

Nonprofit Membership and Interpersonal Trust in Diversity

Luo Ji*, Xie Shun**, Liu Kai***, and Mian Asad Amin****

Abstract: Diverse values and unified interpersonal trust have both been stressed as prerequisites in social governance, although contradictions can arise in trying to achieve both. Using cross-national data of more than 29,000 samples from the World Value Survey and relying on the circle and layer structure of governance consensus, we investigate the extent to which the participation of nonprofits in social governance influences interpersonal trust and value diversity. Our findings show that nonprofits increase the perception of fairness in social governance and that they contribute to cultural diversity.

Keywords: interpersonal trust, diversity, nonprofit membership, circle and layer structure

* Luo Ji, corresponding author, is a postdoctoral researcher in the School of Public Policy and Management at Tsinghua University, in Beijing, China. Email: luojijiluo2014@hotmail.com. We thank the participants and scholars at the 2019 Seoul University Graduate School of Public Administration conference and the 2019 English Workshop of Nonprofit Studies at Tsinghua University, especially Professor Zhang Zhibin of Flinders University for all their suggestions.

** Xie Shun is a professor in the School of Public Administration at Guangxi University in Nanning, China. E-mail: xieshun64@sina.com.

*** Liu Kai is a PhD student in the Faculty of Economics and Business at Gadjah Mada University in Indonesia. E-mail: 602346485@qq.com.

**** Mian Asad Amin is a PhD student, in the Business School at Guangxi University in Nanning, China. E-mail: asad_amin146@yahoo.com.

Manuscript received November 18, 2019; out for review November 21, 2019; review completed January 30, 2020; accepted February 3, 2020.

Korean Journal of Policy Studies, Vol. 35, No. 1 (2020), pp. 53-73.

© 2020 by the GSPA, Seoul National University

INTRODUCTION

With the explosion of multicollaboration among different stakeholders in the last fifty years, interpersonal trust has become key to coping with the uncertainty and complexity of global governance (Harvey, Reiche, & Moeller, 2011; Gilbert & Behnam, 2013; Kim, 2007). But how might diverse values among different stakeholders be lost or maintained in the building of interpersonal trust?

Although interpersonal trust has long been a topic in social organization literature, it remains a controversial concept and its exact definition is still contested among scholars (Lewicki, Tomlinson, & Gillespie, 2006). It can be understood as deriving from the shared interest between an organization's mission and public needs (Hardin, 1993) but as directed toward a specific target such as a leader, a negotiation partner, a stranger, or a coworker (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). It can also be viewed in terms of rational-choice behavior, as a matter of cooperative choices in a game (Hardin, 1993; Williamson, 1981) or as a strategic emotional sharing that arises from mutual information asymmetry among different stakeholders (Bryce, 2012). It can also be seen as a complex psychological state associated with expectations, intentions, affect, and dispositions (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998) or as the confidence that others will do the right thing even if offered incentives to do the contrary (Granovetter, 2005).

On one hand, individuals can join external organizations as a means of seeking to ensure that their preferences are attended to and not subordinated (Arrow, 2001; Bryce, 2007). This type of relationship implies that interpersonal trust stems from internal organizational commitment and may have spill-over effects among individuals outside organizations (Song, Kim, & Kolb, 2009; Baek & Jung, 2015; Suh, Chang, & Lim, 2012). Hence, the interpersonal trust that arises from organizational membership also reflects the organization's image, which includes shared goals, norms, values, and networks (Putnam, 2000). Although a number of definitions and conceptualizations of interpersonal trust have been proposed (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012), efforts to analyze the organizational and institutional undertakers of interpersonal trust and how it is formalized and spread, especially under in the context of value diversity, have not kept pace.

On the other hand, debates have begun to emerge over the dual effects of value diversity on interpersonal trust in global governance have (Stolle, Soroka, & Johnston, 2008). Most studies conclude that high levels of value diversity caused by racial and ethnic heterogeneity are accompanied by lower levels of interpersonal trust (Stolle et al., 2008). In essence, value diversity discourages individuals from

relying on their neighbors, friends, and colleagues which reduces levels of interpersonal trust (Stolle et al., 2008). Other sociopsychological studies, however, following the contact theory hypothesis, hold that if appropriate conditions for contact between groups can be arranged, it may be the best means of increasing interpersonal trust (Stolle et al., 2008). This means “social interactions among individuals from dissimilar groups foster a superordinate identity that helps to diminish in-group bias and encourage the inclusion of former out-group members” (Stolle et al., 2008, p. 59).

These two different accounts reflect the complexity of interpersonal trust in diversity (Curşeu & Schrujjer, 2010). Whereas racial, ethnic, religious and team heterogeneity is fairly negatively related to interpersonal trust inside groups, interactions between groups made up of individuals from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds tend to foster trust (Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1998; Qi & Chau, 2013). Hence, a question is whether there is a different organizational perspective that can bridge external mediation and internal competition and so reconcile these seemingly contradictory perspectives in the study of interpersonal trust.

