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ABSTRACT

The problem for study was whether certain selected factors influenced social workers' responses to nuclear disarmament. Using a random sampling of B.C.A.S.W. members throughout the province of British Columbia, a semi-structured mail questionnaire solicited responses to a number of questions aimed at discovering the respondents' perceptions of the seriousness of the nuclear threat, the sense of personal or professional responsibility for action against that threat, belief in their own ability, and the B.C.A.S.W.'s ability to act to counter the threat, and their sense of personal efficacy.

Most respondents saw nuclear disarmament as a social work issue that was important in comparison with other issues, and for which social workers had something unique to offer. The majority also saw global social issues to be as important as local ones and money spent on the arms race as taking money away from social programs. However, respondents saw very little adverse effects on their clients, their families, and themselves. There were some relationships individually between respondents' nuclear disarmament activity and the selected factors. There were no strong relationships, however, between single items of measure and respondents' actual nuclear disarmament activity, and there were moderate relationships between measures of B.C.A.S.W. ability to act and respondents'
activity. As well, there were low relationships between several items of personal and professional responsibility and respondents' nuclear disarmament activity. However, action may result from a combinations of factors, rather than one factor in isolation, and multiple regression techniques could show stronger relationships.

Respondents were inconsistent in their answers. This means that, in looking at social workers' attitudes toward the threat of nuclear war, research may have to deal with the issue on several levels: the political, the personal, the professional, and the social.
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CHAPTER I: BACKGROUND

OVERVIEW OF STUDY

Awareness of the nuclear threat and recognition of the lack of social work consensus about action to counter that threat have increased the profession’s interest in social workers’ attitudes towards nuclear disarmament and in the factors that might influence social workers’ disarmament activities (Alexander, 1983; Mather 1986; Dean, 1987; Desmarnis et al, 1986 pilot study). As one study in a student research series at the University of British Columbia School of Social Work between 1985-1987, the thesis considers some factors that may affect social workers’ response to the threat of nuclear war. Using literature from disarmament, social work, and social psychology, the thesis looks at four selected factors related to taking action in response to a threat: the perception of seriousness, personal or professional responsibility for action, ability to act, and belief in the efficacy of one’s actions. To complete the study, the total membership of the B.C.A.S.W. was randomly sampled using a mail questionnaire (Appendix E).

INTRODUCTION

An awareness of the threat of nuclear war is reflected in disarmament and social work literature, as well as research on children and youth. The nuclear arms race is an immediate threat to the world for many reasons: a threat to the economy because of the negative impact of military
spending and the diversion of resources away from meeting human needs (The Ploughshares Monitor, June 1985a & 1985b; Lundy, 1987; Lewis, 1986; Brandt, 1986; N.A.S.W. handout, undated), a threat to world human and civil rights because of the repressive nature of militarism and realpolitik (Crane, 1985; Walker, 1986; Hayter, 1982; Clarke and Swift, 1982), and a threat to the environment from nuclear wastes and the overconsumption of resources (Carothers, 1986a & 1986b).

Nuclear war is also a threat because of its potential for global destruction and because of its negative psychological effect on individuals. Research and opinion polls indicate that adults, children and youth are afraid because they believe that they and their countries will not survive a nuclear war. While many social workers do not appear to be aware of the extent to which they or their clients are disturbed by anxiety about the nuclear threat, the effects of this anxiety may hinder general adaptive functioning and ability to cope. As well, approaches to mitigate the negative psychological effects of the nuclear threat apparently use many traditional social work theories and skills, giving social workers a logical place in the nuclear disarmament community.
NUCLEAR WAR AS A THREAT.
The thesis proposes that the potential for nuclear war is an issue needing further consideration by social workers on two levels: potential global destruction and present psychological disability. Social workers have a responsibility to act on the basis of both kinds of threat. In the case of nuclear war, social workers have specific tasks in the Emergency Social Services division of Canada’s disaster response plan, and nuclear war is treated by Emergency Planning Canada as one of a number of possible disasters. The tasks include immediate response planning, recruitment, training and maintenance of volunteers for provision of food, clothing, shelter, registration and inquiry systems, protection of minor children, financial assistance, and mental health services. Additionally, Emergency Social Services personnel provide information, referral and advocacy services to survivors and coordinate long-term mental health follow-up of both survivors and disaster workers (Emergency Planning Canada, 1986). International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War have gained support because physicians looking at the medical needs of a population subject to a nuclear attack have recognized there can be no effective medical response to nuclear war (Carr, 1986; Goresky, 1986a). While civil
defense planning is not regarded favourably by nuclear disarmament strategists, recognition that there can be no effective response to nuclear war may also mobilize social workers.

In looking at the present negative psychological effects of the threat of nuclear war, findings in the nuclear disarmament literature include: everyone is subject in some way to the anxiety of living in a nuclear age (Lifton, 1982; Bernard et al, 1977; Fried, 1982); individuals have only two choices to combat the effects of living under the threat of nuclear war - action or avoidance (Macy, 1979); action to reduce the subjective feeling of threat is positive or healthy when it results in peace activities of some kind (Gould et al, 1986) and negative or unhealthy when it involves use of defense mechanisms such as those involved in psychic numbing or detached acceptance (Lifton, 1982; Lifton and Falk, 1982; Macy, 1979). In choosing action, individuals open the boundaries of their systems; in choosing avoidance, individuals close those boundaries. Both clinical social work and social action endeavor to give individuals and groups the tools to act, to improve their ability to function, and to change their environments. As the threat of nuclear war is a part of their social and political environment, social workers have the responsibility as well as the knowledge and skills to act, both in response to client need and as social activists.
a) Potential nuclear destruction:

The disarmament literature offers scientific estimates about the effects of blast and radiation (Perry, 1983), the disruption of society (Schell, 1979; Perry, 1983; Pentz, 1986; Chivian, 1981), and nuclear winter (Carr, 1986; Perry, 1986a). The estimates refer to the deleterious medical, economic, political and social byproducts of nuclear war (Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 1982), as well as to the inadequacy of any civil defense planning in dealing with the reality of nuclear war (Chivian, 1981; Pentz, 1983; Perry, 1983; Caldicott, 1982). Scientists have studied the particular and continuing negative effects of the atomic blasts in 1945 upon the lives and health of the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Lifton, 1967; Hersey, 1946), as well as the results of nuclear testing on residents of the South Pacific, U.S. servicemen, and the U.S. states of Utah and Nevada (The Ploughshares Monitor, December 1986; The Greenpeace Examiner, June 1986; Wasserman and Solomon, 1983).

Other studies on the urgency and escalating threat of nuclear war discuss changes in the nuclear strategy of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. who have both moved from a policy of "stable mutual deterrence" (see Appendix B for definitions) to "flexible response" and "limited nuclear war" (Pentz, 1983 and 1986; Carroll, 1986; Bastian, 1986). Military planners are developing strategies to fight and prevail in a "protracted" nuclear war, and "first-strike" weapons are
being developed and tested by both sides (Carroll, 1986; Bundy et al, 1986). Estimates about the extent of the threat of nuclear war to Canadian populations conclude that the Soviet Union has targeted all parts of the North American Aerospace Defense system including all Canadian radar sites, command centres, communication facilities and air defense bases. As well, all Canadian airfields capable of supporting B-52 bombers and all Canadian resource extraction centres are targeted (Carroll, 1983; Ellsberg, 1983).

Many writers state that the nuclear arms race is the single, most pressing issue to be dealt with regarding the immediate fate of the earth. Along with discussion about the escalating risk of accidental nuclear war through a strategy of "launch-on-warning," unpredictable design or systems failure (Suzuki, 1986), and the increasing threat of simple miscalculation (Bastian, 1986), there is a concern about "horizontal proliferation" to non-nuclear countries and terrorist use of nuclear weapons (Schell, 1982; Carroll, 1983). Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll Jr., U.S. Navy (Ret.), states that if nuclear proliferation continues, then by "1990 we will be in a condition where a nuclear war is likely and almost a certainty within this century" (Carroll, 1983; p.246).
b) Present anxiety:

Surveys and opinion polls focus on the level of anxiety about the threat of nuclear war and beliefs about survivability and prevention (Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986). Results of research on adults’ beliefs about the likelihood of nuclear war occurring in the near future vary. Gallop reports that 40% of American adults believe it will occur within ten years (1983); Caldicott states that 31% of American adults believe it will occur within ten years (1986); and Woodworth states that 50% of adults believe it will occur within five years (1987).

Research to date, however, has primarily focused on children’s views of the future and their anxieties about nuclear war. The bulk of research on children has occurred during the 1980’s and comparisons of international data have just begun (Gould et al, 1986). Between 1961 and 1983, a number of studies by Schwebel, and one other study using Schwebel’s model, looked at American children’s beliefs about the likelihood of nuclear war. In that period of time, concern about the likelihood of nuclear war increased from 44% (Schwebel, 1961) to 64% (Gould, Berger Gould, and Eden, 1983). As well, a number of studies (reported in Gould et al, 1986) using the Doctor and Goldenring model looked at children and adolescents’ ranking of fears: in the U.S.A. (Doctor and Goldenring, 1984), in Finland (Solantaus et al, 1983), in Canada (Sommers et al, 1984), and in Sweden (Holmborg and Bergstroem, 1984). Hargreaves (1984) applied
the Beardsley and Mack format to youth in British Columbia. "Fear of nuclear war" ranked either first or second in every study with "parents dying" ranking as the alternate first or second fear in three of the four studies.

There are similarities in concern about nuclear war by adults and youth: 33.1% of youths ages 13-18 think of nuclear war often (Doctor and Goldenring, 1984); 28% of adults worry about the possibility of nuclear war "often"/"a great deal" (L.A. Times survey, 1982 quoted in Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986). Seventy percent of American high school students believe the U.S.A. would not survive a nuclear war (Beardsley and Mack, 1982). Almost 81% of Soviet children ages 9-17 believe that they and their families would not survive a nuclear war, and 78.9% believe the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. would not survive (Chivian, Mack, Waletzky, et al, 1983). Better than sixty-four percent of 13-18 year old American youths do not believe that they or their family would survive a nuclear war (Doctor and Goldenring, 1984). Over two-thirds of Canadian youth suspect they will not live out their natural lives (Hargreaves, 1984). Ninety-two percent of American adults believe their chances for survival are "poor" or "so-so," while only 5% of adults think their chances of surviving a nuclear war are "very good" (Doctor and Goldenring, 1984); 96% of adults believe that nuclear war would mean the end of their country and probably of the earth (Caldicott, 1986).
Anxiety about the potential destructive power of nuclear war and the increasing threat that nuclear war may occur appears to be widespread in the populations studied. Response to anxiety is a complex interaction between the stressful event(s), its significance to the individual, and the individual's ego strength and resources for coping (Goldstein, 1984). Anxiety about the threat of nuclear war has become a part of the social and political environment and that anxiety may affect adaptive functioning.

**RESPONSE TO ANXIETY ABOUT NUCLEAR WAR.**

People may utilize either adaptive or maladaptive coping mechanisms in an attempt to decrease anxiety. Use of maladaptive defense mechanisms generally decrease an individual's ability to function, increase rigid behaviour and operate out of awareness, while adaptive coping increases an individual's ability to function, is purposive and flexible, and involves choice (Goldstein, 1984).

**a) Maladaptive responses:**

A number of writers (Mack, 1986; Macy, 1979; Lifton, 1982; Lifton and Falk, 1982; Woodworth, 1987; Fried, 1982; Pollis, 1983; Van Ornum and Van Ornum, 1984) discuss the negative psychological responses attributed to living with anxiety about the threat of nuclear war. In some cases, these effects are discussed in the context of an inability to mobilize for nuclear disarmament and, in all cases, as maladaptive coping responses. The literature offers
explanations for failure to respond to the threat suggesting the defense mechanisms against anxiety may block an individual’s ability to respond (Woodworth, 1987; Lifton and Falk, 1982). Writers argue that new psychological constructs of the post-nuclear world point to the use of metadefenses (or composites of a number of defense mechanisms), including any number of the following: denial, suppression and repression (Lifton, 1982; Woodworth, 1987; Fried, 1982), habituation, projection, and dissociation (Woodworth, 1987; Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977; Lifton, 1982).

Metadefenses operate on a short-term basis to preserve the individual against hopelessness, confusion, and anxiety (Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977; Van Ornum and Van Ornum, 1984), against a sense of powerlessness (Woodworth, 1987; Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977), against despair (Macy, 1979), or against unbearable, unacceptable thoughts and impulses like inadequacy, revulsion, guilt, and shame (Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977). Metadefenses may be in response to an acute crisis or to the continuing, subtle and all-pervasive nature of the nuclear threat (Fried, 1982). In the theory of psychosocial transition (Parkes, 1982), a crisis or transition occurs when a person discovers a major discrepancy between the world he encounters and his assumptions about that world. In this case, the thought of nuclear war creates an overwhelming horror; it involves the "loss of the assumption that the species will inevitably
pull through....At the prospect of the extinction of our civilization, feelings of grief and horror are natural" (Macy, 1979; p. 42). In the face of such loss, the individual feels unable to rely on his internal perception to guide him any longer; hence he suffers bewilderment, fear, and anxiety. Some of the grief that follows is the attempt to resist acknowledging or accepting the change (Parkes, 1982). In Fried's theory of endemic stress, individuals are not presented with an acute stressor to which they can respond. Rather, they become habituated to the background danger that persists unchanged over time leaving them unable to judge or respond to the seriousness of the danger (Pollis, 1983; Woodworth, 1987).

For adults, the results of maladaptive coping mechanisms are psychic numbing or the phenomenon of detached acceptance in the face of overwhelming horror (Lifton, 1982; Lifton and Falk, 1982), blindness to the implications of the threat (Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977), the shutdown of the creative life processes needed to motivate or energize an individual to take appropriate action (Woodworth, 1987), the blunting of inhibitions and social sanctions against mass death or destruction, and the acculturation to nuclear war as a viable alternative in diplomatic strategy (Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl, 1977). In addition, such maladaptive coping may be insufficient to contain the anxiety, leaving the individual with an increased sense of helplessness,
isolation, resignation, and apathy. Because of the distortion of reality involved in such ego defenses, overall ego functioning is impaired, coping ability is hampered and belief in one's efficacy is damaged (Goldstein, 1984).

For children and adolescents, the reaction of hopelessness and despair to unsolvable problems blunts and warps the process of attaining competence and mastery (Pollis, 1983; Maluccio, 1979). Growing up in a society where adults appear impotent to change a social environment that tolerates total destruction harms the development of immature egos and tends to foster negative patterns of personality functioning. It can lead to depression and withdrawal, a sense of powerlessness and cynical resignation, it can erode hopes for the future and cause narcissistic personality traits, decreased ability to delay gratification, and feelings of bitter resentment and anger towards adults (Schwebel, 1982; Chivian and Snow, 1983; Holmberg and Bergstroem, 1984; Mack et al, 1980 [as cited in Gould et al, 1986]; Escalona, 1982; Woodworth, 1987). As well, Gould asks whether the increase in teen suicide of 136% between 1960 and 1980 is related to teens' perception of a lack of a future and a lack of anything they can do to change their chances of survival (Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986). "We may be seeing that growing up in a world dominated by the threat of imminent nuclear destruction is having an impact on the structure of personality itself" (Mack, 1981). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of
Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R, 1987) states "There is evidence that prevalence of the disorder [major depression] has increased in the age cohorts that came to maturity after the Second World War.")

b) Adaptive responses:
In the case of the adaptive functioning of an individual's coping mechanisms, response to anxiety or threat involves problem-solving and mobilization for action (Compton and Gallaway, 1979; Goldstein, 1984). Action is both a response to and a prerequisite for a sense of competency, mastery, personal growth, enhanced self-image, and adaptive social functioning (Maluccio, 1979; Pollis, 1983). Social work draws from ego psychology and developmental theory to bring together a unique perspective on the effects of living with the threat of nuclear war. Stamm (1961) states that social work practice is "directed toward the goal of ensuring a social-psychological environment which promotes the development of mature autonomous ego functions" (p.96).

In Erikson's theory of psychosocial maturation, developmental stages are an interaction of inner drives and social environment (Lally, 1986; Goldstein, 1984). Development of ego identity is an evolving configuration gradually established from developmental stages throughout childhood where the beginnings of hope, will, purpose and competence are developed (Verdon-Roe, 1963; Hargreaves, 1984). Students who are able to acknowledge more worry about
nuclear war show better scores on measures of adjustment and self-esteem, talk more with parents, believe that personal action can help prevent nuclear war, and are more hopeful about the prevention of nuclear war than students who don’t report worry about nuclear war (Van Hoorn and French, 1983; Doctor and Goldenring, 1984 as cited in Gould et al, 1986). As well, they are positive and optimistic about the future (Verdon-Roe, 1963), and optimism is positively correlated with school achievement (Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986). Children who see adults taking positive action to change things recognize they are not alone; they believe that they can make a difference and count as individuals; they have some sense of control over their lives (Verdon-Roe, 1963; Excalona, 1982; Schwebel, 1982).

