Paper Number: PN022116

Paper Title: Continuing the Dialogue of Social Entrepreneurship/Social Enterprise: Developing Research

Author(s):

Dr. Jennifer A. Wade, University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Description

At the 2000 and 2001 ARNOVA conferences, scholars and practitioners came together in order to begin a discussion about the use of for-profit and entrepreneurial techniques within a nonprofit organizational setting. The excitement in the room was felt by all and led to the creation of a proposal group for a new section within ARNOVA on the very topic.

In 2002, the discussion continues. Facing possible fiscal stress and/or further resource constraints due to the possible effects of the September 11, 2001 tragedy in New York City and Washington, DC., the need for nonprofit practitioners to become more entrepreneurial and innovative is on the horizon. The use of social entrepreneurship (i.e., the use of for-profit business techniques within a nonprofit context) as a means of creating additional revenue and/or resources and increasing overall organizational capacity and efficiency may become an even more critical factor contributing to the success of a nonprofit organization.

This panel seeks to further our understanding of this topic through the research of three papers : The Impacts of Venture Grants Among United Way Agencies; Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations: The Operation of Profit Making Businesses; and Nonprofit Organizations at a Crossroads: Testing Ed Skloot's Nonprofit Entrepreneurs. The themes of the papers collectively explore how the use of entrepreneurship and its differing for-profit techniques may impact a nonprofit organizationally; impact service delivery; and create different kinds of accountability issues on the part of government, the nonprofit organization, and its clients/constituency. Both quantitative and qualitative information will be provided.

Paper Number: PN022116.1

Paper Title: The Impact of Venture Grants Among United Way Agencies

Author(s):

Dr. Stephen P. Wernet, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Ms. Christina Cook, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Dr. Dwight Jackson, Greenville College, Greenville, IL, USA

Summary of Research

This presentation seeks to answer the question: What impact has the venture grant program of the United Way of Greater Saint Louis had upon social service agencies?

The presentation will report the findings on a stratified sample of applicants between 1993 and 2001 to the Venture Grant Allocations Subcommittee of the United Way of Greater Saint Louis.

The study will report program and organization description consisting of historical data from the venture grant database. The study will also report on program impact data. Key informant interviews will be conducted with staff and/ or board members of venture grant, applicant organizations.

Description

At the 2000 and 2001 ARNOVA conferences, scholars and practitioners came together in order to begin a discussion about the use of for-profit and entrepreneurial techniques within a nonprofit organizational setting. The excitement in the room was felt by all and led to the creation of a proposal group for a new section within ARNOVA on the very topic. In 2002, the discussion continues with this proposed panel.

Three papers will comprise this panel: The Impacts of Venture Grants Among United Way Agencies; Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations: The Operation of Profit Making Businesses; and Nonprofit Organizations at a Crossroads: Testing Ed Skloot's Nonprofit Entrepreneurs. The themes of the papers collectively explore how the use of entrepreneurship and its differing for-profit techniques may impact a nonprofit organizationally; impact service delivery; and create different kinds of accountability issues on the part of government, the nonprofit organization, and its clients/constituency. Both quantitative and qualitative information will be provided.

Paper Number: PN022116.2

Paper Title: Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations: The Operation of Profit Making Businesses

Author(s):

 Ms. Laurie Paarlberg, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Summary of Research

Despite increasing attention to nonprofit enterprise, little is known about its prevalence or organizational characteristics. Based on organizational theory and the literature on innovations, three questions are addressed: the frequency of nonprofits operating for-profit subsidiaries, the characteristics of organizations engaging in it, and how nonprofits differ from adopters of such innovation. Using surveys of Indiana social service nonprofits, the data show a small percentage of organizations operating businesses and nonprofits that are more likely to be characterized by pressures for efficiency. Also, institutional theory suggests that organizations adopt innovations due to social pressures for legitimacy; the results don't support this.

Description

At the 2000 and 2001 ARNOVA conferences, scholars and practitioners came together in order to begin a discussion about the use of for-profit and entrepreneurial techniques within a nonprofit organizational setting. The excitement in the room was felt by all and led to the creation of a proposal group for a new section within ARNOVA on the very topic. In 2002, the discussion continues with this proposed panel.

Three papers will comprise this panel: The Impacts of Venture Grants Among United Way Agencies; Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations: The Operation of Profit Making Businesses; and Nonprofit Organizations at a Crossroads: Testing Ed Skloot's Nonprofit Entrepreneurs. The themes of the papers collectively explore how the use of entrepreneurship and its differing for-profit techniques may impact a nonprofit organizationally; impact service delivery; and create different kinds of accountability issues on the part of government, the nonprofit organization, and its clients/constituency. Both quantitative and qualitative information will be provided.

Paper Number: PN022116.3

Paper Title: Nonprofit Organizations at a Crossroads: Testing Ed Skloot's Nonprofit Entrepreneurs

Author(s):

 Dr. M. Jae Moon, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX, USA

 Dr. Jennifer Wade, University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Summary of Research

Skloot (1988) asserts that the term nonprofit entrepreneur is an oxymoron. He writes: "two such disparate words could hardily coexist" (p.1). However, over the past 20 years, increased attention of entrepreneurial nonprofits has occurred, as evidenced by the increase in the number of management conferences, professional associations, training programs, and articles.

This paper examines the term nonprofit entrepreneur through an exploration of internal and external organizational determinants. The paper is designed to provide an understanding of entrepreneurial behaviors and outcomes of nonprofits using empirical and case study methodology. Additionally, the risks, rewards, and tradeoffs experienced by nonprofits are addressed.

Description

At the 2000 and 2001 ARNOVA conferences, scholars and practitioners came together in order to begin a discussion about the use of for-profit and entrepreneurial techniques within a nonprofit organizational setting. The excitement in the room was felt by all and led to the creation of a proposal group for a new section within ARNOVA on the very topic.

This panel seeks to further our understanding of this topic through the research of three papers : The Impacts of Venture Grants Among United Way Agencies; Innovation in Nonprofit Organizations: The Operation of Profit Making Businesses; and Nonprofit Organizations at a Crossroads: Testing Ed Skloot's Nonprofit Entrepreneurs. The themes of the papers collectively explore how the use of entrepreneurship and its differing for-profit techniques may impact a nonprofit organizationally; impact service delivery; and create different kinds of accountability issues on the part of government, the nonprofit organization, and its clients/constituency. Both quantitative and qualitative information will be provided.

Paper Number: PN022117

Paper Title: Community involvement in public - private partnerships in rural areas: lessons and issues from UK experience

Author(s):

Professor Stephen P Osborne, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Description

This panel addresses the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas. Based on a three-year evaluation of such involvement in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland it is intended both to report the findings of this study and to use these to stimulate a wider theoretical/conceptual empirical and cross-national debate. The panel includes papers on the nature of community and the impact of rurality on community involvement in regeneration partnerships, the extent to which such involvement can combat social exclusion and deprivation, and the processes/structures of such involvement and their impact upon rural regeneration. The panel will be structured to optimise participation and debate with and amongst the audience, rather than linear presentation by the panellists alone.

