers responding)

When asked to indicate which of a list of twenty-eight organizational issues they had experienced as problematic, nine issues were cited
as concerns by 50% or more of the organizations of this type. Details on those responses are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question#/Problem</th>
<th>Rank Among Problems Cited</th>
<th>% of Modified Hierarchy Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Tendency to overcommit time and energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Tendency for people to get burned out working at the center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Integration of programs into mainstream of institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Tension between needs of staff, program administration, and clients</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Setting up accountability processes for staff members' work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 How power is/should be distributed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Diversity or lack of it regarding age, lifestyle, economic status, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Different personal allegiances (i.e., community vs. college/university)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness, and/or skills and experience among staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-four percent of the centers of this type indicated that they needed information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks as well as effective ways of handling group conflict. An even higher percentage of these organizations (94%) reported that help having effective meetings (e.g., setting agendas, making decisions, completing tasks without alienating members, etc.) was needed.

Almost three-quarters (74%) of the centers said they did receive
support from administrators in positions of program and budget decision making influence and authority. For those indicating they did receive such support, 68% felt it came in the form of recognition of the worth of their programs, making budget decisions in their favor was cited by 63%, and 58% of those saying such support was received said it came as helpful information; the same percentage got advocacy for their programs. Table 9 compares their response to those of centers of the other models.

When presented with nine items which might help their centers get support they needed to develop and maintain their programs, five of those items were seen as a possible form of assistance for one-third or more of the respondents of this organizational type. The specific percentages are found in Table 10, along with comparative data about centers of other types.

The factors seen by the least number of centers (21%) as interfering with the centers' effective interaction with campus administrators were those relating to the liaison person (i.e., inexperience, personal style and attitudes). Those factors cited by the largest number of centers were ones related to administrators' attitudes, styles or politics (63%) and factors which influence their college/university as a whole (63%). Almost half (48%) of the centers reported seeing factors related to the center as a whole (i.e., politics, goals) as considerations which interfered with their organization's ability to be effective with campus administrators. Table 11 provides a view of the centers which were Modified Hierarchies on these dimensions in comparison to the other types of centers and the sample overall.
When questioned about changes in the campus environment (politics, practices or finances) which may have affected their women's centers, ninety-four percent of the organizations of this type responded "yes," that such changes had occurred; for 50% those shifts were negative, while 44% indicated the changes were positive. Overwhelmingly, the centers indicated they had been able to keep abreast of such changes (88%).

A somewhat lower percentage of the centers with this organizational type reported experiencing changes in the feminist community which had affected them (83%). In contrast to more of the changes on campuses being seen has having a negative effect on the centers, the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated changes in the women's community affecting their organization were positive (67%) and again the centers had been able to keep up with such changes (89%, yes).

Programs offered by centers of this type, with the percentage of centers indicating they offered each program are found in Table 12.

Overwhelmingly, centers indicated they review the effectiveness of their programs on a regular basis (89%), but only 22% said that review involved a regular procedure and set of criteria for deciding when to end, expand or initiate programs. This was a higher percentage than the overall sample on the first dimension (75%), but lower than overall (32%) on the second dimension.

One hundred percent of the centers said they had space of their own in which to conduct these programs, higher than for the overall sample where the figure was 92 percent. However, 72% of those organi-
izations indicated that the setting in which they operated was inadequate for their needs; almost double the percentage in the overall sample, 41%.

On the average, the centers each provide avenues for programs, services, referrals, etc., for 3,775 women a year. Such a level of use would rank them second among the five types of women's centers. A ranking of the types of women comprising their clients would place undergraduate students as the most frequent users of centers of this type, followed by women from the community, graduate students, college/university workers and then faculty, in that order.

The staffs providing services tend to be diverse for most centers of this type. Sixty-seven percent have both single parents and lesbians represented; sixty percent reported both Black/Afro-American women and women over 40; Spanish surnamed/Spanish speaking women work at 27% of the centers; one fifth of the centers have welfare and other poor women on the staff and seven percent of the women's centers have Asian-American and Native American women staff. Table 13 displays this information comparative to similar data on centers of other types and the sample overall.

The kind of staff women cited by the largest percent of centers (79%) were students paid via work-study monies or stipends; on the average the centers had four such staff. The least likely type of staff person for these centers were students paid by center staff salaries; only 32% of this type of center had such staff and it was only one to two women where it occurred. Students who received credit for their work or were volunteers were both present for approximately
half of the centers; when student volunteers existed the average number reported was nine while the mean number of students working at the centers for credit was three. Only slightly over half (55%) of the centers had paid non-student staff and the average number reported was three. For 42 percent of the centers non-student volunteers are an important human resource, with the average number for these centers being eight.

Centers with this type of structural and decision-making arrangements had the largest average annual budget from campus sources. It is of note that this ranking obtains for the centers which were Modified Hierarchies for every year of the five for which data was sought; that is, this model of center consistently ranks first in size of budget obtained from campus sources. The mean budget for these centers in 1978-79 was $54,200. These funds represented single campus source funding for slightly over two-fifths of the organizations (41%), while 59 percent of the centers indicated they had sought funds from various campus sources. In the year this study was conducted, 47 percent of these centers reported funding from non-campus sources; for these the average amount was $35,000. This places centers of this type first among the five types in regard to frequency of such funding.

Almost three-fourths of these centers were at public higher education institutions (74%); overwhelmingly coed (84%); and most frequently in a city (74%). Large colleges/universities (over 10,000 students) were the setting for 58% of these centers, while 26% of the organizations were located in small schools (under 4,000 students)
and 16 percent at medium size institutions (4,000 to 10,000 students).

Collective -- Model F

These are women's centers which could be characterized as a non-hierarchy or a collective and are organizations having no director or coordinator and in which all members make all decisions regarding the center and its programs and/or services. (Rank #4, n = 13 or 14% of the centers responding)

Organizations of this type could be characterized as having the most problematic profile in terms of organizational issues. Of the twenty-eight possible items to which centers were asked to respond, 50% or more of the centers of this type report having fifteen of the twenty-eight problems. These organizational issues are rank ordered below, with the percentage of the women's centers of this type experiencing each also noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question#/Problem</th>
<th>Rank Among Problems Cited</th>
<th>% of Collectives Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Diversity or lack of it on staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyle, economic status, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Integration of programs into mainstream of institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Tendency for people to get burned out working at center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Different personal allegiances (i.e., community vs. college or university)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to center as a whole vs. single program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the centers which fit this model, only 58% indicated that information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks was a need and of those 50% felt they had the resources to meet the need.

A very high percentage (92%) of the Collectively organized centers said that having effective meetings was a need for their organization and of those 83% felt their women's center had the resources to respond to the need. When queried specifically about whether they had effective ways of dealing with group conflict, again 92% of those centers replied that they needed help with that issue and of those 75% felt they had the resources to respond to that need.

For centers of this type, one-third indicated they did receive
support from administrators on their campuses who had program and budget decision making authority or influence; 25% indicated they did not get that type of support and slightly over two-fifths (42%) indicated the question was not germane to their circumstances, that they received all of their funds through the student government association. Table 9 provides a view of centers of this model in comparison to other types on these dimensions.

For a third of the centers which responded that they got such support, all indicated that it was characterized by helpful information, advocacy for programs, recognition of the worth of the programs and making budget decisions in their favor.

Centers were asked which of nine items might assist them in getting the support they need to develop and maintain their programs (Question 52). Seven of these items were identified by one-third or more of the organizations of this type. These are listed in Table 10.

When asked about what interferes with the effective interaction with administrators who might support their programs and budgets, three of four factors were each cited by 50% of the centers of this type. There were factors which related to the center as a whole (i.e., politics, goals, etc.), to the administrators' attitudes, styles, skills or politics and those which influenced their college/university as a whole. No centers identified factors related to liaison person's (s') interaction with administrators (i.e., inexperience, personal style, and attitudes) as barriers to their effective interaction with administrators. These responses, in comparison
to those of other types of centers are displayed in Table 11.

Seventy percent of the centers of this type saw changes in the politics, policies, practices or finances of their campus as having affected them; 60% negatively and 10% positively. When questioned as to whether they had been able to keep up with such shifts, 75% replied 'yes.' A slightly smaller percentage (60%) of the centers said changes in the feminist community had impacted on their organizations; they were evenly split, 30% positive and 30% negative, as to the nature of such changes. Two-thirds of the centers had been able to keep up with these changes.

Programs offered by centers of this type and the percentage of the organizations replying that they offered each type is detailed in Table 12.

None of the centers of this type offered academic courses. Only slightly more than half of these centers (58%) said they reviewed the effectiveness of these programs on a regular basis; compared to 75% in the sample overall. However, only 8% said they had any regular procedure or set of criteria to do so, while 32% of the centers in the overall sample reported having an explicit procedure.

All of the collectively organized centers have their own space and for almost two-thirds (64%) it was reported to be adequate for their needs. The 36% for whom their space was inadequate was only slightly less than the 41% of the centers overall.

The centers with this type of structure and decision making saw the fewest average annual number of clients (338) and this ranked them fifth in this regard among the various models in the typology.
The overwhelming majority of these clients were undergraduate students, followed second by women of the community. Faculty, graduate students and university/college workers were the least represented in the clients of these organizations.

These centers are largely student staffed, with student volunteers being the most frequent type of student staff person. Slightly less than one-third of this type of center had students paid for their work via work-study monies or stipends and when they had such help, the average number was three to four. Two of the thirteen centers of this type reported having salaried student and non-student staff; for these organizations that averaged six students and one paid non-student. Approximately a third had non-student volunteers, generally about five.

On a number of dimensions, staffs of centers which were Collectives departed from the overall sample of centers. Approximately half the percentage of centers as in the overall sample (30% vs. 57%) had women over 40 on their staff. Double the percentage of Collectives compared to centers overall (80% vs. 39%) indicated there were lesbian staff members. Somewhat fewer of the centers of this type reported single parents on the staff. A higher percentage of the Collectives had staff members who were Black or who were Spanish speaking/ Spanish surnamed or Native American than centers did on the average. That higher percentage for Collectives than centers in general also was true regarding welfare and other poor women. Table 13 gives a view of such staff diversity in comparison to other types of centers and the sample overall.
This type of center ranked fourth among the five models in the size of its budget from campus sources, with the average budget being $5,800. Forty-two percent indicated they had sought funds from various campus sources. Two out of thirteen of these reported non-campus funding, but again in a small amount; on the average $800, ranking them fifth out of the five models in this regard.

More of these centers are located at private than public institutions of higher education (58% vs. 42%). All are at coed campuses. Half of those campuses are small (under 4,000 students), 33% are of medium size, and 17% at larger colleges or universities of over 10,000 students. Generally they are located in a city (50%), some (33%) near an urban area and the least frequent setting for centers of this type was a rural one.

**Conventional Hierarchy--Model A**

These are women's centers which are structured hierarchically with a director who makes all of the decisions. (Rank order #5, n = 8, 9% of centers responding)

These centers were another type of the five where a large number of the twenty-eight organizational issues was cited as problems by half or more of the centers of this type. The problems, the percentage of centers citing them, and the rank of that issue among problems for those with this model follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #/Problem</th>
<th>Rank Among Problems Cited</th>
<th>% of Conventional Hierarchy Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of programs into mainstream of institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between different needs of staff, program administration, needs of clients/participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure vs. structurelessness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to coordinate and divide work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status or title of positions within center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How power is/should be distributed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to center as a whole vs. a single program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to overcommit time and energy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of decision making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fears of cooptation by institution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining, legitimizing, and sharing leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up accountability procedures for staff members' work at center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness and/or skills or expertise among staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-five percent of the respondents with this type of organi-
zational structure indicated that information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks was a need for their center. Of these, 71.4% indicated they did not have the resources to meet this need and could use some help, while a smaller percentage of respondents (14.3%) indicated they had met the need or that it did not apply.