Social workers helping parents deal with questions about nuclear war may focus on encouraging them to role model healthy coping, to teach the skills necessary to participate effectively in community affairs, to offer a realistic hope for the future, to reassure by taking protective measures, and to indicate why it is less painful to act than it is to acquiesce to the powerlessness and irrationality of post-nuclear society (Schwebel, 1982). Sharing concerns about nuclear war appears to be related to an increased feeling of connectedness among family members. Social workers involved in family therapy are aware talking is an activity
important to build confidence, increase a sense of mastery over the environment, develop beginning social responsibility and a competent, healthy personality (Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986).

Since there are few socially sanctioned coping strategies for trauma, and society tends to discourage any acknowledgement of despair, social workers may also use their skills in offering workshops and support groups for individuals dealing with grieving and despair (Macy, 1979; Killilea, 1982). Parkes (1982) notes that when legitimate grieving is delayed or inhibited for either personal or situational reasons, it can result in pathological forms of repression or avoidance, such as psychic numbing. In workshops dealing with grief and despair about potential nuclear catastrophe, social workers may offer many of the same steps involved in working generally with psychological trauma (Macy, 1979). Uses of these techniques in other areas of trauma include group work with disaster personnel (Lamontagne, 1983), sexual abuse survivors (Sexual Abuse Victims Anonymous pamphlet, 1986), and adult children of alcoholics or dysfunctional families (Adult Children Of Alcoholics pamphlet, 1987).

Nuclear disarmament and social work literature prescribe positive action to counter the effects of paralysis (Lifton, 1982) and depression (Pollis, 1983), to decrease the sense of vulnerability, to improve belief in one’s ability to
cope, to decrease fear (Gould, Moon, and Van Hoorn, 1986), to feel better, to increase a sense of self-worth, hopefulness and strength (Van Ornum and Van Ornum, 1984), and to feel a sense of competency (Woodworth, 1987; Goldstein, 1984). Action implies confidence that one can be effective and make a difference (Woodworth, 1987). The emotions of fear, anger and sadness are signals to the individual that something needs to be done to use the energy of that emotion to problem solve and act (Van Ornum and Van Ornum, 1984; Maluccio, 1979). Lifton (1982) sees three steps in the process of regaining emotional health: confronting the reality of the images, experiencing the awe and dread fully, and taking the necessary intense action to change the system. Both he and Woodworth call this action a call or push to life (Lifton, 1982; Woodworth, 1987).

Social work literature on community sociotherapy as an intervention (Rein, 1976) suggests that participation in social action can change the individual regardless of the outcome of the action. The process of organizing for self-help, protest, access to resources, or even revolution creates a change action within the individual. That action has positive effects on personal health, a sense of power, integration, cohesiveness, community competency, and identity (Rein, 1976). When discussing the trauma of psychic numbing and despair, Macy (1979) challenges the traditional view of psychotherapy which looks at individual pathology and argues that not only does the traditional
approach take a dysfunctional view of the ego as isolated and fragile, but it also reinforces the individual's feelings of isolation and craziness. A vision of action as therapy responds to a recognition that traditional therapy, or theories that see only the individual as the target of change, may not offer all the assistance needed for change. In the process of client self-realization through involvement in social groups, social workers can provide healthy role models for clients (Reisch, Wenocur, Sherman, 1981).

A number of disarmament writers also support the need for political action to channel anger into positive change (Caldicott, 1986; Lifton, 1982; Macy, 1979; Pollis, 1983). Thurlow (1982) details the history of survivors of Hiroshima, and notes that, when they joined together for mutual support and action, they gained a sense of mission, an increase in self-concept and self-confidence, and were able to fight off passivity and withdrawal. Lifton notes that there has been a loss of a sense of generativity and immortality in our knowledge that the world may not be there for our children's children. In order to pass on a sense of the future, parents must come to believe it exists for themselves as well (Lifton, 1982).
"Where doom discourse addresses its audience as victims, disarmament discourse speaks to us as activists: what it maps is not global devastation — the geography of Hiroshima multiplied a millionfold — but local points of resistance and transformation; the workers at the Lucas Corporation planning their factory's switch from military to civilian production; the conversion of New Zealand, municipality by municipality, into a nuclear free zone; the subversiveness and creativity of Greenham Women; the undermining of the Cold War in myriad unofficial dialogues between peace activists and dissenters from England and Hungary, Holland and Czechoslovakia, West and East Germany, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R." (Witheford, 1986).

Activism reformulates the problem from devastating holocaust to meaningful and manageable activities able to be grasped and carried out by the individual.

FACTORS INFLUENCING AN ADAPTIVE RESPONSE TO THE NUCLEAR THREAT: INVOLVEMENT IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY

The nuclear disarmament literature influences individuals through a combination of terrifying prospects, factual statistics and information, and an appeal to individual, cooperative, caring natures as well as a sense of commonality with the other peoples of the earth. Social workers, physicians, lawyers, educators, scientists and ex-military persons are involved in nuclear disarmament, each from his/her own professional perspective. Theories of social influence in conjunction with our knowledge of ego psychology and social work theory offer some explanations for individual response to a situation of threat. Factors which may influence an individual to act include: 1. the seriousness of a situation; 2. responsibility for action; 3. ability to act; and 4. sense of personal efficacy.
1. Seriousness.

A number of factors are involved in judgement about the seriousness, emergency, or threat in a given situation. Aronson (1984) notes that a tendency to help in a situation of threat is increased when the occasion can be clearly defined as an emergency and a decision can be made that the threat is important. In the case of the threat of nuclear war, the environmental cues are ambiguous and subject to some argument; individuals tend to look around to see whether others think the situation is serious before committing themselves to action. The theory of group dynamics (Lewin as cited in Zimbardo et al, 1977, p. 62) and the theory of social comparison (Festinger, 1957) both suggest that the reference groups to which individuals belong have a major influence on their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours through their need for acceptance, approval and recognition, and through their need to compare themselves to others in order to evaluate their opinions, attitudes and talents (Zimbardo et al, 1977). A reference group can be used to influence individual perceptions that a situation is serious and involvement in nuclear disarmament activities through identification with a respected group member and internalization of group goals. Permanence of the behaviour can then be increased if the individual makes a firm commitment to continue to interact with that person or group. As well, these role models will influence the way individuals perceive the world through modelling active
responses to the issue, identifying important environmental cues, defining the social reference points, and defining the situation as an emergency (Zimbardo et al., 1977; Aronson, 1984). In the case of nuclear war, individuals might also look to the response of an institutional authority such as their professional association, their government, and their employer (Aronson, 1984).

In the Yale attitude change approach (Hovland as cited in Zimbardo et al., 1977), acceptance of a communication is predicated on a number of factors, including credibility of the information source. To be credible, the source of communication must be perceived to have reputation and prestige (Aronson, 1984), expertise, trustworthiness, sound judgement, competence, attractiveness, good will, and altruism (Zimbardo et al., 1977). Credibility increases in direct proportion to the amount a communication may actually be, in fact, counter to the best interests of a particular communicator. For example, scientists and the military are credible anti-nuclear messengers because of their expertise in the area and the "discontinuity between their messages and the apparent interests of their professions" (Aronson, 1984; p. 78).

In a judgement about the seriousness of a threat, the nature of the information given is important, and certain kinds of information are evaluated differently in deciding whether a situation is serious. Using a Yale attitude change
approach, logical, rational argument is frequently used in attempting to influence commitment to nuclear disarmament activity. The approach suggests that a person's emotional reaction (attitude) towards a particular object can be altered by altering the opinions or beliefs (cognitive or knowledge component) about the object. Only four items are necessary for attitude change: attention, comprehension, acceptance, and retention (Zimbardo et al, 1977). This approach assumes that, given good, objective information, individuals will accept the view that the threat of nuclear war is an emergency requiring immediate and sustained action. Many of the disarmament communications from science and the military fall into this category: they offer rational argument, facts and statistics (Pentz, 1983; pp.54-573; Halsted, 1983; Falk, 1983; Carroll, 1983; Ellsberg, 1983).

While it might suggest a strong cognitive argument in some circumstances, research on persuasion indicates that information attempting to influence behaviour should also have an aspect of emotional arousal (Aronson, 1984), and possibly a fear component (Leventhal, 1970). As well, a vivid personal example is easily remembered and carries more persuasive weight than logic alone (Aronson, 1984). Literature on the effects of the bombing on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is both graphic and personal (Hersey, 1946; Lifton, 1967).
The argument for action in a time of threat may be taken more seriously, however, when the information includes a clear "fear" message combined with effective recommendations for action. Recommendations or instructions that appear to have a good chance of success reduce the dissonant nature of the communication, removing much of the individual's need for ego defenses like avoidance and denial. Messages with a fear content and no prospects for protective action appear to disrupt coping skills and create resistance to persuasion (Leventhal, 1970). However, awareness of danger combined with a perception of effective preventive action may serve as a motivator for acceptance of the serious nature of the communication and a motivator to action (Leventhal, 1970). Aronson argues that such communication has, in fact, happened in the 1980's through the combination of fear messages and directions for action. Since 1980, individuals throughout the world have become frightened in an activated way because of the combination of films and dramatizations of nuclear war and the Nuclear Freeze Proposal. Begun in 1980, this proposal set the information in understandable terms, offered specific goals and recommendations for action, and provided an identified focus (Aronson, 1984; p.86).

Arguments from cognitive dissonance theory by Festinger (1957) indicate that individuals cannot tolerate the uncomfortable tension created by the discrepancies between different and conflicting cognitions. Pressure to reduce
dissonance in some way increases according to the importance of the dissonant cognitions. Consequently, disarmament literature appeals to the dissonance between the cognition, "I love and protect my family," and "Nuclear arms threaten them with a horrible death." As well, the literature attempts to increase the ratio of dissonant to consonant elements in the cognitions in order to increase the need to identify the threat as serious and to take action to reduce dissonance (Zimbardo et al, 1977). In the absence of a specific focus, there can be internal pressure to ignore information about the nuclear threat by simply declaring it irrelevant to one's life (Zimbardo et al, 1977).

2. Personal or professional responsibility for action.

When an individual cannot assume that someone else will take care of the danger, helping behaviour is increased; when it is easy to remove oneself physically or emotionally from the scene, helping behaviour is lessened (Aronson, 1984). Relevancy of the communication to one's professional practice, oneself and one's family tends to increase a sense of responsibility. In like manner, a perceived mutuality or commonality with other individuals in danger increases an individual's sense of personal responsibility to act (Aronson, 1984). Nuclear disarmament literature is consistent in its message of oneness with the planet and all its inhabitants as well as the breaking down of stereotypes through professional and public exchanges, twin cities, "pen-twinning," etc (Hoffmann, undated; Araki, 1986).
The assumption that one is supposed to act may be more important in some circumstances than the receipt of specific instructions on how to act. With an assumption that one is supposed to act, the fear level at the time of communication is then of little consequence (Leventhal, 1970). In fact, in a situation of personal threat, unless a compelling deterrent exists, people who anticipate danger prefer to act rather than do nothing (Leventhal, 1970). In addition, the internalization of a number of values or attitudes towards action may also influence a feeling of personal responsibility. Certain professional or occupational groups have codes of ethics and a number of implicit or explicit values governing responsibility for certain behaviours in situations of perceived threat to clients/patients/public. A strong identification with one's professional reference group, therefore, may influence the effect of the profession on an individual's sense of personal responsibility for action.

If one's reference group can garner a small commitment from an individual, that individual may be more likely to increase that commitment as time passes. A small commitment that entails some reasonably free expression of support for a stance can encourage both attitude and further behaviour change, since individuals tend to find justification to believe what they say (Aronson, 1984). Once a small
commitment is made, individuals tend to be more receptive to increasing their activity. Peace marches may fall into this category. For example, Aronson states that the fastest way to radicalize people is to place them on a picket line.

3. **The knowledge and ability to act.**

Knowledge of what can be done immediately to begin to counter a threat is necessary before an individual can act, and is a component of deciding to act (Leventhal, 1970). The nuclear disarmament literature offers specific suggestions for action, from opening the topic for discussion with one's clients/patients and colleagues to strategies for "noncooperation with nuclearism" (Woodworth, 1987). As well, knowledge of the area in which one is intending to act is important so as to increase understanding and thus commitment to the cause, counter dissonant communication from others, counter the dissonance of decision-making through finding additional information supportive of one's choice, and increasing the attractiveness of the chosen alternative and reducing the attractiveness of the unchosen option (Aronson, 1984).

Different professional groups have organized around the principle that they have unique skills and/or knowledge to place in the nuclear disarmament arena. Scientists give advice to disarmament groups and municipal authorities (Pentz, 1983); retired N.A.T.O. generals write articles against the expansion or use of nuclear arms (Bastian,
1986); lawyers apply the Nuremburg Pledge to the threat of nuclear war (The Ploughshares Monitor, December 1986); and physicians speak about atmospheric testing and medical response after nuclear war (Perry, 1986; Physicians for Social Responsibility handout, undated). Psychologists and Educators write on the effects of the nuclear threat on children, and Alexander (1983) suggests a social work nuclear disarmament program based on the principles of conscientization (consciousness-raising of people, self-education, university peace studies, and looking at militarism from a policy, social justice, environmental, moral, and peace perspective), coalition (through strong affiliations essential in social movements), and conversion (both military and economic) (in Lundy, 1987).

A perception that one has the ability to act also includes an assessment of the cost of helping. Even when a situation is defined as an emergency, people tend to help less when the cost of helping is high (Aronson, 1984). Cost may be counted personally, financially, or professionally; activity may be perceived to be restricted or impeded by the necessity to expend resources that might otherwise be used to deal with issues of competing priorities or to endure social sanctions such as personal or professional loss of status (Steiner, 1970; Zimbardo et al, 1977; Dean, 1986). Costs may simply be reckoned in terms of the energy one has to give to activity outside of work or family time (Desmarnis et al, 1987). Social learning (Zimbardo et al,
1977) suggests that behaviour is determined in large part by the expected consequences of that behaviour. Disarmament activists frequently count consequences versus costs in terms of the potentially serious consequences of not acting.

4. Sense of personal efficacy.

In addition to weighing the costs of assistance, individuals consider the benefits their action will bring. If people believe that there is a good chance that their activity will create a favourable outcome, they will tend to act much more quickly (Aronson, 1984). Likelihood of favourable outcome increases the attractiveness of an uncertain outcome; outcomes we know we cannot have are devalued (Steiner, 1970).

For some nuclear disarmament activists, it has been helpful for them to look at the holocaust of nuclear war in smaller portions. In this way, the picture is manageable, their normal professional skills have immediate utility, and they can see the immediate effect of their labours. Examples of dividing nuclear disarmament activities into manageable pieces include fighting the apathy cycle (Woodworth, 1987), assisting individuals to work through despair (Macy, 1979), teaching or developing peace curricula, teaching material on negotiation and conflict resolution, offering information about prejudice and violence (Dalby, 1986), and producing compendia of peace curricula and peace bibliographies (Wien, 1984).
Attribution theory implies that if one has been active in change (Aronson, 1984) and sees oneself as an effective person, then an individual is more likely to assume some form of action (Bem, 1970). Conversely, a perception of vested authorities as implacable and unmoveable would tend to inhibit one's action. Bernard, Ottenberg, and Redl (1977) see part of the stress of living in a technological, bureaucratic, and nuclear age as coming from an increased perception that one is personally unimportant and relatively helpless, and a belief that one is powerless in response to decisions made about larger issues. In Dean (1987) and in a pilot study by Desmarnis et al (1986), professional respondents identified a range of issues giving them a feeling of being under attack: they also noted their personal sense of powerlessness and helplessness in the face of the nuclear threat.

A perception of oneself as an active change agent (what one does can be effective in changing the situation of threat) is critical in mobilizing an individual's energy for change. Without hope, individuals will not act (Steiner, 1970). Helplessness or hopelessness, the feeling that one cannot avoid either the fear or the danger, paralyzes the will to act (Leventhal, 1970). An inability to cope with fear leads to avoidance reactions and failure to take action. While individuals differ in capacity to cope with stressful circumstances, belief in one's ability to cope increases the likelihood of action (Leventhal, 1970). Leventhal also
suggests that individual differences in coping abilities related to self-esteem do not inhibit performance when all persons have specific action instructions. While people with low self-esteem who have to act immediately are seemingly overcome by a high fear message, self-esteem does not affect behaviour when individuals are shown how to cope and how to take protective action (Leventhal, 1970; Aronson, 1984).