Paper Title: Involving the community in rural regenration partnerships: over-view and the impact of context

Author(s):

 Professor Stephen P Osborne, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

 Ms. Kate McLaughlin, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Summary of Research

This panel is based on research carried out over the three national of England, Northern Ireland and Scotland. It seeks both to explore the actors, processes and structures of community involvement in regeneration partnerships and to evalaute the impact of the differing national institutional contexts upon this involvement

Description

Panel proposal to the 31st ARNOVA Conference
(Montreal 14-16 November 2002
(Addressing the conference theme of 'nonprofits and community')

Title.
Community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas: lessons and issues from UK experience

Nominated panel chair.
Professor Dennis Young, Case Western Reserve University, USA

Introduction.
Community involvement in public-private regeneration (P-PRPs) partnerships has long been seen as a key approach to enhancing the effectiveness of such initiatives. It has been variously argued as improving information acquisition, service planning, increasing community ownership and commitment, and enhancing the legitimacy of regeneration partnerships (Geddes 1997, Shucksmith 2000). This has been especially so in approaches to regeneration in rural areas (Bowler & Lewis 1991, Edwards et al 2000). However, such involvement is not without its difficulties and problems (Huxham & Vangen 2001). Moreover, community involvement in P-PRPs is especially difficult in rural areas, where issues of low population density and the dispersal of social capital make community engagement especially difficult (LEADER European Observatory 1997, Warburton 1998).

This panel directly addresses these issues. It is based on a three-year research project carried out in the UK by the panellists. This project has evaluated community involvement in P-PRPs in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland. It has utilised a qualitative research methodology, including the use of wide ranging semi-structured interviews with key informants at the national level, in-depth cross-sectional case studies, involving intense and prolonged engagement with key local actors, of rural P-PRPs in one locality in each country, and documentary analysis. Using this approach, the project has both evaluated the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in P-PRPs in rural areas and has explored the impact of the differing institutional contexts and cultures across the three nations. A qualitative approach is particularly appropriate to such an evaluative study of process and of policy impact (Gummesson 1991). This panel will use the findings of this study to stimulate a wider cross-national debate about the nature of 'community' and its place in rural regeneration partnerships.

Structure of the panel.
The panel consists of three papers. Paper I provides an over-view of the findings of this study and explores in particular the impact of rurality as a context for community involvement in P-PRPs. It addresses four questions: what is the nature of 'community' in rural areas, what impact does rurality

have upon community involvement in P-PRPs, what are the key inhibitors and catalysts for such involvement and what role do intermediary agencies play in stimulating community involvement in P-PRPs? Paper II explores the extent to which community involvement in P-PRPs can address fragmentation and social exclusion in rural areas. Whilst the legacy of the 'Troubles' and sectarian divide pose especial challenges in Northern Ireland, as it seeks peace and reconciliation, other issues of social exclusions also face rural communities across the UK, such as the exclusion of travelling communities, the retention of young people in rural communities and the negotiation of vested interests and 'incomers' in such communities (Countryside Agency 2000). This paper draws out the roles that community involvement in P-PRPs can play both to address these issues and to promote social inclusion. Paper III addresses in detail the structures and processes by which rural communities are involved in regeneration partnerships. Of particular import here are the issues of the relationships both between planning and service delivery inside such partnerships, and between the local, intermediary and strategic level of partnerships, the way in which 'community involvement' is conceptualised and enacted within P-PRPs and the ways in which the community is actually represented and/or involved (or not!) in regeneration partnerships.

Panel process.
It is important to emphasize that these three papers are not intended as the sole focus of this panel. Rather they are intended to stimulate a wider ranging theoretical/conceptual and comparative debate. In this the chair and the discussant (both from North America) will be crucial. Each paper presenter will have ten minutes to present the key elements of their paper. The (Canadian) discussant will then have ten minutes to highlight the key issues for discussion and contextualise them in a cross-national context. The (American) chair will then act to encourage participation in the forty minutes allowed for discussion, with a focus on audience and participant involvement and in-depth debate. The panel members and discussant will then have a final ten minutes to conclude the session and to offer ways forward in the future for theory, research and practice.

[full references to be included in the final panel submission]

Key words: rural regeneration, community involvement, partnership

Panel summary.
This panel addresses the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas. Based on a three-year evaluation of such involvement in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland it is intended both to report the findings of this study and to use these to stimulate a wider theoretical/conceptual empirical and cross-national debate. The panel includes papers on the nature of community and the impact of rurality on community involvement in regeneration partnerships, the extent to which such involvement can combat social exclusion and deprivation, and the processes/structures of such involvement and their impact upon rural regeneration. The panel will be structured to optimise participation and debate with and amongst the audience, rather than linear presentation by the panellists alone.

Summary of Research
See summary for paper one

Description
Panel proposal to the 31st ARNOVA Conference
(Montreal 14-16 November 2002
(Addressing the conference theme of 'nonprofits and community')

Community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas: lessons and issues from UK experience

(Nominated panel chair: Professor Dennis Young, Case Western Reserve University, USA)

Introduction.
 Community involvement in public-private regeneration (P-PRPs) partnerships has long been seen as a key approach to enhancing the effectiveness of such initiatives. It has been variously argued as improving information acquisition, service planning, increasing community ownership and commitment, and enhancing the legitimacy of regeneration partnerships (Geddes 1997, Shucksmith 2000). This has been especially so in approaches to regeneration in rural areas (Bowler & Lewis 1991, Edwards et al 2000). However, such involvement is not without its difficulties and problems (Huxham & Vangen 2001). Moreover, community involvement in P-PRPs is especially difficult in rural areas, where issues of low population density and the dispersal of social capital make community engagement especially difficult (LEADER European Observatory 1997, Warburton 1998).

This panel directly addresses these issues. It is based on a three-year research project carried out in the UK by the panellists. This project has evaluated community involvement in P-PRPs in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland. It has utilised a qualitative research methodology, including the use of wide ranging semi-structured interviews with key informants at the national level, in-depth cross-sectional case studies, involving intense and prolonged engagement with key local actors, of rural P-PRPs in one locality in each country, and documentary analysis. Using this approach, the project has both evaluated the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in P-PRPs in rural areas and has explored the impact of the differing institutional contexts and cultures across the three nations. A qualitative approach is particularly appropriate to such an evaluative study of process and of policy impact (Gummesson 1991). This panel will use the findings of this study to stimulate a wider cross-national debate about the nature of 'community' and its place in rural regeneration partnerships.

Structure of the panel.
The panel consists of three papers. Paper I provides an over-view of the findings of this study and explores in particular the impact of rurality as a context for community involvement in P-PRPs. It addresses four questions: what is the nature of 'community' in rural areas, what impact does rurality have upon community involvement in P-PRPs, what are the key inhibitors and catalysts for such involvement and what role do intermediary agencies play in stimulating community involvement in P-PRPs? Paper II explores the extent to which community involvement in P-PRPs can address fragmentation and social exclusion in rural areas. Whilst the legacy of the 'Troubles' and sectarian divide pose especial challenges in Northern Ireland, as it seeks peace and reconciliation, other issues of social exclusions also face rural communities across the UK, such as the exclusion of travelling communities, the retention of young people in rural communities and the negotiation of vested interests and 'incomers'

in such communities (Countryside Agency 2000). This paper draws out the roles that community involvement in P-PRPs can play both to address these issues and to promote social inclusion. Paper III addresses in detail the structures and processes by which rural communities are involved in regeneration partnerships. Of particular import here are the issues of the relationships both between planning and service delivery inside such partnerships, and between the local, intermediary and strategic level of partnerships, the way in which 'community involvement' is conceptualised and enacted within P-PRPs and the ways in which the community is actually represented and/or involved (or not!) in regeneration partnerships.

