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Abstract
I elaborate contrasting narratives about international development: the *elite narrative* of academic experts and a *popular narrative* that depicts development not as developing the right institutions but inciting individual mobility. This popular narrative has guided the creation of roughly 10,000 new American NGOs in the last two decades. Most of these are what I call grassroots aid organizations that rely on meager budgets—$25,000 per annum or less—and copious volunteer labor, according to IRS records. They are typically founded by individuals who hold a college degree but have no training or professional experience in the field of development. Because they are financed almost entirely by small, private donations and because they are not professionalized by the circulation of expert staff, grassroots NGOs can durably operate according to a development narrative at odds with the elites of the field. This paper offers evidence for the popular narrative in interviews with volunteers of grassroots NGOs. Then, using an analysis of NGO websites, I offer a typology of grassroots NGO aid. I demonstrate how the popular narrative gives rise to aid projects that reject concerns of institution building in favor of providing goods and services or of developing individuals themselves as religious, educated, or capitalist subjects.
In development economist Angus Deaton’s book *The Great Escape* there is a telling disjuncture between the opening chapter and those that follow. In the preface Deaton relays the story of his father, Lesley Harold, who was born in 1918 in an English coal mining town. Lesley trained with a British commando unit in World War II, but because of a bout with tuberculosis was spared participation in a disastrous 1942 raid on occupied Norway. After leaving the army he married a Scottish girl and studied at night to become a civil engineer; they scrimped and saved to leave grimy Edinburgh for the countryside, where Lesley nurtured young Angus to a scholarship at a prestigious private school. From there, the younger Deaton went on to Cambridge and eventually, to Princeton, where he now holds an endowed chair and is respected as one of the world’s foremost development economists.

Deaton uses the story of his family’s generational mobility to illustrate the magnificent gains in health and wealth enjoyed by much of the world’s population starting in the late 18th century. He acknowledges that humankind’s “great escape” from poverty has left more than a billion people behind, and in the last section of the book he addresses the possibilities of development aid to eliminate poverty in less-developed countries. His argument is that aid fails because it undermines the democratic institutions that foster long-term development. What is needed instead, according to Deaton, are technological advances—a malaria vaccine, for instance—fairer deals in international trade negotiations, technical advice, and more generous migration policies. Well-meaning Americans would do best to advocate these solutions rather than giving to international charities or lobbying wealthy countries to increase their foreign aid.

I argue that the beginning and the ending of Deaton’s book exemplify opposing narratives about development. The latter is an elite narrative. Deaton differs from his colleagues in some particulars, but he represents basic points of consensus among academic
development experts. This elite narrative of development emphasizes technical expertise and the role of competent and democratically accountable institutions (North 1990, Portes and Smith 2012, Rodrik 2006). It embraces the human capabilities approach pioneered by Sen (1999), which posits well-being through health, education, and democratic participation as both the *ends* and *means* of development. Elite narratives of development variously emphasize legal protections for investors (Acemoglu et al. 2001) or political structures that strengthen the accountability of the state to society (Huber and Stephens 2012), but they converge on one point: in the words of Portes and Smith (2012), “institutions count.”

This is the paradox of Deaton’s book. Elite narratives reject the template for development laid out by Lesley Harold Deaton. The themes that emerge from the Deaton family’s rise from poverty are good luck (a case of tuberculosis at the right moment), hard work (night school to achieve professional qualification), and a “hand up” from a charitable benefactor (Angus Deaton’s scholarship to a private school). These themes constitute a *popular narrative* of development that, I argue, enjoys wide currency among Americans. This narrative explains development not as a case of developing the right institutions but as inciting individual mobility—in other words, of developing countries one Deaton at a time. The popular narrative understands development not as historically and contextually specific but as more or less universal across time and place. So it is that many Americans come to support aid projects in the Global South that attempt to jumpstart development by privately providing goods and services (like schools) and by cultivating the “hardworking” character they see as essential in their ancestors’ own escape from hard times.

The revolutions in transportation and communication in the most recent wave of globalization (roughly since 1990) have lowered the barriers to entry in the field of development
aid. Since 1990, more than 10,000 new relief and development organizations have been established by Americans. Most of these are what I call grassroots aid organizations, in that they rely on meager budgets—often $25,000 per annum or less—and copious volunteer labor, according to IRS records.¹ They are typically founded by individuals who hold a college degree but have no training or professional experience in the field of development. These American NGOs, which are based in every U.S. state and one out of every three U.S. counties, are primarily guided by the popular development narrative rather than the elite narrative that dominates academia and official development agencies. The aid projects of these grassroots NGOs, guided by the popular development narrative, focus on providing goods and services and developing educated, religious, or capitalist subjects. The popular development narrative justifies a focus on individuals or communities, and so these organizations abstract themselves from politics and from the institutional concerns that dominate elite understandings of development. Because they are financed almost entirely by small, private donations and because they are not “professionalized” by the circulation of expert staff (DiMaggio 1991), grassroots NGOs can durably operate according to a development narrative at odds with the elites of the field.

This paper elaborates the concept of a popular development narrative in contrast to an elite narrative and offers evidence for that narrative in interviews with volunteers in grassroots NGOs. Then, using a content analysis of grassroots NGO websites, I demonstrate how the popular narrative gives rise to aid projects that reject concerns of institution building in favor of

---

¹ According to the 2012 IRS Business Master File (BMF), the median income for NGOs founded since 1990 is $25,000 or less; income at the 90th percentile is just under $500,000. Although groups founded since 1990 account for 92% of all registered NGOs, they account for only 33% of all NGO income.
providing goods and services or of developing individuals as religious, educated, or capitalist subjects.