In summary, it appears that a number of factors may encourage remedial action in response to a situation of threat. Theories of social influence suggest that a credible communicator who is allied with one’s particular social or professional reference group and who offers a message with a fear component and concrete instructions should elicit maximum activity in response to a situation of threat as long as the cost of helping is not too prohibitive and the chance of a favourable outcome is high. The purpose of this research is to look at the relationship of these factors to nuclear disarmament activity.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Do the selected factors of seriousness, personal or professional responsibility for action, knowledge and ability to act, and belief in one’s personal efficacy influence social workers’ nuclear disarmament activity?
CHAPTER II: METHOD

This study involved a province-wide sample of members of the British Columbia Association of Social Workers (B.C.A.S.W.), and was one in a series of four student research projects undertaken over a two year period at the University of British Columbia School of Social Work, including Mather (1986), Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986), and Desmarnis et al Course Documentation (1987). The research sought to expand upon the earlier studies by investigating social workers' attitudes toward nuclear disarmament activities. As in other studies, an attempt was made to obtain information on social workers' present nuclear disarmament activities and a ranking of nuclear disarmament as a social work issue compared to other social work issues. In addition, the research examined some factors that could influence respondents' nuclear disarmament attitudes and activity: perceived seriousness or relevance of the threat, knowledge of how to respond to the threat, ability to take action, perceived cost of activity, and a belief that one's actions could make a difference.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design was carried out by means of a mail survey. The level of research design was that of a descriptive study and did not attempt to test a hypothesis. Rather, it sought to answer a research question and to help
build a complete and accurate picture of social workers interest in nuclear disarmament activity (Sellitiz, Wrightman, and Cook, 1976). The study also considered the relationship between nuclear disarmament activity and factors that may influence attitudes and action in response to a threat.

SAMPLING DESIGN

The population of interest for this study was social workers belonging to the B.C.A.S.W. throughout the province of British Columbia. The population was chosen for two reasons. First, the study was done under the auspices of the B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement; second, the population was easily accessible through the membership files of the association.

For several reasons, a provincial survey of B.C.A.S.W. members was deemed more appropriate than a metropolitan Vancouver survey. B.C.A.S.W. board members from outside the metropolitan areas of the province expressed concern that studies of urban members did not reflect the views of the whole membership; earlier studies (Mather, 1986; Desmarnis et al 1986 and 1987) all focussed on metropolitan area social workers. There was some discussion from rural board members that their colleagues might view issues differently from urban members because they have fewer professional services from the association, less opportunity to meet with
professional colleagues, fewer training opportunities, and a more self-reliant and independent approach to social issues. As it was considered useful to generalize the results to all B.C.A.S.W. members, the study sought to avoid the testing of a non-representative sample (Grinnell, 1981).

Because urban B.C.A.S.W. members were being studied in two other peace/nuclear disarmament research projects during the 1986-87 academic year, their names were removed from the B.C.A.S.W. membership list before sampling for the study began. Confidentiality was maintained by restricting access to the previous studies' samples to the researcher for the purpose only of removing sampled names from the master membership list. In the Mather study, all respondents were from the metropolitan Vancouver area, and 29 of 42 respondents were B.C.A.S.W. members. Access to that sample list was not available. For mechanical simplicity, the kind of probability sampling used was systematic or interval sampling in which a random name in the first nine B.C.A.S.W. members was picked and then every eighteenth member's name was taken without regard for branch or geographical area.

A population of fifty-five individuals was chosen to represent an adequate sample of B.C.A.S.W. members. Each was mailed a questionnaire, a return card, and two separate stamped self-addressed envelopes for separate return of the questionnaire and card. Since the card requested their
names for purposes of further debriefing, the return of card and questionnaire was separated in order to ensure anonymity. Confidentiality was maintained by restricting access to sample names and return cards to the researcher.

It was accepted that the mailing of questionnaires with no personal contact between the researcher and respondent might result in a lower return rate than that from personal interviews. A two-month data collection period was expected with an initial 10%-50% response rate (Sellitz et al, 1976). Fifty-five questionnaire packages were mailed out and thirty-three return cards and thirty-four questionnaires (62%) came back. Of these, thirty-one questionnaires (56% of those solicited) were completed and three were blank. As there was no follow-up to non-respondents, however, the results cannot be generalized to the population.

INSTRUMENTATION
The questionnaire (Appendix E) covered two main areas: respondents' attitudes towards the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, and factors that might influence activity. The examples of potential impediments to action were taken primarily from spontaneous listings by respondents in the Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986) and social issues were determined from issues noted by these same respondents.
The instrument used for data collection was a semi-structured questionnaire. Most questions were fixed responses with a few open-ended "other" categories. Additionally, comments on the individual questions or the questionnaire as a whole were solicited. The research used information gathered from the Mather (1986) survey and the Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986) project in order to improve the instrument. The Mather questionnaire was used for Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986), and both respondents and student interviewers provided a critique of it. In response to that critique, the thesis instrument placed demographic information last on the questionnaire, added the "not applicable" category to the Likert-type scale, and deleted separate scales for personal and professional attitudes or views.

Nominal, ordinal, and Likert-type interval scales were used in the questionnaire. In the Likert-type scale, respondents were deliberately offered an odd number of possible responses on the continuum so that people could clearly indicate their ambivalence or fence sitting (Grinnell, 1981). As well, a "N/A" category was added for respondents who had no opinion. Rank ordering was not used due to the difficulty of execution for respondents and time needed for completion.
The mail-out questionnaire format was dependent upon the motivation of the respondent and the amount of effort required to complete it. However, the questionnaire could be completed in a reasonably short time period and, therefore, it was felt that many respondents would be willing to take the time to complete it (Sudman, 1985).

A pretest was conducted by offering the questionnaire to members of the undergraduate research class involved in studying the same subject and to interested faculty of the U.B.C. School of Social Work. Access to these subjects was arranged through Dr. John Crane of the School of Social Work. Students and faculty indicated no problems in completing the instrument with regard to content or wording, but some modification of the scale of individual questions and format was undertaken in response to feedback from the pre-test group.

Questions related to strategies for use by the B.C.A.S.W. were part of a report to the B.C.A.S.W. and not a part of the thesis. The study did not directly replicate any of the previous studies in the series. The other studies in this series used the following instruments: 1. Mather (1986), a questionnaire; 2. Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986), Mather's questionnaire and a standardized open-ended interview guide; and 3. Desmarnis et al (1987), a questionnaire using many of the same questions as this one.
The focus in previous studies such as the relationship of peace and nuclear disarmament to other social issues, respondents' attitudes towards peace and nuclear disarmament, their levels of personal activities, and strategies for use by B.C.A.S.W. were made part of the present study with the deletion of any reference to "peace." Student researchers and respondents to Desmarnis et al Pilot Study (1986) both felt that peace was a separate issue from nuclear disarmament; respondents could be for one but against the other. It is important to note, however, that the disarmament coalitions in Canada are all part of the Canadian Peace Alliance and the worldwide peace movement, and do not make the distinction noted here. As well, while the defenders of the arms race appeal to arguments that the arms race keeps the peace, there is no equivalent "peace" movement on a grass roots level among these advocates.

Some of the items of the measuring instrument were designed to elicit the desired information based on information presented in literature on factors causing individuals to respond to a situation of threat (See Chapter I). Questions I:1, 6, and 7, and II:1 were designed to measure perceived seriousness, personal and professional responsibility, knowledge and ability, and belief that one's action could make a difference (Zimbardo et al, 1977; Aronson, 1984).
Questions I:1(A) and (E) inquired into respondents' perceptions of the seriousness of the threat and were designed to measure level of fear about nuclear war (Leventhal, 1970; Aronson, 1984). Questions I:1(B), (G), and (H) were intended to measure personal and professional responsibility for action: respondents' perception of the relevancy of the threat of nuclear war to themselves and the social work profession (Aronson, 1984). Question I:1(F) checked whether respondents who had been exposed to disaster planning had made the connection to professional responsibility after a nuclear war (Leventhal, 1970; Goresky, 1986; Carr, 1986). Item I:6(a) measured whether respondents saw nuclear disarmament as a social work issue, while I:7(g) and (h) asked whether respondents saw any personal relevancy in either social advocacy or nuclear disarmament.

Questions I:1(D) and I:6(e) asked whether respondents considered the social work profession to have the knowledge to speak out about the social issues involved in the nuclear arms race (Hirsche, 1986). Questions I:8 & 9 looked at the response to the "peace voter pledge card" in order to test whether specific instructions for action made a difference to nuclear disarmament activity. Questions I:7(d) and (f) measured respondents' perceptions of knowing enough about the issue to act (Leventhal, 1970). The perceived cost of
helping was looked at by several questions: I:6(b), (g), I:7(b) - competing priorities; I:6(c) and (d), and I:7(i) - negative sanctions; I:6(f) and I:7(c) - limited resources, and I:6(i) - no impediments (Steiner, 1970; Zimbardo et al, 1977).

Questions I:1(C), and 7(a) and (e) were intended to capture respondents' perceptions about a potentially favourable outcome to nuclear disarmament activity (Aronson, 1984; Steiner, 1970; Bernard et al, 1977; Leventhal, 1970). Question I:5 measured nuclear disarmament activities to find any correlation between activity and the measures for seriousness, personal and professional responsibility, knowledge and ability, and belief that one's action could make a difference. Question II:2 was intended to find out whether respondents perceived personal efficacy in other areas of service to their profession or community (Aronson, 1984; Bem, 1970).

LIMITATIONS

Unintentionally, insufficient return postage was placed on return envelopes for the questionnaires. Of those questionnaires returned, twelve arrived "postage due," two arrived with additional postage added by respondents, and twenty arrived without action by either postal authorities or respondents. The researcher maintained a forwarding address with the post office for nine months to ensure all
questionnaires were delivered to a new address after the academic year ended, and arrangements were made with the local Vancouver sub-post office and the local mail carrier responsible for forwarding mail to guarantee payment of outstanding postage due by the researcher. The return rate of questionnaires was 62%. Of those questionnaires, 56% were filled out and the remainder were blank, a respectable response for a study of this nature. However, the specific effect, if any, of insufficient postage in preventing questionnaire return remains unknown.

The results of the survey could not be generalized outside the B.C.A.S.W. membership as there were no studies found by the researcher on the difference between those individuals labelled as social workers but not belonging to a professional social work association and those individuals belonging to a professional social work association. Another potential weakness of the study, alluded to by some respondents apparently critical of anti-nuclear activities, was that socially desirable answers (in favour of anti-nuclear activities) might be indicated by the very nature of the questionnaire. As well, Bem (1976) noted that the process of filling out a questionnaire could alter beliefs or attitudes towards the issue, and might alter attitudes simply by raising consciousness. Andrews and Kohn (1985) indicated that a respondent could not dismiss nuclear disarmament when seen on a questionnaire even though s/he
might not think about the subject spontaneously. Mather (1986) suggested that when an activity is undertaken under the auspices of the professional association, members will be more likely to consider it as an important social work issue. Consequently, the study may have changed social workers' consciousness of the issue and biased them in favour of nuclear disarmament as an issue for social work action.

VALIDITY

The literature suggested that a high response rate (even with a small sample) had more validity than a larger sample but low percentage of returned responses (Sellitz et al, 1976), since a low return rate could bias the results: the respondents might be only those members with a particular interest in the subject, either pro or con, and the responses could not be guaranteed to cover a broad range of members' opinion (Sellitz et al, 1976; Monette et al, 1986). In this case, a 56% return rate is adequate. Sudman (1985) noted that busy professionals were often reluctant to take part in a mail survey where the topic area was not noticeably relevant and/or the instrument did not allow full expression of opinion. As well, academic studies often had "substantially lower cooperation rates" (Sudman, 1985; p.352).
External validity or adequate response rate was addressed in several ways. In considering Sudman's suggestions for increasing the response rate, five methods were used: inclusion of a personalized cover letter from the executive director of the B.C.A.S.W. and the chairperson of the B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement, a copy of a write-up on social work peace activities from *The Social Worker*, a one-page explanation of the study from the researcher acknowledging that nuclear disarmament was a complex issue not easily captured by a short questionnaire (see Questionnaire Package, Appendix E), and the provision of stamped, self-addressed return envelopes. As well, respondents received instructions to add comments as needed to qualify or explain their answers. Additionally, regional representatives to the board were given information about the study so they could answer questions about sponsorship if approached by respondents in their local areas. Sensitive items about future directions of the B.C.A.S.W. board were avoided and questions were pertinent to the issues at hand (Grinnell, 1981).

Respondents were specifically requested to return both the return card and the questionnaire regardless of their desire to become participants in the study. If they wished to make their views on non-participation known to the researcher, they were encouraged to add comments regarding their preference to refrain from participation in this study.
It was recognized that participation in the present study could cause emotional stress for the participants, and the return card served the dual purposes of identifying those participants wishing further debriefing or information, as well as creating a more favourable return rate. Pre-testing the instrument to check wording, content, question order and design was also intended to improve the response rate. The B.C.A.S.W.'s Executive Director and President of the Board then reviewed the entire research package with a specific view to improving positive respondent impressions of appearance and presentation.

Internal validity was addressed by attempting to make items as clear as possible in order to reduce measurement error, pretesting the instrument for clarity using individuals who were not included in the final study, avoiding questions asking more than one thing at a time, avoiding negative items, and using language well within the limits of the projected respondents (Grinnell, 1981). As well, the questionnaire used closed-ended questions which were simple and easy to answer, and easy to code. Additional space for write-in answers was offered in order to ensure that respondents would not be unduly limited by the closed questions.
Validity was improved by having questions about respondents' activities cover only the eighteen months previous to the study. While an accurate listing of activities over a longer time period might have given a more complete picture than events noted in the short term, respondents were asked about present community activities and nuclear disarmament activities of the recent past, rather than reconstructed events over a long time period. The validity of items that measured concrete events which could be observed directly (such as number of activities over the past 18 months) was not then considered to be a problem of major significance. However, the validity of items measuring abstract constructs such as attitudes was more difficult. Consequently, the study was intended to assist researchers in the gradual, incremental process of building a knowledge base about the attitudes of social workers toward nuclear disarmament, rather than as an end in itself. That is, it was intended to correlate with other measures of the same abstract construct of attitudes and expand the richness of the construct, rather than to offer definitive answers.

The questionnaire was somewhat longer than optimum for a maximum response rate. However, the increased number of items and scoring categories on some questions improved the reliability of the measure. Keeping in mind the law of diminishing returns, it was decided that in this case it would be better to have too many items than too few
(Grinnell, 1981). Reliability was also based on the examples of questions and information provided by the two previous studies in the series. Construction of the questionnaire was based on information concerning the areas of focus of previous studies and the examples of questionnaire items of past studies.
CHAPTER III: RESULTS

A total of 55 questionnaires was sent out and 34 returned. Data were obtained from (31) 56% of the total, with three blank questionnaires returned. Thirty-three return cards were received, and fifteen of these asked for follow-up discussion. Thirty-one of the return cards were received in separate return envelopes and two arrived with the respondents' questionnaires. All returned questionnaires arrived within a thirty-five day period. While the researcher cannot know whether all completed and mailed questionnaires were received, the results suggest that the probability of missing data was relatively low given the correspondence between the numbers of return cards and questionnaires.

Data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA, histograms, and univariate descriptive statistics measuring central tendency and variability. As well, bivariate analysis of variance using crosstabulation and Pearsons' Rho correlation coefficient were used, with all statistics analyzed using the U.B.C. S.P.S.S.X. statistical package. Multiple regression analysis was not used because of the small sample size.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Respondents ranged in age from 30 to 71 years, with an average age of 45.7 years. Nine (26%) of the respondents were male and twenty-two (71%) were female.
Whereas approximately 81% of members on the December, 1987 membership tally were R.S.W.'s, all respondents to the study were registered (social workers) with their highest degrees or training including: one PhD, ten MSW's, four MA's, seven BSW's, six BA's, one community College certificate/diploma, one-two year U.K. School of Social Work certificate, and one BSc. Twelve of the respondents did not have formal social work training.

Paid and volunteer experience were separated for clarity of data. Volunteer experience was very broadly defined, but only the years in which the respondents had not also worked in social work employment were counted. Volunteer experience ranged from none to thirty years with an average of four years. Paid employment in social work ranged from 1 to 46 years, with an average of 16.5 years. A weakness of the data was the lack of the names of respondents' employers. Consequently, occupational data by job title and description were not exact. Generally, it appeared that seven people worked in the B.C. Ministry of Social Services and Housing or closely related agencies, including child protection, foster and adoption services, and services to the mentally handicapped. Five of the seven had more than 12 years paid experience and one of those had 23 years paid experience. Five persons indicated that they worked in the
Ministry of Health or related agencies, including three geriatric social workers, one long-term care and one psychiatric social worker. Four of the five had 13 to 18 years paid experience.

Five respondents noted that they were employed in private societies or institutions: two hospital social workers with 22 and 28 years paid experience, two workers in institutions for the mentally handicapped with 10 and 12 years paid experience, and one social worker in an agency for disturbed children with 28 years paid experience. Three respondents in private practice had 15, 19, and 20 years paid experience respectively. Two persons were retired, three unemployed, and two worked in non-social work fields. One respondent was a teacher of social work with 37 years paid experience. None of the respondents were students.

Twenty individuals or 65% of respondents indicated that they had children (and grandchildren in some cases).