Panel process.
It is important to emphasize that these three papers are not intended as the sole focus of this panel. Rather they are intended to stimulate a wider ranging theoretical/conceptual and comparative debate. In this the chair and the discussant (both from North America) will be crucial. Each paper presenter will have ten minutes to present the key elements of their paper. The (Canadian) discussant will then have ten minutes to highlight the key issues for discussion and contextualise them in a cross-national context. The (American) chair will then act to encourage participation in the forty minutes allowed for discussion, with a focus on audience and participant involvement and in-depth debate. The panel members and discussant will then have a final ten minutes to conclude the session and to offer ways forward in the future for theory, research and practice.

[full references to be included in the final panel submission]

Key words: rural regeneration, community involvement, partnership

Panel summary.
This panel addresses the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas. Based on a three-year evaluation of such involvement in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland it is intended both to report the findings of this study and to use these to stimulate a wider theoretical/conceptual empirical and cross-national debate. The panel includes papers on the nature of community and the impact of rurality on community involvement in regeneration partnerships, the extent to which such involvement can combat social exclusion and deprivation, and the processes/structures of such involvement and their impact upon rural regeneration. The panel will be structured to optimise participation and debate with and amongst the audience, rather than linear presentation by the panellists alone.

Paper Number: PN022117.3

Paper Title: The structures, actors and processes of community involvement in rural regeneration partnerships

Author(s):

 Dr. Rona Beattie, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

Summary of Research
See paper one

Description
Panel proposal to the 31st ARNOVA Conference
(Montreal 14-16 November 2002
(Addressing the conference theme of 'nonprofits and community')

Community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas: lessons and issues from UK experience

(Nominated panel chair: Professor Dennis Young, Case Western Reserve University, USA)

Introduction.
 Community involvement in public-private regeneration (P-PRPs) partnerships has long been seen as a key approach to enhancing the effectiveness of such initiatives. It has been variously argued as improving information acquisition, service planning, increasing community ownership and commitment, and enhancing the legitimacy of regeneration partnerships (Geddes 1997, Shucksmith 2000). This has been especially so in approaches to regeneration in rural areas (Bowler & Lewis 1991, Edwards et al 2000). However, such involvement is not without its difficulties and problems (Huxham & Vangen 2001). Moreover, community involvement in P-PRPs is especially difficult in rural areas, where issues of low population density and the dispersal of social capital make community engagement especially difficult (LEADER European Observatory 1997, Warburton 1998).

This panel directly addresses these issues. It is based on a three-year research project carried out in the UK by the panellists. This project has evaluated community involvement in P-PRPs in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland. It has utilised a qualitative research methodology, including the use of wide ranging semi-structured interviews with key informants at the national level, in-depth cross-sectional case studies, involving intense and prolonged engagement with key local actors, of rural P-PRPs in one locality in each country, and documentary analysis. Using this approach, the project has both evaluated the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in P-PRPs in rural areas and has explored the impact of the differing institutional contexts and cultures across the three nations. A qualitative approach is particularly appropriate to such an evaluative study of process and of policy impact (Gummesson 1991). This panel will use the findings of this study to stimulate a wider cross-national debate about the nature of 'community' and its place in rural regeneration partnerships.

Structure of the panel.
The panel consists of three papers. Paper I provides an over-view of the findings of this study and explores in particular the impact of rurality as a context for community involvement in P-PRPs. It addresses four questions: what is the nature of 'community' in rural areas, what impact does rurality have upon community involvement in P-PRPs, what are the key inhibitors and catalysts for such involvement and what role do intermediary agencies play in stimulating community involvement in P-PRPs? Paper II explores the extent to which community involvement in P-PRPs can address fragmentation and social exclusion in rural areas. Whilst the legacy of the 'Troubles' and sectarian divide pose especial challenges in Northern Ireland, as it seeks peace and reconciliation, other issues of social exclusions also face rural communities across the UK, such as the exclusion of travelling communities, the retention of young people in rural communities and the negotiation of vested interests and 'incomers'

in such communities (Countryside Agency 2000). This paper draws out the roles that community involvement in P-PRPs can play both to address these issues and to promote social inclusion. Paper III addresses in detail the structures and processes by which rural communities are involved in regeneration partnerships. Of particular import here are the issues of the relationships both between planning and service delivery inside such partnerships, and between the local, intermediary and strategic level of partnerships, the way in which 'community involvement' is conceptualised and enacted within P-PRPs and the ways in which the community is actually represented and/or involved (or not!) in regeneration partnerships.

Panel process.
It is important to emphasize that these three papers are not intended as the sole focus of this panel. Rather they are intended to stimulate a wider ranging theoretical/conceptual and comparative debate. In this the chair and the discussant (both from North America) will be crucial. Each paper presenter will have ten minutes to present the key elements of their paper. The (Canadian) discussant will then have ten minutes to highlight the key issues for discussion and contextualise them in a cross-national context. The (American) chair will then act to encourage participation in the forty minutes allowed for discussion, with a focus on audience and participant involvement and in-depth debate. The panel members and discussant will then have a final ten minutes to conclude the session and to offer ways forward in the future for theory, research and practice.

[full references to be included in the final panel submission]

Key words: rural regeneration, community involvement, partnership

Panel summary.
This panel addresses the nature, processes and impact of community involvement in public-private partnerships for regeneration in rural areas. Based on a three-year evaluation of such involvement in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland it is intended both to report the findings of this study and to use these to stimulate a wider theoretical/conceptual empirical and cross-national debate. The panel includes papers on the nature of community and the impact of rurality on community involvement in regeneration partnerships, the extent to which such involvement can combat social exclusion and deprivation, and the processes/structures of such involvement and their impact upon rural regeneration. The panel will be structured to optimise participation and debate with and amongst the audience, rather than linear presentation by the panellists alone.

Paper Number: PN022118

Paper Title: Findings from "Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support System for U.S. Artists"

Author(s):

Carole Rosenstein, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Description

Artists are an important creative force in American life. Their work as creators, tradition-bearers, change agents and social entrepreneurs contributes in powerful ways to our society's well-being and its creative potential. Artists reflect our histories, aspirations, values and contradictions. They inspire and challenge us; they help us confront our humanity and imagine a different future. Artists embody the elemental human need to create and express, and they are essential components of a healthy and democratic human society.

While artists play significant roles in American communities, we lack a comprehensive picture of the mechanisms that foster their creativity, sustain their work and bolster their contributions to our national life. Emerging technologies, collaborations between the for-profit and nonprofit sectors, expanding philanthropic interests and growing recognition of the positive roles artists play in community life all present new opportunities to enhance the environment for artists' work. Understanding the current landscape of support and exploring new ways to bolster existing mechanisms are important precursors to more broad-based, inventive and effective investment in independent artists across the United States.

With resources from more than 35 private and public sector funders at national and local levels, the Urban Institute is completing a comprehensive research effort to illuminate public, philanthropic and community support mechanisms for artists in the U.S. The project documents and analyzes existing programs supporting artists, explores the interplay of nonprofit and commercial mechanisms in artists' careers, and proposes ways to enhance structures that facilitate artists' work. The research results and recommendations will be valuable for foundations, public agencies and artist advocates.