Data

To elaborate the popular development narrative I draw from interviews with 43 founders and volunteers from five grassroots NGOs that were selected for in-depth case studies. These groups were chosen from the universe of 501(c)3 organizations coded by the IRS as International Relief, Development, or Human Rights organizations, which totaled 10,624 active groups at the end of 2011. This confines the analysis to American-based groups and excludes what Watkins et al. (2012) call “free-floating altruists,” individuals doing aid work without a registered organization, as well as social enterprises that aim for some public benefit but are incorporated as businesses rather than nonprofit entities. Were there some systematic way of finding and counting these individuals and groups, the grassroots aid movement would be even larger in numbers and more varied in scope than described here.

The case studies were one phase of a larger research project on grassroots NGOs. The five case study NGOs were based in East Africa, the most common global destination region for grassroots NGOs. The five NGOs varied in revenue, the sector in which they worked, the target recipients, and whether they described themselves as secular or religious. Features of each

---

2 When an organization applies for tax-exempt status with the IRS, it is given a code from the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE). Based on each code’s detailed description in the NTEE-CC handbook and analysis of a sample of organizations with the relevant codes, I include organizations in the BMF with the following codes Q30-39: International Development and Relief and Q70-71: International Human Rights. Web searches of a random sample of organizations with these codes revealed that organizations labeled as “human rights” organizations and those labeled as “development” were carrying out very similar work. When I use the term “NGO” in this paper, it is to these organizations that I refer.
organization (named with pseudonyms\(^3\)) are described in Table 1. For each of these organizations five to twelve in-depth interviews were conducted with the founders, board members, key staff or volunteers, and a small number of the organizations’ beneficiaries. All but two of the 43 interviews were conducted in person at the African project location or in the U.S. city where the NGO is based.

### Table 1. NGO Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>U.S. Headquarters</th>
<th>International Base</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Explicitly religious?</th>
<th>Annual Revenue*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Kenya’s Tomorrow</td>
<td>Rural southeast Michigan</td>
<td>Nairobi, Kenya</td>
<td>Sanitation, microenterprise</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>~$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda Ultrasound Initiative</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Ultrasound training for Rwandan doctors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>~$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indego Africa</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Microenterprise</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$457,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellsprings of Hope</td>
<td>Suburb of San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>Large town in Uganda</td>
<td>Mission, schools, clinic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$189,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activate Tanzania</td>
<td>St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>Village in Tanzania</td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$79,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*501(c)3 organizations with less than $50,000 in revenue are not required to report an exact amount to the IRS with their annual Form 990 filing. Their revenues are recorded by the IRS as $0. The revenue figures here were from given to me in interviews by the presidents of For Kenya’s Tomorrow and Rwanda Ultrasound Initiative.

A second phase of research drew data from the larger population of NGOs’ websites.\(^4\)

The majority of grassroots NGOs are not affiliated with umbrella organizations like Interaction, so websites constitute the main or only public source of information on their projects, volunteers or staff, and global locations. But websites are much richer sources of data than some sort of

---

\(^3\) The chairman of Indego Africa preferred the use of true names for the organization, himself, and co-founder Ben Stone because of previously published accounts of the organization.

\(^4\) The 1% sample can be interpreted as probabilistically representative of all organizations with websites but not of all grassroots NGOs. A search for websites for all 10,624 organizations using Amazon Mechanical Turk yielded working sites for 6,564, or 61%. A comparison of IRS data for a sample of organizations with and without websites showed that NGOs with websites had higher average income and were older than NGOs without websites at statistically significant levels.
imagined directory with this kind of information. The strengths of website data are their ubiquity and orientation towards the interested public—in other words, they are deliberately constructed discourse about the NGO itself, its recipients, its donors, and the relationships among them.

To show how narratives of aid align with particular projects, recipients, and rationales, I carried out an in-depth content analysis of 150 of these organizations’ websites. Each site was captured as a PDF file and marked with 152 codes in the categories of *location, aid context, donor, images, mode of action, networks, rationales, recipients,* and *volunteers.* Moreover, when content analysis is paired with data from IRS records, it is possible to make generalizations between NGOs’ age and income and their approach to aid. A strong majority (roughly 90%) of the NGOs in the sample are what I have defined as “grassroots” NGOs—less than 25 years old, started by individuals who are not trained aid workers, and sustained through volunteer labor rather than paid staff. NGOs’ efforts can be understood with three broad models of aid, two of which fit strongly with the popular development and dominate the efforts by grassroots NGOs.

**Narratives of Development, Elite and Popular**

*The Elite Narrative*

Deaton’s account of development in the latter part of *The Great Escape* observes basic points of consensus among academic experts about how development is defined and how it might be achieved. To trace these points of agreement is not to obscure sources of internal debate among experts, which are many (ranging from measurement of China’s growth to the ethics of anti-retroviral drugs). What is at stake here is to illuminate the terms of the conversation held by economists, political scientists, and sociologists in universities, government, and established development agencies.
A key feature of the post-Washington Consensus elite narrative is the embrace of Sen’s (1999) understanding of expanding human capabilities as both the ultimate goal of development and as a means for achieving traditional goals of economic growth. Sen’s broad understanding of human development as encompassing physical well-being, intellectual development, and autonomy gave rise to the creation of the UN Human Development Index in 1990. The theoretical perspectives that saw capabilities as consistent with human capital creation and therefore with growth have been bolstered by studies that link improvements in human development to subsequent economic growth (Ranis, Stewart and Ramirez, 2000; Boozer, et al., 2003; Ranis and Stewart, 2006). The policy implication of this redefinition of “development” as enhancing capabilities is a broadly accepted economic rationale for investing in health, education, and other human services. The parameters of that investment are debated, but agreement on the role of capabilities in development is a sea change from the Washington Consensus, which had defined development by growth in GDP per capita and prescribed a set of neo-liberal policy measures towards that end.