Eighty-seven and a half percent of respondents indicated they needed help with having effective meetings (e.g., setting agendas, making decisions, completing tasks without alienating members, etc.). However, 42.9% said they had the resources to meet the need and had done so. Fourteen percent indicated they had the resources to meet the need but it remained unmet for other reasons. Twenty-eight and a half percent of the respondents indicated they did not have the resources to meet the need. Fourteen percent felt that the issue did not apply to them or their situation.

Dealing with group conflict in effective ways was a need for 62.5% of the respondents with this type of organizational structure. None of the respondents felt they had the resources to meet this need and had met it, but 14.3% of centers of this type indicated they thought they had the resources to address this need. Forty-three percent of the respondents of this type felt they did not have the resources to meet those needs and could use some help. The remaining 42.9% of these centers felt that the question regarding whether they had the resources to meet this need did not apply for them.

When asked if they got support from administrators on their
campuses who have program and budget decision making authority, slightly over half (57.1%) indicated they did, while 28.6% said that the administrators from whom they get support are not in such positions. Approximately fifteen percent (14.3%) noted that the question was not applicable for their situation because they got their funds from student government.

For those who indicated they got such administrative support, 75% would characterize it as coming in the form of both "advocacy for their programs" and "recognition of the worth of their programs." Making budget decisions in their favor and providing helpful information were each cited by 50% of the respondents as types of assistance they received. Table 9 details this information for centers of this type as well as others.

When asked which of the items listed in Table 10 might help them to get the support they need to develop and maintain their programs, eight of the nine items were cited by one-third or more of the organizations of this type.

Eighty-five and a half percent of the respondents indicated that factors which influence their college/university as a whole interfered with their effective interaction with campus administrators who currently or potentially could support programs and budgets for their centers. Factors related to administrators' attitudes, styles, skills or politics and factors related to the center as a whole (i.e., politics and goals) were each seen by 37.5% of the centers as interfering with the type of interactions cited above, while 25% of those responding saw factors related to their liaison person's
interaction with administrators (i.e., inexperience, personal style and attitudes) as a barrier. Table 11 displays the responses of centers of this type in comparison to other centers and the sample overall.

When questioned as to whether there had been changes in the policies, politics, practices or finances of their campus which affected their center, 62.5% of the centers said yes there had been such changes, but for only 25% had they been negative ones. Respondents were equally divided as to whether they found themselves able to keep abreast of changes at their campuses which could affect their organization.

A somewhat higher percentage (75%) responded yes when asked if there had been changes in the feminist community which had affected their center, but the percentage reporting those changes to have negatively affected them was the same (75%). The remaining 25% of the centers did not feel there had been changes in the women's community which affected them. A higher percentage of respondents indicated they were able to keep current of changes in that community (85.7%) than with the similar question regarding the campus.

Table 12 provides data on the percentage of Conventional Hierarchy model centers offering each type of program, as well as comparative information on centers of other types and the sample overall.

Sixty-two and a half percent of the centers indicated they review the effectiveness of their programs on a regular basis; slightly less than the percentage of the overall sample, 75%. The 37.5% who said they have a regular procedure and set of criteria for deciding
when to end, expand or initiate programs represent a somewhat higher figure than the 32% of the sample overall.

The overwhelming majority (75%) of centers of this type have their own space, but this was almost one-fifth less than the percentage of centers overall, 92%. Only slightly more than a quarter (28.6%) of these who have their own space felt it was adequate to their organization's needs, in comparison to 41% of the centers overall.

An average of 1,228 women per year used the centers which could be classified as Conventional Hierarchies. This is in contrast to an overall average of 2,362 per year for centers responding, irrespective of model. This level of use ranks centers with the Conventional Hierarchical structure third of the five types. For these centers overall, the largest percent of their clients were reported to be women in the community, followed closely by undergraduate students. This is the reverse of the frequency of use for these two groups. For other centers, undergraduate women were the most frequent clients. Least frequent users are graduate students, faculty and university/college workers.

Most frequently, these centers are staffed by students paid via work-study monies (one to two staffers) or paid non-students. About one-third of the centers have student or non-student volunteers. Average figures were high for this type of staffer--nine as an average for student and thirty-seven as a mean number of non-student volunteers.

The extent of diversity to their staff reported by centers of this type varied considerably from the pattern of women's centers in general on a number of dimensions. One area was that none of
centers which fit the Conventional Hierarchy model reported having lesbians, Native Americans or Asian-Americans on their staff. Hispanic women were found on the staff of approximately the same proportion of centers of this type as for centers overall. More of these centers reported Black women as staff than was the general pattern. One of the most striking departures from the figures for centers overall is reflected in the percentage of centers which were Conventional Hierarchies having women over forty on their staff (83% vs. 57% overall). Also a lower percentage of these centers had single parents on the staff than centers in general. Table 13 displays the specific percentages for these centers in comparison to the same data for other types of centers.

These centers ranked second among the five types in the size of their on-campus budgets. The latter averaged $17,300 a year. Only one-fourth of them had sought such money from various campus sources. Only one women's center of this type had non-campus funding, which placed it in a fourth rank among the types.

Slightly over one-third were located at private colleges, with approximately 62% at public institutions; more frequently those schools were coed (88%). Half of the schools were ones with less than 4,000 students, with medium sized schools being the next most frequent setting (38%) and campuses with over 10,000 students being the location for the smallest percentage (13%). Fifty percent were in a city and rural or suburban areas were each the locale for a fourth of Model A centers.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

This study has explored and described both the reported organizational problems and structural choices of a sample of feminist organization—women's centers. In so doing it sought to provide previously unavailable data on a unique type of feminist social change organization. As outgrowths of the broader civil rights and social justice struggles of the 1960s and 1970s, but more directly the second wave of feminist activity in this country, these organizations were created and staffed solely by women to meet their own and other women's needs. The choice to focus solely on sexism and the empowerment of women distinguished them from a variety of other social change and participatory organizations of that era. Those choices reflected a felt lack of inclusion or consideration of women's needs in the purposes and functioning of other political organizations, yet also carried with them a key dimension of the circumstances of women in this society—marginality—institutional, political and economic in its forms.

It is in the context of such marginality and disenfranchisement—both individual and organizational—that the women's centers studied must be understood. Having previously described some of that marginality and the way in which it forms, a critical aspect of the organizational reality for women's centers, the following section begins the discussion of significant organizational problems they report experiencing. It is followed by commentary on some of the situations of each type of center studied. In understanding the choices made regarding structure
and decision making and the centers described for each type, the reader is cautioned against any inclinations to single out a particular type of model as most effective. Some of that caution should be a function of recalling that the sample reported on is a self-selected one and can not be assumed to be representative. Similar hesitancy should flow out of an appreciation of the circumstances of these organizations. Each model of center described previously and discussed here reflects a particular adaptive combination of compromise. As such, each is a "type" which can be seen as one effort to combine, integrate and adapt to: particular institutional environments; certain selected social change goals; options perceived and efforts made regarding the distribution or sharing of power; various staffing patterns; multiple programming efforts; and the political, institutional and economic marginality of women and their organizations.

Thus, these organizations are discussed with the desire to further our understanding of choices perceived and made by the women staffing them under a variety of circumstances, not with the intent of deeming any particular type or model more or less effective or as reflective of correct choices.

After discussion of each type of center and its problems, a more general discussion of trends in the problems reported by these feminist organizations is provided, then closure brought to this section by focussing on the strengths and importance of these organizations.
Significant Organizational Issues: An Open Systems View

The three items which revealed the strongest differences between structural types ($X^2$ significant at or beyond $p = .05$) were diversity or lack of it on the staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyles, economic status, etc.), Item #24; staff members' differing personal expectations of the center (find new friends, develop professional skills), Item #41; and who is or should be staff, Item #21.

That who is or who should be staff of the women's centers studied showed a significant difference between structural types gives us a direction for further inquiry and speculation. Data generated by the survey questionnaire has not made clear around what points of difference discussions or debates over staffing of these organizations may revolve (e.g., interpretations of commitment to feminism noted by Wooley (1980), student vs. professional staff, "match" of staff to client population served, the diversities listed in Table 12 of the Results section or any combination of these and other factors). Further, that the boundaries for these organizations regarding "membership" or staff status are problematic could also be seen as having implications for their functioning. Some possible implications may become clearer if these organizations are seen through open systems theory and some of its applications to organizational problems.

Open systems theory assumes each unit is both a system in its own right, containing subsystems within it and a subsystem within a larger suprasystem. Interdependence among parts and among attributes of parts is seen as characteristic of all open systems and the condition
of systems boundaries is therefore seen as influencing other system properties (Miller 1978). In applying some of the tenets of open systems theory, Alderfer (1979) noted that open systems depend on transactions with their environment; therefore, there is an 'optimal' degree of boundary permeability for each system and to its organization-environment interactions or exchanges and relationships.

For organizations such as women's centers which are politically and economically marginal, and thus somewhat "at-risk" in the environments in which they exist, defining and managing organizational boundaries and handling boundary spanning relationships and activity could be viewed as vital to the existence and possibly the effectiveness of these organizations (Leifer 1976). If these organizations identify who is or who should be staff as a significant problem and if such uncertainty should extend to "boundary-spanning" or who handles the relationships of the center with the larger environment, one price of such lack of clarity may be a lack of support for the centers' programs.

Another of the organizational issues showing strong differences between type of centers (diversity or lack of it on the staff) may add a more specific flavor to the conflicts involved in who is or should be considered staff for these organizations. Given the data reported in Table 12 in the Results section, it would seem that diversity, rather than lack of it, may be the nexus around which the struggles occur. Such diversity implies a pluralistic nature to the staff of these organizations and further suggests potentially competing or conflicting views and styles among such staff.
Both of these problems would seem to hold the potential for engaging, if not knotting up, sizeable portions of the human energy available to these organizations in internal struggles among a generally un- or under-paid staff, already self-described as having a tendency to overcommit time and energy.

The third organizational issue noted revealing significant differences between structural types--staff members' differing personal expectations of the center (find new friends, develop professional skills)--would also seem to be one which could engage considerable energy in overt or covert conflicts among staff. Alderfer (1979) notes that conflict may be seen as inevitable in a system complex enough to have several well-defined groups. He distinguishes, but includes, both task and identity groups in that regard: **task groups** are those defined by the kind of work they perform and by the level of the hierarchy (or portion of the organization) in which they are located; **identity groups** are those affiliations which help an individual shape their personal identity (e.g., gender groups, ethnic/racial groups, generational groups and others proscribing life before entering the organization). The range of programming and likely clustering of tasks, as well as the diversity of staff and likely identity groups for centers of all types would suggest that the conflict referred to by Alderfer would probably be present for many of these organizations.

Thus, a number of organizational problems experienced by the women's centers were significant in that they showed strong differences among the various types of these organizations. Further, some problems also occurred with sufficient frequency as to be considered significant.
These were: the tendency for staff to overcommit time and energy; the integration of programs into the mainstream of the institution; who is or should be staff; diversity or lack of it on staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyles, economic status, etc.); and staff members' differing personal expectations of the center (find new friends, develop professional skills).

It is unclear exactly what the impact might be on the marginal political or economic status, the success or effectiveness of the centers' programs or the attainment of their external social change goals should the organizations studied be able to effectively address the issues cited above. Though it would seem worth noting that the majority of these problems are ones over which the centers themselves are likely to have some measure of control and thus on which they have the potential for impacting.

Having described and discussed the trends to the significant organizational problems experienced by the women's centers, elaboration and comparison across models of some of the problems of the centers and other characteristics of each type follows. Also included in that portion of the Discussion section are some speculations regarding what the "trade-offs"; "costs" or adaptations may be for the particular choices made or circumstances experienced by women's centers of each type.

Consultative Hierarchy Model of Women's Centers

The Consultative Hierarchy centers reported the smallest number
of overall problems; only six of a possible twenty-eight were cited by 50 percent or more of centers of this type. None of the six problems were totally unique to centers of this type and two of those six were problems cited by 50 percent or more of centers of all types. Almost uniformly when a problem was reported by 50 percent or more of the centers of this type, the percentages tended to cluster near the 50 percent mark. The one dramatic departure from that tendency in the data was that 80 percent of the Consultative Hierarchies reported that Item #29--a tendency to overcommit time and energy--was a problem. Further, that problem was one of only two cited by 50 percent or more of each type of center and the 80 percent figure for the Consultative Hierarchies is the highest proportion reported by centers of any type.