This panel presents initial findings from the research and identifies priority avenues for enhancing support to individual artists indicated by the research. Papers will: 1) provide an overview of the project along with results of polling and interviews with national leaders that situate the study within broad civic attitudes, discourses and priorities; 2) present findings from 450 interviews with artists as well as arts professionals, nonprofit administrators, funders and community members about local ecologies of support in 9 U.S. cities; 3) present findings from the National Information Network for Artists (NINA) database of nonprofit, philanthropic and public programs that provide financial and in-kind support directly to individual artists; and, 4) discuss how these findings highlight important advantages gained by increased interaction both among nonprofit, for-profit and public arts entities and between the arts and other policy areas (i.e., education, community development, housing, public safety, etc.).

Paper Number: PN022118.1

Paper Title: Overview of "Investing in Creativity"

Author(s):

Dr. Maria-Rosario Jackson, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Summary of Research

This paper presents the goals, approach and research components of Investing in Creativity. The results of our polling on public attitudes toward artists are used to situate the study within broad civic attitudes and discourses. Some priority areas for future work and research are highlighted, with insights provided from interviews with national leaders in cultural policy and other fields.

Description

This paper presents the goals, approach and research components of Investing in Creativity. The results of our polling on public attitudes toward artists are used to situate the study within broad civic attitudes and discourses. Some priority areas for future work and research are highlighted, with insights provided from interviews with national leaders in cultural policy and other fields.

Paper Number: PN022118.2

Paper Title: Findings from Fieldwork in 9 U.S. Cities

Author(s):

Dr. Carole Rosenstein, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Daniel O Swenson, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Summary of Research

This paper reports findings from fieldwork that included 450 interviews in 9 U.S. cities with artists, arts professionals, funders, critics and "connectors" who have articulated the value of artists within the broader policy community. This data was used to identify and describe perceptions about the needs of artists, about how local ecologies of support shape and serve those needs, and about key agents of advocacy and change. Using this data and analysis, priority avenues for enhancing support are suggested.

Description

This paper reports findings from fieldwork that included 450 interviews in 9 U.S. cities with artists, arts professionals, funders, critics and "connectors" who have articulated the value of artists within the broader policy community. This data was used to identify and describe perceptions about the needs of artists, about how local ecologies of support shape and serve those needs, and about key agents of advocacy and change. The paper discusses: how components of these ecologies intersect, distinctively local forms of support and some of their strengths and weaknesses, and how these local forms integrate with national, global and virtual structures and networks. Using this data and analysis, priority avenues for enhancing support are suggested.

Paper Number: PN022118.4

Paper Title: Cross-sector Policy Implications of the "Investing in Creativity" Findings

Author(s):

Dr. Maria-Rosario Jackson, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Kadija S Ferryman, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA

Summary of Research

This paper examines the degree to which priority avenues for change that have been identified in Investing in Creativity demand increased interaction both among nonprofit, for-profit and public arts entities and between the arts and other policy areas (i.e., education, community development, housing, public safety, etc.). Discussing several key policy issues identified through our research the paper suggests some of the most important and potentially fruitful avenues of interaction, highlighting cases of particularly effective cross-sector initiatives and challenges arising from such collaborations.

Description

This paper examines the degree to which priority avenues for change that have been identified in Investing in Creativity demand increased interaction both among nonprofit, for-profit and public arts entities and between the arts and other policy areas (i.e., education, community development, housing, public safety, etc.). Discussing several key policy issues identified through our research the paper suggests some of the most important and potentially fruitful avenues of interaction, highlighting cases of particularly effective cross-sector initiatives and challenges arising from such collaborations.

Paper Number: PN022119

Paper Title: Effective Economic Decisionmaking

Author(s):

 Dr. Dennis R. Young, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

Description

Abstract: In today's turbulent environment, nonprofit organizations need guidance in using scarce resources wisely to accomplish their missions. This environment is characterized by heavy dependence on sales revenues, strong competition in raising charitable contributions, mandates to increase returns on invested funds, and pressures to use available resources efficiently. While it is important in this milieu for nonprofits to manage themselves efficiently and to be sophisticated in their business methods, nonprofits are also now more highly challenged to remain focused on their social missions and to ensure that their business goals support rather than slight or supplant their social goals. The purpose of this panel is to explore some of the economic issues that nonprofit organizations face, and to consider how basic principles of economic analysis can be applied specifically to those issues. The panel will offer presentations based on current task force reports of the National Center on Nonprofit Enterprise, in four areas: pricing of nonprofit organization services, spending on fund raising, investment and expenditure of nonprofit funds, and outsourcing of management and services and functions.

Proposal:

In today's turbulent environment, nonprofit organizations need guidance in using scarce resources wisely to accomplish their missions.   Various aspects of this environment have been studied and documented in recent publications. For example, an overview of this environment and how nonprofits have responded to it is provided by Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld (1998). The changing character of nonprofit finances, especially the increasing reliance on earned revenue, is summarized by Salamon (1999). The trends toward reliance on commercial ventures and practices has been studied by a team led by Weisbrod (1998). And the growing collaboration between nonprofit organizations and business corporations has been analyzed by Austin (2000).

It is especially relevant that nonprofits have become more strongly embedded in a market environment than ever before, and must compete effectively for the resources they use and in the services they provide. This environment is characterized by heavy dependence on sales revenues, frequent involvement in commercial activities, engagement in partnerships with business corporations, strong competition in fund raising for charitable contributions, mandates to increase returns on invested funds, strong competition for executive and staff talent, and pressures to use available resources efficiently. While it is increasingly important for nonprofits in this milieu to manage themselves efficiently and to be sophisticated in their business methods and decisions, nonprofits are also now more highly challenged to remain focused on their social missions and to ensure that their business goals support rather than slight or supplant their social goals. Hence, principles of economic decision making cannot be adopted blindly from the business sector, but must be carefully adapted to the particular economic and social circumstances of the nonprofit sector. However, relatively little attention has been paid to guiding nonprofit organizations in addressing this task. Exceptions include books by Young and Steinberg (1995), Heilbrun and Gray (1993) and Oster (1995) which apply principles of micro-economic analysis specifically to the nonprofit context, and Kearns (2000) which adapts business sector strategies to nonprofits. The purpose of this panel is to explore more broadly the issues that nonprofit organizations face in particular facets of their business decisionmaking, and to consider how basic principles of economic decisionmaking can be applied specifically to those issues.

The panel will consist of four presentations based on task force reports of the National

Center on Nonprofit Enterprise (NCNE), a center established in Arlington, Virginia in 1998 for the purpose of "helping nonprofit organizations make wise economic decisions." As part of its program, the NCNE has organized eight task forces, each consisting of leaders from the academic, nonprofit, business, management consulting and funding communities. The task forces have addressed the following topics: pricing of nonprofit organization services, undertaking of commercial ventures by nonprofit organizations, institutional collaborations, compensation of staff, spending on fund raising, investment and expenditure of nonprofit funds, outsourcing of services and functions, and Internet commerce. Initial task force reports were presented to the NCNE's inaugural conference in January 2002. After that conference, the reports have been revised for general circulation and in preparation for a book to be published on the subject of Effective Nonprofit Economic Decisionmaking. The proposed panel will consist of the chairs of four of these task forces.