Nonprofit membership, an increasingly important organizational mode in global governance, among different stakeholders might provide an answer. Scholars generally recognize that nonprofits and their members need to be trusted by external groups in order to earn organizational legitimacy, be effective, and attract nonfinancial as well as financial support (Bryce, 2007). Yet there are few studies that explore the extent to which individuals who are predisposed to be trusting join nonprofits because of this disposition.

Given the inherently diverse composition of nonprofits and the potentially competing interests among their members, establishing trust with respect to their vision and their strategies for achieving their goals is a foundational task for them (Hearld, Alexander, Bodenschatz, Louis, & O’Hora, 2013). Nonprofits are communities that are grounded in sibships, georelationships and professional relationships and that share the common values and ethics of different social and economic members (Salamon Sokolowski, & List, 2004). In certain social and economic environments that foster interaction, different stakeholders in nonprofits are able to integrate their personal ethics with the organization’s ethics (Arenas, Lozano, & Albareda, 2009; Whitehead, 2014; Witesman & Fernandez, 2013). These nonprofits embrace heterogeneous values and unified belongingness at the same time, satisfying various stakeholders’ interests and facilitating social recognition (Saurugger & Eberwein, 2009).

Although researchers have made great theoretical progress in explicating the role of nonprofits in developing trust in the context of diversity, empirical research

has lagged behind. Not only have there been few studies that explore the difference between internal trust of the public and the spillover effect that internal trust has on, but also most research measures the intrinsic nature of nonprofits by assessing the extent of their value diversity and their trust orientation (Bryce, 2007). But the correlation may be the other way around; that is, individuals with certain characteristics may have an orientation that is more geared to interpersonal trust and may be more interested in nonprofit membership than other individuals. Although we have learned a great deal from these studies, they provide limited empirical evidence into the extent to which interpersonal trust in these organizations is sustained by certain people who join them rather than the opposite, namely, that nonprofit membership instills interpersonal trust and acceptance of diversity in those who join them.

In all, existing studies tend to focus more on the inherent trustworthiness of nonprofits due to their nonprofit status and accountability to which they are held (Sargeant & Lee, 2010). Inside nonprofits, the trust level is correlated with shared values, common interests, and interaction among different members (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). But how nonprofit membership and external interpersonal trust interact with each other in such a way as to maintain diversity has not been thoroughly addressed. It is not enough for nonprofits to have pluralistic and diversified internal goals; to secure external diversity, they should aspire to better organizational performance at the grassroots interpersonal level.

This article offers a conceptualization of interpersonal trust relevant to nonprofit membership, identifies the organizational characteristics that affect interpersonal trust in an environment that fosters diversified values. The contributions of this article are as follows. First, it creatively deploys a “circle and layer” structure of interpersonal trust to expand existing research boundaries in light of vertical professionalism and horizontal closeness. It also highlights how members of nonprofits serve as the undertakers of heterogeneous values who foster the integration of harmony and diversity. The empirical results of our study can also be used to answer the question of mutual causality between interpersonal trust and nonprofit membership, that is, the extent to which nonprofit membership helps build interpersonal trust in diversity, on the one hand, and the extent to which, on the other, individuals with certain characteristics tend to be more trust oriented and so for that reason join nonprofit organizations. This distinction can help explain how nonprofit membership plays complementary roles in the parallel crossing and embedded overlapping of the circle and layer structure.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Interpersonal trust in the context of diversity requires collective action among individuals with different interests and beliefs. Especially in a time of social transformation, conflicts within a diversified governance structure become fiercer. Interpersonal trust is a social practice that has both subjective and objective aspects (Dye, 1992; Howlett, 2019) and can be divided into two types. One is scientific trust that is represented by factual knowledge and technology and that guides the implementation of interpersonal governance aims. The other is democratic trust, defined as communication, consultation, and compromise among diversified interest groups and individuals that is formalized by value reconciliation.

The circle and layer structure of trust takes account of these two types of trust in the form of horizontal and vertical dimensions: the consciousness ripples of individuals in a three-dimensional “pattern of discrete circles,” a Chinese system of social organization known as *chaxegeu*, or “differential mode of association” (Fei, 1992, pp. 67-68), intersects mutually with values and facts on the horizontal circle and vertical layer of common beliefs. The circles with centers represent individuals with different values who achieve primary socialization through interactions between them. Formalized by organizations with objective knowledge on every level, these circles represent organizational identification as a system of rules and norms that produce unified action, rules and norms that spread inside organizations to construct a collective consciousness. In turn, this collective consciousness spreads outside each organization and enables resocialization, a process through which adults come to recognize new values as a result of joining new groups or experiencing a life change, among different interest groups. In this process, democratic trust is constructed and represented by the values and interests of different hierarchies that display an increasing homogeneity. Bonded by “weak ties” (Granovetter, 1977) among members and spread by a differential mode of association among individuals and organizations, this circle structure is grounded in the exchange of values that are connected with horizontal and subjective experiences.

Weak tie bonds are especially rich for individuals and organizations located at a greater distance from the center of the circle. The horizontal exchanges of value consciousness that take place can be visualized in terms of the collision between two circles of ripples in the water that are generated by the throwing of two stones. When the ripples collide, they overlay each other but do not lose their independent shape. A variety of organizations and groups representing primary collective consciousness act as media facilitating the process of the spread and integration of different ripples, which will also coparticipate in the spread of several ripples in the

overlapping areas (resocialization).