At the moment when the Asian financial crisis and the failed fast-track market reforms in the former Soviet states were eroding the Washington Consensus (Stiglitz 1999 and Broad 2004), an “institutional turn” (Portes and Smith 2012) was taking place among social scientists. The result was that experts came to converge on the importance of legal and political institutions to development: “We are all institutionalists now,” wrote economist Gerard Roland in 2004. The institutions that economists emphasized were the sort of market safeguards that had been taken for granted in highly developed Western economies: property rights, contract enforcement, corporate governance, government mechanisms to address unemployment (Acemoglu et al. 2001, North 1990, Rodrik 2006, Stiglitz 1999). Political institutions also came to be seen as critical,
particularly because development objectives had expanded to include health and education, traditional responsibilities of the state. These institutions include participatory mechanisms whereby the civil society can engage the state (Baiocchi et al. 2008), offering clear signals of democratic preferences and feedback on the government’s performance (Evans 2004).

That NGOs would be a catalyst for civil society mobilization was one of the promises of the initial NGO movement in the 1980s. The description of the political role NGOs might play in inciting “development from below” foreshadows contemporary discussions of democratic deepening:

NGOs have an important role to play in political development to the extent that they can offer ordinary people an opportunity to participate in decisions and represent local interests. They have the potential to assemble scattered social groups into integrated social movements. Ideally, they can provide access not only to economic opportunities, but to a broader understanding of a citizen’s rights and duties under the law. By building independent organizations at the community, regional and national levels, NGOs in Africa have already helped to populate and pluralize the institutional landscape. As such, their impact should be evaluated, not purely in terms of economic growth and social welfare, but also with regard to the strengthening of civil society. (Bratton 1989, p. 585)

Contemporary assessments of NGOs are more apt to view them as resource-dependent organizations, orienting themselves towards donors and adopting the objectives and organizational practices that are most likely to win funding (Bano 2008, Aksartova 2009, Swidler & Watkins 2009, Morfitt 2011, Watkins et al. 2012). Dependent on donor funding, NGOs’ mechanisms of accountability become technocratic (evaluations of outputs) rather than democratic (Mebrahtu 2002, Ebrahim 2005). After a period of embrace by development experts (Fisher 1997), NGOs’ place in the elite development narrative now hinges on their ability to work without undermining state-society relations or weakening local institutions (Brautigam and Knack 2004, Leonard & Straus 2003, Watkins et al. 2012, Wenar 2011).
Popular Narrative

In contrast to this elite development narrative that sees the routes to progress as historically and contextually specific, and that emphasizes the need for strong institutions, is a popular development narrative that highlights individual transformation and the global diffusion of subjectivities and skills that enabled people in the Global North to make their “great escapes.”

Popular narratives of development are consistent with a focus on health and other capabilities emphasized by the elite development narrative, but they are largely indifferent to what I have broadly characterized here as “institutions.” In the popular development narrative, adequate human knowledge exists; the riddle of development is transferring that knowledge across borders from those who have it to those that don’t. The popular development narrative differs from the elite narrative in several features: 1) it uses stories of American success as blueprints for individual mobility in less-developed countries; 2) it focuses on direct transfer of skills and subjectivities from Americans to aid recipients; 3) it understands sustainable development not as a question of developing institutions but as “investing” in individuals, who create social change through contagion. I illustrate these features of the popular narrative with evidence from interviews with grassroots NGO volunteers.

The popular narrative depicts development as a basically universal process across time and place. As a result, the lessons learned from one’s own stories of social mobility are understood as reasonable blueprints for human development in the Global South. The founder of Indego Africa explained that he looked to his grandmother’s biography in creating a women’s microenterprise project in Rwanda.

[T]here was a narrative from my family history that was very, what’s the word I’m looking for—not “entrepreneurial,” it’s not quite right. We would not be an entrepreneurial family, but a bootstrap family, I guess. My grandmother would be an inspiration. . . there are a lot of parallels between her life and the lives of the
women that we support. She grew up on a farm. She went through 6th or 7th grade only because that’s what the family could afford to send her to. No running water in her house, no heating, none of those things. And she had to go out and eventually she did start her own business in catering that she used to support herself. . . So I would say our view of the world is shaped by that experience not only because it was women-driven but also because it was about taking advantage of opportunities. . . (Mitro)

Mirroring the story of the Deatons, leaders of other grassroots NGOs spoke of the need for aid recipients to seize opportunities. A board member of Wellsprings of Hope expressed her frustration over a Ugandan boy to whom she had provided a scholarship who had failed his exit examination three consecutive years. “I really had some serious discussions with him when I was there last year. ‘I understand it's hard, but you have to take advantage of this... you have to raise your grades before I'm gonna spend that extra money to send you to boarding school.’ ”

This narrative holds that education and small business are demanding but achievable routes to success in any setting.