The problems cited by the largest percentages of centers of this type also seemed to "cluster" in some ways. While no specific correlations were done in the data analysis, it is interesting to note that out of the six problems, three relate to the balance of attention or lack of it paid to the needs of individual staffwomen, the organization and the clients (the tendency to overcommitment of time and energy, tendency to feel guilty for not committing a lot of time and energy and the tendency to get burned out). However, Item #32, which specifically addressed this balance or tension was not one of the organizational problems cited by 50 percent or more of these centers. That absence is even more curious when one notes that it was only for centers classified as Consultative Hierarchies that the tension among needs of staff, programs and clients was not an issue with that frequency of occurrence.

These centers' choices of a structure which has a director who
exercises both organizational and programmatic decision making authority and responsibility, but who consults with a board or administrator would not seem to be able to account for the overcommitment and burnout problems noted. Additionally, problems which one might expect to also occur with a similar frequency did not. For example, if these centers had reported difficulty with problems such as dividing and coordinating work, the distribution of power, structure vs. structurelessness, differences in the amount and type of staff members' previous work experience, varied personal expectations, etc., with a similar frequency, one might have a fuller sense of problems which could be contributing to the overcommitment and burnout. That was not the case.

A fuller understanding of the organizational problems experienced by centers fitting this structural and decision making type may require elaboration of other characteristics and circumstances of women's centers such as this. One likely place to seek data to further that understanding may be the information regarding the nature of and levels of support for the programs conducted by these centers.

Consultative Hierarchies fairly closely resembled the sample overall in the frequency with which they offered any given type of program. Some departures to that pattern were the following: 1) that a higher percentage of this type of women's center reported doing referrals (legal, medical, social service, etc.) than the average (84% vs. 67%) and in fact, centers of this kind had the largest percentage of any type doing such work; 2) this was the only type of center where none of the respondents indicated they offered assertiveness training; and 3) these centers had the highest percentage of any doing affirmative
action/discrimination advocacy work within their college or university.

Approximately two-thirds of these centers reported receiving support from administrators with fiscal decision making authority; however, their average size campus-based budgets ($16,400) would provide only minimal support for the large average number of clients (3,800) they served annually. Only 16 percent of the Consultative Hierarchy women's centers reported also having non-campus funds to support their activities.

Not only were the fiscal resources available to these centers minimal, but further, only 50 percent of these centers had paid non-student staff with an average number of 2.5 women and 87.5 percent reported paid workstudy students with an average number of two.

What begins to emerge when these circumstances of the Consultative Hierarchy women's centers are considered is a picture of a type of center with their reported organizational problems clustered around issues of overcommitment and burn out, serving large numbers of clients on minimal fiscal and human resources. What was also interesting is that centers such as these, structured with consultative relationships to an advisory board or administrator, had a rather low percentage of their numbers which reported receiving administrative support. In fact, of the four types of support about which centers were queried, centers structured this way generally had the lowest or next to the lowest proportion receiving such assistance. Table 7 elaborates the detail on this.

Thus, while structurally they may have the mechanism, through an advisory board or consultative relationship with a college or university administrator, which hypothetically could help get them the fiscal
support to ease some of the stress related to overcommitment and burn out given the workload, the reported low levels of budget and administrative support would suggest further problems.

Collaborative Model of Women's Centers

Centers classified as Collaboratives were the second most frequently occurring type and also ranked second in the number of problems cited by 50 percent or more of these centers. Twelve out of the twenty-eight organizational issues about which centers were queried were problems for half or more of the centers organized as Collaboratives.

Of those twelve problems, one was a problem reported by 70 percent or more of these centers, and four were difficulties for 60 percent or more. None of the problems experienced and reported were unique to this type of women's center. The most frequently reported problem, Item #29—the tendency to overcommit time and energy—was a problem with a similar frequency of occurrence among all but one of the other types of women's centers.

As with the predominant type of centers—Consultative Hierarchy—the problems reported by women's centers which were Collaboratives seemed to form a certain constellation or "cluster." As noted previously, though no specific statistical tests for correlation between or among items was done in the data analysis for this study, there were some interesting patterns to the problems cited with the greatest frequency for centers of this kind.

Again problems related to the amount of energy committed to the
work of the organization seem paramount; overcommitment of time and energy (#29) and the tendency for staff to get burned out working at the center (#39) were the most often reported problems by these centers. One might also assume these problems could be exacerbated by or related to the guilt feelings (#30) on the part of staff for not committing enough time and energy and their fear of cooptation by the institution (#36), also cited by approximately three-fifths of these organizations.

Another set of related but also somewhat different issues was represented in problems having to do with how staffs of centers deal among themselves and relate their efforts to other activities or programs within the institution. Issues of leadership (#40), differing personal expectations of the center by staff members (#41), how to divide and coordinate the work (#19), staff development (#38) and the integration of center programs into the mainstream of the institution (#35) were all reported to be problems for approximately 60 percent of the women's centers.

Here some of what may be contributing to problems of overcommitment and burn-out of staff may be easier to speculate on than with the Consultative Hierarchies described previously. Data on the Collaboratives' problems provides evidence of the kinds of problems that one might expect to relate to such difficulties. The differing expectations of staff, the tensions cited between the needs of staff, the organization and clients, the problems reported around issues of leadership, the guilt feelings for not being able to commit enough time and energy and the difficulties around how to divide and coordinate the work all contribute to a picture of organizations and women whose energies could
be exhaustively spent trying to keep themselves and their programs functioning, yet never feeling like they're doing enough. Further, these particular centers were those characterized as having a low degree of formal structure and a director in name only, where all staff members made all decisions, making it more understandable how difficult untangling a web of problems such as those listed might be.

Without someone with the formal position, authority and responsibility to make decisions or intervene, the delicate balances involved in allocating and coordinating resources to get the needs of clients, the work of the organization and the needs of individuals met would be difficult to maintain even under optimal conditions of adequate fiscal and human resources.

An even more detailed view of the complexity of such a task for centers of this type and the nature of the conditions under which they were operating can be obtained by reviewing and discussing their activities and resources.

Collaboratives followed the pattern and frequency of the overall sample in the programs these centers generally offered. When there were departures from the general trends regarding a given type of program, the tendency more often was for a lower proportion of the centers of this kind to offer the program than was the case generally. For instance, fewer Collaborative centers offered the following programs: career counseling or workshops (55% vs. 67% overall); referrals—legal, medical, social service, crisis, etc. (55% vs. 67%); workshops (46% vs. 63%); short-term counseling (46% vs. 62%); re-entry and support programs for non-traditional women students (46% vs. 56%); and affirmative action/
discrimination advocacy (37% vs. 46%). For both workshops and short-term counseling, this was the lowest percentage of centers of any type.

However, in some cases the situation was reversed and more women's centers of this type offered a given kind of program than centers on the average. More collaboratively organized centers had speakers' services (77% vs. 67%), and the percentage of these centers offering academic courses was considerably higher than was generally the case (41% vs. 24%) and, in fact, the second highest of all the types.

While centers of this kind certainly offered a similar range of programs as centers of other types and fairly closely resembled the overall sample in the frequency with which centers made a given program available, they did so on budgets from campus sources that were, on the average, the lowest of any of the kinds of women's centers in the sample--$4,600 annually.

The average number of clients for centers of this kind was the second lowest for centers of all kinds (760 on the average, annually). However, a review of some of the variations in the frequency with which certain kinds of programs were offered may help understand that. Several types of programs which would be likely to increase the number of clients served (e.g., referrals, career counseling and workshops, workshops, short-term counseling, re-entry and support programs for non-traditional women students and affirmative action/discrimination advocacy) occurred with a lower reported frequency for centers of this type than for centers in the overall sample.

It is not surprising that the fiscal resources available to support the activities of this type of center were on the average the lowest
of any kind, given a number of these centers' characteristics. For example, Collaborative women's centers were those with directors in name only, who would be likely to have minimal or none of the authority of such a position; they were those with low average annual numbers of clients and were those with fewer centers reporting that they conduct some of the kinds of program activities which would maintain a high visibility within the institution. In the absence of numbers of clients to provide evidence of need and with no one who had the position or authority to negotiate for resources, low budgets would seem to follow.

The minimal success of these centers in securing funding for their activities is corroborated by the responses of the centers in other aspects of the data. Only 27 percent of these centers reported that the support they received from administrators with budget and decision making authority took the form of making budget decisions in their favor. However, this is in contrast to a much higher proportion of these centers, approximately three-fifths, which indicated they received support in the form of helpful information, advocacy for programs and recognition of the worth of their programs.

What remains unclear in all of this is the relative contribution of various aspects of the situations of these centers to the problems they experience, as well as a kind of "chicken and egg" dimension to their circumstances. That is, if there was the client demand for some of the programs which would give these centers more visibility (which are less frequently offered) and if these centers took on yet another commitment of time and energy, would the funds be available from the administrators (who seem more generous with helpful information than
dollars) to pay salaries for conducting such programming and possibly diminish some of the burn-out, overcommitment of time and energy, etc., reported?

Modified Hierarchy Model of Women's Centers

The type of women's centers which ranked third out of the five types in its frequency of occurrence was the Modified Hierarchy. These centers also ranked third in overall number of problems cited by 50 percent or more of such organizations.

As with the first and second most frequently occurring types of centers (Consultative Hierarchies and Collaboratives), overcommitment of time and energy (Item #29) was the problem cited most often. Further, the constellation of problems noted with the types of centers previously discussed is repeated. For more than three-fifths of the centers of this kind, overcommitment; burn-out of women who work at the center (#39); tensions between needs of staff women, needs of the organization and clients' needs (#32); and issues around integration of programs into the institution were cited as unresolved difficulties. A problem reported with similar frequency by these centers, but which had not been a part of this cluster of problems for other centers, was the issue of setting up accountability processes for staff members' work (#43). Approximately half of the women's centers of this type also indicated there were problems for them regarding the distribution of power (Item #22), diversity or lack of it on the staff—i.e., race, age, lifestyle, economic status, etc., (#24), differing personal allegiances—community vs. college or university (#31), and in dealing with differences
in skills, assertiveness and expertise among staff (#46).

While the occurrence of many of these problems repeats the experiences of centers of the two types previously discussed, two issues surfaced in the responses of centers organized as Modified Hierarchies which had not been reported by 50 percent or more of the centers discussed thus far. Those were: how power is or should be distributed (#22) and dealing with differences in skill, assertiveness and expertise (#46).

Again, while no tests for statistical correlation among the survey items was done, it would seem plausible to speculate that some of the problems which occurred may be related to each other. For instance, differences in skill, expertise, assertiveness and articulateness could also be viewed as reflecting differences in actual or potential power and influence in these organizations. Also, overcommitment of time and energy and burn-out would logically seem to be related.

A more expanded view of the situations of centers such as this may elaborate our understanding of the problems they report. What are the types of programs offered by these centers and what support do they receive for such activity?

Overall the range of programs and the frequency with which they were offered by Modified Hierarchies followed the general pattern for centers in this study. In cases where there were variations in that pattern, the general tendency was for a larger proportion of these centers to offer a particular type of program than was the situation overall: for example, career counseling and workshops (84% vs. 67%); workshops (84% vs. 63%); and re-entry and support programs for non-
traditional women students (74% vs. 56%). Also offered by a higher percentage of these centers were libraries, newsletters and assertiveness training. Fewer of them tended to provide referrals (58% vs. 67%), affirmative action/discrimination advocacy (37% vs. 46%) or rape crisis intervention (5% vs. 17%).

The activities of this type of center received higher levels of fiscal support than centers of any other kind. The average size budget from campus sources was $54,200, approximately three times as large as the closest average budget for other kinds of centers (i.e., $17,300--Conventional Hierarchies); centers of this type had the highest percentage which reported that they received support in the form of administrators making budget decisions in their favor (63%); and they had the largest proportion (59%) that reported they had sought funds from various sources.