The layer of trust is professional knowledge supplied by various industries, territories, educational backgrounds, who serve as information carriers in different layers, that contributes to the formation and dissemination of common beliefs. The lowest layer is represented by general citizens, whose status is recipients of scientific trust. The middle layer contains nonprofits and communities that act as media in “structural holes” (Burt, 2009), which come into being when there is no direct contact between two or more organizations. The upper layer is represented by specialists with the knowledge authority and appropriate tools to build knowledge-oriented trust on a relatively small range of issues. The vertical translayer popularization of professional trust is conducted through mass media from the top to the bottom.

Nonprofits of various sizes and types can obtain the “greatest common denominator” of interests and preferences of citizens through the (re)socialization of the different value rationalities within them (Saurugger & Eberwein, 2009). The grassroots property of nonprofits facilitates the integration of divergent values and the building of interpersonal trust among members (Tönnies & Harris, 2001; Korte & Lin, 2013). This reconciliation results in a reclassification and automatic grouping of divergent preferences among members with different preferences who have freely chosen to join a given nonprofit group (Salamon et al., 2004; Anheier, 2014; Demirovic, 2003).

Nonprofits, with their own cultures, traditions and customs that give them legitimacy, effectiveness, and sources of financial support, can be viewed as incubators of the interpersonal trust that is required for their own internal cohesion (Kramer & Tyler, 1995). Trust among members in nonprofits reflects organizational mission and individual identity, which is derived from shared interests and public needs (Akerlof & Kranton, 2005; Bryce, 2007).

The diversity of members in nonprofits within the circle and layer structure is represented by multiple subjects who embed, overlap, integrate and collide mutually in a shared communication position. Divergent individual consciousness occupies the center of a circle and reflects the multisubjectivity of layers in the process of diffusion. The internal layer is individual consciousness that represents value diversity. The middle layer is the collective consciousness that combine the views of the group and individual heterogeneity. The outer layer captures the greatest common denominator of the group, represented by a group sense of belongingness. Different layers of consensus diffuse in this differential mode of association. These circles are constructed by the embeddedness and overlapping of nonprofits, and as with interpersonal trust, this embeddedness and overlapping are communicated

through horizontal weak ties and vertical structural holes.

The relative independence of individual consciousness in information exchanges is further captured by the way trust in the circle and layer structure embeds “concentric circles” of diversity in parallel with the same center of circles and different radii. This independence is reflected in nonprofits as the common ground of trust construction. In social practice, different kinds of groups nurture and construct organizational recognition and belongingness through socialization. In this process, they construct shared and recognizable norms and rules of collective actions and internalize mutual recognition as the impetus of collective development and communication.

The diversity of values exchanged across dimensions results from progressive transmission, while trust formalization results from knowledge. This internal factual consciousness of the layer (at the center of the circle) can generate a “resonance effect” on nonprofits’ members that strengthens group consciousness. In the same layers, consent, beliefs and expectations may not only acquire the same intensity among diverse consciousnesses but also maintain independence and identification in the translayer diffusion. Based on this theoretical framework above, we offer the following hypotheses: that nonprofit members have higher levels of interpersonal trust level than nonmembers and that nonprofit members have more diverse social values than nonmembers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data and Variables

The main data used in our paper is from World Value Survey Wave 6 (2010-2014), a cross-section global network of scholars who study changing values and their impact on social and political life (Inglehart et al., 2014). For other regional level data, we also use data from the World Bank. To distinguish between respondents among our sample who were members of nonprofits and those who were not, we used questions V25-V35 from the survey, which ask whether one is a member of and active or not in various organizations, including church or religious organization (V25), sporting or recreational organization (V26), art, music, or educational organization (V27), labor union (V28), political party (V29), environmental organization (V30), professional association (V31), humanitarian or charitable organization (V32), consumer organization (V33), self-help group or mutual aid group (V34), or any other voluntary organization (V35). We used the variable of volun-

tariness as a dummy. If the individual samples were members (active or inactive) in at least one of these nonprofits, voluntary equals 1; if the individual samples did not belong to any of these nonprofits, voluntary equals 0.

The data regarding interpersonal trust level comes from questions V105-V107, which are how much do you trust people you meet for the first time (V105), how much do you trust people of another religion (V106), and how much do you trust people of another nationality? (107) We used distrust of strangers, distrust of people of different religions, and distrust of people of other nationalities as variables. Following the raw questionnaire, we scored responses using a Likert scale from 1-4, where 1 equals trust completely and 4 equals do not trust at all. To check for robustness, we constructed the variable of fairness to measure the level of trust in communities from the question “Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?” (V56). We scored responses using a Likert scale from 1-10, where 1 equals people try to take advantage of you and 10 equals people try to be fair.