Greater Vancouver Branch received fewer questionnaire packages than its membership share because persons contacted by the other two studies during the 1986-87 academic year were deleted from the membership list before sampling. A number of respondents did not know their B.C.A.S.W. branch; four were not categorized because they had not provided data enabling the researcher to do so. Other respondents were assigned branches by the researcher through clues from the answer to the B.C.A.S.W. branch question or their other
comments. Given the unassigned and excluded respondents, the returned questionnaires were consistent with the pattern of B.C.A.S.W. membership in the province (See Table 1(a) - Appendix C: "Percentage and Number of Respondents by Branch").

1. Factors Under Consideration.

a) Seriousness:
Forty-three percent of respondents were concerned "a lot" to "a great deal" about the effects on Canada of a nuclear attack, while another 39% were "somewhat" concerned (See Table I following). Five persons (18%) were concerned "very little" or "a little." (See Table 2(a) - Appendix C for complete Section I. Question 1. responses: "Consciousness of Nuclear Disarmament Issues").

Over three-quarters of respondents (77%) indicated that survival of the world was dependent on stopping the nuclear arms race "a lot" to "a great deal." One respondent commented, "I believe that nuclear disarmament is a (THE) survival issue for the human race. How can that conceivably not involve people who happen to be involved in the social work profession!!"
Issues that tended to impact more directly on social workers' clients (child abuse, poverty, family violence, mental illness, addictions, and the handicapped) were generally rated as higher in importance than nuclear disarmament by most respondents, whereas larger social issues (civil liberties, minority rights, and Native issues) were seen as equal or lower in importance by approximately one-half of respondents. Ten of 31 respondents rated all other social issues higher in importance than nuclear disarmament, while one rated all social issues lower and two rated all other social issues of equal importance. Two respondents did not answer the question and two respondents rated two of the issues. Fourteen respondents indicated mixed ratings of importance.

b) Personal or professional responsibility:

**TABLE III: MEASURES OF PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**
(Rating scale: 1. very little; 2. a little; 3. somewhat; 4. a lot; 5. a great deal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean/Median</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues facing the world</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ spent on arms race</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects clients</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community disaster plan</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects family</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects self</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional responsibility.

A belief that global social issues were as important to social work as the social issues facing an individual or community was true "a lot" to "a great deal" for 64.5% or twenty respondents. Eighty-seven percent of respondents (27) stated that money spent on the arms race took money away from social programs "a lot" to "a great deal". As well, four respondents (13%) believed nuclear disarmament was not a social work issue.

Fifteen of twenty-four respondents (62.5%) reported seeing "very little" adverse psychological effects on their clients of living under the "nuclear threat," while one respondent (4.5%) reported "a little" adverse effect. With regard to community disaster planning, only five respondents (16%) had been approached to take part in their community disaster plan. Of the five persons contacted, three of the five said they realized the importance of social work practice issues in coping with the results of a nuclear war "a lot" or "a great deal."

Personal relevance.

Fifteen of twenty-nine respondents (52%) saw "very little" adverse effect on their families, while another three respondents (10%) reported "a little" effect. Fourteen respondents (45%) also saw "very little" adverse effect on themselves, with six others (22%) seeing "a little" adverse effect, and one person responding that the question was not
applicable. In addition and not noted in the table, no respondents stated they were not interested in social advocacy, and only two (6%) indicated they were not interested in nuclear disarmament.

c) The knowledge and ability to act:

Concrete instructions.

As part of a political campaign by the B.C.A.S.W Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement and the End The Arms Race Coalition, approximately eight hundred "Peace Voter Pledge Cards" were included in a regular monthly mailing to social workers by the B.C.A.S.W. The pledge card offered concrete instructions for action by recipients. Seven respondents remembered receiving a pledge card and five filled out and returned it. One of the five added a financial contribution. Of the two remaining respondents receiving the pledge card, one indicated she meant to sign it but didn’t and the other said it was thrown away. It was unknown how many respondents may have received a card, but had thrown it away without seeing or recognizing it.

Knowledge.

Thirty-nine percent of respondents saw social workers as qualified to speak about the effects of the arms race on human beings and their environment "a lot" to "a great deal," with a further 35% responding "somewhat." The mean was 3.4 and the median was 3 "somewhat."
TABLE IV: MEASURES OF KNOWLEDGE AND ABILITY TO ACT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing most effective way to be involv.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing enough to take stand</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Wkrs. having nothing unique to offer</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy to be involved</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. lack $ resources to be involved</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative sanctions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative publicity for social work prof.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too political an issue for soc. wrk. prof.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too radical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competing priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impediments to B.C.A.S.W. activity</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. more pressing S.W. problems</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. more pressing issues</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. unimp. compared other advoc. issues</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited resources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from respondents: "It's hard to get too excited about disarmament activities when you are working all the time!" "I have a limited amount of time & energy & choose with care my freetime activities, while I am interested in nuclear disarmament, it is not my top priority." "This issue is less important in comparison to other social advocacy issues for my current energy level."

**d) Personal Efficacy:**

Forty-eight percent of respondents agreed world leaders could be influenced to agree to disarmament "a lot" or "a great deal," and a further 22.5% indicated an ambivalent "somewhat." Seven persons felt this issue was too overwhelming to think about and two thought it was a
hopeless cause. Comments included opinions that nuclear disarmament was too big an issue to tackle. One respondent said: "I have chosen to spend my time working in an area where I think my efforts can have a more positive & immediate affect." Another added: "On the level of day to day immediacy: on the level of immediate effectiveness and return for time and energy and money, the nuclear disarmament issue and movement just does not produce results."

Nuclear Disarmament Activity.
The first three activities listed below were considered to be neutral in terms of individuals feeling their actions would make a difference, and were not considered to indicate any intent to change public opinion or policy. Participation in the other nuclear disarmament activities was considered to indicate both an intent to change policy and belief that one's actions could make a difference. Nearly one-third of all respondents had taken part in a recent peace walk, and nearly one-fifth had written letters about nuclear disarmament or attended workshops or seminars in the past eighteen months.
TABLE V: RESPONDENTS' NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>family discussions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions with colleagues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watching a film</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace walks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops or seminars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>button/bumper sticker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. group or coalition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund-raising walks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no N.D. activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Activity.

Community activity was considered to indicate a sense of personal effectiveness. Most respondents were active in their local communities and some were responsive to international social advocacy agencies. Fifty-eight percent of respondents were on boards of directors of community agencies and 39% were involved in non-board volunteer work with community agencies. Twenty-nine percent participated in a social action group and 48% offered financial and other support for international social advocacy agencies. In all, seventeen persons (55%) were involved in two or three activities, and five more (16%) participated in four or more activities. Nine persons (29%) reported none or one community or social advocacy activity.
2. Correlation between the factors that may influence activity in a situation of threat and reported nuclear disarmament activities by respondents:

a) Seriousness:

The results showed a negligible relationship between concern about the effects on Canada of a nuclear attack and the numbers of nuclear disarmament activities in which respondents engaged. A negligible relationship was also found between nuclear disarmament activities and a belief that the survival of the world was dependent on stopping the nuclear arms race.

A low negative relationship was found between the numbers of nuclear disarmament activities engaged in by respondents and their rating of other social issues as higher in importance than nuclear disarmament ($r = -.43351$), but a negligible relationship existed with rating other issues as lower or equal in importance to nuclear disarmament.

b) Personal or professional responsibility:

**TABLE VI: CORRELATION BETWEEN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES AND PERSONAL OR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects of nuclear threat on family</td>
<td>$r = .39599$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects of nuclear threat on self</td>
<td>$r = .44401$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues facing the world as a whole</td>
<td>$r = .41237$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms race takes money from social programs</td>
<td>$r = .39912$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community disaster plan</td>
<td>$r = .49099$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects of nuclear threat on clients</td>
<td>$r = .37403$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal responsibility.
There was a low positive relationship between the numbers of nuclear disarmament activities engaged in by respondents and the level of concern about adverse psychological effects on their families \((r = .39599)\), or themselves \((r = .44401)\). As well, a negligible negative relationship was found between nuclear disarmament activities and the statement "I’m not interested in nuclear disarmament."

Professional responsibility.
There was a low positive relationship between disarmament activities and the following: belief that social issues facing the world as a whole were as important to social work as the social issues facing an individual or community \((r = .41237)\), and belief that money spent on the arms race took money away from social programs \((r = .39912)\).

There was a low positive relationship between the nuclear disarmament activities engaged in by respondents and their level of concern about adverse psychological effects (attributable to living under the nuclear threat) on their clients \((r = .37403)\). A low-moderate positive relationship \((r = .49099)\) was found between nuclear disarmament activities and involvement of respondents in their community disaster plans.
c) The knowledge and ability to act:

TABLE VII: CORRELATION BETWEEN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES AND KNOWLEDGE AND ABILITY TO ACT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers qualified to speak</td>
<td>$r = .54164$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. lacks financial resources</td>
<td>$r = -.31028$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impediments to B.C.A.S.W. activity</td>
<td>$r = .63844$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing S.W. pbms.</td>
<td>$r = -.50075$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.A.S.W. has more pressing issues</td>
<td>$r = -.54836$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuc.dis. unimportant in comparison to other issues</td>
<td>$r = -.25258$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge.

There was a moderate positive relationship of activity to belief that social workers were qualified to speak about the effects of the arms race on human beings and their environment ($r = .54164$). There was a negligible positive relationship between activity and thinking that one doesn't know enough to take a stand, as well as between activity and not knowing the most effective way to be involved. There was a negligible negative relationship between nuclear disarmament activities and belief that social workers had nothing unique to contribute to existing disarmament groups.

Limited resources.

There was a negligible relationship between activity and feeling one was too busy, and a low negative relationship with a belief that the B.C.A.S.W. lacked financial resources to be involved ($r = -.31028$)
Negative sanctions.
No respondents said nuclear disarmament was too radical, and there was a negligible relationship between activity and the belief that nuclear disarmament activities could cause negative publicity for the social work profession.

Competing priorities.
There was a moderate positive relationship ($r = .63844$) between the belief that there were no impediments to B.C.A.S.W. involvement with nuclear disarmament and nuclear disarmament activities by respondents. There was a moderate negative relationship between nuclear disarmament activity and the belief that the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems ($r = -.50075$). As well, there was a moderate negative relationship ($r = -.54836$) with the belief that B.C.A.S.W. had more pressing issues. There was a negligible negative relationship ($r = -.25258$) between nuclear disarmament activities and belief that this issue was unimportant in comparison to other social advocacy issues.

d) Personal efficacy:
There was a low positive relationship between disarmament activities and belief that world leaders could be influenced to agree to disarmament ($r = .43506$). There were negligible
relationships between activity and feeling this issue was too overwhelming or a hopeless cause. As well, the sum of community activities had a negligible relationship to nuclear disarmament activities.
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

Except for the study series by Beardsley and Mack (1982), who looked at children over a twenty year span from the early 1960’s, little was known about the psychological effects of the nuclear arms race prior to the 1980’s. Research, first on children and later on adults, began to explore those effects, and in the 1980’s, research on children was conducted in the U.S.A., Canada, Sweden, and U.S.S.R. The primary data on adults, however, have been from opinion polls.

Andrews and Kohn (1985) appear to have done the first studies on social workers and nuclear disarmament, but they researched how well social workers understood or predicted the level of fear and anxiety about nuclear war in their clients. At this time, it appears that the only available research on social workers’ attitudes toward nuclear disarmament has been conducted at the U.B.C. School of Social Work. This study series was carried out over a two-year period by three graduate and twelve undergraduate students under the direction of Dr. John Crane.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

In discussion of this data, available data from the three other studies in the U.B.C. School of Social Work 1986-87 series were used. Because the findings of Mather (1986) were generally outside the parameters of the other three studies, a question was raised about the nature of the
samples and comparability of the data: none of the samples was exactly the same, and only two of the samples fit random sampling methods. As well, the first two studies researched both peace and nuclear disarmament and the last two studies looked only at nuclear disarmament.

The Mather (1986) study on peace and nuclear disarmament was self-selected: the sample was solicited from social work students and social workers in the Vancouver area, and those who responded may have had a specific interest in peace or disarmament. The Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study on peace and nuclear disarmament was carried out with B.C.A.S.W. members who were identified by the association as being active on its committees and who lived in Greater Vancouver or the Lower Fraser Valley. The Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study examined nuclear disarmament using a true random sampling method by drawing each name from the common sample of B.C.A.S.W. members in Greater Vancouver. Follow-up to all respondents who received questionnaires was done in order to pick up the questionnaires. The thesis study on nuclear disarmament used a form of random sampling (interval sampling) of B.C.A.S.W. members in B.C. There was no way of knowing how a self-selection process may have worked in the thesis study because follow-up to non-respondents was not done. Some of the completed questionnaires had very negative comments, however, and it appeared that some of
those respondents who were against nuclear disarmament action by the B.C.A.S.W. decided to respond. One respondent from the study summed up his feelings with, "Now, at last we can put this issue to rest."

It was also notable that while the male/female split of both the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study and the thesis study were very similar to that of the B.C.A.S.W. membership, the Mather (1986) research had a somewhat lower ratio of women to men, and the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study came from a sample that was almost half male and half female. This latter suggests a disproportionate number of male B.C.A.S.W. members may become active in the association.

Data from the thesis study were sorted urban or rural through B.C.A.S.W. branch information. "Urban" was identified as Greater Vancouver, Victoria, and South Vancouver Island; "rural" was determined to be all other areas of the province. Because some of the rural branches were inactive, it seemed reasonable that rural respondents might have been less likely to know their branches than urban members. Consequently, data were analyzed by both including and deleting the unknown and non-branch data with the rural sample. The unknown or non-branch responses were consistent with the rural sample; therefore, because of the
small N, unknown and non-branch were sorted into the rural. If branch information is useful on future studies it would be helpful to provide a checklist of branches for respondents to tick off.

In this study, only 55.5% of the urban respondents compared to 77% of the rural respondents indicated they had children. The percentage of urban respondents with children (and/or grandchildren) was similar to Desmarnis et al (1987), an urban study.

FACTORS UNDER CONSIDERATION

a) Seriousness:

While most respondents (82%) were "somewhat" to "a great deal" concerned about the effects of a nuclear attack on Canada and declared their strong belief that the survival of the world depended on stopping the nuclear arms race, these concerns did not translate into nuclear disarmament activities. Both active and inactive respondents acknowledged their concern. Leventhal (1970) argued that fear without instructions for protective action disrupted coping skills and hindered action to counter the threat.

The more nuclear disarmament activities respondents engaged in the less likely they were to agree that all other social issues were higher in importance for association action than nuclear disarmament. This relationship may have been due to a number of factors. Attribution theory suggested that individuals tended to find justification to believe what
they said and did (Aronson, 1984); cognitive dissonance theory implied that individuals may reduce their dissonance from choosing nuclear disarmament over other social issues by believing that what they chose to do had more importance (Festinger, 1957). As well, activity might have changed attitudes (Bem, 1970).

While the majority of respondents rated some immediate social issues such as child abuse, poverty and family violence higher in importance for association action than nuclear disarmament, less than one-third rated all other social issues higher in importance than nuclear disarmament and very few (less than one in five) stated that nuclear disarmament was unimportant in comparison to other social issues. The respondents' ambivalence was stated clearly in their comments, such as "it's [Nuclear disarmament] not unimportant but...." Some respondents stated that nuclear disarmament simply couldn't be rated against other social issues. Spontaneous comments from respondents to Desmarnis et al (1986 & 1987) were consistent with those from the thesis study concerning the day-to-day priorities that may have taken precedence for social workers in the field: basic client needs for food and shelter, local issues and client family crises were noted in all three studies. Individuals also noted the connection between these client issues and the larger social ills of poverty and unemployment (Dean, 1987; unpublished research course documentation). The connection to global issues was not as clear in comments,
and it was unclear if respondents may have answered the question differently if it had not linked the importance of social issues (relative to nuclear disarmament) to action by the professional association. Not surprisingly, the most active association members, respondents to the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study, appeared to be more focused on association issues and the image of social work as a profession. That is, respondents were very concerned that the association project a positive, professional, credible image in all its activities. A sense of powerlessness as individual social workers and as a profession was pervasive in respondent responses to the interviews conducted as part of that study. In order to gain the power to create change, respondents suggested that social workers must "build a strong, credible professional association both through all actions identified in the public mind as "SOCIAL WORK" and through coalitions which give social workers the opportunity to increase their power by joining with credible groups to effect change" (Dean, unpublished qualitative research course project, 1987; p.14).

b) Personal or professional responsibility:
The majority of respondents recognized that global social issues were important and that the nuclear arms race had adverse effects on social service spending. Respondents overwhelmingly disagreed (87%) with the statement that nuclear disarmament was not a social work issue. There seemed to be a gap, however, between seeing the connection
and actually acting. Relevant knowledge about the deleterious effects of the nuclear arms race was not, by itself, enough to create action (Aronson, 1984; Leventhal, 1970). Aronson (1984) stated that action was more likely when an individual believed no one else would act, and Leventhal (1970) suggested that a belief that one was supposed to act might be critical to taking action in an emergency. While social workers have internalized a number of values about their responsibility to act in response to community social issues, there may as yet be no values about action on an international level. While there was not a strong relationship between nuclear disarmament activity and those attitudes, active respondents showed more awareness of personal and professional issues than inactive respondents.