Apparently, they had some measure of success, as 47 percent reported non-campus sources of funds, with the average size allocation reported to be $35,000. This ranks centers organized as Modified Hierarchies first in both the percentage having non-campus funding, as well as in the average amount of such monies.

Not only was fiscal support for these centers forthcoming, but three-quarters reported getting support in general from administrators. For between three-fifths and three-fourths of them such support also included helpful information, advocacy for programs and recognition of the worth of their programs.

It should be noted that while in some cases the responses of other types of centers reflect a higher percentage receiving particular types of non-fiscal support, that assistance seems to have stopped short
of making budget decisions in their favor for a larger proportion of the other four kinds of centers in this study. Table 8 in the Results section provides detail on this pattern.

Modified Hierarchies were also distinct on a number of other dimensions: they had the highest percentage of their numbers reporting paid, non-student staff (with a reported average of three such staff members). Further, a larger percentage of these centers reported having women from various groups on the staff than the sample overall (e.g., single parents--67% vs. 48% overall; lesbians--67% vs. 39%; Black women--60% vs. 29%; and Latin women--27% vs. 16%).

While it would be difficult, if not inappropriate, to attribute the apparent success of these centers in securing fiscal support for their programs and staff members to any particular element of how they can be characterized, some choices or aspects of their situations seem worth noting.

Centers classified as Modified Hierarchies--those with a director or coordinator who makes some of the decisions, but in which decision making is also done by various groups in the organization which have autonomy and final say regarding program decisions--may reflect a particularly effective set of adaptations. The choice of a structure which includes a director or coordinator also provides a clearly identifiable "authority figure" to relate to administrators within the institution, to negotiate for budgets, to represent the interests of the center and the needs of women in various settings. That such centers more frequently have non-student, paid staff would also suggest that such boundary spanning activities are more likely to be effectively conducted
by someone unencumbered with student status in such dealings and thus able to negotiate for needed resources from more of a collegial position.

Further, that these centers also have chosen to decentralize program decision making reflects an effort to democratize the organization and share power in ways which would be more consistent with feminist ideology and social change goals than might be the case with a conventionally hierarchical organizational structure.

**Collective Model of Women's Centers**

Women's centers organized as Collectives were those centers with no director and in which all members of the staff made all decisions regarding both the organization and its programs. Over half of the twenty-eight organizational issues were cited as problems by 50 percent or more of such centers. The only other type of center reporting such frequency of occurrence for the organizational problems was the Conventional Hierarchy. In both cases, fifteen of the twenty-eight issues in the survey questionnaire were cited by half or more of the centers responding.

In some regards, the frequency with which problems were cited by a large proportion of this type of center would incline one to characterize them as organizations whose adaptations to their environments or circumstances seemed the most difficult of any type and in which large amounts of energy may be tied up in ongoing tension or conflict. This inclination is supported and reflected in the types of problems cited by 60 percent or more of these centers.
For example, the extent of the diversity to their staffs (#24), differing personal allegiances for those various women (#31), differing personal expectations of the center by those women (#41), dealing with those differences (#46) and commitment to the center as a whole vs. a particular program (#23) form a cluster of problems that were each reported by the overwhelming majority of the Collectively organized centers. Most of these issues were not cited with a similar frequency by centers of any other type.

Further, the constellation of problems which maintained for the three most frequent types of centers previously described was also reported by centers of this kind. Overcommitment of time and energy (#30), burn-out (#39), tension between the needs of staff, needs of the organization and client needs (#32), as well as integration of programs into the mainstream of the institution (#35) were present for 60 percent or more of these centers.

In addition, several issues which could be seen as reflecting another "cluster" of problems were also evident. Problems with clarifying goals for the organization (#42), structure vs. structurelessness (#34), how power is or should be distributed (#22), leadership (#40), and how to divide and coordinate the work (#19) were all reported by between 75 percent and 50 percent of these centers. It should also be noted that clarity regarding goals for the centers was not a problem reported by 50 percent or more of the centers of any other type.

Thus, what would appear to be facing many of the women's centers organized as Collectives are problems in multiple areas of their functioning. Personal and interpersonal conflicts around a variety of
issues, tensions around commitments to a portion of or the whole organization, differing allegiances to the campus or community, lack of clarity regarding goals and division and coordination of labor, and further, the relationship or integration of center activities into the more mainstream efforts of the institution.

Difficulty finding workable balances or adaptations in any of these areas could and probably would drain the productive energies of any organization and its staff members. For organizations engaged in social change work to report such a variety of problems occurring for so many of these Collectives, as well as for problems to reflect difficulty in so many aspects of their functioning, raises questions about the costs of choices apparently being made by these centers and the actual or potential impact on their viability as organizations.

A view of the programmatic efforts of this type of women's center may provide another perspective on the activities or context within which some of these struggles play out.

There were two areas in which these centers departed dramatically from the general pattern of programming offered by the women's centers studied: none of the centers organized as Collectives reported offering either re-entry or support programs for non-traditional women students or academic courses. They were the only type of center for which this was the case. Table 10 details the frequency with which such programming was reported by the four other kinds of centers in this study.

More centers of this type than was generally the case, or than was the case for any one other model, offered women a drop-in center and arts program. In two regards this was interesting. Both are a
kind of programming which could be seen as less likely than some others
to raise ideological differences among women on staffs of such organiza-
tions; further, such programming is also less likely to entail commitment
of or require such extensive fiscal resources as other kinds of endeavors.
Also, other often more costly to operate programming was either noticeably
absent or much less frequently present among the women's centers organized
as Collectives. As noted above, none of these centers reported offering
academic courses or re-entry programs for non-traditional students
and a much lower proportion offered career counseling or workshops,
speakers' services or assertiveness training than was generally the
case.

Such situations seem particularly understandable when one looks
at other aspects of this type of center's situations. Centers of this
type reported the second lowest average budgets from campus sources
and the lowest allocation from external sources. Their average annual
budget from campus sources was $5,800 and for the 16 percent which
had monies from sources external to the institution, only $800.

Further, their staffs overall appeared to be at least as diverse
as the other kinds of women's centers studied. One of the keenest
points of difference from both the pattern overall and from each other
type of center was the low percentage of the Collectives reporting
older women on their staffs (30% vs. 57% overall). Also, with the
exception of single parents, all other groups in the questionnaire
were represented in greater or comparable frequency by the Collectives
as for centers overall.

While such diversity or pluralism of an organization's staff could
promote a rich weave or assortment of programs, given the extent of
the organizational problems cited and the extremely scarce fiscal re-
sources available to this type of center, the extent of programming
reported would seem to be a testament to the commitment of the staff
of these organizations. Further, for only an eighth of the Collectives
were these staffs paid and for almost half of these organizations the
funds were received from student agencies. This was the highest percentage
reporting student monies for any type of center. In addition, the
Collectives had the lowest proportion of any kind of women's center
which got support from administrators with decision making power (33%)
and another quarter said they got no support at all.

What seems to emerge is a type of center that is even more marginal
than the other types of women's centers in this study. More of the
Collectives than other types seem to receive their minimal fiscal assistance
from student sources (possibly limited in amount for that very reason),
rather than administrators at the institution. Additionally, they
are staffed in a manner which, considering their context, may give
them less access to channels of influence or power than some other
types of centers: fewer older women and greater percentages reporting
welfare recipients, lesbians, Black and other women of color on their
staffs. None of these groups have any great measure of power or influence
within higher education or other social institutions. Generally, admini-
strators and key decision makers in such institutions are overwhelmingly
white males. Further, their choice of organizational form, in terms
of organizational structure and decision making approach, could be
seen as representing the furthest departure from the context or environment
within which they exist of any of the types of women's centers. Their lack of even nominal directors to provide a consistent, visible liaison person to the college or university, combined with staffs comprised of particularly disenfranchised groups operating with minimal or no support from administrators could be seen as placing them in a particularly vulnerable position.

Yet a paradox (or irony) to such a position could also be seen as existing. To the extent that they get minimal or no resources, yet can survive, they may be freer to challenge the institutions within which they exist. However, the paradox (or irony) could also be a dilemma in some ways for these centers--such challenges to the sexism in the policies and practices of an institution, without the power or influence to make that challenge felt or the resources to create and sustain the alternative organization and the staff from which the challenge emanates have less likelihood of effecting or promoting the changes sought. Thus, in some ways, this type of center could be seen as exemplifying the types of marginality described previously and their consequences to the greatest extent of any of the models.

Conventional Hierarchy Model of Women's Centers

Those women's centers categorized as Conventional Hierarchies were the least frequently occurring type of the five represented in the study. As with the fourth ranked Collective type of women's centers, over half (15) of the twenty-eight organizational issues were reported to be problems for 50 percent or more of the centers organized as Conventional
Hierarchies.

Given that frequency of problems reported by a large proportion of these centers, an inclination to describe them as organizations ill-adapted to their environment or un-responsive to by the contexts in which they exist would be as tempting as with the collectively organized women's centers. Such an inclination should be tempered to an even greater extent than was cautioned in regard to the Collectives. In both the proportion of these centers reporting a given item as a difficulty and in the type of problems reported, there are some interesting differences to the patterns of these two types.

For instance, the problem identified by the largest proportion of the Collectives--diversity or lack of it on the staff (#24) was not cited as an issue by half or more of the Conventional Hierarchy centers (in fact, only 12.5%). However, approximately the same percentage of the centers of each type reported integration of their programs into the mainstream of the institution to be problematic (87.5% Conventional Hierarchies and 83.3% Collectives), making that issue the second or first most frequently reported problem for each kind of women's center. Problems around two other items were reported with comparable frequency for both these types. Tensions between the needs of staff, the organizations' needs and clients' needs (#32) and structure vs. structurelessness (#34) were each cited by approximately 60 percent of the centers of both kinds.

It is from there on that the points of comparability between Conventional Hierarchies and Collective women's centers diminish. Several problems were reported by the centers organized as Conventional Hierarchies
and either not reported by 50 percent or more of the Collectives or reported less frequently.

For example, three-quarters of the Conventional Hierarchy model centers cited (#38) staff development as an issue (vs. 45.5% for Collectives). Also, half of them had problems around: (#20) status or titles (vs. 8.3%); around methods of decision making (vs. 33.3%); around fears of cooptation (vs. 45.5%); and around setting up accountability processes for those who work at the center (vs. 25%). Further, Conventional Hierarchies were the only model of the five where half of the centers had problems with status or titles and methods of decision making.

Thus, while diversity in the composition of the staff may not be problematic for large numbers of this type of center, the data would suggest that their choice to centralize decision making authority in someone with the status and title of "director" and who makes all the decisions regarding both the organization and programs may be a difficulty: not only difficulties but issues which could promote internal tensions that pull energy from either programmatic or other concerns.

It should also be noted, however, that diversity may not have been reported as a problem (or its lack seen as a problem) in part because the staffs of centers of this kind were markedly less pluralistic than most other kinds of centers in this study. In fact, Conventional Hierarchies were the only model where none of the centers of that type reported staffwomen who were lesbians, Native Americans or Asian Americans. Two other groups were reported as staff less frequently than for centers overall—single parents (33% vs. 38%) and welfare recipients or other poor women (17% vs. 29%). However, a much higher percentage of these
centers (83% vs. 57%) said there were older women on their staffs. Both Black and Hispanic women were reported to be staff with comparable frequency for this type of center as for centers overall, (33% vs. 29% and 17% vs. 16%, respectively).

Just as this type of women's center departed in some particular ways from the overall pattern for centers in terms of the nature and type of organizational problems, so too they varied in terms of the frequency with which they reported offering certain kinds of programming.

For one activity in particular--academic courses--these centers reported offering such programs with three times the frequency as centers overall (62.5% vs. 24%). Several other kinds of programs were also offered by more of these centers than was the case for centers in general: career counseling and workshops (87.5% vs. 67%); speakers' services (87.5% vs. 67%); short-term counseling (87.5% vs. 62%); and re-entry and support programs for non-traditional women students (75% vs. 56%).