Value diversity data comes from questions V203-V207, which ask whether one thinks homosexuality (V203), divorce (V205), sex before marriage (V206), or suicide (V207) are ever justified, are never justified, or fall somewhere in between. We use the variables of homosexuality, divorce, sex, suicide as the reflection of different kinds of diverse values. We scored responses using a Likert scale from 1-10 where 1 equals never justifiable and 10 equals always justifiable. Other individual variables include respondent’s age, whether the respondent has children or not and the respondent’s religious belief, personal income, gender, and education level. In light of regional and transnational variations, we also add some regional value indexes to check for robustness, include savings rate, the level of women’s participation in family decision making, and life expectancy for each countries and regions.

Life expectancy and rate of savings can be seen as human capital investments (Doshi, 2010), while the extent of women’s participation in family decisions reflects traditional preferences, the level of women’s autonomy, and the prevailing social system and norms shared by nations in similar geographic locations (Bayudan-Dacuycuy, 2013; Simon, Adams, & Madhavan, 2002). To overcoming endogeneity, we used the first-order time lag of these regional variables and calculated their mean value using data from 2009-2013. We also cleaned up the data by deleting invalid or incomplete samples. The calculation methods, data sources, and descriptive statistics of all variables are shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Calculation Method and Source of Other Variables

Level	Variable	Source	Calculation Method
individual	age	World Value Survey Wave 6 V242. You are ____ years old	the age of the interviewee: extracted directly
individual	children	World Value Survey Wave 6 V58. Have you had any children?	whether the respondent has children or not: if yes, set value to 1; if no, set value to 0
individual	religion	World Value Survey Wave 6 V144. Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination?	the religious belief of the respondent: if yes, set value to 1; if no, set value to 0
individual	income	World Value Survey Wave 6 V239. What group does your household fall in, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes?	the income level of the respondent: set value to 1-10 from lowest group to highest group
individual	gender	World Value Survey Wave 6 V240. Code respondent's sex	the gender of the interviewee: if male, set value to 1; if female, set value to 0
individual	education	World Value Survey Wave 6 V248. What is the highest educational level that you have attained?	educational background: set value to 1-9 from no formal education to university-level education with degree
regional	rate of savings	World Bank Open Data	regional gross savings (% of GDP)
regional	participation of women		the extent to which women participate in three decisions, those regarding their own health care, major household purchases, and the visiting of family (% of women age 15-49)
regional	life expectancy		life expectancy at birth (total years)

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistics of All Variables

Variable	Observations	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Voluntary	29926	0.55	0.49	0	1
Stranger Distrust	29926	3.07	0.79	1	4
Interreligious Distrust	29926	2.75	0.85	1	4
Transnational Distrust	29926	2.83	0.85	1	4
Fairness	29926	5.75	2.63	1	10
Age	29926	44.87	14.28	18	93
Children	29926	2.45	1.62	0	8
Religion	29926	0.86	0.33	0	1
Income	29926	4.95	2.06	1	10
Gender	29926	0.48	0.49	0	1
Education	29926	5.61	2.41	1	9
Divorce	29926	4.02	2.99	1	10
Homosexuality	29926	2.80	2.75	1	10
Sex	29926	3.80	3.15	1	10
Suicide	29926	2.05	2.05	1	10
Savings Rate	28071	25.34	10.37	5.46	50.40
Participation of Women	16535	4.67	1.27	2.34	7.06
Life Expectancy	29926	74.38	7.75	51.98	86.33

Our sample size was more than 29,000 for most variables (except for rate of savings and the level of participation of women in family decision making). We found the average value for voluntary participation was 0.55, which means nonprofit members and nonmembers were nearly equally distributed in our sample. The mean values of distrust of strangers, distrust of those of other religions, distrust of those from other countries and the perception of fairness in social governance were 3.07, 2.75, 2.83 and 5.75 respectively, which also represent median intervals (1-4 or 1-10). The mean values of the diversity indexes (the extent to which homosexuality, divorce, sex, and suicide are justified in the respondent's view) are less than 5, indicating that a larger proportion of respondents thought they were less justifiable than justifiable. This is reasonable, as most of these behaviors are controversial and antitraditional.

These values were also similar to the average value of women’s participation in family decision, which was 4.67, meaning that only 4.67% of women make decisions regarding their health care, major household purchases, and visits to family.

Model

As the dependent variables are multivariate discrete variables, we first used an ordered logistic regression model to calculate the impact of nonprofits on interpersonal trust and value diversity, considering only individual-level variables. The equations are as follows.

$$Trust = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 \text{ Voluntary} + \text{Individual Variables} + \mu_1$$

$$Diversity = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 \text{ Voluntary} + \text{Individual Variables} + \mu_2$$

where α_1 and α_2 are the variables we used to measure trust level and value diversity respectively, β_1 is the variable we used to distinguish nonprofit members from non-members, β_2 are other individual-level variables, and μ_1 and μ_2 are residuals. To check for robustness, we added regional-level variables for different countries to control for various traditions, cultures, customs, and social preferences locally, which yielded the following equations.

$$Trust = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 \text{ Voluntary} + \text{Individual Variables} + \text{Regional Variables} + \mu_1$$

$$Diversity = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 \text{ Voluntary} + \text{Individual Variables} + \text{Regional Variables} + \mu_2$$