Respondents appeared to be unaware of the relevance of the nuclear threat to their own practice (Zimbardo et al, 1977). Andrews and Kohn (1985) were consistent with the findings that social workers were not very aware of the fears and anxieties their clients may have had about the threat of nuclear war (67% of respondents saw "very little" or "a little" adverse effect). Mather (1986) reported that social workers were reluctant to include nuclear war in client assessments. While the relationship between nuclear disarmament activities and awareness of the effects on clients was low, active respondents were more aware than non-active respondents. They were also more aware of the negative effects on their families and themselves. Most
respondents saw "very little" to "a little" adverse effect on themselves (67%) or their families (62%). One explanation for this might be the presence of psychic numbing or denial (Lifton, 1982; Gould et al, 1986). In the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study, respondents were asked if they saw any effect of nuclear disarmament issues on their families. Fifty-three percent of seventeen respondents completing the question in Desmarnis et al (1987) answered affirmatively, with some respondents including extensive supportive or explanatory comments. The difference in responses between the two studies raised some questions: was this a difference in consciousness about nuclear disarmament issues, a difference in consciousness about psychological effects, or a difference in how the questions were constructed? In Desmarnis et al (1987), the question solicited a "yes"-"no" answer plus comments; in the thesis study, respondents were offered a Likert-type scale. As well, "families" were not defined in either questionnaire, and respondents' interpretations may have included adult and/or minor children, families of origin, and/or those individuals residing in the same household in a family-like environment.

Since all respondents agreed they were interested in social advocacy and only two were not interested in nuclear disarmament, the lack of action was striking. Inactive
respondents may not have been aware in a way that led to action because they did not have clear instructions about how to act or see action as their responsibility (Leventhal, 1970; Aronson, 1984).

While N was small, the low-moderate relationship between nuclear disarmament activities and recognition of the implications of a community's disaster plan was interesting because disaster planning offered social workers a concrete role and a professional responsibility, as well as giving specific planned responses to disaster (Emergency Planning Canada, 1986; Leventhal, 1970). The peace movement disapproves of civil defense planning because it is an inappropriate response to the threat of nuclear war. However, like physicians, social workers, given a concrete possibility, seemed to expand the disaster planning role to include nuclear war. The issue was no longer ambiguous or irrelevant (Aronson, 1984).

c) The knowledge and ability to act:
Concrete instructions.

Those respondents who reported receiving the "Peace Voter Pledge Card" were all urban social workers not noticeably different from the rest of the sample; they did not report more nuclear disarmament or community activities than other respondents. It was interesting to note that while approximately 58% of B.C.A.S.W. members (given 1987 membership rates) should have received the cards, only 13%
of respondents to the study remembered seeing them, and those respondents were all urban social workers. While there was no way of accounting for possible reasons for their remembrance of receiving the cards, their responses to the Peace Voter Pledge campaign, or the lack of relationship between those responses and other nuclear disarmament activity, it appeared that the campaign was successful in gaining specific commitments from those recipients who remembered receiving the card. That is, five of seven recipients filled out and returned the card, and one included a financial donation. Aronson (1984) and Leventhal (1970) suggested that offering specific instructions in a situation of threat would increase active behaviour in response to the threat.

Knowledge.
Belief that social workers were qualified to speak on relevant arms race issues related to nuclear disarmament activity \( (r=.54164) \). While belief that social work had something unique to say did not relate directly to activity, both active and inactive respondents (84%) overwhelmingly disagreed with the statement that social work had nothing unique to offer.

There was little relationship, however, between activity and a belief that one had enough knowledge about nuclear disarmament. Those respondents who were active didn’t feel any more confident about their knowledge than inactive
respondents did. The findings of the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study were consistent with those of the thesis study suggesting some respondents were not involved in nuclear disarmament activity because they didn’t know the most effective way to be involved. Twice as many respondents to the thesis study indicated they knew enough to take a stand (93.5%) compared to those who felt they knew enough to act (45%). However, approximately twice as many respondents to Desmarnis et al (1987) compared to the thesis study indicated that they didn’t know enough about the subject to take a stand. This difference may have related to the lower percentage of respondents who participated in workshops and family discussions in Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study.

**Limited resources.**

Somewhat more of the thesis sample than respondents to the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study thought the B.C.A.S.W. lacked the financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament, but respondents involved with nuclear disarmament activity were less likely to agree with that statement. Active or urban respondents were also less likely to agree the B.C.A.S.W. lacked money to be involved. Being too busy was noted by both active and inactive respondents as a drawback to involvement but was unrelated to activity. The Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study, however, was consistent with findings that approximately one-quarter of all respondents stated being too busy as an impediment to individual involvement.
Negative sanctions.
Desmarnis et al (1987) was consistent with the findings that no respondents noted the issue being too radical as a drawback to involvement. As well, that study found a similar small percentage of respondents agreeing that the possibility of negative publicity was a drawback to B.C.A.S.W. involvement. This was surprising given the strong themes in the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study of respondent concern about nuclear disarmament groups being too radical or too political, and the comments in Desmarnis et al (1986 & 1987) and the thesis study detailing concern with professional credibility and the positive image of social work. Here, as in other parts of the questionnaire, some respondents outlined their ambivalence by marking specific answers to closed questions and then modifying or changing their stands in comments that followed the question.

Competing priorities.
Results from the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study were consistent with the findings that over one-fourth of respondents believed there were no impediments to nuclear disarmament activity by the B.C.A.S.W. This suggested there were a sizable minority of members who were, at the least, neutral to involvement of the B.C.A.S.W. in nuclear disarmament activities. As well, some comments in Desmarnis et al (1986) suggested that there were a number of B.C.A.S.W. members non-active in nuclear disarmament who
looked to the association to be active in their steads. Active respondents showed a moderate relationship between activity and belief that competing priorities were not impediments to B.C.A.S.W. involvement. The moderate relationships between nuclear disarmament activity and the belief that no impediments to B.C.A.S.W. activity existed, as well as between activity and disagreement with statements that the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems or more pressing issues indicated that the issue of competing priorities for the B.C.A.S.W. seems to have been resolved for many nuclear disarmament activists (Zimbardo et al, 1977).

The Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study did not support the findings of the thesis study regarding the belief the B.C.A.S.W. had more pressing issues or the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems. More than three times as many respondents (52%) compared to those responding to the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study (16%) felt the B.C.A.S.W. had more pressing issues; 52% of respondents in the thesis sample compared to 28% of respondents in Desmarnis et al (1987) believed the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems. The Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study findings were much closer to data from the thesis study for urban B.C.A.S.W. members. That is, 39% of urban respondents to the thesis study felt the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems and the B.C.A.S.W. had more pressing issues. These findings
suggested that urban respondents were less concerned about competing priorities than rural ones. All but two urban and two rural respondents answered in the same way to both questions.

d) Personal efficacy:

Nuclear Disarmament Activities.
The relationship between disarmament activities and belief that world leaders could be influenced to agree to disarmament ($r=.43506$) may have related to a belief in or hope of a favourable outcome (Aronson, 1984; Steiner, 1970; Bernard et al, 1977). While most respondents to the thesis study did not find nuclear disarmament too overwhelming to think about, a somewhat larger number of respondents (23%) to the thesis study did so compared to respondents in Desmarnis et al’s (1987) urban study (16%). Desmarnis et al (1987), however, was consistent with the findings of only a small percentage of respondents (6%) who felt nuclear disarmament was a hopeless cause. Because of the small numbers of respondents who agreed that nuclear disarmament was too overwhelming or a hopeless cause, the lack of relationship between activity and those beliefs suggests that respondents did not acknowledge those beliefs as a reason for non-activity and may not have acknowledged those feelings at all. Such denial and failure to respond to the threat is reported in the literature (Mack, 1986; Lifton, 1982; Woodworth, 1987).
The amount and kind of nuclear disarmament activity engaged in may have also reflected respondent beliefs that their activities could make a difference. For the purposes of this research, the most committed activities were considered to be those requiring more effort: peace walks and fund-raising walks, letter writing, workshops or seminars, and membership in a nuclear disarmament group. Other activities were considered to entail a less activist stance. For example, the number of well advertised t.v. movies aired over the eighteen months previous to this study may have increased the likelihood that uncommitted respondents would watch a film or would take part in discussions with family or colleagues.

Roughly twice as many respondents from the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study purchased peace buttons and were members of a nuclear disarmament group compared to those responding to the thesis study. The Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study was consistent with the findings for urban thesis respondents who took part in no nuclear disarmament activities. Three times the number of rural respondents took part in no nuclear disarmament activities. Partly because of the rural sample, the study had a lower percentage of respondents taking part in peace walks compared to the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study and the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study. Unanswered questions about those activity patterns included a consideration of
whether this difference was accounted for by the difference in opportunity between rural and urban populations or a difference in some unidentified characteristics of urban respondents versus rural ones.

Respondents to the thesis study took part in more discussions than those from Desmarnis et al (1986 & 1987). Roughly two-thirds of respondents to this study indicated that they had participated in family discussions about nuclear disarmament compared to approximately half of those from the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study and one-quarter of those in the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study. Since Desmarnis et al (1987) was conducted at the same time as this study, the reason for the difference was unknown. Desmarnis et al (1987) and Mather (1986) were consistent with the findings of the study on discussions with colleagues, with Desmarnis et al (1987) and Mather (1986) falling on either side of the study findings. Desmarnis et al (1987) also reported similar findings in respondents watching films on nuclear issues. The Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study had similar findings to the thesis study on respondents' membership in disarmament groups, and the findings of the Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study fell approximately in the middle between those two findings and Mather (1986). The results of the three other studies on
respondents who had written letters all were consistent with the data. Participation in workshops by respondents to all four studies ranged from 12% to 25%, with the thesis study almost exactly in the mid-range.

The study was the only one of the four research projects to ask about community activities. Community activities were deemed relevant to the study because they might indicate which respondents were predisposed to activity as an effective change action response. The lack of relationship between nuclear disarmament activities and community activities left an unanswered question about how a perception that one's activities would make a difference on a community level translated beyond the community. Did the immediate community impact of social issues relate to their highly visible, unambiguous nature and clear definition by the community as an emergency, or to a sense of personal or professional ownership or responsibility of the solution to the problem because there was no one else to solve it (Aronson, 1984). The literature supported comments from respondents indicating many of them had focussed on more manageable social issues (Woodworth, 1987; Macy, 1979; Dalby, 1986). However, since nearly half of the respondents were involved with international social advocacy agencies, there was a question about why interest in nuclear disarmament did not translate into involvement with peace
organizations. Unlike the case of those not engaging in any nuclear disarmament activities, there was no significant difference between urban and rural respondents not engaging in any community activities.

SUMMARY

There were no strong relationships between single items and respondents' nuclear disarmament activity (See Appendix C). Low relationships were found between items of personal and professional responsibility and respondent nuclear disarmament activity; moderate relationships were found between some items of B.C.A.S.W. ability to be involved and respondents' nuclear disarmament activity.

However, most respondents saw nuclear disarmament as a social work issue (87%) that was important in comparison with other issues (81%), and for which social workers had something unique to offer (84%). They saw global social issues to be as important as local ones "a lot" to "a great deal" (64.5%) and money spent on the arms race as taking money away from social programs "a lot" to "a great deal" (87%). Measures of seriousness alone did not relate to nuclear disarmament activity, except that nuclear disarmament activists were less likely to rate all other social issues as higher in importance for action by the B.C.A.S.W. (r=-.43351).
However, respondents saw very little adverse psychological effects on their clients (62%), their families (52%) and themselves (45%). Measures of personal and professional responsibility or relevance had a low relationship to activity (Table VI in Chapter three). While active respondents appeared to feel as unsure as inactive respondents about their own knowledge of nuclear disarmament issues and their knowledge of how to be involved in disarmament activities, measures of B.C.A.S.W. ability to act had the strongest relationship to nuclear disarmament activity. That is, respondents active in nuclear disarmament tended to believe that there were no impediments to B.C.A.S.W. nuclear disarmament activity \(r = .63844\); to believe that the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems \(r = -.50075\) or more pressing issues \(r = -.54836\); and, to a lesser extent, to disagree that the B.C.A.S.W. lacked the financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament activities \(r = -.31028\). As well, belief that social workers were qualified to speak about the effects of the arms race on human beings and their environment had a moderate relationship to nuclear disarmament activity \(r = .54164\).

In some cases, the lack of relationship between a question or questions and nuclear disarmament activity was notable. Action taken in response to concrete instructions (i.e. peace voter pledge cards) did not relate to other nuclear disarmament activity. This suggests that individuals may
have acted when they perceived they had concrete directions on how to act and the required action was not difficult, rather than acting because they had taken an active stance on nuclear disarmament. A respondent’s perception of being too busy or having concerns about negative social sanctions did not relate to nuclear disarmament activity.

Although less than a third of respondents were involved in committed nuclear disarmament activities, only a few (13%) took part in no nuclear disarmament activity at all. Respondents indicated they were interested in nuclear disarmament (94%), were not overwhelmed by it (77.4%), did not think it a hopeless cause (93.5%), and were not too busy to be involved (74%). However, such measures of personal efficacy had little relationship to activity. Activists were, however, somewhat more likely than non-activists to believe that world leaders could be persuaded to agree to disarmament.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

The study was conducted to look at some factors influencing social workers' activities in support of nuclear disarmament. The level of research design was that of a descriptive study; it did not attempt to test an hypothesis but to obtain a measure of the views of a sample population, and increase the richness and variety of the data being gathered in a series of studies. The central research question was: what factors influence nuclear disarmament activity? Data were obtained from thirty-one members of the B.C.A.S.W. via a semi-structured mail questionnaire. To allow for multiple regression techniques looking at the relationship between all factors together and nuclear disarmament activity, the sample size should have been larger than thirty-one.

Activity might have resulted from a combination of factors, rather than one factor in isolation. Aronson (1984) saw action in response to a threat to someone else as resulting from a combination of the emergency nature of the situation and a sense of responsibility about taking action. Leventhal (1970) noted that action in response to a personal threat appeared to result from a combination of fear message and action instructions that caused one to act. Measures that implied seriousness might also have taken into consideration that, while an acknowledgement of seriousness seemed to be a prerequisite to taking action, an expressed
worry about nuclear war may have decreased as an effect of taking action (Woodworth, 1987; Berger Gould, Moon, Van Hoorn, 1986). Thus, questions that attempted to measure anxiety about the threat of nuclear war in order to determine respondent perceptions about the seriousness of the threat may not have adequately captured the desired information. Future research with a more sophisticated instrument might confirm if the measures used to test those factors were accurate enough to actually capture that data or whether they measured something else that also had some relationship to nuclear disarmament activity.

The sample appeared to be representative of the membership of the B.C.A.S.W. in distribution by sex and branch. Comparability between the four studies in the series, however, was limited by differences in the sampling methods, the samples, the measuring instruments, and the research questions of the four. While there were problems of comparability, the different data collection methods had the benefit of capturing a greater richness and variety of social workers' opinions. Results showed that there were both differences and similarities between respondents of this study and the three other student studies at U.B.C. Except for peace walks, respondents to Mather (1986) consistently showed higher levels of activity than those from the other three studies. These results may have been due to the self-selected nature of the sample. Desmarnis et al (1987) generally supported the findings of this study.
The Research Question: Factors influencing individual nuclear disarmament activity.

There were some relationships individually between respondents' nuclear disarmament activities and measures of perceived seriousness, personal and professional responsibility, knowledge and ability to act, and a belief that one's actions would make a difference. Respondents to this study who were active in nuclear disarmament had some tendency not to rate other social issues as higher in importance than nuclear disarmament, to be more aware of the adverse psychological effects of living under the threat of nuclear war, to believe world leaders might be influenced to agree to disarmament, to think social issues facing the world as a whole might be as important to social work as those facing an individual or community, and to believe money spent on the arms race took money away from social programs.

There was a moderate relationship between nuclear disarmament activity and a belief that social workers were qualified to speak about the effects of the arms race on human beings and their environment, and a low-moderate relationship of activity to respondents having been involved in their community disaster plans. There was also a moderate tendency for respondents involved in individual nuclear disarmament activity to believe there were no impediments to B.C.A.S.W. involvement with nuclear disarmament, to disagree with the idea the B.C.A.S.W. should
pursue more pressing social work problems, as well as with the suggestion that the B.C.A.S.W. had more pressing issues. A lesser relationship existed between individual activity and a disagreement that the B.C.A.S.W. lacked the financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament.