References

James E. Austin, The Collaboration Challenge, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000

Joseph Galaskiewicz and Wolfgang Bielefeld, Nonprofit Organizations in an Age of Uncertainty, New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1998

James Heilbrun and Charles M. Gray, The Economics of Arts and Culture, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993

Kevin P. Kearns, Private Sector Strategies for Social Sector Success, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000

Sharon M. Oster, Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995

Lester M. Salamon, America's Nonprofit Sector, New York: The Foundation Center, 1999

Burton A. Weisbrod (ed.), To Profit or Not to Profit, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998

Dennis R.Young and Richard Steinberg, Economics for Nonprofit Managers, New York: The Foundation Center, 1995

Paper Number: PN022119.1

Paper Title: Pricing of Nonprofit Organization Services

Author(s):

Professor Sharon M. Oster, School of Management, New Haven, CT, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will address two related issues: when it is appropriate for nonprofit organizations to charge prices for their services, and how prices should be set once the decision has been made to charge.

Description

Draft task force report will be supplied on request.

Paper Number: PN022119.2

Paper Title: Investment and Expenditure Strategies for Nonprofit Funds

Author(s):

 Ms. Marion R. Fremont-Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will address the application of modern principles of investing to the management of funds administered by nonprofit organizations.

Description

Draft task force report will be supplied on request

Paper Number: PN022119.3

Paper Title: Spending on Fund-Raising

Author(s):

Dr. Patrick Rooney, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Summary of Research

This presentation, given by Patrick Rooney and Joseph Cordes, will apply the concept of fund-raising efficiency to the question of how much nonprofit organizations should spend on fund raising.

Description

Draft task force report available on request

Paper Number: PN022119.4

Paper Title: Outsourcing of Services and Functions

Author(s):

 Dr. Avner Ben-Ner, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Summary of Research
This paper will apply transactions cost analysis to the issue of what functions nonprofit organizations should carry out in-house and what functions may be contracted to outside suppliers.

Description
Draft task force reports available on request.

Paper Title: Knowledge for Inclusion: The Relationship Between Innovation and Community Economic
Development

Author(s):

 Dr. Edward T. Jackson, Carleton University, Ottawa, CANADA

Description

This panel will report on the findings of a national action-research project on innovation and CED for
urban and rural comunities in both English-speaking Canada and Quebec. Lessons will be drawn fromt
the research for Canada's current public policy debate on innovation and the new economy.

Paper Number: PN022156.1

Paper Title: Sustaining Livelihoods: Constructing a Role for Community Economic Development in Technology-Cluster Growth

Author(s):

Dr. Edward Jackson, Carleton University, Ottawa, CANADA

Summary of Research

This paper will explore the limits and possibilities for community economic development (CED) strategies to be employed in the context of business and governments promoting the growth of technology clusters.   Drawing on the experience of Canada's National Capital Region (Ottawa-Hull)—which is home to at least three technology clusters—and that of other Canadian cities, this paper will examine the barriers to, and evidence and prospects for, the use of CED approaches to promote sustainable livelihoods and inclusive employment in technology clusters.

Description

This paper will explore the limits and possibilities for community economic development (CED) strategies to be employed in the context of business and governments promoting the growth of technology clusters.   Non-profit-driven CED approaches to employment and training, business development and investment seek to optimize sustainable livelihoods and inclusive opportunities. Technology clusters—regional networks of large and small technology enterprises, venture capital corporations, governmment agencies, and research and education institutions, all focused on one or more technological/scientific specizliations (eg. biotechnology, photonics, semi-conductors, information technology, etc)—are central to the Government of Canada's industrial strategy for urban areas. However, little attention has been paid to the question of how such clusters, operating in volatile global markets, can generate broad-based, sustainable livelihoods for households in the cluster region, and maintain social cohesion and social peace. More specifically, little policy or programmatic work has been done on ways and means of dealing in economically and socially excluded groups in the labour force in a cluster region.   Drawing on the experience of Canada's National Capital Region (Ottawa-Hull)—which is home to at least three technology clusters—and that of other Canadian cities, this paper will examine the barriers to, and evidence and prospects for, the use of CED approaches to promote sustainable livelihoods and inclusive employment in technology clusters.

Paper Number: PN022156.2

Paper Title: Innovation and Community Economic Development in Urban and Rural Quebec: Research Findings and Policy Directions

Author(s):

Mr. Jacques Carrière, CEDTAP, Carleton University, Ottawa, CAN

Summary of Research

In addition to—and in many ways because of--its distinct French culture and language, Quebec has also developed a unique network of public and private institutions to advance economic and social development. This paper will report on findings and policy implications for Quebec from the joint research project on innovation and CED sponsored by the Community Economic Development Technical Assistance Program and the Caledon Institute for Social Policy.

Description

In addition to—and in many ways because of--its distinct French culture and language, Quebec has also developed a unique network of public and private institutions to advance economic and social development. In Quebec, there is a close relationship between the state and the nonprofit sector; the Government of Quebec and the social economy sector cooperate extensively. This cooperation, along with federal government programs, has given rise to a large number of active and diverse (and sometimes competing) community economic development organizations in urban and rural Quebec. However, historically, there has been little cooperation between government and CED groups on issues of scientific and technological innovation—notwithstanding the fact that CED groups themselves have shown considerable management innovation.   This paper will report on findings and policy implications for Quebec from the joint research project on innovation and CED sponsored by the Community Economic Development Technical Assistance Program and the Caledon Institute for Social Policy.

Paper Number: PN022156.3

Paper Title: Innovation and Community Economic Development in Canada: Research Findings and Policy Directions

Author(s):

Dr. Sherri Torjman, Caledon Institute for Social Policy, Ottawa, CAN

Eric Leviten-Reid, Caledon Institute for Social Policy, Ottawa, CAN

Summary of Research

The paper will identify the emerging practices through which CED organizations are attempting to respond to the needs of marginalized individuals and communities in both rural and urban settings. It will propose ways to strengthen the innovation capacity of the sector.

Description

Much of the discussion around innovation has focussed on ways to secure economic benefits from advances in science and technology. Far less attention has been paid to the social innovations needed to build an equitable and inclusive society. As a field, community economic development (CED) has long sought practical ways to meet this double bottom line – economic and social. This paper will discuss the unique opportunities and difficulties encountered by CED in relation to the innovation agenda. It will report the findings of the Caledon/CEDTAP research initiative on 'CED and the Innovation Challenge.' The guiding questions of the research have been: What is the meaning of innovation in the context of community economic development? What are the strengths and weaknesses of CED organizations with respect to innovation? What measures are needed to enhance innovation in this field? The paper will identify the emerging practices through which CED organizations are attempting to respond to the needs of marginalized individuals and communities in both rural and urban settings. It will propose ways to strengthen the innovation capacity of the sector.

Paper Number: PN022159

Paper Title: Tracking the Origins of Public Trust: Investigations of Three Cases

Author(s):

Ms. Ginger L. Elliott, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Description

The authors of the papers for this panel address some of the gaps evident in theories of public trust. We will as a group consider the ways in which rhetorical and active participation in given institutions influence the generation of public trust in participants.

Paper Title: The Relationship Between Program Application and Public Trust

Author(s):

 Ms. Ginger L. Elliott, Indiana University-Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA

Summary of Research
Evaluating the capacity-building aspects of the AmeriCorps*VISTA program in a specific subset of nonprofit organizations, this paper will examine the different definitions (implicit and explicit) of capacity used by stakeholders and the impact of these differences on program implementation, perceptions of program success and institutional public trust. When public programs are incorporated into nonprofit organizations, there is a need to examine whether the public's resources are being applied effectively and according to policy. When the program's essential purposes and policies are interpreted in multiple ways, however, public trust can be harmed among the participants and the public at large.