Due to the different level of the variables, if we had continued to use a normal single-level regression method, the clustering and group effects between countries and regions would have been lost. Hence, we then used a multilevel ordered logistic model to obtain correct standard errors and to measure between-nation variability, and the effects of region-level and individual-level characteristics on α_1 and α_2 . We treated the data as a two-level structure with individuals at level 1 and countries (regions) at level 2. We ran all regressions using STATA 15.0. The results of the single-level and multilevel ordered logistic models are show in tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Table 3. Single-Level Models of the Effects of the Variables on Nonprofit Interpersonal Trust

	(1) Stranger Distrust	(2) Interreligious Distrust	(3) Transnational Distrust	(4) Fairness
Voluntary	-0.215*** (-9.870)	-0.445*** (-20.599)	-0.198*** (-9.177)	0.055*** (2.686)
Age	-0.012*** (-14.422)	-0.013*** (-16.169)	-0.016*** (-19.805)	0.001* (1.953)
Children	0.053*** (7.277)	0.079*** (10.913)	0.090*** (12.441)	0.035*** (5.021)
Religion	0.160*** (4.984)	-0.093*** (-2.954)	0.066** (2.073)	-0.202*** (-6.838)
Income	-0.067*** (-12.249)	-0.042*** (-7.750)	-0.050*** (-9.338)	0.116*** (21.749)
Gender	-0.028 (-1.294)	-0.007 (-0.336)	0.002 (0.077)	-0.139*** (-6.826)
Education	-0.010** (-2.079)	-0.043*** (-9.035)	-0.106*** (-21.980)	0.037*** (8.157)
N	29926	29926	29926	29926

t statistics in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 4. Single-Level Models of the Effects of the Variables on Nonprofit Value Diversity

	(1) Divorce	(2) Homosexuality	(3) Sex	(4) Suicide
Voluntary	0.200*** (9.497)	0.606*** (25.678)	0.486*** (22.288)	0.470*** (18.519)
Age	0.016*** (20.699)	0.014*** (16.496)	0.016*** (20.528)	0.003*** (3.091)
Children	-0.131*** (-18.301)	-0.113*** (-14.066)	-0.216*** (-28.400)	-0.058*** (-6.718)
Religion	-0.828*** (-26.923)	-1.108*** (-34.053)	-1.119*** (-36.092)	-0.853*** (-25.228)
Income	0.018*** (3.474)	0.065*** (11.174)	0.011** (2.077)	0.088*** (13.954)
Gender	-0.178*** (-8.504)	-0.306*** (-13.135)	-0.070*** (-3.255)	-0.084*** (-3.349)

Education	0.125 ^{***} (26.704)	0.071 ^{***} (13.727)	0.099 ^{***} (20.675)	0.026 ^{***} (4.629)
N	29926	29926	29926	29926

Table 5. Two-Level Models of the Effects of the Variables on Nonprofit Interpersonal Trust

	(1) Stranger Distrust	(2) Interreligious Distrust	(3) Transnational Distrust	(4) Fairness
Voluntary	-0.160 ^{***} (-4.668)	-0.162 ^{***} (-4.771)	-0.111 ^{***} (-3.301)	0.104 ^{***} (3.299)
Age	-0.006 ^{***} (-5.131)	-0.008 ^{***} (-6.411)	-0.007 ^{***} (-5.434)	0.002 ^{**} (2.201)
Children	0.023 ^{**} (2.046)	0.030 ^{***} (2.720)	0.039 ^{***} (3.555)	-0.007 (-0.653)
Religion	-0.026 (-0.531)	-0.232 ^{***} (-4.804)	-0.083 [*] (-1.709)	-0.006 (-0.127)
Income	-0.063 ^{***} (-7.798)	-0.027 ^{***} (-3.419)	-0.054 ^{***} (-6.867)	0.117 ^{***} (15.216)
Gender	-0.030 (-1.015)	0.035 (1.169)	-0.003 (-0.095)	-0.116 ^{***} (-4.214)
Education	-0.026 ^{***} (-3.372)	-0.082 ^{***} (-10.753)	-0.089 ^{***} (-11.801)	-0.001 (-0.182)
Savings Rate	0.004 (0.235)	-0.029 (-1.638)	-0.012 (-0.692)	0.007 (0.803)
Participation of Women	-0.195 (-1.476)	-0.361 ^{***} (-2.955)	-0.301 ^{**} (-2.504)	0.127 ^{**} (1.970)
Life Expectancy	-0.024 (-1.029)	-0.011 (-0.506)	-0.040 [*] (-1.886)	0.008 (0.669)
Var(Cons[Country])	0.536 ^{***} (3.544)	0.459 ^{***} (3.549)	0.444 ^{***} (3.536)	0.123 ^{***} (3.413)
N	16535	16535	16535	16535

Table 6. Two-Level Models of the Effects of the Variables on Nonprofit Value Diversity