There were also programs for which this pattern reversed and a much smaller proportion of centers organized as Conventional Hierarchies offered certain activities or programs. For example, none of these centers reported offering rape crisis intervention or arts programs and they were the only type for which this was the situation. Only 50 percent of the conventionally hierarchical women's centers indicated they provided a drop-in center. This was in marked contrast to the 81% for centers overall. Further, this type of center had the lowest proportion of any offering support groups (37.5%); on the average 52 percent of the centers responding offered such programming.

As might be expected, there seems to be some measure of "fit"
between the nature of the programs conducted, who tends to be staff, and the type or model of center. A greater percentage of these conventionally structured and operated centers, many staffed by older women (with fewer reporting staff from the even more marginal groups such as women of color, poor women and lesbians) offer programs that are likely to be responsive to the needs of the particular population their staff represents and/or programs which may not put them in a particularly oppositional stance with their institutions. For example, career counseling and workshops, speakers' services, short-term counseling and academic courses stand in sharp contrast as programming choices to something like rape crisis intervention and support groups. The latter could be seen as reflecting or having the potential to foster the development of a more radical view of the experiences of women in our society, both for the women conducting them as well as for the clients or participants.

In some ways, the staffing patterns, organizational problems and the programming reported by this type of center could be summed up as being "conventional." Another way of viewing the choices made by these organizations could be as reflecting a kind of adoption of the status quo in many dimensions of existence that reflects less risk taking than some of the other models. Their programming is less "radical," their staffs less diversified and, while fifteen of the twenty-eight problems cited by 50 percent or more, the overwhelming majority of those difficulties were reported by only half of the centers. This was in clear contrast to the Collectives, the other model of centers with such a high number of problems cited by 50 percent or more. For
while Collectives had the same number of problems cited by half or more, each item was generally an issue for three-quarters or more of the Collectives.

The impression which begins to surface as one reviews the pieces contributing to a profile of this type of center is that they are organizations which while they may serve clients, provide programming and acquire budgets, they may not command an intense engagement of the energy of their staffwomen. In fact, one begins to wonder if they may be trading off the "conventionality," and possibility of some kinds of "stability" or less conflicted existence which may go with that, for the intense engagement or commitment of staffwomen. One could also speculate on whether these centers reflect a set of choices which have limited their diversities in ways that while they may be adaptive for their survival, may not provide the potentially creative tensions which can keep an organization, particularly a feminist, social change one, focused on the very things it set out to challenge and change. This speculation is lent some support by the 50 percent of the centers of this type reporting that they had fears about cooptation by the institution.

Given the conventionality to some of the dimensions or choices of this type of center and the ways in which those choices could make them more "compatible" with the institutions at which they exist, one might expect these centers to have large budgets and enjoy the greatest amounts of administrative support. However, the data did not support such an assertion.

Approximately one-third of the Conventional Hierarchy centers
reported that they received no support from administrators with program and budget decision making authority. And, while almost 60 percent of these centers said they did get such support, the most frequently reported kind of assistance was recognition of the worth of programs and advocacy for programs. Only half said that assistance took the form of making budget decisions in their favor.

That budget support from campus sources averaged $17,300 annually. While these centers' average size budget ranked second in size, the contrast to the highest average funding levels reported--$54,200 for Modified Hierarchies--is a sharp one. Thus, opting for more conventional organizational arrangements and programming does not in itself seem to have netted these women's centers significantly larger budgets than those models of centers which chose more non-traditional options for their structures and decision making.

Trends in Organizational Problems

In addressing what might be the implications of structural and decision making choices (or models of organization) for the women's centers studied, some of the findings which emerged as particularly interesting were the patterns or trends to the organizational problems cited by 50 percent or more of the total sample of centers. Choices regarding type of organization may or may not impact on the extent to which an organizational issue is experienced as problematic, but for most of the survey items to which centers responded, those particular choices apparently do not eliminate the occurrence of such issues as
problems for 50 percent or more of the women's centers studied.

Centers of all types had 50 percent or more of their numbers reporting ongoing problems with two issues: 1) the tendency for staff to overcommit time and energy (#29); and 2) integration of their programs into the mainstream of the institution (#35). This suggests that factors other than choice of structure and decision making mode were related to the presence of these problems.

The pattern of these issues persisting irrespective of model or type of center was clear in the data. In fact, the persistence of these problems would seem to be highlighted by several other aspects of the findings. For each of the three most frequent models of centers—Consultative Hierarchies, Collaboratives and Modified Hierarchies—(which account for slightly over three-fourths of the centers responding), the tendency to overcommit time and energy was the first ranked problem reported by centers of each type. For all three types of centers the issue of integrating their programs into the institution was ranked in the top three issues. This pattern existed despite the many differences represented by the three models: in structure and decisionmaking; in the average size budget for centers of each type; in the number of clients seen annually by the different types of centers; in the amount and nature of administrative support received by these centers; in staffing patterns and program offerings; and in the number of organizational problems reported by 50 percent or more of the centers of each type.

What is it in the circumstances of the women's centers that might contribute to the persistence of these problems? It would seem that
the tendency for women to overcommit themselves in these organizations might be understood in terms of several characteristics of these centers. First, these organizations can be viewed as a unique social and political phenomenon. They represent explicit efforts by women on behalf of themselves and other women to significantly expand their opportunities, to get and give support for major life changes and to have all of this occur in an environment that has been created by women to meet women's needs. The contrast of that experience to the more usual one of existing in a society, in social institutions and in organizations operated by men and, frequently, unresponsive to the lives and needs of women, could only be an exciting one and could incline a staff member to overcommit time and energy. Secondly, the same uniqueness which may on the one hand provide a novel or exciting experience for staffwomen, has another dimension—the lack of any models for experience with what these women are striving to create. Thirdly, the programs offered by these centers, both in their numbers and type, and on the limited fiscal resources available to staff suggest another possible avenue for understanding the frequency with which overcommitment of time and energy was cited as an issue.

On the average, these centers offer nine programs; over half had budgets of less than $5,000 a year (with the median being $3,950) and they are often operated by volunteer staff. When there were paid staff they were more often students paid on work-study monies than paid non-student professional staff. In either case, the average number was two to three paid staff. Such a situation could certainly promote a tendency to overcommit time and energy for staff who were invested
in the work and ideals of the organization and the needs of the clients.

On the one hand, the situation could be seen as likely to be an empowering and exciting one—the opportunity to work in a unique organizational setting, to work with other women to see that services and programs are offered to meet the needs of women, to advocate for changes in higher educational institutions and in social policy and practice that would better incorporate and respond to the needs of oneself and other women. However, those same dimensions, and the attempt to do demanding social change work on such limited resources can also be viewed as a set-up that would almost require an "overcommitment" of time and energy.

In addition, there is a further complexity or stressor added by the nature of the most frequent types of programming offered by these organizations. For the most part that programming tends to be short-term and crisis counseling, information and referral aimed at responding to a plethora of emotional, social and legal needs, workshops and career counseling—all work which it would be hard to do in a conscious, caring fashion without confronting the varieties of social injustice that are woven into the fabric of the society inhabited by the women who use the services of these organizations. The very caring and concern about one's own and other women's lives and self-development could conceivably lead to a situation where the fuller the view one gets of the needs, the harder it could be to say 'no,' to not overcommit time and energy.

Further, given the sexism in society in general and its social institutions, the work of these organizations and their staffwomen
is likely to be resisted, and thus require more time, energy and commitment to both the tasks at hand and survival of the organizations undertaking such work.

Such a trend is repeated in the prevalence of another problem for centers. For all types of centers responding, the issue of the integration of their programs into the mainstream of the college or university ranked first, second or third as a problem among centers of each model. What is unclear is whether that issue was a problem because a) centers experienced pressure to mainstream programs they had created and were engaged in resisting such efforts to integrate their programs into the mainstream, or b) whether the resistance was from more conventional departments, divisions or services in the institutions and came in response to the centers’ own work to try and mainstream their activities. Either form of resistance to change is understandable and would provoke a problem or stress for the centers, albeit of different types.

In the former circumstance (a), it is understandable why an organization which had worked to create responses to needs unaddressed by other parts of an institution might resist integration of its program into that larger institution. What reasons would a women’s center have to believe that a college or university with a history of unresponsiveness to the needs of women would continue programs created by an organization whose very existence challenged the operating policies of that institution? Why expect that if such programs were integrated into the mainstream of institutional activities they would be conducted in a non-sexist or feminist manner?
In addition to the issue of trust in the larger institution, it would seem that the excitement and newness of the experiences of conceiving, creating and controlling programs and an organization for a group which has been and still is politically and socially disenfranchised would make them ones to savor; not only to savor, but to practice, refine, promote and pass on as an opportunity for other women.

The persistence of the pattern of overcommitment of time and energy as a problem, regardless of a center's model of organization was mirrored almost exactly in the reported tendency for staff to get burned out (#39). The exception to the pattern occurred for centers classified in the typology as Conventional Hierarchies (Model A). For all other types of centers the issue of burn-out ranked second, third or fourth in its frequency of reporting by centers of each type.

It would seem possible that the Conventional Hierarchy model, with its more familiar role definitions and possible tendencies toward more formal arrangements, more explicit boundaries, etc., in some way may balance or mitigate against the overcommitments of time and energy that could promote a tendency for staff to get burned out. A further possibility, since centers of this type had less diverse staff than other models, and had 83 percent of the centers reporting women over forty on the staff, is that women working at centers of this type had lives sufficiently organized around home and/or family responsibilities that they had less time or chose to get less involved in center operations, and thus did not overcommit to the extent of getting burned out.

Another organizational issue also surfaced as a problem and ranked
in the top five for centers of all but one type. Centers classified as Modified Hierarchies (Model C) were the only kind for which a tendency to feel guilty about not being able to commit enough time and energy (#30) went uncited as an issue by 50 percent or more. Why centers of this type should not report this issue as problematic with a frequency similar to the other four models of centers is not immediately apparent. Nothing distinctive stands out in the nature or scope of their programming; the diversity of the women conducting the programs at these centers is not particularly different than for centers overall, though more centers of this kind reported Black and Hispanic women, single parents and lesbians on their staffs than for women's centers overall. The percentage of centers of this type indicating they could use assistance with organizing administrative tasks, having effective meetings and dealing with group conflict was generally within the same range as for centers of other types. These centers did not depart dramatically from the responses of centers overall regarding factors they saw as blocking their organization's effective interaction with campus administrators, nor in how those who received support from administration characterized it.

However, a closer look at the percentage of those centers classified as Modified Hierarchies to the questions of 1) whether they get support from administrators with program and budget decision making authority; 2) the level and sources of their funding; and 3) the average size of their staffs begins to surface some differences.

Centers of this type had the largest percentage of those of any kind which reported that they got support from the type of administrators
noted above; further, centers which could be classified as Modified Hierarchies had the greatest proportion of any type for which that support took the form of making budget decisions in their favor. These centers also had the largest average budgets from campus sources, the highest percentage of centers indicating they had sought funds from various sources, the largest percentage of any type receiving funds from non-campus sources and for those centers receiving such funds, the average amount from that external source was larger than either the average campus, the non-campus funding for centers of any other type.

The women's centers which fit in the Modified Hierarchy category of the typology were also those with the highest average number of non-student, paid staff and while they ranked second to centers described as Consultative Hierarchies (Model B) in the percentage reporting paid student staff (87.5% vs. 79%), the average number of such staff for the Modified Hierarchies was double that of the Consultative Hierarchies (4 vs. 2).

One other than fiscal contribution which budgetary support and the option of paid staff may make to the functioning of centers is the communication of worth—valuation and regard for programs conducted and the time and energy spent in making them work. Once that time and energy has salary tied to it, the salary to some extent could be seen as not only setting a boundary or parameter about what is expected in terms of amount of time, but as reflecting the value of that time to those outside the women's center. This would seem to stand in contrast to the likely situation at centers with little or no fiscal resources
and fewer or no paid staff, but comparable levels of programming. In their cases, the messages from funding sources in and outside the institution could be seen as disregard of or lack of value for the work being done. Under those conditions, it would seem like a short leap from a situation of already overcommitting time and energy to feeling guilty for not being able to commit enough time and energy to "succeed," to get the funding to support and validate the worth of the work being done by the women in those organizations. What is also interesting in this regard is that feeling guilty could be seen as implying a felt sense of responsibility, if not self-blame for being unable to commit enough time and energy. This is in contrast to an alternative position that might involve or incline one more toward anger or the assertion of one's right to have one's own and the needs of other women responded to and met by the college or university.