Some writers have raised concerns that social workers are ambivalent and inconsistent with a lack of consensus in their attitude toward peace (Alexander, 1983; Mather, 1986). As well, social work activists in nuclear disarmament have expressed concern that social work is under-represented and have argued that social workers and their associations must become more involved. It may be, however, that ambivalence and lack of consensus on peace or nuclear disarmament relates more to the nature of social work than specifically to the nature of social workers attitudes towards peace or nuclear disarmament. That is, there appears to be some ambivalence and lack of consensus in social work on many issues, not just on nuclear disarmament.

Respondents were inconsistent in their answers to both Desmarnis et al (1987) and the thesis study, with some comments appearing to disagree with their responses to closed questions. Many of the respondents qualified their answers and changed or broadened the context of the questions, indicating that a structured questionnaire could not capture the complexity of their attitudes and feelings about social work and nuclear disarmament.
This may mean that, in looking at social workers' attitudes toward the threat of nuclear war, research may have to attempt to deal with the issue on several levels. First, there is a political dimension to nuclear disarmament; second, social workers are also dealing with their own psychic numbing and endemic stress; third, peace and nuclear disarmament are complex issues that do not stand alone; fourth, nuclear disarmament may not be comparable to other issues dealt with by social workers; fifth, the nature of social work identity is an unknown; and sixth, members of the B.C.A.S.W. do not all agree about the role and function of the association.

1. There is a political dimension to nuclear disarmament. In looking at nuclear war in conjunction with some of the factors that encourage an individual to act in a situation of threat, it is important to recognize that the situation won't be automatically defined as unambiguous or an emergency by every social worker, given the broad range of social workers' political opinion and belief by some social workers that nuclear war will never happen. As well, in a political sense, nuclear deterrence may be seen as necessary to maintain peace, rather than as a threat to peace. Only when physicians were confronted with the impossibility of dealing with the magnitude of physical and emotional trauma after a nuclear war, did they begin to shift the issue from the political to the professional (Caldicott, 1982).
2. Social workers are also dealing with their own psychic numbing and endemic stress.

Respondents were not very aware of the effect of the threat of nuclear war on their clients, their families, or themselves, and generally did not see the clinical counselling issues involved. They were not generally favourable to questioning clients about nuclear anxieties or training social workers in the clinical issues involved. This suggested that psychic numbing and denial were likely present for many respondents and, by implication, for many members of the B.C.A.S.W. Psychic numbing has implications for the task force in its efforts to interest B.C.A.S.W. members in nuclear disarmament activity, and implications for social work practice. However, this avoidance and lack of awareness may actually allow social workers to deal with the endemic stress of social work practice (Pollis, 1985). That is, focussing on day-to-day priorities and "business as usual" may allow social workers to distance themselves enough to respond to more social issues and greater social problems on a daily basis. It may, however, also have some profound implications for the self-awareness needed for purposeful involvement in social work and therapeutic interventions, and may relate over time to burnout and lack of effectiveness as a worker (Lifton, 1967; Macy, 1979).
3. Peace and nuclear disarmament are complex issues that do not stand alone.

The responses of ambivalence and lack of consensus that are discussed by Alexander (1983) and Mather (1986) may have resulted at least partially from the complexity of peace and nuclear disarmament issues. The first two studies considered peace and nuclear disarmament, while the latter two looked at nuclear disarmament only. Because researchers in the Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study noted that no respondents were against peace and findings in that study indicated that respondents had different opinions about peace than they did about nuclear disarmament, the thesis study and Desmarnis et al (1987) focussed on nuclear disarmament only. The range of opinion about nuclear disarmament by respondents in the studies was complex and related to their attitudes and beliefs about other issues. Some respondents' beliefs about peace or nuclear disarmament also involved value stances about war, non-violent conflict resolution, unilateral, bilateral or multilateral nuclear disarmament, militarism and the attendant social problems of poverty, unemployment, and human rights violations. For respondents, nuclear disarmament ranged from banning of all uses of nuclear power to concern only with actual manufacture and use of nuclear weapons.
4. Nuclear disarmament may not be comparable to other issues dealt with by social workers.

Several respondents in the thesis study indicated they had difficulty in rating nuclear disarmament as an issue against other social issues. Some respondents struggled to explain their feelings that while nuclear disarmament is not unimportant, day-to-day client survival concerns could not be compared to an issue that formed a part of the overriding environmental context. One respondent, a Quaker, indicated that nuclear disarmament was a part of the value stance inherent in her beliefs and couldn't be separated from them as an issue. When respondents were trying to sort out their priorities among various social issues, there appeared to be two general themes in comments about nuclear disarmament activity: one, the consequences of nuclear war were so terrible that social workers couldn't not be involved in nuclear disarmament activity or, two, that the day-to-day priorities of social work were too pressing for social workers to divert energy from their clients' immediate survival concerns to a potential problem that might never happen.

The way in which respondents dealt with the relationship of nuclear disarmament to other issues caused some variation in answers. For example, some comments suggested that respondents may have answered by comparing nuclear disarmament to other social issues or problems for most questions, while other respondents appeared to answer most
questions in isolation considering nuclear disarmament only. It would be helpful for future surveys of this kind to note that many social workers do not wish to divorce one issue from others.

5. The nature of social work identity is an unknown. The nature of social work identity is still being explored, and findings may explain the lack of identified social work disarmament groups. Social work literature speaks about the professional issues that may hinder development of a sense of consensus among social workers, and a question is raised about the relationship of identity to desire for identified social work action groups or to activity undertaken by the association (Polansky, 1961; Washington, 1982; Weinbach, 1982; Specht, 1976; Meyer, 1961; Minahan, 1982). In the first study (Mather, 1986), respondents were questioned about their personal and professional attitudes separately, and Mather found little relationship between personal and professional attitudes. These findings lead her to question whether respondents had a "social work identity" or saw social work merely as a route to employment. Desmarnis et al (1986), which sampled active B.C.A.S.W. members, found respondents reluctant to separate the personal and the professional, stating that the two were both a part of their identity. Those different findings about social workers' personal and professional identities combined with a lack of social work identity indicated by some present non-degreed "social workers" at the Ministry of Social Services and
Housing suggests that a picture of social work identity may relate to a combination of factors, including one's status in the profession. That is, B.C.A.S.W. members and those active on its committees by their very nature may have more of a social work identity than those who choose not to join the professional association. As well, students, non-degreed workers, workers employed in an area where social work is not acknowledged in job title or client interaction, and those not employed in social work at present may have less of a sense of social work identity. There does not appear to be research available on how social work identity affects one's attitudes about involvement in different activities, but the nature of one's social work identity may limit comparability between social work studies.

6. Members of the B.C.A.S.W. do not all agree about the role and function of the association.

Respondents to Desmarnis et al (1987) and the thesis study appeared to have no problem with integration of the personal and professional, but those who were active in nuclear disarmament did not necessarily see it as an appropriate issue for the B.C.A.S.W., and some respondents commented that there might not be a necessity for separate identified social work nuclear disarmament groups. Respondents had some very eloquent and polarized views about the nature and purpose of the B.C.A.S.W.: on the one hand, the B.C.A.S.W. should be an association for the purpose of advancing the professionalism of social work and the cause of social
workers; on the other hand, the B.C.A.S.W. should work to better the social conditions in which all people live. That is, in the latter case, social work should consider all of the "adaptive transactions" between clients and their environments (Goldstein, 1984), including the threat of nuclear war. The implications of this split on policy formation and association priorities forms one of the contexts within which the B.C.A.S.W. works.

The respondents who were favourable toward B.C.A.S.W. activity seemed to fall into two groups: first, those who were active in nuclear disarmament and believed that all social workers, including the association as a whole, should be active, and second, those who saw the issue as important, but were inactive and wanted the B.C.A.S.W. to be involved on their behalf. It appeared that favourable attitudes also included two other value judgements: B.C.A.S.W. should be involved in social issues, and nuclear disarmament is an important social issue.

Unfavourable attitudes toward B.C.A.S.W. activity seemed to relate to beliefs that nuclear disarmament was either not a social work issue or not a B.C.A.S.W. responsibility. According to thesis respondents, the Association had more important social work issues, or had too few resources to spend on nuclear disarmament. In those cases, factors influencing respondents to be active in nuclear disarmament
issues might not have been relevant to a social worker's wish that the Association not take action or to the lack of any wish to join an identified social work peace or disarmament group.

Discussions in the nuclear disarmament literature about social work activity include both a micro and a macro focus. Social workers involved in nuclear disarmament activity have come from psychotherapy, family therapy, and individual and group casework with children and youth (Gould, Eden, Green and Roberts in Gould et al, 1986; Demuth in Van Ornum and Van Ornum, 1984; Thurlow, 1982; Pollis, 1983; Saville, 1987). Their arguments for involvement outline both local and national arenas for action. Washington (1982), in arguing for a greater social action focus in social work, stated that social workers who have a broad perspective as change agents have demonstrated leadership in community action and social development. They have been involved in national and international spheres of community development, policy development, and provision of expertise to the United Nations. Social workers are the logical choice as leaders in the international sphere (Washington, 1982). However, ambivalence and value conflicts are to be expected since social work is a value-laden profession and some of those values will conflict (Rein, 1976). Since values determine
professional attitude and behaviour, have different meaning in different situations, and are given different emphasis within the profession, value conflicts and continuing value change are to be expected (Krause, 1982). Nevertheless, "the values and ethics of the profession leave no doubt as to the stand we must take on issues that threaten peace, life, equality and human rights" (Hirsche, 1986; p.2).
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APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS BY SOCIAL WORK GROUPS
STATEMENTS BY SOCIAL WORK GROUPS


"WHEREAS Social Workers are committed to the fundamental value of human life and to the worth, dignity and creative individuality of every human being; and

"WHEREAS Social Workers acknowledge the problem-solving capacities of people to effect change in society toward social justice for all; and

"WHEREAS Social Work knowledge attests to the harmful effects of anxiety and fear on the physical well-being and mental health of all persons, and in particular recognizes that children and youth are most vulnerable to these destructive effects; and

"WHEREAS the International Federation of Social Workers declares itself to be committed to effecting social change fostering human well-being; therefore:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the International Federation of Social Workers support worldwide nuclear disarmament and commitment to peace and calls for immediate cessation of the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons wherever they exist; and further,

"BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the International Federation of Social Workers investigate and inform themselves and others how much money now budgeted for nuclear weapons could be diverted to increase allocations toward social development and social services and toward the creation of employment opportunities for youth;

"BE IT RESOLVED that members of the International Federation of Social Workers promote, in their daily practice, the development of methods of non-violent conflict resolution in their work with individuals, groups, and communities;

"BE IT RESOLVED that the International Federation of Social Workers seek ways to work in cooperation with other professional groups committed to nuclear disarmament and peace."

(From the International Conference of Social Workers, August 10, 1984).
B.C. Association of Social Workers, 1983, Resolution on Nuclear Disarmament.

BE IT RESOLVED that B.C.A.S.W. urge all people and nations to work toward global nuclear disarmament and global peace; AND

B.C.A.S.W. adopt the position that B.C. and Canada must become zones free of nuclear weapons and any industrial or military activity which contributes to their continued existence; AND

B.C.A.S.W. communicate its position to the governments of B.C. and Canada, the C.A.S.W. and the general public.


WHEREAS in view of the active interest B.C.A.S.W. has demonstrated in peace issues through its membership in End The Arms Race and recent support of the Vancouver City Council's resolutions on nuclear free zones,

BE IT RESOLVED that the board establish a task force for peace. Its functions would include public education on social welfare aspects of the arms race, education of our own members on peace issues, and establishing working relationships with other peace groups.
APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS
DEFINITIONS

Stable mutual deterrence means that regardless of which side first uses nuclear weapons against the other, both countries will suffer unacceptable losses rendering nuclear war unthinkable.

Flexible response is a strategy allowing for commitment of a limited number of nuclear weapons in a battlefield scenario of controlled escalation during a limited nuclear war.

Limited nuclear war assumes controlled and planned commitment of enough nuclear weapons to fight and win a war over a period of days or weeks.

First-strike nuclear weapons are those weapons for which there is no other use than a pre-emptive attack on an enemy rather than a retaliatory strike in response to attack. These nuclear weapons are accurate enough to pinpoint and destroy a protected missile, and relatively difficult to detect in time to launch a retaliatory attack before one’s missiles have been destroyed. These weapons rely on either speed over a short distance (i.e. Pershing II) or ability to evade radar (i.e. Cruise missile).

Horizontal proliferation means an increasing number of countries gaining the ability to produce their own nuclear arms and using that ability to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Launch-on-warning means computer control of deployment of nuclear missiles because of human inability to respond before the incoming first-strike enemy missiles destroy one’s missiles on the ground.
TABLE 1a

RESPONSES BY BRANCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRANCH</th>
<th>% OF MEMBERS*</th>
<th>% OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Vancouver Island</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Branch category</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % of B.C.A.S.W. membership as of December, 1987
TABLE 2a

Section I: Question 1

CONSCIOUSNESS OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ISSUES

SCALE - 1 (very little); 2 (a little); 3 (somewhat); 4 (a lot); 5 (a great deal); 0 (N/A-not applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Concern abt. N. attack on Canada</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adverse effect on clients</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adverse effect on family</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adverse effect on self</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. World leaders can be influenced</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Soc.Wrkers are qualified to speak</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Survival means stopping nuclear arms race</td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community disaster plan showed practice issues</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Global social issues as important as local ones</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Money spent arms race takes away from soc.pgms</td>
<td>4.226</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2b
CORRELATION OF RESPONDENT'S ACTUAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES TO CONSCIOUSNESS OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Concern abt. N. attack on Canada</td>
<td>.10766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adverse effect on clients</td>
<td>.37403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adverse effect on family</td>
<td>.39559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adverse effect on self</td>
<td>.44401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. World leaders can be influenced</td>
<td>.43506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Soc.Wrkers are qualified to speak</td>
<td>.54164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Survival means stopping nuclear arms race</td>
<td>.20342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Comm. disaster plan showed practice issues</td>
<td>.49099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Global social issues as imp. as local ones</td>
<td>.41237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. $ spent arms race takes away from soc.pgms</td>
<td>.39912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3a

**NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY**

Section I: Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>STUDY #1</th>
<th>STUDY #2</th>
<th>STUDY #3</th>
<th>STUDY #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace Walks</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising Walks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Discussion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Discuss</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wkshps &amp; Seminars</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button/Sticker</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Symposium</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Writing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Films</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Disobedience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDY #1**: Mather (1986)  
**STUDY #2**: Desmarnis et al (1986) pilot study  
**STUDY #3**: Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study  
**STUDY #4**: Dean (1987) thesis study
### TABLE 4a

**DRAWBACKS TO B.C.A.S.W. ACTIVITY**

**Section I: Question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAWBACKS</th>
<th>Study #3</th>
<th>Study #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not SW Issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue More Press Issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Publicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Political</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing Unique to Offer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack $ Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has More Press Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impediments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY #3: Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study

STUDY #4: Dean (1987) thesis study

### TABLE 4b

**CORRELATION OF RESPONDENT’S ACTUAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY TO POTENTIAL DRAWBACKS TO B.C.A.S.W. NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAWBACKS</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not SW Issue</td>
<td>-.22211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue More Press Issues</td>
<td>-.50075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Publicity</td>
<td>-.08014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Political</td>
<td>-.15113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing Unique to Offer</td>
<td>-.26923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack $ Resources</td>
<td>-.31028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has More Press Issues</td>
<td>-.54837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impediments</td>
<td>.63855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5a

**IMPEDIMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITY**

**Section I: Question 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPEDIMENTS</th>
<th>Study #3 N</th>
<th>Study #3 %</th>
<th>Study #4 N</th>
<th>Study #4 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Overwhelming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm Too Busy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless Cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Enough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested in ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Radical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDY #3: Desmarnis et al (1987) urban study**

**STUDY #4: Dean (1987) thesis study**

### TABLE 5b

**CORRELATION OF RESPONDENT'S ACTUAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTION TO POTENTIAL DRAWBACKS TO INDIVIDUAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPEDIMENTS</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Overwhelming</td>
<td>-.01285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>-.225258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm Too Busy</td>
<td>.20349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Way</td>
<td>.15789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless Cause</td>
<td>-.00625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know Enough</td>
<td>-.19997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested in ND</td>
<td>-.19997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Radical</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE RAW DATA
SECTION I. NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT.

1. NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT IS AN ISSUE THAT MAY RAISE STRONG EMOTIONS. PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH COMES THE CLOSEST TO YOUR VIEW.

USE THE RATING SCALE: 1 - VERY LITTLE; 2 - A LITTLE; 3 - SOMEWHAT; 4 - A LOT; 5 - A GREAT DEAL; N/A - NOT APPLY.