	(1) Divorce	(2) Homosexuality	(3) Sex	(4) Suicide
Voluntary	0.042 (1.241)	0.092** (2.469)	0.005 (0.151)	0.041 (1.037)
Age	-0.004*** (-3.727)	-0.011*** (-8.445)	-0.012*** (-9.694)	-0.008*** (-5.755)
Children	-0.046*** (-4.149)	-0.028** (-2.317)	-0.075*** (-6.392)	-0.024* (-1.839)
Religion	-0.467*** (-10.097)	-0.585*** (-11.963)	-0.568*** (-12.073)	-0.532*** (-10.520)
Income	0.061*** (7.554)	0.096*** (10.795)	0.072*** (8.562)	0.085*** (9.090)
Gender	-0.110*** (-3.748)	-0.280*** (-8.594)	0.124*** (4.015)	-0.057* (-1.656)
Education	0.054*** (7.202)	0.051*** (6.109)	0.032*** (3.988)	0.006 (0.660)
Savings Rate	-0.025 (-1.294)	-0.017 (-0.583)	-0.037 (-1.571)	0.008 (0.431)
Participation of Women	0.267** (2.006)	0.462** (2.269)	0.467*** (2.802)	0.298** (2.218)
Life Expectancy	0.132*** (5.636)	0.141*** (3.969)	0.162*** (5.545)	0.045* (1.917)
Var(Cons[Country])	0.548*** (3.558)	1.279*** (3.550)	0.859*** (3.574)	0.554*** (3.535)
N	16535	16535	16535	16535

Findings

The single-level models of the effects of the variables on nonprofit interpersonal trust (table 3), we found that the coefficients of the variable of voluntary participation in nonprofit organizations are significantly negative (from -0.445 to -0.198 at the 1% level) in model (1)-(3). This supports the hypothesis that nonprofit mem-

bers tend to have higher levels of interpersonal trust level than nonmembers. This effects was always present among nonprofit members who were strangers and who were not coreligionists. Professionalism among strangers in nonprofits has always been emphasized because as S. Wojciech Sokolowski (1998) has noted, professionals often use nonprofits to introduce services that might be regarded as controversial; nonprofits are useful in this respect because they tend to be viewed favorably by the public and so the public is more likely to embrace controversial services because of that image. Nonprofits embed internal transactions and negotiations between individuals whose relationship is characterized by information asymmetry in socially recognized knowledge structures, which can generate the social trust and confidence necessary for consensus building (Granovetter, 1985; Hansmann, 1987). But due to fiercer intercultural differences, the effect of interactions among nonprofit members from different countries as compared to nonmembers is weaker than the effect of the former two. Owing to nonprofits' professionalism, related services and production activities inside nonprofits can reinforce members' sense of positive contribution, enhance interpersonal interactions, and expand individuals' knowledge.

The coefficient of the effect of the perception of fairness on levels of trust is significantly positive (0.055 at 1% level). Member perceptions of fairness in nonprofits' activities are positively associated with a perceived level of consensus among members regarding transparency and inclusiveness (procedural fairness) and benefits relative to costs (distributive fairness) (Hearld et al., 2013). In the context of consensus building, this perception of fairness refers to the extent to which an individual's contribution to an organization is matched by reward (Luo, 2007). When nonprofit members believe that their efforts are not being taken advantage of, they may trust others more, especially strangers, in pursuit of a shared goal (Campbell, 2008).

The single-level models of the effects of the variables on nonprofit value diversity (table 4), show that the coefficients of the variable for voluntary participation were all significantly positive (from 0.200 to 0.606 at 1% level in 1-7). This is consistent with the hypothesis that that nonprofit members are inclined to have more open and divergent values than nonmembers. Diversity as an organizational value has become an integral part of most nonprofits, especially for disadvantaged groups (Knoppers, Claringbould, & Dortants, 2015).

Because value diversity in consensus building is a constellation of social consciousnesses such as gender, ethnicity, and sexuality that constitute organizational interests (Janssens & Zanoni, 2005; Prasad, Pringle, & Konrad, 2006), the constructions of social values among diverse nonprofit members and nonmembers may

vary. Due to their public-service-oriented nature, nonprofits are more likely to attend to the values that are important to the minority customers they try to serve. This construction of value diversity have spillover effects and be socially beneficial to the whole community, as the public is disposed to trust nonprofit organizations. The social diversity of nonprofits is embedded in the circle and layer practice of consensus building in gendered, sexualized, and ethnicized interpersonal relationships.

Tables 5 and 6, which records our addition of regional-level control variables as a way to overcome the influence of various nations on regression outcomes, show that the variances of the constants that stand for different nations are almost all significant at the 1% level. This proves the necessity and rationality of multilevel models (individual and regional). We also checked to see whether the Akaike information criterion of the two-level models was smaller than in the single-level models. As in the single-level models, the coefficients of the variable of voluntary participation were still significant at the 1% level in the two-level models, as table 5 indicates. But the results in table 6 shows that they become less significant (only significant in the case of homosexuality). This suggests that the effect of nonprofits on value diversity may be weakened by country differences. What's more interesting are the coefficients of for the regional variable that reports the participation of women in family decisions. Table 5 shows that they are significantly negative (about -3.0 at the 5% level in 2-3) and positive (about 0.13 at the 1% level in 4). This implies that women's participation in family decisions and the advancement of the status of women within the family could also enhance interpersonal trust levels. It accords with the measurement of the effect of women's participation on value diversity reported in table 6 (significantly positive at 1% level), which indicates that woman's participation in nonprofits amounts to an instance of value diversity, value diversity that is especially manifested in the positive relations among women's empowerment, voluntary action, and nonprofit sector strength (Themudo, 2009).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