Another trend of interest regarding the frequency of occurrence of organizational problems for centers of each kind in the typology (see Figure 1) was the extent to which the centers with the largest number of problems cited by 50 percent or more of the respondents of that type were the two at opposing ends of the typology: that is, Conventional Hierarchies (Model A) and Collectives (Model F). Of these two, Collectives were the more frequently occurring organizational type (14% of centers vs. 9% for Conventional Hierarchies). In each case, centers of that type had over half of the twenty-eight organizational issues cited as on-going problems by 50 percent or more of such centers. That two types of centers, so disparate in terms of their choices of organizational structure and decision making approaches,
should report the same number of items as organizational problems would suggest the value of further assessment of points of similarity or difference to the problems experienced, comparison of the frequency of problems cited by 50 percent or more of centers of one type but not the other. Additionally, it would also provide a fuller context for those problems to review and compare the two types of centers along a variety of other dimensions as well.

While at first glance some degree of similarity may be evidenced between the two models of centers regarding the numbers of problems experienced, a closer view of the data surfaces differences in that pattern, rather than extending the similarity. One glaring difference seems to lie in the percentage of the centers of each type reporting an organizational problem, when the issue was one held in common. With the exception of two items (#19 and #40), where the percentages were equal, when centers of both types responded to an issue it was cited as problematic by a larger percentage of the centers classified as Collectives than Conventional Hierarchies. In only one instance (Item #32--tension between the needs of staff, program administration needs and needs of participants), was the reported frequency of occurrence for Collectives lower than for Conventional Hierarchies.

Further, when items were cited as problems for centers which were organized as Collectives, but not cited by those which were Conventional Hierarchies, they also tended to be difficulties for a very high percentage of those Collectives. For example, 90.9 percent of the Collectives reported problems with Item #24--diversity or lack of it on the staff regarding age, life-style, economic status, etc.; 83.3 percent cited
Item #39--tendency for people to get burned out working at the centers; 72.7 percent cited Item #41--staff members' different personal expectations of center (i.e., new friends, professional skills, etc.); and 75 percent cited Item #42--clarifying the goals of the centers.

It should also be noted that Collectives were the only type of women's center where 90 percent reported the occurrence of any particular problem. They were also distinct in having the largest number of problems (8) cited by 75 percent or more of their kind. For all other models, only one, two or none of the problems were responded to that overwhelmingly. More specifically, in regard to the comparison of the Collectives and the Conventional Hierarchies, of the fifteen problems experienced by 50 percent or more of each kind of center, only four of the fifteen issues were cited by more than 50% of the centers which were Conventional Hierarchies; while for Collectives, thirteen of the fifteen problems received a greater than 50 percent response.

While there were items occurring as problems for 50 percent or more of the Collectives, and not the Conventional Hierarchies as described above, the converse was also true; some problems were reported by the hierarchical centers which did not have 50 percent or higher frequency of occurrence for collectively organized centers. These were: Item #20--status or titles of positions within the center; Item #30--models of decision making; Item #36--fear of cooptation by the institution; and Item #43--setting up accountability processes for staff members' work at the center. For each of these issues, 50 percent of the Conventional Hierarchy centers indicated it was a problem.

Thus, while these very different types of centers may have had
a comparable number of issues which were problematic, the extent to which centers of each kind experienced an issue as a difficulty varied considerably. They also each had some problems which were not shared with centers of the contrasted type.

Another interesting trend regarding the frequency of occurrence of the centers' organizational problems was the "progression" to the number of problems reported by centers of each type in the mid-range of the typology. As indicated in Table 6, six out of twenty-eight issues were reported by 50 percent or more of those centers classified as Consultative Hierarchies, nine out of twenty-eight by the Modified Hierarchies and twelve out of twenty-eight for the centers which were categorized as Collaboratives. That "progression" to the number of problems cited corresponds to the movement or direction along the dimensions of the typology having to do with high to low degree of formal structure and centralized to decentralized decision making. Thus, those centers which had less formal structure, which could be characterized as having less formally designated leadership arrangements and shared decision making reported more organizational problems than those closer to the Conventional Hierarchy end of the continuums used to create the typology used. However, it should be remembered in considering that trend or tendency in the data that the centers which fit the categories at both extremes of the typology were those which reported the greatest number of problems of any type of these organizations.
Strengths of Women's Centers as Feminist Organizations

In reviewing and discussing the data on the women's centers studied, much of the emphasis thus far has been on the various problems they reported, the frequency with which certain organizational difficulties were cited by those feminist organizations reflective of each model in the typology and points of similarity and contrast to the circumstances of the five different kinds of women's centers. However, in viewing alternative organizations, of which women's centers are one type, Kanter (1973) cautions against what criteria one might use when discussing or evaluating alternative institutions and their strengths or weaknesses. That caution might well be applied here in two ways; first, by not limiting our discussion or efforts to understand these organizations to a viewing which is filtered solely through a recounting of their problems; and second, by incorporating some of the criteria Kanter suggests into a fuller view of the women's centers studied.

Several of the considerations Kanter (1973) insists must be taken into account in understanding alternative organizations have clear relevance for women's centers. A particularly critical one is a tendency to discount ventures which may not appear to be "making it;" that is, those that seem to have problems or have not succeeded in effecting the social change goals to which they are addressing themselves. Judged by such a criterion, women's centers would be hard pressed to demonstrate that they have erradicated the effects of the centuries of sexism which resulted in a felt need for their existence. That is exactly the kind of unexamined criterion or judgement regarding the success or failure,
strength or weakness of an organization which Kanter would see as "stacking the deck" against a positive evaluation of the type of organization in question.

Rather than framing a judgement of "success" or "failure" in terms of whether success has been achieved in turning the tide of centuries of values, social practices, limited options and proscribed roles and their effect on women, we might do well to understand the achievement which is reflected in the very existence, survival and struggle to succeed of these women's centers. However "successful" or not their programs may be, however large or small their budgets, however satisfied and effective or overcommitted and burned-out their staffs, these organizations reflect a unique type of social change effort.

Historically, and to a large extent currently, women's lives have been located in or around the home. While more and more women have both entered the paid workforce and sought college or advanced degrees, these shifts in aspiration and accomplishment have yet to result in sizeable numbers of working women being in positions to exercise power or control over programs, services or decisions which affect their own and other women's lives. Women have been, and continue to be, conspicuously absent from managerial positions, program decisions and policy positions. Women have been and still are largely marginal and disenfranchised members of society.

Women's centers reflect the determination and commitment of feminists to create alternatives to that set of realities in women's lives. Their very creation is an affirmation of the right and importance of women having organizations where they have control over decisions affect-
ing them, where they have the experience of opportunity and effectiveness, where they can struggle for their own and other women's empowerment in an environment they create and control. Further, their commitment to exist, survive and be effective must be recognized as occurring in a society embued with values countering what they affirm; a society whose social institutions, power structures and decision makers will not provide them with the wider levels of social and fiscal support afforded other organizations. Kanter (1973) noted that alternative organizations are not franchises, not branches, not simple extensions of on-going dominant institutions. And, also, that corporations owned privately by well-educated and well-funded people have had more than a century to develop and demonstrate their viability and even develop a monopoly on what standards of viability are. The same argument can be made about public school systems and social service organizations and bureaucracies.

As an extension of such issues, Kanter further notes that another assumption or buried criterion often biasing the case against innovative organizational forms is the assumption that all institutions or organizations have to "make it" on their own. Denied or forgotten in any such assertions are the plethora of direct and indirect support which give aid to the established, even when the established may be less than optimal, and in so doing maintain the status quo. As has been noted and detailed previously, not only are women's centers alternative social change organizations, but as feminist organizations they are even more marginal to the kind of support which might be enjoyed by ventures of another sort, especially ventures which maintain the social, economic
and political status quo.

Additionally, the difficulties or internal organizational problems experienced by women's centers, as well as other types of alternative institutions and social change organizations, could be attributed as much to the lack of external support they receive as to any failings of structure or practice. Further, for women's centers that lack of sustaining external support is often coupled with active resistance, since the changes advocated call into question fundamental aspects of social relationships and the distributions of power, authority and control over women's lives.

Thus, the women's centers need to be understood as affirmations or statements of strength, as well as the creation of a particular type of social change organization. Affirmations on the part of women creating and staffing them of their own and other women's rights, power, potentials, spirits and faith in themselves and their efforts on their own behalves; creations which reflect those women's desire for organizations where diverse groups of women can gather, work and struggle to meet their own and other women's needs; and further, where women learn and teach each other to design programs, manage, share and exercise leadership and power.

In the 1970s and on into the 1980s, thousands of women chose to create organizations which expanded their work options, to create environments affirming and empowering themselves and other women. This study has sought to describe some of the choices made and problems encountered in those ventures and in so doing create a database on a unique social phenomenon and contribute to our knowledge of contemporary feminist
and social change organizations. It is also hoped that this exploratory
and descriptive work will inform the efforts of women working in and
with these organizations; efforts which seek to expand the dreams,
the lives and the options of women and which reflect a spirit touched
on centuries ago by Goethe:

"What you can do or dream you can
begin it.
Boldness has genius, power and magic
in it."
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Table 1

OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEEDS SURVEYS

A. To document the needs of campus-based women's centers in terms of:
   1. level of funding
   2. budget preparation and accountability
   3. program planning
   4. organizational development
   5. handling issues of power and leadership
   6. communicating effectively with administrators
   7. handling conflict
   8. dealing with the institutional context
   9. handling boundary issues
  10. planning long-term growth
  11. networking

B. To determine important characteristics of centers, such as:
   1. types of programs offered
   2. whether centers have their own space on campus
   3. the target population of centers
   4. number of staff: paid, volunteer and student
   5. age of centers
   6. current and past budgets
   7. organizational structures
   8. demographic characteristics of colleges or universities in which centers are located
   9. how centers are perceived on their own campuses.
presented in the second chapter, followed by a chapter that presents a more
detailed analysis of some questions of interest (e.g., which type of women's
centers have larger budgets). In the last chapter, we will present the
results from similar items that appeared in both surveys and examine some
possible developmental trends in women's centers.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

The procedures describing the development of NS I, and its revision for
NS II are presented in detail below.

1. **State the goals of the survey.** Two major goals were stated:
   a. To document the needs of campus-based women's centers
   b. To determine important descriptive characteristics of women's
      centers

2. **Determine the objectives of the survey.** Four major sources of
   information were used to identify the specific topics that were to
   be measured. These were:
   a. Content analysis of letters received by EWC requesting informa-
      tion and services
   b. "Research Concerns of Women," a report produced by Project on
      the Status and Education of Women
   c. Report from the Women's Studies Conference, Fall, 1974
   d. "Two Studies of Women in Higher Education," by Judy Bertelson,
      Mills College (1974)

   The specific objectives were then identified. These are presented
   in Table 1.

3. **Item Development.** Criteria for developing items were identified,
   and are presented below:
   a. coverage of the objectives
   b. practical considerations of length, simplicity and interest
APPENDIX B
DIRECTIONS: PART I - PLEASE READ ALL ABOUT IT

For each question below there are two parts. The first part asks, "Is this a need of your center?" Responses range from A to D. The second part of the same item asks, "Do you have the skills, informational and/or people resources available to you to meet this need?" Responses range from A to D. The responses for both parts of the question are described below.

Read the first item. Then, circle the appropriate response to the first part. Next, consider whether or not you have the resources you need to meet this need. Circle your response to this part of the question. Go on to the next item.

RESPONSES: Is this a need of your Center?

A. Yes, it's an important need that has to be met (on an on-going basis or as it arises).
B. Yes, though it's not central to our Center's functioning.
C. No, it doesn't seem applicable to: our programs; our structure; or our relationship to the college/university.
D. Don't know, it hasn't been discussed.

Do you have the skills, informational or people resources available to you to meet this need?