Popular narratives focus on direct transfer of skills and subjectivities (e.g. knowledge of water-borne illness) rather than on cultivating the institutions (a government capable of maintaining public sanitation) that are needed to sustainably apply them. Later in recounting the story of his grandmother, Mitro specifically mentioned the libraries, schools, and political stability that allowed his grandmother to raise three sons successfully. But in explaining what he thought to be the most effective aid intervention, he emphasized transmitting skills:

[Question]: What made you sort of move away from . . a model that is more focused on institution building rather than sort of developing human capital?

[Mitro]: A few reasons. One, I think that the actual conduct of economic activity in business is really healthy and we—and I think that was also where our experience came from. Because really this was in many ways a joint project between my father and I in the beginning. **So I would say we were quite keen to pass on some of the skills and knowledge that we had.** We thought like actually helping them conduct business was a valuable form of training . . .
A recurring theme in interviews was the desire of well-educated NGO volunteers to diffuse their professional skills. This is the entire premise behind the Rwanda Ultrasound Initiative: extending training on diagnostic ultrasound from American to Rwandan doctors. One of the founders described her reaction to seeing unused equipment at Rwandan hospitals: “I found these machines, these two beautiful brand new machines off in some side room. I would be using that every second of the day, but if they don’t know how to use it then it’s totally wasted, and it’s this amazing technology.” Doctors (5) accountants (2), pastors (2), teachers (2), a nurse, and a librarian all described in interviews their efforts to transmit their skills to African counterparts.

This transfer of professional skills—along with the more abstract dispositions like future planning, risk-taking, and problem-solving—is an appropriate intervention in a narrative that explains development as aggregated cases of individual mobility. Elite narratives—even those of economists—make space for spillover effects and emergence—but the popular narrative as articulated by NGO volunteers is relentlessly atomized. Broader social change happens through contagion as well-trained individuals go on spread their knowledge, gradually developing the nation from the bottom up. This pattern emerged in interviews to describe the impact of ultrasound-trained doctors, children educated in personal hygiene, religious primary schools, religious evangelism, village health workers, and youth in politics.

Institutions become hollowed out. In interviews, discussions of government centered on corruption, which was framed as fundamentally a problem of character. When asked about the roles that government should play in development, respondents often spoke of government officials in terms of their personal character or as role models for citizens. One volunteer cited the presence of a government official at a ceremony for a private school opened by an NGO as
providing an inspirational message for the children there: “I thought that was a very positive thing, to see somebody who was a Ugandan in a position, first off, a woman, who is educated, and is in a position of power, talking to them about their rights.” In an extreme example of focus on personal character, one NGO volunteer explained the predatory reign of Idi Amin as damaging because of the example it set of sexual immorality:

I think that the reign of Idi Amin damaged that country so badly. He was a very poor role model as a father and as a husband; had many wives, and didn't -- you know he encouraged men to just take as many wives as they wanted and-- he was very corrupt.

The popular development narrative depicts the state as either feeble or as a source of corruption and an impediment to the direct transactions between aid givers and receivers. The grassroots NGO volunteers described their work as taking the place of government services: “it's really stepping into the gap of what the government can't or won't do.” Yet when local or national governments attempted to fold NGO efforts into broader development schemes or to exert political control over their projects, volunteers expressed frustration at what they saw as unnecessary roadblocks to the primary goal of providing services and transferring knowledge. That transfer, to the recipients identified by the NGO, took precedence over the development of indigenous institutions that could offer capability-enhancing services.

**Grassroots NGOs’ Models of Aid**

Development narratives are prescriptive: they describe not only what development is, but what action by local and foreign actors will foster it. The key point here is that a wave of aid organizations—modest in budgets but many in number—are not operating according to a professional logic that guides organizational fields (DiMaggio 1991). In the remainder of the paper I use a content analysis of 150 relief, development, and human rights organization websites
to show how the popular narrative of development is associated with identifiable approaches to aid. I show that the popular development narrative defines the sort of projects that this new wave of NGOs engage, the recipients they target, and the roles they offer for American supporters.

The NGO websites depicted three basic models of aid. The first model has to do with the direct provision of goods and services; the second involves transmitting skills and subjectivities; and the third (and least associated with the popular development narrative, for reasons I will discuss) engages aid recipients’ social relations. As the descriptors suggest, these models are distinguished by the type of aid project, but I will show that these projects are associated with distinctive recipients, rationales, and roles for American supporters. Differences among the models on these dimensions is illustrated by Table 3 (see appendix), which gives relative frequencies for codes in these three broad areas. I define rationales as discursive acts that explain why something was done. In the context of NGO websites they are most often making an explicit claim of why particular people should be helped or why a particular intervention is appropriate. Recipient codes include both status categories (men, women, children/youth, orphans), and qualitative descriptions of aid recipients. Finally, roles for U.S. supporters refer to descriptions of action already taken by supporters or appeals for readers of the website to offer particular kinds of support to the NGO. In this analysis each NGO is assigned to one model according to its primary sector of work as determined by the qualitative coding. It was possible to assign a primary model to all but one NGO based on their websites for a usable n of 149.

The goods/services and the subjectivities models, in particular, are consistent with assumption of the popular development narrative that the supply of wealth and knowledge in the world is sufficient, and that the task of aid should be to transfer them. The subjectivities model
especially relies on the assumption that individual mobility is possible once a person acquires particular knowledge and dispositions.

The advantage of analyzing a probability sample of all registered relief, development, and human rights organizations is that it allows differences between what I have called “grassroots NGOs”—relatively young, small budget, founded by individuals without professional aid experience—and more “traditional” NGOs to emerge organically. Organizations working in the social relations model, which I define below as interventions that aim to empower marginalized social groups or to create partnerships between groups in other countries, are commonly what I have called “traditional” NGOs. Many of them are older and employ full-time staff. The social relations model also is employed by only 11% of NGOs. The strong majority of NGOs rely on models consistent with the popular development narrative—those that focus on directly providing the goods and services or on cultivating aid recipients’ skills and subjectivities.