To explore whether nonprofit members across countries join nonprofits because they are predisposed to trust and to embrace value diversity, this paper proposes a circle and layer model that links horizontal subjective and vertical objective consensus to account for the combination of value and fact elements in trust and diversity. Nonprofits have the ability to harmonize contradictory interests in the public's eye,

create interpersonal trust across members of different religions, and preserve value diversity. In short, nonprofits are discrete opinion aggregators that signal to other stakeholders like public sectors that it is feasible to use consensus building as a way to integrate divergent interests. In this respect, this paper has drawn lessons from the differential mode of association proposed by Xiaotong Fei, which claims that interpersonal relations are like spreading ripples that extend outward circle by circle according to the distance between them. Nonprofits act as the transmission medium of individual or group interests and consciousness in the formalization of shared values.

If nonprofits choose to embrace a range of selective individual interests and values, its collective consciousness could become a public benefit. Though traditional norms and social expectations hamper the self-expression of diversified (or even antimonic) subjective knowledge, the practices of value diversity in nonprofits are more likely to reflect the minorities they serve. In other instances, however, the opinions or values manifested by nonprofits may be socially acceptable to the whole community. In such situations it is the exchange of objective internalization and subjective externalization in the public perception of these issues that ultimately determines an individual's private evaluation of the public interests being served. An important theoretical implication of this argument is that value diversity is not an objective property. Instead, it is a function of the embedding of subjective knowledge, for example, the relationship between genders, in a particular social context, such as feminism.

On the practical side, this empirical study contributes to better understanding of the key role of nonprofits in consensus building. First, it allows us to forecast the emergence of cultural and cognitive conflicts in developing countries where there either are no nonprofits or the nonprofits that are there are ill prepared to provide the professionalism needed and to serve as the collective spokesperson of personalized interests. Second, it identifies nonprofits as an important social and intellectual force that can contribute to the construction of consensus in a social setting where such consensus is missing. Third, drawing on the idea of the interference and diffraction effects described by the circle and layer model, it identifies nonprofits as important tools for transmitting trust.

Last but not least, instead of establishing causality in this study, we examine the relationship between nonprofit members, interpersonal trust, and value diversity. Our empirical results indicate that nonprofit members have higher interpersonal trust levels, especially with respect to strangers, and that their values are more diverse. The underlying mechanism may be that nonprofit members are affected by organizational informative rules and collective actions when they interact with

other members. These effects are apparent even in different genders, after controlling for national variations. The relationship between nonprofits and trust in the context of diversity is in fact tenuous, as nonprofits can be made up members with divergent values and yet can still produce uniform decisions.

This paradox can help us to systematically explore and understand cross-regional and normative differences in people's perceptions of nonprofits and social consensus. Identifying the nonprofit as a micro-carrier or a transmission medium that evokes normatively grounded evaluations about the nature and public worthiness of consensus building is a way to explain how different values can coexist in the same organization. The circle and layer model of nonprofits operation can foster a more meaningful and mutual understanding among different groups and segments of pluralism in a global governance framework.

REFERENCES

- Akerlof, G. A., & Kranton, R. E. 2005. Identity and the economics of organizations. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(1): 9-32.
- Anheier, H. K. 2014. *Nonprofit organizations: Theory, management, policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Arenas, D., Lozano, J. M., & Albareda, L. 2009. The role of NGOs in CSR: Mutual perceptions among stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1): 175-197.
- Arrow, K. J. 2001. Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 26(5): 851-883.
- Baek, Y. M., & Jung, C. S. 2015. Focusing the mediating role of institutional trust: How does interpersonal trust promote organizational commitment? *Social Science Journal*, 52(4): 481-489.
- Bayudan-Dacuycuy, C. 2013. The influence of living with parents on women's decision-making participation in the household: Evidence from the southern Philippines. *Journal of Development Studies*, 49(5): 641-656.
- Bryce, H. J. 2007. The public's trust in nonprofit organizations: The role of relationship marketing and management. *California Management Review*, 49(4): 112-131.
- Bryce, H. 2012. *Players in the public policy process: Nonprofits as social capital and agents*. New York: Springer.
- Burt, R. S. 2009. *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Campbell, D. A. 2008. Getting to yes... or no: Nonprofit decision making and inter-organizational restructuring. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 19(2): 221-241.
- Curşeu, P. L., & Schrujier, S. G. 2010. Does conflict shatter trust or does trust obliterate conflict? Revisiting the relationships between team diversity, conflict, and trust. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 14(1): 66-79.
- Demirovic, A. 2003. NGOs, the state, and civil society: The transformation of hegemony. *Rethinking Marxism*, 15(2): 213-235.
- Doshi, K. 2010. Determinants of the saving rate: An international comparison. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 12(1): 37-45.
- Dye, T. R. 1992. *Understanding public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fei, X. 1992. *From the soil: The foundations of Chinese society*. Trans. G. G. Hamilton & W. Zheng. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Fulmer, C. A., & Gelfand, M. J. 2012. At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management*, 38(4): 1167-1230.
- Gilbert, D. U., & Behnam, M. 2013. Trust and the United Nations Global Compact: A network theory perspective. *Business and Society*, 52(1): 135-169.
- Granovetter, M. S. 1977. The strength of weak ties. In S. Leinhardt (ed.), *Social networks: A developing paradigm* (pp. 347-367). New York: Academic Press.
- Granovetter, M. S. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3): 481-510.
- Granovetter, M. 2005. The impact of social structure on economic outcomes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(1): 33-50.
- Hansmann, H. 1987. Economic theories of nonprofit organizations. In W. W. Powell (ed.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, (pp. 27-42). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hardin, R. 1993. The street-level epistemology of trust. *Politics and Society*, 21(4): 505-529.
- Harvey, M., Reiche, B. S., & Moeller, M. 2011. Developing effective global relationships through staffing with inpatriate managers: The role of interpersonal trust. *Journal of International Management*, 17(2): 150-161.
- Hearld, L. R., Alexander, J. A., Bodenschatz, L., Louis, C. J., & O'Hora, J. 2013. Decision-making fairness and consensus building in multisector community health alliances: A mixed-methods analysis. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(2): 139-161.
- Howlett, M. 2019. *Designing public policies: Principles and instruments*. New York: Routledge.