Description
Distinguishing the milieu of political trust within the rubric of public trust is difficult. Usually it refers to confidence in governmental systems and the political world and may or may not be separated from a more traditional normative description of social or personal trust (Newton, 2001 and Ruscio, 1999). Both Newton (2001) and Ruscio (1996, 1999) claim that not differentiating these concepts leads to ineffective evaluation and even misrepresentation of interactions within the public realm.

Adam Seligman (1997) argues that public trust has become institutionalized through rules and regulations to such an extent that it is no longer engendered in "sociability," making for a weakened democratic state. Ruscio (1999), in a discussion of trust in government institutions, argues that the rules and regulations developed to define interactions among persons and government are not the bane of public trust but instead are its boon, but only in regard to political trust (he supports the contention that the institutionalization of non-political trust is problematic [1999, p. 652]). Newton (2001) echoes this sentiment, writing "the point about democracy is to recruit political leaders who are honest and trustworthy, and more importantly, to create a political system that ensures they behave in a trustworthy manner" (p. 206). They, and others, claim that normative personal/social trust is not enough to maintain a responsible and responsive political establishment. However, they do not claim that rules and regulations are enough, either. Ruscio (1999) calls this two-sided aspect of political trust "Jay's Pirouette," from the writings of John Jay in Federalist Paper Number 64.

Based also on Rawls' writings, Ruscio (1999) suggests that both institutional design and a confidence in the good intentions of others are required in political trust. He proposes that within the set of rules and regulations, a "zone of discretion" is required to both ensure political trust and permit managerial maneuvering. Within this zone, authority is granted to behave according to the situation. The manner and size of authority must have firm boundaries, however, which are determined by "the community of interest, the evident intention, and the wisdom and integrity of leaders" (p. 653).

It is the intention of this paper's author to examine the zone of discretion accorded to nonprofit organizations in their implementation of the AmeriCorps* VISTA program in relation to the program's mandate for capacity building. Without a clear definition of capacity, the VISTA program administrators (and Congress in its authorization) have required VISTA members to be involved in capacity building. Program application has, within boundaries, been left up to the supervisors of these members. The questions to be addressed by this paper are whether the set of rules governing action and the discretion left to these organizations have a) served the purposes of the program in the area of capacity-building and b) served to increase or decrease public trust among program supervisors. I will argue that the discretion assigned to these organizations in program implementation has diminished program achievement while increasing the organizations' sense of trust in government. The paper will be based on the results of a survey mailed out to a specific subset of nonprofit organizations around the nation and a group of follow-up interviews.

References

Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. International Political Science Review, 22, 201-214.

Ruscio, K.P. (1996). Trust, democracy, and public management: A theoretical argument. Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory, 6, 461-477.

Ruscio, K.P. (1999). Jay's pirouette, or why political trust is not the same as personal trust. Administration & Society, 31, 639-657.

Seligman, A.B. (1997). The problem of trust. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Paper Title: The Rebirth of Trust as a Form of Sociability: The Case of National Service Participants

Author(s):

 Ms. Christina Standerfer, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

Summary of Research

Using information gathered from interviews with and observations of national service participants, I argue trust as a form of sociability is evident in the discursive practices of stipended volunteers. Specifically, the ways stipended volunteers articulate their motivations for service reveal civic identities that may transcend group identities. Moreover, analysis of discussions of various social problems suggests a public discourse in which trust is a property of interaction rather than external rules and regulations. Suggestions for how trust as a form of sociability may be advanced in the larger public sphere are offered.

Description

Many theorists who decry the state of public life in America link decline in civic responsibility to the pejorative impact of identity politics on public dialogue (see, e.g., Elshtain, 1995; Glendon, 1991). Our public language has become overwhelmed by declarations predicated on narrow self-interests. These self interests are largely based in our allegiances to some group identity based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, mental and physical (dis)abilities, etc. According to Adam Seligman (1997, 1998), this return to what amounts to tribal loyalties derives from a need to have some basis for a sense of self. However, if identity based on group affiliation becomes the foundation for an understanding of self, Seligman argued "it will herald an end to trust as a form of sociability and interaction making life that much more nasty, brutish and short" (26).

The end of trust founded in interaction is the main concern of Seligman. Using historical evidence as well as contemporary examples, Seligman evinced that trust in the public realm has become a matter of rules and regulations. The reason for this shift from trust as a mode of relationship among people to a property of impersonal laws is role diffusion. As social actors have been afforded multiple roles to assume, trust based on interaction has eroded. We can no longer make reasonable assumptions concerning how another will act in situations of uncertainty or when opinions may differ. As such, we construct impersonal measures to ensure we have some level of certainty about how our acts will be interpreted as well as how others will respond. In essence, trust in others and accountability for behavior are no longer engendered in concrete instances of discursive exchange but rather in abstract adherence to official rules and fear of sanction given those rules. While Seligman's argument is evocative, he stops short of offering insights concerning how to stem the tide of trust based on formal rules and to return trust as a form of sociability to the public realm.

Using information gathered from interviews with over 75 national service participants and observations conducted at six orientations attended by these participants, I argue trust as a form of sociability is evident in the discursive practices of stipended volunteers. Specifically, the ways stipended volunteers' articulate their motivations for service reveal civic identities that may transcend group identities based on race, sex, ethnicity, etc. Moreover, analysis of national service participants' discussions of various social problems suggest a public discourse in which trust is a property of the interaction rather than rules and regulations external to the immediate context. Reasons why national service participants are able to engage in these types of interactions are explored as well as suggestions for how trust as a form of sociability may be advanced in the larger public sphere.

References

Elshtain, J.B. (1995). Democracy on trial. New York: Basic Books.

Glendon, M.A. (1991). Rights talk: The improverishment of political discourse. New York: Free Press.

Seligman, A.B. (1997). The problem of trust. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Seligman, A.B. (1998). Trust and sociability: On the limits of confidence and role expectations. The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 57. Retrieved March 8, 2002, from Infotrac Database.

Paper Number: PN022159.3

Paper Title: The Rhetoricity of Trust: Illustrations from Online Discussion Groups

Author(s):

Ms. Chantal Benoit-Barné, University of Colorado-Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA
Dr. Gerard Hauser, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

Summary of Research

The problem of trust is at the heart of the current debate on the degenerative state of our public realm. Interdependency's increased scope and complexity has resulted in lessened capacity to understand our partners' actions and their level of commitment to common goals, and raised trust as a paramount problem for civil society. Relying on a rhetorical reading of civil society, this paper suggests that trust is a rhetorical achievement established through the civic conversations of vernacular rhetoric. It aims to illustrate how this rhetorical process is unfolding amongst citizens involved in online discussion groups about issues of public interest.

Description

The problem of trust is at the heart of the current debate on the degenerative state of our public realm. As citizens throughout the world seem to be losing their interest in political matters, confidence in public institutions and trust in fellow citizens, the prospects for civil society are undermined. The notion of civil society emphasizes relations of mutual dependency. As conditions that bind us to partners who are marked by difference increase in scope and complexity, we lose our capacity to understand the basis for our partners' actions and their level of commitment to common goals. Our diminished capacity raises trust as a paramount problem for civil society. The paper argues that there are at least five defining characteristics necessary for trust: 1.) Trust surfaces in conditions of uncertainty. If one knows for sure, one does not need to trust. 2.) Trust emerges in situations in which a choice between alternatives is required. 3.) To trust, one must rely on beliefs about others to form expectations about their behavior and use these expectations to make choices. 4.) To trust, one must rely on the familiar to anticipate the unfamiliar in the sense that one uses the available repertoire of experiences to form expectations. 5.) Trust relationships are self-stabilized by establishing an obligation to honor trust. Relying on a rhetorical reading of civil society, this paper suggests that trust is a rhetorical achievement established through the civic conversations of vernacular rhetoric. These exchanges are at the heart of transforming our understanding of civic relations from interest-based rational choices to a deliberative process aimed at the common good. Building on the literature that treats trust as a social mechanism that highlight the five defining characteristics of the development of trust outlined above, it describes how each attribute is unfolding in a virtual environment. The paper aims to illustrate this rhetorical process as it is developing among citizens involved in online discussion groups about issues of public interest.