Model #1: Direct Provision of Goods and Services

The most common model for NGO aid involves direct provision of the goods and services that poor people lack. This can involve distributing the necessities of life like food and clothing, either in times of disaster or to the chronically needy. It also includes building housing or providing the sorts of infrastructure and capability-enhancing services that are typically the purview of the state: medical clinics and care, water, electricity, orphanages or foster homes. In other words, organizations working in this model stand in for the family or the state.

The sophistication with which these goods and services are distributed varies. Some organizations collect small items like pencils or soccer balls to be distributed as gifts when they arrive in country. Other organizations provide more sophisticated and large-scale redistributive
schemes for American surplus items: several library projects move English-language books by the shipping container to Africa, while MedShare operates two warehouses in the U.S. to which hospitals can donate surplus supplies and international NGOs can request them. The provision of services can be more durable—the building of wells or clinics, and in some cases, the training of their staff. World Children’s Initiative provided the expertise and funds for a new hospital in rural Sri Lanka and is organizing a scheme to train pediatric surgeons in East Africa.

Disaster relief organizations are part of this category. For well-funded NGOs with capabilities like cargo flights or pop-up hospitals, the distinction between relief and development operations is apparent. The difference is less clear for grassroots NGOs. In a typical example, an organization that had made previous contact with a pastor in Haiti sent volunteers with donated stocks of clothing and medical supplies after the 2008 earthquake. As the months went on, volunteers would continue to come and would assist in an orphanage established by the pastor. For these grassroots NGOs the distinction between relief and development projects is less salient than the common effort to provide goods and services directly from American volunteers or through private indigenous efforts funded by American dollars.

However, there is a distinction between relief and development projects in the discourse about recipients. Websites featuring relief projects tend to make few distinctions among recipients. But development organizations dealing with chronic poverty tend to emphasize marginalized populations—women, children, the sick—in their discourse. For all recipients, the rationales for aid tend to emphasize suffering. Compared with other models of aid, organizations working in this model rarely appeal to abstract principles (e.g. human rights) or elaborate political causes for disadvantage. NGOs working in the goods and services model most often
rely on the implicit claim that human suffering demands on a response, and the texts themselves focus on explaining the source of the suffering, as in the text below:

In Senegal, and in much of Africa, there is a season that we do not experience. . . The Hungry Season. In many rural villages, families are reduced to one meal a day, and not even that. The hardship goes largely unnoticed because it is not a widespread famine. . . it is just a slow, gnawing, debilitating hunger that robs people of their energy and strength.

Then, the organization makes the claim for how their project is positioned to alleviate the suffering:

We at Anandao hope we can be a small part of the solution. We are working at creating an environment in rural villages where people have enhanced ability to grow their own food, through micro lending, water security and education. There are no quick solutions, but village by village we hope to make a small difference along the way. (Anando)

The response that suffering seems to demand, according to this discourse, offers roles for Americans. These roles include the donation of goods and the logistical management of their transport from the U.S. Second is the volunteer labor of Americans who may offer low-skill work (playing with children in orphanages is a common example) or high-skill interventions (cardiac surgery). These groups justify their presence by the imperative of the human need and the absence of indigenous providers: “Cameroon’s East region is sometimes characterized as ‘forgotten’ by politicians and development projects. . . Its ‘forgotten’ status is one major reason why Opportunity Africa chose to concentrate our work in the East.” (Opportunity Africa)

_Model #2: Skills and Subjectivities_

If the goods and services model can crudely be characterized as the “give a man a fish,” approach to development, the second model is about teaching a man to fish—more specifically, to have both the skills and the _initiative_ to fish. What unifies this model is the attempt to alter
aid recipients’ cognition and behavior—their desires, their habits, their strategies—so that they can eventually prosper on their own. Within this model I include three seemingly disparate types of programs: education, small business, and religious ministry. There are differences in the targeted recipients and in the techniques of intervention, but the unifying thread is an effort a) that is about transforming the dispositions and behavior of recipients b) and therefore, by definition, is aimed squarely at individuals rather than collectivities.

One-third of NGOs in the sample primarily work in this model. They provide education (by directly operating schools, offering scholarships, or summer enrichment programs), give training for small business or offer microcredit, or engage in spiritual or religious ministries (evangelizing, teaching meditation techniques, building of churches). The targeted recipients vary. Education projects target youth, predictably, while small business programs often target women. Religious ministry programs are more broadly aimed, though conservative Christian programs differ from other NGO projects by reserving particular religious roles for male recipients. What all programs have in common is the discourse of transformation. Small business and microcredit organizations strive to build people’s sense of initiative, risk-taking, and future planning. By making people more forward thinking and entrepreneurial, they can seize market opportunities and reap material and social gains. Small business and microcredit programs are depicted as offering women social empowerment vis-à-vis men; as providing self-esteem and dignity; as generating leadership qualities; and as driving overall change—economic and social—in the communities.