- Inglehart, R., Haerpfer, C., Moreno, A., Welzel, C., Kizilova, K., Diez-Medrano, J., Lagos, M., Norris, P., Ponarin, E., Puranen, B. et al. 2014. *World Values Survey: Round six—Country-pooled datafile version*. Madrid: JD Systems Institute.
- Janssens, M., & Zanoni, P. 2005. Many diversities for many services: Theorizing diversity (management) in service companies. *Human Relations*, 58(3): 311-340.
- Kim, J. 2007. Nongovernmental organizational governance and corporate governance: A comparative analysis. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, 22(1): 47-71.
- Knoppers, A., Claringbould, I., & Dortants, M. 2015. Discursive managerial practices of diversity and homogeneity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 24(3): 259-274.
- Korte, R., & Lin, S. 2013. Getting on board: Organizational socialization and the contribution of social capital. *Human Relations*, 66(3): 407-428.
- Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (eds.). 1995. *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C., & Gillespie, N. 2006. Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 991-1022.
- Luo, Y. 2007. The independent and interactive roles of procedural, distributive, and interactional justice in strategic alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3): 644-664.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 709-734.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. 1994. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3): 20-38.
- Prasad, P., Pringle, J. K., & Konrad, A. M. 2006. Examining the contours of workplace diversity. In A.M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle (eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity* (1-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Putnam, R. D. 2000. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In L. Crothers and C. Lockhart (eds.), *Culture and politics* (pp. 223-234). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Putnam, R. D. 2007. E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2): 134-67.
- Qi, C., & Chau, P. Y. 2013. Investigating the roles of interpersonal and interorganizational trust in IT outsourcing success. *Information Technology and People*, 26(2): 120-145.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. 1998. Not so different

- after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3): 393-404.
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & List, R. 2004. *Global civil society* (vol. 2). Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. 2010. Improving public trust in the voluntary sector: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(1): 68-83.
- Saurugger, S., & Eberwein, W. D. 2009. Professionalization and participation: NGOs and global participatory democracy? Paper presented at the International Political Science Association convention, Santiago di Chile, July.
- Simon, D., Adams, A. M., & Madhavan, S. 2002. Women's social power, child nutrition and poverty in Mali. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 34(2): 193-213.
- Sokolowski, S. W. 1998. Innovation, professional interests, and nonprofit organizations: The case of health care in Poland. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 8(4): 363-386.
- Song, J. H., Kim, H. M., & Kolb, J. A. 2009. The effect of learning organization culture on the relationship between interpersonal trust and organizational commitment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(2): 147-167.
- Stolle, D., Soroka, S., & Johnston, R. 2008. When does diversity erode trust? Neighborhood diversity, interpersonal trust and the mediating effect of social interactions. *Political Studies*, 56(1): 57-75.
- Suh, C. S., Chang, P. Y., & Lim, Y. 2012. Spill-up and spill-over of trust: An extended test of cultural and institutional theories of trust in South Korea. *Sociological Forum*, 27(2): 504-526.
- Themudo, N. S. 2009. Gender and the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4): 663-683.
- Tönnies, F., & Harris, J. 2001. *Community and civil society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitehead, D. 2014. Chinese NGO-firm partnerships and CSR from an institutional perspective. *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, 43(4): 41-74.
- Williamson, O. E. 1981. The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3): 548-577.
- Witesman, E. M., & Fernandez, S. 2013. Government contracts with private organizations: Are there differences between nonprofits and for-profits? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(4): 689-715.
- Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. 1998. Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science*, 9(2): 141-159.