Paper Title: Interfaces between the Non-profit and Voluntary Sectors and the Social Economy in Quebec Society

Author(s):

Professor Yves Vaillancourt, University of Quebec Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, CAN

Dr. Margie Mendell, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, CAN

Nancy Neamtan, Chantier de l'economie sociale

Deena White, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, CAN

Description

The Quebec society is often seen as a "distinct society" in North America. This specificity can be observed in many areas of socio-economic practices, including in the actions of non-profit and voluntary organizations. In this regard, it is relevant to examine the contemporary interfaces between initiatives of the non-profit and voluntary sectors and that of the social economy sector in Quebec. Since the socio-economic Summit of October 1996, the expression social economy has been used both in the civil society and by the Quebec government, to refer to enterprises, organizations and practices that encompass initiatives and realities of the non-profit and voluntary sectors. Although the large and inclusive official definition of the social economy put forward by the Chantier de l'economie sociale has been accepted by social actors and by the Quebec government in 1996, there is still an ongoing public debate in Quebec about the exact content of social economy. In particular, it is interesting to ask whether or not the so-called "autonomous community organizations" are included under the definitions used by both practitioners and researchers. The way to approach community-based organizations, theoretically and practically, is a meaningful question not only for the definition of the social economy, but also for the definition of non-profit and voluntary organizations in Quebec and Canada. In this regard, it is significant to note that the name of the Voluntary Sector Initiative (a major project of the Federal government) has been translated into French not as the Initiative du secteur benevole, but as the Initiative du secteur benevole et communautaire (cf. http://www_vsi-isbc.ca).

Paper Number: PA021251

Paper Title: Capacity Building from the Grassroots

Author(s):

 Professor Eric Shragge, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, CAN

Summary of Research

The process of capacity building and leadership development are crucial for strong community organizations. This paper will report on a cross Canada study of 15 grassroots organizations that have successfully found ways to build their organizational capacity and leadership through participative processes. The discussion will examine their processes and strategies and will report on the lessons learned from their experiences.

Description

In Canada, the role of community organizations has changed over the last 15 years. Many began as organizations that contested policy and experimented with new forms of service provision. Over the years, they have evolved relations of partnership with government and have become central in a variety of service networks, and in the fields of community revitalization, and local economic development. Their role has also received greater recognition by governments, who have begun to develop new policies to reflect these changes. For example, the consultation process and document the Ministry of Social Solidarity's has developed called The community network. A key player in Quebec's development. As a consequence of these changes, it is necessary for community organizations to become more effective actors and therefore, both capacity building and leadership become vital elements for both the organizations themselves and the wider society.

The characteristics of community capacity include their ability to identify, mobilize, and address social and public health problems. The purpose of capacity building, therefore, is to foster conditions that strengthen the characteristics of communities that enable them to plan, develop, implement, and maintain effective community programs. (Poole:1998)) These processes are undertaken through organizations by themselves and/or working in partnership with others.

Leadership is a key factor in developing organizational strength. What are the elements that contribute to leadership in community organizations? Lazzari et al. (1998) argue that many factors contribute to leadership development. These include relationships with role models and mentors. Personal characteristics such as, interpersonal skills enhance leadership. Experiences of injustice and watching others engage in action were key factors in leadership building. Personal satisfaction derived from the work, support from others and commitment to personal beliefs and values also contributed. These factors demonstrate the complex interaction between the person, his or her immediate relations and the wider context.
Capacity building and leadership are central elements in strong and effective community organizations. How do organizations build capacity and leadership? Often it occurs through trial and error and gradually an expertise develops. Some succeed in this way and have developed their own legacy and history; however, many fail to learn these lessons by themselves and seek outside help.

Based on interviews and site visits of 15 organizations accross Canada, this paper will report on the approaches and practices of the organizations. The organizations represent diverse practices, ranging from urban grassroots organizing to work with homeless people to developing services to address child hunger to rurual aboriginal community development. The common thread is that they all have succeeded in developing active participation by members.   The paper will present the results of these case studies, and the lessons for building strong community based organizations.

References:
Lazzari,Marceline; Ford,Holly; and Haughey, Kelly, (1998) "Making a Difference: Women of Action in Community" Patricia L. Ewalt, Edith M. Freeman, and Dennis Poole (editors) (1998) Community Building-

Renewal, Well-Being and Shared Responsibility, National Association of Social Workers Press, Washington in p.165-176.

Poole, Dennis L. (1998) "Building Community Capacity to Promote Social and Public Health: Challenges for Universities" in Patricia L. Ewalt, Edith M. Freeman, and Dennis Poole (editors) (1998) Community Building-Renewal, Well-Being and Shared Responsibility, National Association of Social Workers Press, Washington p.369-379.

Paper Number: PA021495

Paper Title: Nonprofit Co-Locations Centers: Capacity-Building Tools for Communities

Author(s):

 Professor Diane Kaplan-Vinokur, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

 Mr. David S. Dobbie, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Summary of Research

Nonprofit co-locations are one way in which communities restructure and build their local nonprofit capacity. Therein, nonprofit agencies are purposefully sited in one building or campus with some shared services or infrastructure, and expectation of cooperation. These new buildings represent local responses to growing community needs, shrinking resources, political devolution, rising rents, and limited or deteriorating physical agency infrastructures. We present survey results on 80 such U.S. sites, profiling their primary goals, the nonprofit subsectors and tenant organizations they serve, and their financial bases. We also examine their role in incubating new nonprofits, thus further enhancing nonprofit capacity.

Description

Problem Addressed: Communities across the United States have sought innovations to enhance the capacity of their local nonprofit sector to respond to growing service needs. Additionally, communities are responding to the recent political climate of devolution, cost-cutting, "the war on waste" (Light, 2000), and calls for nonprofits to be more efficient and "business-like" in their operations (Kearns, 2001). These efforts often emphasize new relationships between existing organizations, such as mergers, restructuring (LaPiana, 1997), collaborations (Alter, 1993; Arsenault, 1998), and public-private partnerships (U.S. GAO, 1999).

One particularly intensive strategy used in response to this climate is co-locating nonprofit organizations together in a single building or site with some shared facilities or equipment, with expectations of cooperation and economies of scale to result. Co-location reflects local, restructuring efforts to foster new nonprofits (such as business incubator models) and to meet emerging community needs (Molnar, 1997; Hurley, 2000). While a few sites offer extensive on-site services to local populations, others seek to enhance the administrative capacities of nonprofit agencies. Co-location can also reflect recognition of the declining availability of adequate physical space and modern infrastructure for nonprofits (Gronbjerg et al., 1992).