A. Yes, and we meet (have met) the need.
B. Yes, but the need remains unmet for other reasons.
C. No, we could use some help.
D. Doesn't apply.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS:

X. Strategies for involving women from the local community in our programs.
   a. Is this a need? A B C D
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D

Y. Fresh perked coffee in the morning.
   a. Is this a need? A B C D
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D

Z. Information on the amount of funding other women's centers receive.
   a. Is this a need? A B C D
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D

NOTE: You might want to detach this sheet and use it to refer to while answering the questions.
Is this a need of your center's?
A—Yes, it's an important need that has to be met on an ongoing basis or as it arises.
B—Yes, though it's not central to our center's functioning.
C—No, it doesn't seem applicable to our program, our structure, or our relationship to the college/university.
D—Don't know, it hasn't been discussed.

Do you have the skills, informational or people resources available to you to meet this need?
A—Yes, and we meet (have met) the need.
B—Yes, but the need remains unmet for other reasons.
C—No, we could use some help.
D—Doesn't apply.

** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **

1. More information on the budget and funding procedures on your campus in order to make decisions on where or how to seek funding.
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

2. Exploration of feasibility of getting funding from various campus sources (e.g., student govt, academic depts, health services, etc).
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

3. Strategies for checking the accuracy of information you're given about campus budget and resource possibilities, decisions, and procedures.
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

4. Information on who makes what budget decisions and the time line for those decisions in the areas/depts from whom you seek or would like to seek funding.
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

5. Information on the informal resource allocation processes and network at your institution (or at least that part that would most affect you).
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

6. Strategies for gaining or increasing participation in the informal resource allocation or budgeting processes which could affect your center.
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

7. Awareness of different strategies for getting (seeking) salary money within a college/university.
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D

8. Information on different internal approaches to selecting (adding, cutting or maintaining) programs within your center (e.g., based on program priorities, on external demand, on staff interests, etc.).
   a. Is this a need?
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it?
   A B C D
9. Additional funding from campus to cover current or badly needed new programs or positions.
   a. is this a need?
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
10. Strategies for creating or maintaining the center's credibility with campus administrators.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
11. Exploration of ways of delegating and organizing budget related work.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
12. Skills in determining or documenting needs.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
13. Ideas for new programs.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
14. Ability to translate ideas into program goals and activities.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
15. Clarification of the most important considerations in making decisions at all stages of program development.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
16. Information on how other programs operate in terms of size, costs, budget, staff and numbers reached.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
17. Ways of determining the physical, personnel and dollar resources needed to implement a program
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
19. Information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?  
20. Strategies for reaching diverse groups.
    a. is this a need?
    b. do you have the resources to meet it?
21. Skills in evaluating program effectiveness or getting feedback on programs.
   a. is this a need?  
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  

22. Ways of using feedback in revising programs.
   a. is this a need?  
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  

23. Knowledge of different considerations in deciding to limit or expand programs.
   a. is this a need?  
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  

24. Skills in developing and selecting attainable program goals.
   a. is this a need?  
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  

25. Information on different ways of writing up proposals for program funding.
   a. is this a need?  
   b. do you have the resources to meet it?  

DIRECTIONS--PART II. Below are some organizational issues that might be raised within a women's center. Please read the list of items and then answer questions 26 - 28.

Organizational issues:

a. how to coordinate and divide the work
b. status of positions (hierarchical, non-hierarchical)
c. who is/who can be considered staff
d. how people are hired and fired
e. how power is/should be distributed
f. what the goals of the center should be
g. commitment to the center as a whole vs. commitment to a single program
h. diversity or lack of it on the staff
i. impact of differences in verbal skills on the group
j. salaries--how much, who gets them, how these decisions are made
k. skills sharing
l. decision-making processes and responsibilities
m. structure of the center
n. tendency to overcommit time and energy or to feel guilty for not being able to do that
o. utilizing volunteers or not
p. tension between needs of staff, program administration needs and needs of participants
q. consensual decision making
r. structure vs. structurelessness
s. evaluation of personnel
t. collaboration
u. OTHER (please specify):

26. Which of these has been difficult for your group to deal with? (list the letters of all appropriate items, and then circle the letter of the most difficult one)
27. In which of these areas do you think your center would benefit from additional information; for example, information on how other centers had handled certain issues? (Again, list the letter of all the appropriate items)

28. Do you think the other members of your center would agree for the most part with your answer in question 27? (Circle the most correct answer)
A. most probably would
B. most probably would not
C. don't know

DIRECTIONS--PART III. For the next several questions refer to the following definition:

Administrative support is used to mean--providing helpful information, advocating for your programs in meetings where you are present and in those in which you’re not, recognizing (grudgingly or generously) the worth of the programs you have or wish to create, or making budget decisions in your favor.

29. Do you get support from administrators on your campus who have program and budget decision making authority or influence?
A. Yes--from 1-2
B. Yes--from 3-5
C. Yes--from more than 5
D. No--those administrators from whom we get support are not in such positions
E. No--we get no administrative support

30. If you indicated that you do get administrators’ support, which elements of the above definition characterize that support? (Circle all that apply)
A. helpful information
B. advocacy for programs
C. recognition of the worth of programs
D. making budget decisions in your favor
E. doesn’t apply—we get no support
F. OTHER (please specify)

31. Which, if any, of the following do you think might help you to get the support you need to develop and maintain your programs? (Circle the letters of all that apply)
A. skills in identifying sources of support and resistance to programs
B. strategies for increasing support and minimizing resistance to programs for women on college/university campuses
C. more skills in developing programs (from documenting needs to evaluating effectiveness)
D. more knowledge of leadership styles and effectiveness in differing settings
E. organizing the center (or group) more effectively
F. improving communication skills—especially those related to situations where you’re dealing with people whose values, politics and rhetoric are different than one’s own
G. collaborating more on projects with faculty, students and administrators
H. skills in negotiating the college/university budget process
I. OTHER (please specify)
32. On what basis do you decide who will be the liaison between your center and campus administrators? (Circle the letter of all that apply)

A. verbal skills  
B. personality  
C. interest  
D. position within the center  
E. willingness  
F. familiarity with campus policies

33. Do you think that being an effective liaison between a center and campus administrators requires certain skills, attitudes or information?

A. no  
B. yes  
If you said yes, what are the most important ones?

34. Do the members of your group who are the liaison with administrators have these skills, attitudes and types of information?

A. not really  
B. somewhat  
C. pretty much

35. Which of the following items reflect attitudes, situations or feelings that make dealing with campus administrators difficult for your staff? (Circle the letters of all that apply)

A. difference in values  
B. difference in politics  
C. difference in goals  
D. they feel threatened  
E. they're a lot older  
F. we can't prove that we can do what we say  
G. they have all the power  
H. they don't listen  
I. we feel threatened  
J. they say the campus already has (for everybody) the services we want to create for women  
K. they don't understand what we want to create for women  
L. we don't respect them  
M. we're defensive  
N. they're defensive  
O. they're all straight males  
P. OTHER (please specify)

DIRECTIONS--PART IV. The following information will help us to understand how similar or dissimilar college and university women's centers are. It will also help us in determining how similar or dissimilar the centers who are trained are to those centers who do not receive training.

1. What types of programs does your center offer? (Circle the letters of those that apply)

A. short term counseling  
B. career counseling or workshops  
C. long term counseling or therapy  
D. support groups (CR groups)  
E. re-entry or support programs for non-traditional women students  
F. drop-in center  
G. library  
H. assertiveness training  
I. newsletter  
J. arts program  
K. credit or noncredit workshops  
L. academic courses  
M. medical, legal, educational and/or social welfare referrals  
N. speakers service  
O. affirmative action/discrimination advocacy  
P. rape crisis intervention  
Q. OTHER (please specify)
2. Which of the following is true of your center? (Circle the letters of all that are true)
   A. has it's own space
   B. there is a known (identifiable) group of people who organize and conduct activities through the center
   C. the center has an identity separate from other campus programs and separate from specific individuals
   D. has the potential to act as an advocate for all groups of women on campus (staff, faculty, undergraduates, graduate students)
   E. willingness to respond to a wide variety of women's needs and issues
   F. has been in existence for over a year

3. Who are the consistent users of your center's programs? (Circle the letter of all that apply)
   A. faculty
   B. college/university workers
   C. undergraduates
   D. graduate students
   E. women from the community
   F. OTHER (please specify)

4. How many paid staff do you have?
   A. none
   B. 1 - 2
   C. 3 - 5
   D. 6 - 10
   E. more than 10

5. How many people on your staff work on a volunteer basis?
   A. none
   B. 1 - 2
   C. 3 - 5
   D. 6 - 10
   E. more than 10

6. How many people on your staff receive credit for the work they do at your center?
   A. none
   B. 1 - 2
   C. 3 - 5
   D. 6 - 10
   E. more than 10

7. How many of your staff work full time (40 hours/wk)?
   A. all
   B. most
   C. some
   D. very few
   E. none

8. How many of your staff are students?
   A. all
   B. most
   C. some
   D. very few
   E. none

9. What proportion of your staff has worked at your center for more than 1 full year?
   A. all
   B. most
   C. some
   D. very few
   E. none
   F. doesn't apply--center hasn't existed 1 full year
10. How long has your center been in existence?
   A. less than 3 mos.   D. 2 - 3 years
   B. 3 - 11 mos.      E. 3 - 4 years
   C. 1 - 2 years      F. 5 or more years

11. How large is your budget from campus sources?
   A. $0                E. $10,001 - $20,000
   B. less than $1,000  F. $20,001 - $50,000
   C. $1,000 - $5,000   G. $50,001 - $75,000
   D. $5,001 - $10,000  H. over $75,000

12. How large is your budget from outside (non-campus) sources?
   A. $0                E. $10,001 - $20,000
   B. less than $1,000  F. $20,001 - $50,000
   C. $1,000 - $5,000   G. $50,001 - $75,000
   D. $5,001 - $10,000  H. over $75,000

13. Which of the following groups are represented on your staff?
    A. Blacks/Afro Americans   E. single parents
    B. Spanish surnamed/Spanish speaking F. historically poor
    C. Oriental Americans      G. Lesbians
    D. Native Americans        H. older (over 35)

14. Generally, how is your center organized? (Circle the letter of all that apply)
    A. hierarchically
    B. non-hierarchically
    C. some blend of hierarchical and non-
       hierarchical
    D. unstructured
    E. highly structured
    F. loosely structured
    G. OTHER (if none of these terms describe your center's structure, describe it briefly)

15. Is your college or university: (Circle the most correct letter for each group)
    A. public or B. private
    A. large (over 10,000 students) or B. medium (4,000 - 10,000) or C. small
    A. coed or B. single sex
    A. in a city or B. near an urban area or C. rural
    A. innovative in academic policies or B. traditional in academic policies

Do you have any comments on the questionnaire?
It will be a great day when our centers have all the money they need and the Navy has to hold a bake sale to buy a battleship.

Return this questionnaire to: Women's Educational Equity Project
University of Massachusetts
Draper Hall 114
Amherst, MA 01003

Don't forget to include the form indicating if you wish to be on our mailing list for further information on the training and printed materials. (The form was attached to the letter that explained the questionnaire, the project, etc.)
DIRECTIONS

This survey has four parts. Each part contains questions related to different aspects of women's centers. The response format to each part is different and explained for each part. PLEASE READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY AND COMPLETELY BEFORE YOU ANSWER. The survey data will be useful only if you consider each question carefully and answer to the best of your knowledge. The questionnaire should take you no more than one hour to complete. Your time and effort in completing this survey is greatly appreciated. We hope that the information compiled from the survey will be helpful and important to you and other centers throughout the country.

PART I

For each question in this section, there are three parts. The first part (part a) asks, "Is this a need of your center?". The second part (part b) of the same item asks, "Do you have the skills, informational or people resources available to you to meet this need?". The third part (part c) of the question asks, "If you do not have the resources to meet this need, which resources would help you meet it?".