A) I HAVE BEEN CONCERNED ABOUT THE EFFECTS ON CANADA OF A NUCLEAR ATTACK

B) I HAVE SEEN ADVERSE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO LIVING UNDER THE NUCLEAR THREAT

ON MY CLIENTS .................................. 1--2--3--4--5--N/A 1.9
ON MY FAMILY .................................... 1--2--3--4--5--N/A 2.1
ON MYSELF ........................................ 1--2--3--4--5--N/A 2.1

C) I BELIEVE WORLD LEADERS CAN BE INFLUENCED TO AGREE TO DISARMAMENT

D) I CONSIDER THAT SOCIAL WORKERS ARE QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF THE ARMS RACE ON HUMAN BEINGS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT

E) I BELIEVE THAT THE SURVIVAL OF THE WORLD IS DEPENDENT ON STOPPING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

F) WHEN I WAS CONTACTED TO BE A PART OF MY COMMUNITY'S DISASTER PLAN, I REALIZED THE MANY SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE ISSUES IN COPING WITH THE RESULTS OF A NUCLEAR WAR

G) I CONSIDER THAT THE SOCIAL ISSUES FACING THE WORLD AS A WHOLE ARE AS IMPORTANT TO SOCIAL WORK AS THE SOCIAL ISSUES FACING AN INDIVIDUAL OR COMMUNITY

H) I BELIEVE THAT MONEY SPENT ON THE ARMS RACE TAKES MONEY AWAY FROM SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Key to results: ▼ Mean  M  Median
2. PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING AND PLACE A CHECK MARK BESIDE THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST OUTLINES YOUR VIEWS.

THE B.C.A.S.W. SHOULD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>not be involved in nuclear disarmament activities at all;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>create a committee for those who are interested in this issue;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>make it only a minor part of the B.C.A.S.W.'s social advocacy program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>make it a major part of B.C.A.S.W.'s social advocacy program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>other, specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>(several checked more than one)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. IN THE PAST, SOME ASSOCIATION MEMBERS HAVE INDICATED AN INTEREST IN FURTHER EDUCATION ON THE SUBJECT OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE TASK FORCE TO KNOW WHICH KIND OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM WOULD BE MOST APPEALING TO B.C.A.S.W. MEMBERS. (PLEASE CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>none;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>workshops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>self-educational packages of discussion materials for small groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>videos made available to groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>mail outs from the B.C.A.S.W. office of fact sheets on peace issues, activities, or developments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>knowledgeable speakers available to come to our branch;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>knowledgeable speakers available to come to our branch;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. IF 0 MEANS "NO IMPORTANCE" AND 10 MEANS "VERY IMPORTANT" AND YOU MAY USE ANY NUMBER IN BETWEEN 0 - 10, PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STRATEGIES FOR USE BY THE B.C.A.S.W. TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL WORK AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

THE B.C.A.S.W. SHOULD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean/Median</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5. train B.C.A.S.W. members in clinical skills to work with families who are troubled by this issue;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3. support members of the association who decide to place a portion of their income tax which goes to military defense in a special &quot;PEACE TAX&quot; fund;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4. maintain the current B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3. support participation in efforts to block U.S. warships from entering Vancouver harbour;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7. have the president and/or executive director make public statements of support for nuclear disarmament;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5. develop educational programs for the public about nuclear disarmament;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2. give financial contributions to nuclear disarmament coalition groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9. lobby politicians to support policies to slow or scale down the nuclear arms race;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7. support peace walks for nuclear disarmament;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8. support a B.C.A.S.W. banner in the annual WALK FOR PEACE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5. research nuclear disarmament issues as they relate to the practice of social work;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6. develop an educational program for members about this issue;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6. request B.C. schools of social work add nuclear disarmament to the school curriculum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8. lobby politicians on nuclear disarmament issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7. join with other nuclear disarmament groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7. financially support political candidates who endorse nuclear disarmament;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4. encourage social workers to discuss nuclear disarmament in their workplaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3. encourage social workers to question their clients about possible fears and anxieties concerning nuclear disarmament and the threat of nuclear war;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: all categories ranged between 0 and 10 except 8 which ranged between 1 and 10.
5. WOULD YOU PLEASE NOTE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ISSUES OR ACTIVITIES, IF ANY, BY CHECKING OFF ANY ACTIVITY YOU HAVE ENGAGED IN OVER THE PAST 18 MONTHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- peace walks;
- fund-raising walks for peace, e.g. MOVE-A-THON;
- family discussions about nuclear disarmament;
- discussions with colleagues about nuclear disarmament;
- workshops or seminars on nuclear disarmament;
- membership in a disarmament group or coalition;
- purchase of a disarmament button or bumper sticker;
- attendance at Vancouver Peace Symposium - April, 1986;
- letter writing regarding nuclear disarmament;
- viewing of films about nuclear disarmament;
- participation in act(s) of civil disobedience to protest nuclear arms;
- other, please specify

6. THERE MAY BE DRAWBACKS TO PARTICIPATION IN ANY SOCIAL ADVOCACY PROGRAM. IN YOUR JUDGEMENT, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING COULD IMPEDE INVOLVEMENT BY THE B.C.A.S.W. IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES? PLEASE CHECK ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THAT EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- nuclear disarmament is not a social work issue;
- the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems;
- nuclear disarmament activities would cause negative publicity for the social work profession;
- nuclear disarmament is too political an issue for the social work profession;
- the social work profession has nothing unique to offer existing nuclear disarmament groups;
- the B.C.A.S.W. lacks financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament;
- the B.C.A.S.W. has more pressing issues;
- other, please describe

- there are no impediments to activity in this area.
7. SOME OF THE FOLLOWING ARE REASONS WHY INDIVIDUALS MAY FIND INVOLVEMENT IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES DIFFICULT. PLEASE CHECK ANY STATEMENTS WHICH DESCRIBE YOUR PRESENT SITUATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23% this issue is too overwhelming to think about;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19% this issue is unimportant in comparison to other social advocacy issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24% I am too busy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23% I don’t know the most effective way to be involved;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17% I think it’s a hopeless cause;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17% I don’t know enough about the subject to take a stand;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10% I don’t know enough about the subject to take a stand;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10% I’m not interested in nuclear disarmament;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29% I don’t know enough about the subject to take a stand;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A FEW MONTHS AGO, THE B.C.A.S.W. TASK FORCE ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT ASSISTED THE END THE ARMS RACE COALITION BY DISTRIBUTING PEACE VOTER PLEDGE CARDS TO AS MANY SOCIAL WORKERS AS POSSIBLE. THESE CARDS REQUESTED ASSISTANCE IN LOBBYING FEDERAL POLITICIANS ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT ISSUES.

8. DID YOU RECEIVE A "PEACE VOTER PLEDGE CARD" THIS FALL?
   YES: NO.
   7 (23%) 24 (77%)

9. IT YES, THERE WERE SEVERAL POSSIBLE WAYS IN WHICH YOU COULD RESPOND. WHICH DID YOU CHOOSE? PLEASE CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14% I threw it away;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14% I meant to sign and return it, but didn’t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>57% I signed it and mailed it back to END THE ARMS RACE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17% I signed it and volunteered to help organize the campaign;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17% I signed it and made a financial contribution;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17% I signed it and volunteered to distribute more cards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17% I signed it and volunteered to join my local peace &amp; disarmament riding committee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>other, specify,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

________________________________________
SECTION II. PRIORITIES FOR SOCIAL ADVOCACY.

THERE ARE MANY SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES WITH WHICH THE B.C.A.S.W. AND ITS COMMITTEES COULD BECOME INVOLVED.

1. PLEASE COMPARE THE FOLLOWING LIST OF SOCIAL ISSUE AREAS TO NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT AND CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY - "HIGHER," "LOWER," OR "EQUAL" IN IMPORTANCE FOR ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.

IN COMPARISON TO NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, I WOULD RATE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL ISSUE AREAS</th>
<th>HIGHER</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>EQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADICTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD ABUSE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY VIOLENCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POVERTY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE HANDICAPPED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTAL ILLNESS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPTION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINORITY RIGHTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE ISSUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL LIBERTIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER, SPECIFY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WE ARE INTERESTED IN FINDING OUT IF THERE IS ANY CORRELATION BETWEEN NON-RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE OF WORK HOURS AND INTEREST IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT.

2. WOULD YOU PLEASE TELL US IF YOU ARE INVOLVED IN ANY COMMUNITY AND/OR ADVOCACY ACTIVITIES (NOT INCLUDING NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT) AT PRESENT? PLEASE CHECK ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS IN WHICH YOU ARE PRESENTLY INVOLVED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>work on board(s) of directors of community agency-ies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>financial and other support for international social advocacy agencies, i.e. Amnesty or relief agencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>other, specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III: DEMOGRAPHICS:

THIS SECTION WILL HELP TO PLACE YOU WITHIN THE BROAD SPECTRUM OF B.C.A.S.W. MEMBERS:

1. AGE. ___ YEARS. Average: 45.7 years
   Range: 30-71 years

2. SEX. M__; F__.
   9 (29%)  22 (71%)

3. UNIVERSITY DEGREE(S): BA__; BSW__; MA__; MSW__; PHD__; OTHER__; N/A__.
   6 (19%)  7 (23%)  4 (13%)  10 (32%)
   1 (3%)    3 (10%)  

4. ARE YOU A REGISTERED SOCIAL WORKER? YES__; NO__.
   31 (100%)  — (-)

5. JOB TITLE, IF EMPLOYED ____________________________________________

6. MY JOB INVOLVES, BRIEFLY __________________________________________

7. NUMBER OF YEARS I HAVE WORKED IN SOCIAL SERVICES OR RELATED ACTIVITIES: PAID__ VOLUNTEER__
   Average: 16.5 yrs  Average: 4.0 yrs
   Range: 1-47 yrs  range: 0-30 yrs.

Please count only the total number of years you have been involved in social services or related activities. For example, a year in which you have done both volunteer and paid employment counts as one year.

Related activities might be any human service position, including: child care counsellor, crisis line volunteer, hospital or other volunteer, any number of formal or informal peer counselling positions, or.............

8. B.C.A.S.W. BRANCH ____________________________________________

9. DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN? YES__; NO__
   20 (65%)  11 (35%)

10. WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADD ANY COMMENTS TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE? PLEASE FEEL FREE TO JOT DOWN ANY NOTES ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.
APPENDIX E: THESIS QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE
SECTION I. NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT.

1. NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT IS AN ISSUE THAT MAY RAISE STRONG EMOTIONS. PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AND CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH COMES THE CLOSEST TO YOUR VIEW.

USE THE RATING SCALE: 1: VERY LITTLE; 2 - A LITTLE; 3 - SOMEWHAT; 4 - A LOT; 5 - A GREAT DEAL, N/A - NOT APPLY.

A) I HAVE BEEN CONCERNED ABOUT THE EFFECTS ON CANADA OF A NUCLEAR ATTACK 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

B) I HAVE SEEN ADVERSE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO LIVING UNDER THE NUCLEAR THREAT:

ON MY CLIENTS .............. 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

ON MY FAMILY ................ 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

ON MYSELF .................... 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

C) I BELIEVE WORLD LEADERS CAN BE INFLUENCED TO AGREE TO DISARMAMENT 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

D) I CONSIDER THAT SOCIAL WORKERS ARE QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF THE ARMS RACE ON HUMAN BEINGS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

E) I BELIEVE THAT THE SURVIVAL OF THE WORLD IS DEPENDENT ON STOPPING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

F) WHEN I WAS CONTACTED TO BE A PART OF MY COMMUNITY'S DISASTER PLAN, I REALIZED THE MANY SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE ISSUES IN COPING WITH THE RESULTS OF A NUCLEAR WAR 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

G) I CONSIDER THAT THE SOCIAL ISSUES FACING THE WORLD AS A WHOLE ARE AS IMPORTANT TO SOCIAL WORK AS THE SOCIAL ISSUES FACING AN INDIVIDUAL OR COMMUNITY 1-2-3-4-5-N/A

H) I BELIEVE THAT MONEY SPENT ON THE ARMS RACE TAKES MONEY AWAY FROM SOCIAL PROGRAMS 1-2-3-4-5-N/A
2. PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING AND PLACE A CHECK MARK
BESIDE THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST OUTLINES YOUR VIEWS.

THE B.C.A.S.W. SHOULD:

__ not be involved in nuclear disarmament activities at all;
__ create a committee for those who are interested in this
  issue;
__ make it only a minor part of the B.C.A.S.W.'s social
  advocacy program;
__ make it a major part of B.C.A.S.W.'s social advocacy
  program;
__ other, specify ____________________________________________

3. IN THE PAST, SOME ASSOCIATION MEMBERS HAVE INDICATED AN
INTEREST IN FURTHER EDUCATION ON THE SUBJECT OF NUCLEAR
DISARMAMENT. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE TASK FORCE TO KNOW
WHICH KIND OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM WOULD BE MOST APPEALING
TO B.C.A.S.W. MEMBERS. (PLEASE CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY):

__ none;
__ workshops;
__ self-educational packages of discussion materials for
  small groups;
__ videos made available to groups;
__ mail outs from the B.C.A.S.W. office of fact sheets on
  peace issues, activities, or developments;
__ knowledgeable speakers available to come to our branch
__ OTHER, please describe _______________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

__ OTHER, please describe _______________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
4. If 0 means "NO IMPORTANCE" and 10 means "VERY IMPORTANT" and you may use any number in between 0 - 10, please rate the following strategies for use by the B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement.

THE B.C.A.S.W. SHOULD:

- train B.C.A.S.W. members in clinical skills to work with families who are troubled by this issue;
- support members of the association who decide to place a portion of their income tax which goes to military defense in a special "PEACE TAX" fund;
- maintain the current B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Social Work and the Peace Movement;
- support participation in efforts to block U.S. warships from entering Vancouver harbour;
- have the president and/or executive director make public statements of support for nuclear disarmament;
- develop educational programs for the public about nuclear disarmament;
- give financial contributions to nuclear disarmament coalition groups;
- lobby politicians to support policies to slow or scale down the nuclear arms race;
- support peace walks for nuclear disarmament;
- support a B.C.A.S.W. banner in the annual WALK FOR PEACE;
- research nuclear disarmament issues as they relate to the practice of social work;
- develop an educational program for members about this issue;
- request B.C. schools of social work add nuclear disarmament to the school curriculum;
- lobby politicians on nuclear disarmament issues;
- join with other nuclear disarmament groups;
- connect with social work associations in other countries;
- financially support political candidates who endorse nuclear disarmament;
- encourage social workers to discuss nuclear disarmament in their workplaces;
- encourage social workers to question their clients about possible fears and anxieties concerning nuclear disarmament and the threat of nuclear war;

OTHER, please specify

OTHER, please specify
5. Wouldn't you please note your involvement in nuclear disarmament issues or activities, if any, by checking off any activity you have engaged in over the past 18 months.

- peace walks;
- fund-raising walks for peace, e.g. MOVE-A-THON;
- family discussions about nuclear disarmament;
- discussions with colleagues about nuclear disarmament;
- workshops or seminars on nuclear disarmament;
- membership in a disarmament group or coalition;
- purchase of a disarmament button or bumper sticker;
- attendance at Vancouver Peace Symposium - April, 1986;
- letter writing regarding nuclear disarmament;
- viewing of films about nuclear disarmament;
- participation in act(s) of civil disobedience to protest nuclear arms;
- other, please specify__________________________

- no nuclear disarmament activities.

6. There may be drawbacks to participation in any social advocacy program. In your judgement, which of the following could impede involvement by the B.C.A.S.W. in nuclear disarmament activities? Please check any of the following that express your views:

- nuclear disarmament is not a social work issue;
- the B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems;
- nuclear disarmament activities would cause negative publicity for the social work profession;
- nuclear disarmament is too political an issue for the social work profession;
- the social work profession has nothing unique to offer existing nuclear disarmament groups;
- the B.C.A.S.W. lacks financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament;
- the B.C.A.S.W. has more pressing issues;
- other, please describe__________________________

- there are no impediments to activity in this area.
7. SOME OF THE FOLLOWING ARE REASONS WHY INDIVIDUALS MAY FIND INVOLVEMENT IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES DIFFICULT. PLEASE CHECK ANY STATEMENTS WHICH DESCRIBE YOUR PRESENT SITUATION.

- this issue is too overwhelming to think about;
- this issue is unimportant in comparison to other social advocacy issues;
- I am too busy;
- I don't know the most effective way to be involved;
- I think it's a hopeless cause;
- I don't know enough about the subject to take a stand;
- I'm not interested in social advocacy of any kind;
- I'm not interested in nuclear disarmament;
- it's too radical;

OTHER

A FEW MONTHS AGO, THE B.C.A.S.W. TASK FORCE ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT ASSISTED THE END THE ARMS RACE COALITION BY DISTRIBUTING PEACE VOTER PLEDGE CARDS TO AS MANY SOCIAL WORKERS AS POSSIBLE. THESE CARDS REQUESTED ASSISTANCE IN LOBBYING FEDERAL POLITICIANS ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT ISSUES.