5 In this sample, 18 organizations employed ministry as their primary method of aid. Eighteen additional organizations carried out “ministry” activities as secondary to other objectives, including one Buddhist group. Twenty-six additional organizations in the sample identified with some religious affiliation or as “faith-based,” but their projects did not include proselytizing, clergy training, or building and maintaining religious facilities.
Education programs also aim to cultivate a work ethic and agile mind, though the particular tasks to which an educated youth will apply these traits is left unspecified. The theme is that an educated person is one that can “break the cycle of poverty.” The language of transformation is prevalent here as it is with business projects:

Education offers children a way out of the cycle of poverty by giving children a broader range of choices for their lives. It provides individuals with the necessary tools to transcend poverty, to participate in their communities, and to provide a higher quality of life for themselves and future generations. (Wings of Peace)

Religious ministries aim to incite a devout subjectivity. Discourse on ministries’ websites focuses less on a religious imperative to save souls\(^6\) than on the earthly benefits for recipients. In addition to spiritual solace, aid recipients’ newfound devoutness may lead to a reform in habits—or new network links—that yield income opportunities. American volunteers have a particularly important role to play in the religious variant of this model. The skills and subjectivities to be transferred here are not technical but *religious*; one need not be a surgeon to be useful. As a result, this model variant more than any other solicits Americans to travel as short term volunteers. Supporters who are unable to travel as volunteers are asked to support the ministry through prayer.

In the education and small business variants of this model, Americans have a less direct role. They are not directly providing goods or services; instead, they are promoting the cultivation of skills or ways of thinking among aid recipients. Americans tend to play complementary roles that offer incentives to the new subjectivities of aid recipients; they offer scholarships, or act as buyers for the products (e.g. fair trade coffee or artisan goods) that the

---

\(^6\) Contrast the language used by the (American) Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions in 1894: “There is a great Niagara of souls passing into the dark in China. Every day, every week, every month...!” Quoted in Varg 1954.
nascent businesspeople market. Organizations working in this model were more likely than those in the goods and services model to cite as rationales abstract principles of human rights, justice, or gender equality. These are rationales that emphasize the *sameness* between recipients and donors rather than their differences, even as the projects themselves aim to make recipients more like donors. While religious variants tend to emphasize “God’s will” or “God’s love” in their rationales, their discourse too emphasizes sameness:

> We do not want to go with the attitude of “doing” but of being with our friends, to learn from each other, to pray with and encourage each other, to partner with what God is already doing there. While we hope to accomplish a lot, we also hope to spend our time building relationship with Malawians, each other, and with God. (Circle of Hope)

Perhaps it should not be surprising that NGOs using this model are more apt than in any other to highlight recipients’ personal narratives on their websites. These narratives trace the transformation of recipients’ material circumstances but also their hopes and plans for the future. Discourse about recipients in this model is more likely than in any other model to emphasize recipients’ “hard work” or “positive attitude.”

*Model #3: Strengthen social groups or build relations between groups*

Organizations in this model work on policy advocacy, capacity building, democratization, cultural exchange, and preserving cultural heritage. While improving the standard of living might be a long term goal, the more immediate intervention is to allow people to build collective skills or relationships that will empower them. This can mean building women’s groups capable of lobbying in local politics; it can be a children’s anti-corruption group; it can be shoring up Tibetan monasteries to preserve their traditional practices against Han Chinese pressure. Cultural exchange groups such as Partners of the Americas also fall into this category.
Organizations who aim to alter recipients’ relationships with institutions or other social groups face a fundamentally different task than those who aim to provide social services or needed goods. Here the needs and aspirations of individuals recede in favor of the fates of some collectivity. Organizations that intervene solely at the level of social groups comprise only 4% of the sample, and they are immediately distinct from other aid groups in the sample because their primary mode of activity is advocacy. Human Dignity International (formerly Christian Solidarity International) is part of an international organization of groups advocating for the rights of Christian minorities outside of the West. The Washington Kurdish Institute advocates for the Kurdish ethnic minority in Iraq, while two organizations in the sample combine general political advocacy for Tibetan people with support for Tibetan Buddhist institutions in exile. The theme here is that these organizations are supporting the rights of political minorities. Of all of the organizations in the sample, these are the most explicitly political; they are led by well-educated members of diasporas and have strong political constituencies in the United States. But rather than engaging directly in politics in their home countries, these organizations operate in the manner of Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) transnational advocacy groups, leveraging connections among powerful allies (here, the U.S., though some of these groups also have branches in Europe) for their political ends. They operate at the margins permitted within designation as a 501(c)3 public charity, so their public language must be carefully chosen to remain within the discursive framework of human rights advocacy rather than political lobbying.

Other organizations aim to build more equitable and collaborative relationships between Americans and communities in the Global South through exchange and service programs. Minnesota Uruguay Partners (a Partners of the America chapter), Amigos de las Americas, and the Wallace Toronto Foundation and Global Routes—aimed at Mormons and students,
respectively—all operate exchange or voluntarism trips for Americans to communities in the Global South. While the American visitors often take part in some service project, that project is a means to the broader end of international friendship and solidarity. In the case of the Wallace Toronto Foundation, the social groups whose relationships are to be transformed can be pinpointed: the goal is to improve relations between the LDS church and the Czech and Slovak republics. Mormon missionaries had fled the country in World War II and returned, according to official accounts, after the fall of the iron curtain. The Toronto foundation, named for the founding LDS missionary in Czechoslovakia, returns with volunteer groups each summer to engage in a service project designated by municipal leaders. Foundation volunteers also assisted in the petition effort for legal recognition of the LDS church under Slovak law.