Read the first item. Then review the response alternatives to the first part ("a") -- reprinted at the top of each page for your reference -- and circle the appropriate letter (A to D) which best describes your center's needs. Next consider whether you have the resources to meet this need (part b). Review the response alternatives to this part and circle the letter which best describes the resources available to your center. Then, if you have any additional comments regarding the item, or if you have some specific resources that would help you meet that need, please complete part c. (If you wish, you can complete "c" only for those items that you feel strongly about or ones that you have clear ideas about resolving.)

RESPONSES:

a. Is this a need of your Center?
   A. Yes, it's an important need that has to be met (on an ongoing basis or as it arises).
   B. Yes, though it's not central to our center's functioning.
   C. Don't know, it hasn't been discussed.
   D. No, it doesn't seem applicable to: our programs; our structure; or our relationship to the college/university.

b. Do you have the skills, informational or people resources available to you to meet this need?
   A. Yes, and we meet (have met) the need.
   B. Yes, but the need remains unmet for other reasons.
   C. No, we could use some help.
   D. Doesn't apply.
SAMPLE QUESTIONS:

X. Strategies for involving women from the local community in our programs.
   a. Is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________

Y. Fresh perked coffee in the morning.
   a. Is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________

2. Information on the amount of funding other women's centers receive.
   a. Is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________

SAMPLES: a. Is this a need of your Center?

A. Yes, it's an important need that has to be met (on an on-going basis or at its present).  
B. Yes, though it's not central in our Center's functioning.  
C. Don't know, it hasn't been discussed.  
D. No, it doesn't seem applicable (i.e. our programs; our structure; or our relationship to the college/university).

b. Do you have the skills; informational or people resources available to you to meet this need?

A. Yes, and we meet (have met) the need.  
B. Yes, but the need remains unmet for other reasons.  
C. No, we could use some help.  
D. Doesn't apply.

Part 1

1. Additional funding from campus to cover current or badly needed new programs or positions.
   a. is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________

2. More information on the budget and funding procedures on your campus in order to make decisions on where or how to seek funding.
   a. is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________

3. Information on the informal funding processes at your institution (or at least that part that would most affect you).
   a. is this a need? (A B C D)
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? (A B C D)
   c. resources needed: ____________________________
1. Is this a need of your Center?
   A. Yes, it's an important need that has to be met (on an on-going basis or as it arises).
   B. Yes, though it's not central to our Center's functioning.
   C. Don't know, it's not been discussed.
   D. No, it doesn't seem applicable to our programs, our structure, or our relationship to the college/university.

4. Ways of determining the physical, personnel and dollar resources needed to implement a program.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

5. Information on different ways of writing up proposals for program funding.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

6. Information on and/or strategies for obtaining funding from non-campus sources.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

7. Information on or strategies for developing fee-generating programs.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

8. Skills in determining or documenting needs.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

9. Ability to translate ideas into program goals and activities.
   a. is this a need? A B C D
   b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. resources needed

10. Skills in evaluating program effectiveness or getting feedback on programs.
    a. is this a need? A B C D
    b. do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
    c. resources needed
11. Ways of using feedback in revising programs.
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

12. Strategies for making decisions about limiting, expanding or terminating programs.
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

13. Information on how other centers operate in terms of size, costs, budget, staff and numbers reached.
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

14. Strategies for reaching diverse groups (e.g., third world women, lesbians, poor women)
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

16. Information on alternatives in organizing administrative tasks.
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed

17. Having effective meetings (e.g., setting agendas, making decisions, completing tasks without alienating members, etc).
   a. Is this a need? 
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? 
   c. Resources needed
18. Effective ways of dealing with group conflict.
   a. Is this a need? A B C D
   b. Do you have the resources to meet it? A B C D
   c. Resources needed

Part II

Below are some organizational issues that might be a problem within a women's center. Please read each item and circle the letter (A - D) that describes your center. The possible responses are:

A. Has not come up because it's not a problem.
B. Has never come up, but it is a problem.
C. Has come up, but no satisfactory/lasting solution has been reached.
D. Has come up and been resolved.

19. How to coordinate and divide the work A B C D
20. Titles or status of positions within center A B C D
21. Who is/who can be considered staff A B C D
22. How power is/should be distributed A B C D
23. Commitment to the center as a whole vs. commitment to a single program A B C D
24. Diversity or lack of it on the staff (i.e., age, race, lifestyles, economic status, etc.) A B C D
25. Salaries -- how much, who gets them, how these decisions are made A B C D
26. Skills sharing A B C D
27. Decision-making processes and responsibilities A B C D
28. Structure of the center A B C D
29. Tendency to overcommit time and energy A B C D
30. Tendency to feel guilty for not being able to commit a lot of time and energy to the center A B C D
31. Different personal allegiances (i.e., community vs. college or university) A B C D
32. Tension between needs of staff, program administration needs and needs of participation  A B C D
33. Methods for decision making  A B C D
34. Structure vs. structurelessness  A B C D
35. Integration of programs into mainstream of institution  A B C D
36. Fears of cooptation by institution  A B C D
37. Differences in amount and type of staff members' previous work experience  A B C D
38. Staff development  A B C D
39. Tendency for people to get "burned out" working at the center  A B C D
40. Defining, legitimizing and sharing leadership  A B C D
41. Staff members' differing personal expectations of the center (find new friends, develop professional skills)  A B C D
42. Clarifying the goals of the center  A B C D
43. Setting up accountability processes for staff members' work in center  A B C D
44. Determining central criteria for hiring volunteer or paid staff  A B C D
45. Dealing with termination/firing of staff members (paid or volunteer)  A B C D
46. Dealing with differences in assertiveness, articulateness, and/or skills and experience among staff  A B C D

47. What is your position within the center?

Please take time and honestly think about your perceptions of the center and those of other staff members. Do you think the other members of your center would agree for the most part with your answers to questions 19 - 46?

A. Most probably would.
B. Most probably would not.
C. I don't know.
48. If you selected response B to question 47, to what do you attribute the difference in perception.

Part III

The responses for each question in this section are listed below the questions. In some cases, you are asked to select more than one response for a question. These questions are clearly labelled, and you are to circle the letters for all responses that apply to your center. For those questions which require a written reply, please write in the space provided. If you need more space, use an additional sheet of paper and label the question number on it.

By administrative support, we mean -- providing helpful information, advocating for your programs in meetings both when you are present and when you aren't, recognizing (generously or generously) the worth of the programs you have or wish to create, or making budget decisions in your favor. For the next several questions, please refer to this definition.

49. Do you get support from administrators on your campus who have program and budget decision making authority or influence?

A. Yes
B. No -- those administrators from whom we get support are not in such positions
C. No -- we get no administrative support
D. Not applicable; we get all of our funds through student government or student association channels.

50. If you answered "yes" to question 49, please specify how many administrators support you.

51. If you answered "yes" to question 49, indicate which elements characterize the support. (circle all that apply)

A. Helpful information
B. Advocacy for programs
C. Recognition of the worth of the programs
D. Making budget decisions in your favor
E. Doesn't apply -- we get no support
F. OTHER (please specify)
52. Which, if any, of the following do you think might help you to get the support you need to develop and maintain your programs? (circle all that apply)

A. strategies for increasing support and minimizing resistance to programs for women on college/university campuses.
B. more skills in developing programs (i.e., documenting needs to evaluating effectiveness).
C. more knowledge of leadership issues in women's groups and strategies for handling those issues.
D. organizing the center (or group) to meet program goals.
E. organizing the center (or groups) to meet individual needs.
F. improving communication skills -- especially those related to situations where you're dealing with people whose values, politics, and rhetoric are different than one's own.
G. collaborating more on projects with faculty, students and administrators.
H. skills in negotiating the college/university budget process.
I. information on current political and administrative concerns on your campus.
J. OTHER (please specify)

53. What skills, attitudes or information, in general, do you think are necessary for effective liaison between your center and campus administrators?

54. What interferes with your effective interaction with campus administrators who currently or potentially could support programs and budgets for your center? (circle all that apply and specify the problem)

A. factors related to liaison person(s') interaction with administrators (i.e., inexperience, personal styles and attitudes)
B. factors related to the center as a whole (i.e., politics, goals)
C. factors related to administrators' attitudes, styles, skills or politics
D. factors which influence your college/university as a whole

55. What skills, attitudes and types of information does your center need to be more effective in working with campus administrators?
56. Have there been changes in the politics, policies, practices or finances of your campus which have affected your center?
   A. Yes, positively (please specify)
   B. Yes, negatively (please specify)
   C. No

57. Is your center able to keep abreast of changes in the campus that could affect the center?
   A. Yes
   B. No

58. Have there been changes in the women's or feminist community which have affected your center?
   A. Yes, positively (please specify)
   B. Yes, negatively (please specify)
   C. No

59. Is your center able to keep abreast of changes in that community which have affected your center?
   A. Yes
   B. No

Part IV

The responses for each question in this section are listed below the question. In some cases, you will be asked to select more than one response. These items are clearly marked, and you should select all that apply to your center.

60. What types of programs does your center offer? (circle all that apply)

   A. short term counseling
   B. career counseling or workshops
   C. long term counseling, therapy
   D. support groups (CR groups)
   E. re-entry or support programs for non-traditional women students
   F. drop-in center
   G. library
   H. assertiveness training
   I. newsletter
   J. arts program
   K. credit or noncredit workshops
   L. academic courses
   M. medical, legal, educational and/or social welfare referrals
   N. speakers service
   O. affirmative action/discrimination advocacy
   P. rape crisis intervention
   Q. OTHER (specify)
61. Do you review the effectiveness of these programs on a regular basis?
   A. Yes
   B. No

62. Do you have a regular procedure and set of criteria for deciding when to end, expand or initiate programs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

63. Does your center have its own space?
   A. Yes
   B. No

64. If you answered "yes" to question 63, is the space adequate for your center's needs?
   A. Yes
   B. No

65. If you answered "no" to question 63, what interferes with the acquisition of adequate space?

66. Which groups of women is your center primarily concerned with serving?

67. Approximately how many women use your center each year (i.e., via program participation, referrals, etc.)?

68. Of the number given in question 67, estimate the percentage of the following groups that make up the total
   A. Undergraduate students
   B. Graduate students
   C. University/college workers
   D. Faculty
   E. Women of the community
   
   Total 100%
69. How many people (total) work at your center?  
   Paid  Volunteer  Total

70. How many people work full time at your center?  
   Paid full-time  Volunteer full-time  Total full-time

71. How many people work part-time at your center?  
   Students
   Students paid via center staff salaries
   Students paid via work-study monies or stipends
   Students who receive credit for their work
   Student volunteers
   TOTAL STUDENTS

   Non-Students
   Paid non-student
   Non-student volunteers

72. If you do not have volunteers currently working at your center, have you tried working with volunteers in the past?  
   A. yes  B. no

73. Has utilizing volunteers been problematic for your center in the past?  
   A. Yes  B. No  C. Not applicable
   Please explain.

74. How many of your staff have worked at the center for more than one full year?

75. Which of the following groups are represented on your staff? (circle all that apply)
   A. Blacks/Afro Americans  E. Single parents
   B. Spanish surnamed/Spanish speaking  F. Welfare and other poor
   C. Oriental Americans  G. Lesbians
   D. Native Americans  H. Older (over 40)

76. How long has your center been in existence?

77. How large is your budget from campus sources and what are (were) the sources of funds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Sources (please indicate all sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
78. How large is your budget from non-campus sources and what are (were) the sources of funds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Sources (all sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79. Have you sought funds from various campus sources?
   A. Yes
   B. No

80. How is your center organized?

81. How are decisions made at your center and who makes them?

82. Does your center have an advisory board?
   A. Yes
   B. No

83. If you have one, please describe how you select people for the board, what groups are represented on the board and describe the degree of involvement the board has in your center's functioning.

84. How would you characterize your college or university (please check only one item in each category)?

A. public ______  C. coed ______
   private ______  single sex ______

B. large (over 10,000 students) ______  D. in a city ______
   medium (4,000 - 10,000) ______  near urban area ______
   small (under 4,000) ______  rural ______
85. How is your center perceived by administrators and other campus agencies (i.e., what is your center's image on campus)?

Congratulations and thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire. We will send you a summary of the results of this survey when they are tabulated.