8. DID YOU RECEIVE A "PEACE VOTER PLEDGE CARD" THIS FALL?  
   — YES;  — NO.

9. IF YES, THERE WERE SEVERAL POSSIBLE WAYS IN WHICH YOU COULD RESPOND. WHICH DID YOU CHOOSE? PLEASE CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

- I threw it away;
- I meant to sign and return it, but didn't;
- I signed it and mailed it back to END THE ARMS RACE;
- I signed it and volunteered to help organize the campaign
- I signed it and made a financial contribution;
- I signed it and volunteered to distribute more cards
- I signed it and volunteered to join my local peace & disarmament riding committee;

OTHER, specify
SECTION II. PRIORITIES FOR SOCIAL ADVOCACY.

There are many social problems and issues with which the B.C.A.S.W. and its committees could become involved.

1. Please compare the following list of social issue areas to nuclear disarmament and circle the appropriate category - "higher," "lower," or "equal" in importance for action by the association.

In comparison to nuclear disarmament, I would rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>In Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of the Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are interested in finding out if there is any correlation between non-recreational activities outside of work hours and interest in nuclear disarmament.

2. Would you please tell us if you are involved in any community and/or advocacy activities (not including nuclear disarmament) at present? Please check any of the following areas in which you are presently involved:

- Work on board(s) of directors of community agency-ies;
- Volunteer (non-board) with community agency-ies;
- Work with youth group(s), non-religious;
- Volunteer with a religious organization;
- Participate in a social action group;
- Financial and other support for international social advocacy agencies, i.e. Amnesty or relief agencies;
- Other, specify ____________________________
SECTION III. DEMOGRAPHICS:

THIS SECTION WILL HELP TO PLACE YOU WITHIN THE BROAD SPECTRUM OF B.C.A.S.W. MEMBERS:

1. AGE. ____ YEARS.

2. SEX. M____; F____.

3. UNIVERSITY DEGREE(S): BA____; BSW____; MA____; MSW____; OTHER____; N/A____;

4. ARE YOU A REGISTERED SOCIAL WORKER? YES____ NO____

5. JOB TITLE, IF EMPLOYED ________________________________

6. MY JOB INVOLVES, BRIEFLY _____________________________

                    _____________________________
                    _____________________________
                    _____________________________

7. NUMBER OF YEARS I HAVE WORKED IN SOCIAL SERVICES OR RELATED ACTIVITIES: PAID____ VOLUNTEER_____

Please count only the total number of years you have been involved in social services or related activities. For example, a year in which you have done both volunteer and paid employment counts as one year.

Related activities might be any human service position, including: child care counsellor, crisis line volunteer, hospital or other volunteer, any number of formal or informal peer counselling positions, or ...........

8. B.C.A.S.W. BRANCH ________________________________

9. DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN? YES____, NO ____

10. WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADD ANY COMMENTS TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE? PLEASE FEEL FREE TO JOT DOWN ANY NOTES ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.
APPENDIX F: DESMARNIS ET AL (1986) QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE
1. What would you say are the most important social issues facing you as a social worker today?

2. To what extent are you personally worried about nuclear disarmament issues?

3. How do you think that social work as a profession should be involved in nuclear disarmament issues?

4. In the past two years, have you been involved in any way with n.d. as an issue? If yes, in what ways?

5. What kinds of n.d. activities might you engage in in the future?

6. What n.d. activities should the B.C.A.S.W. as a professional association engage in?

7. Is there anything you'd like to add to this interview? OR... Do you have any other comments you'd like to add? OR...
I. **GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Age? ________ years

2. Sex ________ male
    ________ female

3. Degree(s) completed: (please check)
    Bachelor of Social Work ____
    Master of Social Work ____

4. Year Bachelor of Social Work completed: 19____
   Year Master of Social Work completed: 19____

5. Are you presently working in the field of social work?
   yes ______
   no ______ (if no, proceed to #9)

6. Job Title: ________________________________

7. My job involves primarily: (check one)
    ____ direct supervision
    ____ supervision of staff
    ____ administration
    ____ community organization
    ____ other

8. Number of years working at present job: ____ years

9. Present status: (check primary one)
    ____ student
    ____ unemployed
    ____ employed outside field of social work
    ____ employed within field of social work

(please continue on page 2)
10. Are you presently a member of the British Columbia Association of Social Workers?  
   _____yes  
   _____no

11. If you answered yes to #10, what year did you become a member?  

12. Are you presently a member of the Association of Professional Social Workers?  
   _____yes  
   _____no

13. If you answered yes to #12, what year did you become a member?  

(please continue on page 3)
## II. SOCIAL ISSUES

Indicate how important the following issues are to you as a professional social worker: (circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 very important</th>
<th>2 important</th>
<th>3 somewhat important</th>
<th>4 not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Spouse Abuse</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Native Indian Land Claims</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please continue on page 4)
III. ATTITUDES TOWARD NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

The following section examines personal and professional attitudes towards nuclear disarmament. Questions #1 through #12 address personal attitudes and questions #13 through #23 address professional attitudes.

A. PERSONAL ATTITUDES:

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am concerned about the possibility of a nuclear war.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I would rather be involved in issues other than nuclear disarmament.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Fear of nuclear war is psychologically damaging.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I believe nuclear disarmament is basically anti-American.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I do not believe there will be a nuclear war.  
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Nuclear disarmament is a personal concern.  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Canada has little international influence regarding nuclear disarmament.  
   1 2 3 4 5

8. I am concerned for my future due to the arms race.  
   1 2 3 4 5

9. I believe the Canadian government knows what is best to do in terms of the arms race.  
   1 2 3 4 5

10. I am a pacifist.  
    1 2 3 4 5

11. I am concerned for the survival of the planet.  
    1 2 3 4 5

12. I am concerned for the future of my children.  
    1 2 3 4 5

(please continue on page 5)
B. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 moderately disagree</th>
<th>3 neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 moderately agree</th>
<th>5 strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The profession of social work should not political stands.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Fear of nuclear war is a clinical counseling issue.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The profession of social work cannot offer any-thing unique to the already existing nuclear disarmament groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nuclear disarmament is not within the domain of social work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are too many other issues the social work profession needs to deal with before addressing nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Money is being directed to military costs at the expense of social services.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If we do not stop the arms race, everything else will be peripheral.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Nuclear disarmament should be an issues for the profession of social work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Nuclear disarmament is a social issue therefore a social work issue.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The profession of social work has more influence to affect change than does the individual.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Involvement in nuclear disarmament may create bad publicity and the profession of social work has had enough bad publicity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please continue on page 6)
IV. CHANGE STRATEGIES

The following section examines personal and professional attitudes towards change strategies with regards to nuclear disarmament. Questions #1 through #11 address personal attitudes and questions #12 through #26 address professional attitudes.

A. PERSONAL ATTITUDES

Of the following activities, how likely would you be to engage in these? (circle responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Join a nuclear disarmament group. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Join the B.C.A.S.W. Task Force on Peace and Nuclear Disarmament. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Organize groups of friends to discuss this topic. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Support political figures who endorse nuclear disarmament. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Write letters to Canadian government indicating support for nuclear disarmament. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Meet with your M.P. or M.L.A. and make your opinions known. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Encourage your place of employment to have a staff meeting focusing on nuclear disarmament. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Participate in peace rallies. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Participate in protest marches. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Participate in acts of civil disobedience. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Write letters to local newspapers in response to articles published on nuclear disarmament. 1 2 3 4 5

(please continue on page 7)
8. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES

With regards to nuclear disarmament, what priorities should the professional association give to participate in these activities? (circle response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 high priority</th>
<th>2 some priority</th>
<th>3 no priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Writing letters to the Canadian government indicating support for nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Appearing before government committees and presenting briefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Meeting with legislators and making opinions known.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Entering coalitions with other nuclear disarmament groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Organizing public meetings to educate people about nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Organizing meetings/lectures to educate social workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Contributing dollars to political candidates who endorse nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Publicly endorsing political figures who endorse nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Publicly criticizing political figures who do not endorse nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Organizing peace rallies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Encouraging social workers to discuss nuclear disarmament in their place of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Encouraging social workers to include nuclear war (thoughts and feelings) as part of the client assessment routine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Encouraging social agencies to have pamphlets and posters on nuclear disarmament available in the reception areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Organizing protest marches.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Supporting acts of civil disobedience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please continue on page 8)
V. PRESENT LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES

The following section deals with your level of activity over the past 24 months.

Over the past 24 months, have you: (please circle)

1. Participated in a peace rally.  
2. Written a letter to the federal or provincial government indicating your opinion on nuclear disarmament.  
3. Attended lectures/meetings regarding the arms race or related topics.  
4. Organized a meeting centered on the nuclear disarmament issues.  
5. Joined a nuclear disarmament group.  
6. Discussed nuclear disarmament at your place of work.  
7. Discussed nuclear disarmament with friends.  
8. Watched a film (TV/Theater) on the arms race or related topic.  
9. Participated in a protest march.  
10. Participated in an act of civil disobedience with regards to nuclear disarmament.  
11. Discussed with your clients, what their thoughts and feelings were on nuclear war or nuclear disarmament.

Please indicate social organizations/political groups you presently belong to.

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  
### Lynn Mather - Results of Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL ISSUES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEV.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Abuse</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian Land Claims</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=very important 2=important 3=somewhat important 4=not important

n=42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL ATTITUDE SCALE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a pacifist</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned for my future due to the arms race.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear disarmament is a personal concern.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of nuclear war is psychologically damaging.</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about the possibility of nuclear war.</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada has little international influence regarding nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned for the future of my children.</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the Canadian government knows best what to do in terms of the arms race.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned for the survival of the planet.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather be involved in issues other than nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe there will be a nuclear war.</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(scores were reversed scored)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear disarmament is basically anti-American.</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE</td>
<td>CORRELATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear disarmament should be an issue for the profession of social work.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear disarmament is a social issue therefore a social work issue.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we do not stop the arms race, everything else will be peripheral.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The profession has more influence to affect change than does the individual.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of nuclear war is a clinical counselling issue.</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear disarmament is not within the domain of social work. (reversed scored)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The profession of social work should not take political stands (reversed scored)</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money is being directed to military costs at the expense of social services.</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The profession of s.w. can not offer anything unique to the already existing nuclear disarmament groups.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement may create bad publicity and the profession has had enough bad publicity.</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many other issues besides nuclear disarmament that we should attend to first.</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support political figures who endorse nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partcipate in peace rallies.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in protest marches.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write letters to Canadian government to indicate support for n.d.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join a nuclear disarmament group.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join the BCASW Task Force on Peace &amp; nuclear Disarmament.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write letters to newspapers in response to articles.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with your M.P./M.L.A. and make opinions known.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage place of employment to have a staff meeting focusing on n.d.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize friends to discuss n.d.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in acts of civil disobedience.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=very unlikely 2=unlikely 3=maybe 4=likely 5=very likely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST.DEV.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter coalitions with other nuclear disarmament groups.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write letters to government indicating support for n.d.</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize meetings to educate social workers.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present briefs to government committees.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with legislators and make opinions known.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage social workers to discuss n.d. at place of work.</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage social agencies to have pamphlets on n.d. available in reception area.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly endorse political figures who support n.d.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize peace rallies.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize meetings to educate public.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly criticize political figures who do not endorse nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize protest marches.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage social workers to include fear of nuclear war in client assessments.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute money to political candidate who support nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support acts of civil disobedience.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=high priority  2=some priority  3=no priority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT LEVEL OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>1 - 2X</th>
<th>3 - 5X</th>
<th>6 - 10X</th>
<th>more than 11 X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a peace rally.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written letters to government indicating support of n.d.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended lectures/meetings on the arms race.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized a meeting on nuclear disarmament.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined a nuclear disarmament group.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed nuclear disarmament at place of work.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed nuclear disarmament with friends.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched films on the arms race or related topics.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a protest march.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an act of civil disobedience.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: DESMARNIS ET AL (1987) QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. OF THE FOLLOWING, WHAT NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES, IF ANY, HAVE YOU ENGAGED IN OVER THE PAST 18 MONTHS?
   - peace walks
   - fund-raising walks for peace, e.g. move-a-thon
   - family discussions about nuclear disarmament
   - discussions about nuclear disarmament with colleagues
   - workshops on nuclear disarmament
   - membership in a nuclear disarmament group
   - purchase of a nuclear disarmament button or bumper sticker
   - attendance at Vancouver Peace Symposium - April, 1986
   - letter writing regarding nuclear disarmament
   - viewing of films/movies about nuclear disarmament
   - participation in an act(s) of civil disobedience to protest nuclear arms
   - no nuclear disarmament activities

What additional nuclear disarmament issues/activities have you been involved in?
2. SOME OF THE FOLLOWING ARE REASONS WHY INDIVIDUALS MAY FIND IT DIFFICULT TO BECOME INVOLVED IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES. DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY TO YOU?

___ I think nuclear disarmament is too overwhelming to consider
___ I think nuclear disarmament is unimportant in comparison to other social work issues
___ I am too busy
___ I don't know the most effective way to be involved
___ I think nuclear disarmament is a hopeless cause
___ I don't know enough about nuclear disarmament to take a stand
___ I'm not interested in nuclear disarmament
___ I think nuclear disarmament is too radical
___ I do not think nuclear disarmament will solve world problems
___ I think nuclear disarmament would leave the western world vulnerable
___ I have other priorities

What other reasons make it difficult for you to become involved in nuclear disarmament issues?
3. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IMPEDE THE B.C.A.S.W. FROM FURTHER INVOLVEMENT IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES? PLEASE CHECK ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THAT EXPRESSES YOUR VIEW.

___ Nuclear disarmament is not a social work issue
___ The B.C.A.S.W. should pursue more pressing social work problems
___ Nuclear disarmament activities would cause negative publicity for the social work profession
___ Nuclear disarmament is too political an issue for the social work profession
___ The social work profession has nothing unique to offer existing nuclear disarmament groups
___ The B.C.A.S.W. lacks financial resources to be involved in nuclear disarmament
___ The B.C.A.S.W. has more pressing issues
___ There are no difficulties

What else might impede the B.C.A.S.W. from further involvement in nuclear disarmament activities?
ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 10, IF 1 MEANS NOT IMPORTANT AND 10 MEANS VERY IMPORTANT, PLEASE RATE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STRATEGIES FOR POSSIBLE USE BY THE B.C.A.S.W. IN DEALING WITH NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT:

- support members of the Association who decide to place a portion of their income tax which goes to military defense in a special 'peace tax' fund
- maintain the current B.C.A.S.W. Task Force dealing with nuclear disarmament
- support participation in efforts to block U.S. war ships from entering the Vancouver harbour
- have the B.C.A.S.W. President/Executive Director make public statements of support for nuclear disarmament
- develop educational programs for B.C.A.S.W. members about nuclear disarmament
- develop education programs for the public about nuclear disarmament
- give financial contributions to nuclear disarmament groups
- lobby politicians to support nuclear disarmament issues
- support a B.C.A.S.W. banner in the annual walks for peace
- promote awareness of and participation in the April peace walks
- research nuclear disarmament issues as they relate to the practice of Social Work
- join with other nuclear disarmament groups
- connect with Social Work associations in other countries
- financially support political candidates who endorse nuclear disarmament
- encourage social workers to discuss nuclear disarmament in their work places
- encourage social workers to question their clients about possible fears and anxieties concerning nuclear disarmament and the threat of nuclear war.
- request that the B.C. schools of social work add nuclear disarmament to the school curriculum.

What other strategies could the B.C.A.S.W. take to promote nuclear disarmament? Please note and rate these.
5. **IN YOUR JUDGEMENT, HOW IMPORTANT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ISSUES COMPARED TO NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT? CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY.**

- **addictions:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **child sexual abuse:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **family violence:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **poverty:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **unemployment:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **the handicapped:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **mental illness:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **problems of the elderly:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **adoption:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **acquired immune deficiency syndrome:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **civil liberties:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **native issues:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL
- **minority rights:** HIGHER LOWER EQUAL

What other issues are of importance to you? Please add and circle the appropriate category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGHER</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>EQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>EQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>EQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td>EQUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **DO YOU THINK THE ISSUE OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT HAS HAD ANY EFFECT ON YOUR FAMILY? IF SO, PLEASE ELABORATE.**
DEMENRAPHICS:

AGE ______ YEARS
SEX ______ M ______ F
EMPLOYMENT STATUS ____________________________
UNIVERSITY DEGREE(S): BA ______ BSW ______ MA ______ MSW ______ OTHER ______ NA____
ARE YOU A REGISTERED SOCIAL WORKER? YES ______ NO ______
JOB TITLE, IF EMPLOYED ____________________________
MY JOB INVOLVES, OR INVOLVED, BRIEFLY ____________________________
NUMBER OF YEARS I HAVE WORKED IN SOCIAL SERVICES OR RELATED ACTIVITIES: PAID ______ YEARS; VOLUNTEER ______ YEARS
B.C.A.S.W. BRANCH ____________________________

DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN? YES ______ NO ______.