These organizations are older on average than those working in other models: the mean founding for organizations intervening in institutions is 1998, compared with the overall sample mean of 2003. Among these are longstanding exchange programs Amigos de las Americas and a Partners of the Americas branch based in Minnesota. These partnership groups represent a departure from the popular narrative development, and embrace something more like a pan-national understanding of development that relies on partnerships for mutual improvement. A handful of groups engage in transnational advocacy, and only one, the Cabeceras Aid Project, takes building political capacity as a primary goal. These groups not only represent a minority of NGO approaches, but they also hold a declining market share among NGO models since 1990. They also represent a disproportionately small share of NGO revenues. Though NGOs working primarily on social relations comprised 11% of the sample in webpages, their income comprised less than 1% of NGO gross receipts.
Discussion

The 10,624 American NGOs that existed by the end of 2011 represent a new manifestation of “altruism from afar” (Swidler and Watkins, forthcoming) enabled by the latest wave of globalization. Altruistic people concerned about development are no longer bound to give to stalwart NGOs like Oxfam or CARE, to their churches, or to intergovernmental agencies like UNICEF. In the period between World War II and roughly 1990, during the Washington Consensus’ period of ascent, experts increasingly dominated understandings of development. Global South governments wishing to receive aid and aid agencies who wished to subcontract with donor governments had to orient themselves to expert understandings of development, even if some made efforts at contesting them (Sommer 1977). I argue that the period since 1990 has seen an ascendance in the popular narrative of development, as global activism against the Washington Consensus bruised experts’ standing, and as Americans have had increased direct access to the Global South.

The popular narrative of development focuses on individual mobility, and sees development as the aggregated effect of individual progress. Because individuals are the unit of analysis, the popular narrative makes possible the transferring of templates for individual mobility in the Global North to the Global South. Where elite narratives might have focused on the legal and political institutions that facilitate individual mobility, the popular narrative emphasizes the skills and dispositions that the individual must acquire to be successful. From this perspective, the riddle of development is not the creation of locally-appropriate institutions or technology, but the transfer of existing knowledge across borders to those who purportedly need it. In this narrative the state is largely envisioned as enfeebled or corrupt.
This popular narrative is a variant of what Deaton calls a “hydraulic” approach to aid: an assumption that development is a technical problem. If aid is pumped in, development will pump out. The contribution of this paper is to show that Americans involved in grassroots NGOs see that technical problem as one about which they have personal knowledge. They believe that the goods that they have should be enjoyed by others, and that the skills and subjectivities that have allowed them to enjoy success can be piped across borders. Indeed, this approach seems to have precedence in the American imagination, as this description of private post-World War II giving shows:

Roughly speaking, the things aimed at are those which, to an American eye, appear most needed—health and clean water, plentiful crops, houses with tight roofs, the right and indeed the duty to learn, the ambition and the opportunity to get ahead without stepping too hard on the next man. These are the things which to an American are essential and ought to be essential everywhere. The programmes as they emerge are expressions of American experience, American dreams, American shrewdness, and American biases, against the background of a pervasive memory that it is not so very long since Americans worked their own way out of primitive conditions, and of an insistent belief that the techniques which they found useful then may now also be useful elsewhere. (The Economist, “Private versus Public Giving,” 1958)

The fundamental difference between 1958 and today is that Americans can—and do—put this narrative into action in the Global South with personal, direct action. The end of the Cold War, inexpensive international flights, free email, and near-universal mobile phone coverage make it possible for Americans to establish their own aid efforts.

This paper offers evidence that this popular narrative finds material expression in the models of aid used by American NGOs. Less than 10% of organizations orient themselves towards the social relations that affect development, and that figure is even smaller among grassroots organizations. The most common organizations aim to provide goods and services to the underserved privately, taking on the responsibilities of the family or the state. By using
discourse that emphasizes the suffering of aid recipients, they encourage impatience with politics and local solutions. Another common approach is to transmit the skills and subjectivities—religious, educated, and capitalist—that Americans understand to be essential to their mobility. These organizations highlight the personal qualities of dedication and optimism in their recipients. In justifying their work they appeal to abstract principles of gender equality and human rights, using arguments that emphasize the equivalent aspirations of aid donors and recipients.

These models of aid answer the elite narrative’s call to enhance capabilities, but they neglect the questions of sustainability and local accountability. The issue of sustainability—how development will continue once external support ends—is reframed by claiming that investment in human skills will somehow ensure continued progress. Moreover, beyond relying on advice from local brokers or intermediaries (Swidler and Watkins 2008), grassroots NGOs typically include no mechanisms for their programs’ accountability to the clients they serve. These organizations are also subject to critiques traditionally offered to aid projects: that they neglect spillover effects, that they outbid the public sector for local talent, and that they burden and fragment the attention of local government.

Unlike Official Development Assistance, which is the target of the harshest judgment from aid critics like Deaton (2013) and Easterly (2007), grassroots aid is not the handmaiden of security or macroeconomic interests. The rapid pace with which grassroots aid has emerged in the last 25 years and the small size of individual organizations suggest that change in this subsector could be easier to achieve than in ODA. The question of whether grassroots NGOs can contribute meaningfully to development exceeds the empirical question of whether grassroots aid organizations are effective deliverers of goods, services, and skills. Is it possible
for organizations based in narratives of individual mobility to recognize their political effects? Will American donors who start organizations that reflect their ideals be willing to embed their efforts in local structures? Can local leaders harness would-be aid givers into development schemes that are democratically accountable? Discussion must turn to whether it is possible for these organizations to contribute to—or not obstruct—a more sustainable and democratically rich approach to development.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of IRS Registration</th>
<th>Gross Receipts*</th>
<th>Primary Aid Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Day Hero</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bridge For Africa Foundation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>369,556</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Childs Hope International Inc</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>732,834</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Glimmer Of Hope Foundation</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18,402,778</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Touch Of Love Foundation</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>137,622</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Little Angels-Nhom Tinh Thuong</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>204,454</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham's Tent</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACDIVOCA</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>138,000,000</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Hope</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa In Mind Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Resurrection And Restoration Ministries</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Leadership Inc</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,520,478</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHope For Children</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>317,002</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Medicine International</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amigos De Las Americas</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>29,190</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andando Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>139,246</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antahkarana Society International</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baobei Inc</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrels Of Love Inc</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Missions International</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>551,264</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Library Project</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15,979</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharathi Theertha</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Missions Incorporated Nfp</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>129,432</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Marble Dreams Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books For Africa</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23,800,000</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge 2 Rwanda</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>951,653</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabeceras Aid Project</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe Femenino Foundation</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>71,877</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacitar Inc</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>176,228</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic Renaissance Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Brazil Mission Inc</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,140,191</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childfund International Usa</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>245,064,261</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Dental Care International</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>316,890</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Opportunity Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>70,069</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Solidarity International Inc</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>739,209</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Of Hope International</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMJ USA</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>323,458</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Aid International</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,641,226</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo Global Action</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100,132</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Connection</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>54,204</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Tree Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Of War Education Project</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban American Military Council</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham Foundation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>191,101</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Connect Humanitarian Aid</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>98,618</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discover The World</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>863,778</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Africa Social Ventures Inc</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating Africans For Christ Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>201,382</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families In Vietnam</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50,495</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farafina</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financiers Without Borders</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five For Water Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff International Relief Effort F I R E Inc</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>105,430</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum For Information Technology Initiatives Incorporated</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation For International Medicine</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Rancho De Ninos</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>78,825</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of UNIFAT</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>75,363</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundacion Alma Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansu Inc</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>365,424</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Connections Project</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environmental Relief Incorporated</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnerships</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,765,574</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Passion Mission</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Routes</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>154,493</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods Grace Ministries Nfp</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16,134</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Bridge Asssociation Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmothers Raising Grandchildren Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groks Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana Medical Relief</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>45,389</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing 2 The Nations International</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>51,340</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Makwanpur Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri Riquet Perpignand Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cloud Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Charities Inc</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41,233</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope International Relief And Development Agency</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Seeds Inc</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>292,717</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House On The Hill Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dignity International</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>40,789</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaging The World Corp</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>561,996</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Of Global Education</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aid</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isuikuwato Progressive Union</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Foundation</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>12,900,000</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellermann Foundation</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>510,954</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Matter International</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>504,968</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopernik Solutions</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51,510</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Luz De Cristo Ministries Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>445,725</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Frontiers Mission Nfp</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>140,338</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Of The World Charities</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>339,777</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaya Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>151,976</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine And Beyond</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medshare</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Airlift</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy-USA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>7,014,034</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzi Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Uruguay Partnership</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9,704</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions Of Grace</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>26,180</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Fighting For Others Inc</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Windmills Project Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>185,430</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles Of Great Hopes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nechung Foundation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>40,870</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal House Society - Us Chapter Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan Relief Society</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB Mexico Inc</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23,311</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMID USA Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Acre Fund</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,638,567</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onemaker Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15,992</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One seventeen Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Africa</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Helping Hands</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>108,693</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners With Haiti</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>626,385</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Africa</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Of One Ministry</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto Bienestar</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow World Mission Inc</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15,242</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read For Kids Donate To Kids Inc</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild Southern Africa Association Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahasra Deepika</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>71,302</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shic Inc Asian Health Services Exchange</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>91,120</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shining City Foundation Inc</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60,471</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup By The Yard</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. David’s Relief Foundation</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>110,307</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Of Faith Ministry Inc</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suba Yo Foundation For Women And Children</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Collective Solutions Inc</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>56,381</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation For A Civil Society Ltd</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>497,061</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Human Relief Organization</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>563,600</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threads Of Hope Africa Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82,143</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMAGC Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Africa Partners Inc</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udhyami Nepali</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Hope Africa</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unite Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village School Foundation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtis Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Toronto Foundation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Kurdish Institute</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>199,211</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We R Love</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Of Hope International Inc</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weniruda Enterprise</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Better Looks Like Inc</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Dove Foundation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>64,270</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wings Of Peace</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Work Together</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womens Entrepreneurship Initiative</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Birth Aid</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Childrens Initiative Inc</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>651,440</td>
<td>Goods/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 4 The Kingdom A Non Profit Corporation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>224,694</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yspaniola Incorporated</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills/Subjectivities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: July 2012 IRS Business Master File via the National Center for Charitable Statistics

*Gross receipts are for last year that the organization filed IRS Form 990, typically 2011. The IRS codes organizations with gross receipts of less than $50,000 that do not file Form 990 as "0" by default.*
Table 3.
Frequencies of Codes for Rationales, Recipients, and Roles for US Supporters by Aid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>Goods and Services</th>
<th>Skills and Subjectivities</th>
<th>Business*</th>
<th>Education*</th>
<th>Ministry*</th>
<th>Social Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffering</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods love</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Oppression</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political strife</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphans</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind/good/hospitable</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future ambitions</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed by project</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to by work role</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles for US supporters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donate money</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate goods</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer US</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer abroad</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal n</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subcategories of the Skills and Subjectivities model are not mutually exclusive. Website texts described projects in multiple subsectors, but it was not always possible to link discourse about recipients or rationales with particular projects.