Topic's relation to the state of knowledge in the field: Co-location's success in meeting local nonprofits' needs was found in an earlier study by the author; 150 nonprofit tenants surveyed at four co-locations (in four states) were highly satisfied with the beneficial financial arrangements, physical environments, and managerial support provided by those sites (Vinokur-Kaplan & McBeath, 2001). But apart from that study, there is little systematic, comparative information about nonprofit co-locations as a means for capacity-building, apart from the following: one descriptive study of six arts incubators (Gerl, 2000), some case studies in British Columbia and San Francisco (Hutchinson, 1999; Hurley, 2000), and other earlier, descriptive papers from this author's ongoing "Under One Roof" study (Vinokur-Kaplan, 2001).

Approach & Data Sources: This paper provides an initial national overview of this capacity building phenomenon of nonprofit co-locations, using data from 80 US co-location sites. It probes the breadth and type of the distribution of such nonprofit centers (do they require urban density?), and the recent growth of this phenomenon (half of the sites were established since 1993). It queries their primary goals, the subsector types and heterogeneity of organizations housed there, whether incubation of fledgling nonprofits occurs, whether such sites also include for-profit tenants, and the types of services they provide to tenants. It also examines the financial profile of the sites' supporting or management organization regarding their current financial resources and expenditures, and their dependence on fundraising for such ventures.

Three data sources are included:
(1) an on-going mailed survey begun in 2001 to which 49 of 80 sites have responded to date (61%);

(2) Financial profiles of the nonprofit organizations managing or sponsoring the site, from the Guidestar Database of IRS documents (www.guidestar.org); and

(3) sites' public documents and websites.
Contribution to the field: This study will help illuminate the goals and requirements of a frequently used, but little-studied capacity-building strategy employed by communities to enhance the capabilities, growth, management, and development of local nonprofits, and the scope of resources they themselves require.

References:

Alter, C. and Hage, J. (1993). Organizations Working Together. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Arsenault, J. (1998). Forging Nonprofit Alliances. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gerl, E.(2000) Incubating the Arts: Establishing a Program to Help Artists and Arts Organizations Become Viable Businesses. Athens, OH: Nat'l Business Incubator Assoc.

Gronbjerg, K. A., Nagle, A., Garvin, L., and Wingate, L. (1992). Nonprofit Human Service Facilities in Illinois: Structure, Adequacy and Management. Chicago: Report prepared for the Illinois Facilities Fund. Dept of Sociology-Anthro., Loyola University, 1992.

Hurley, M. (2000). Securing a Safe Haven: Facilities Strategies for San Francisco's Nonprofits. San Francisco: Mayor's Office of Economic Development. [www.orgspaces.org/pdf/SafeHaven.pdf].

Hutchinson, K. (1999). Getting it Together: Collaboration Models for Community Groups. Vancouver, BC: BC Council for Families Comm'ty Agency Partnership Project.

Kearns, K. P. (2000). Private Sector Strategies for Social Sector Success: The Guide to Strategy and Planning for Public and NonProfit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

La Piana, D. (1997). Beyond Collaboration: Strategic restructuring of nonprofit organizations. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation.

Light, P. Making Nonprofits Work: A Report on the Tides of Nonprofit Management Reform. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2000.

Molnar, L.A., Grimes, D., Edelstein, J., De Pietro, R., Sherman, H., Adkins, D., and Tornatzky, L. (1997). "Impact of Incubator Investments." Athens, OH and Ann Arbor, MI: National Business Incubator Association and the University of Michigan, 1997.

US Gov't Accounting Office. Public-Private Partnerships: Key Elements of Federal Buildings and Facility Partnerships. Wash, D.C.: US Gen.Accounting Office. (GAO/GDD-99-23).

Vinokur-Kaplan, D. (2001). "New Landlord Roles for Nonprofit Managers and Boards: Recent Legal and Managerial Structures Used at Co-located Nonprofit Centers." Paper presented at the 30th Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Miami, FL.

Vinokur-Kaplan, D. and McBeath, B. (2001). "Success Factors in Attracting and Retaining Nonprofits in Collaborative Co-Locations." Paper presented at the 30th Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Miami, FL.

Paper Number: PA021622

Paper Title: Capacity Building for Nonprofits: Future Research Needs

Author(s):

Mr. Richard Charles Baron, OMG Center for Collaborative Learning, Philadephia, PA, USA

Mr. Kennard Wing, OMG Center for Collaborative Learning, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Summary of Research

This presentation presents the results of a year-long study of capacity builidng initiatives in order to learn more about the implementation issues that face nonprofit human services agencies strengthening their general operation. The study presents preliminary findings as a first step to framing future research questions that should drive a new generation of studies into the strategies and impacts of capacity building in the voluntary sector.

Description

Introduction

In recent years there has been tremendous growth in the attention paid to strengthening the operations of nonprofit agencies. Philanthropic foundations, in particular, often go beyond their long-standing commitments to much-needed direct services: they now also provide funds to strengthen the overall capacity of agencies to function in demanding and competitive human services environments. 'Capacity building' grants have supported funding for strategic planning, board development, staff training, the upgrading of management information systems, and the restructuring of agency finances, among many other initiatives, to insure that the organization itself – and not just its services to clients – grows more durable. Even more recently, however, foundations have begun to ask a series of probing questions about how much their capacity building initiatives have accomplished, and whether there is a developing body of knowledge about how foundations can best frame these efforts.

However, a preliminary review of the professional literature around 'capacity building' provides evidence that this field is itself at a very early stage of development, and despite the emergence of a 'funder affinity group' (Grantmakers for Effective Organizations), a professional association for consultants that specialize in capacity building (the Alliance for Nonprofit Management), a journal on nonprofit management (Nonprofit Quarterly), and the scholarly publications of Arnova itself, there is a great deal yet to discover about how foundations and/or consultants in the field can most effectively strengthen nonprofit operations.

Much of the formal research and informal explorations undertaken thus far, it should be noted, has focused either on the best funding strategies for foundations to use or the most effective capacity building tools for organizational development consultants. Very little of the research available focuses on capacity building from the perspective of the nonprofit human services agency itself, and there is so far a paucity of useful and practical advice to boards, executive directors, or key staff in how to effectively move their agencies forward. It is hard to find literature that focuses on capacity building as something organizations do for themselves: as a field, there is more interest in studying the helpers who seek to influence capacity building from the outside than interest in those inside who must lead and carry out capacity building activities.

The preliminary study reported on here is based on a year-long assessment of the capacity building experiences of a group of smaller human service non-profit agencies who received foundation funding specifically to enhance their overall ability to function effectively in their communities: although preliminary, the study suggests the wide range of issues on which further research is vitally needed if we are to better understand capacity building as primarily the experience of the agencies themselves – that is, to understand capacity building from the inside.

The Context

A decade ago, The Pew Charitable Trusts – one of the nation's largest philanthropies, with a broad national agenda – established the Pew Fund to provide support to human service nonprofits in the five-

county Philadelphia metropolitan region, its home base. Two years ago, the Pew Fund's three separate programs – for the elderly; for vulnerable adults; and for children, youth and families – expanded its traditional 'direct service' grantmaking to include a wide range of 'capacity building' grants. This new capacity building initiative differed from a number of other foundation programs to strengthen nonprofit operations: rather than encourage and provide financial support for 'comprehensive' capacity building initiatives – in which nonprofits often undertake a wide-ranging assessment of their capacities and then attempt to address all or a significant number of priority problem areas, the Pew Fund allowed agencies to determine a single area they would focus on over a two-year grant period.

At the same time that it inaugurated it capacity building program, the Pew Fund also sought the support of 'intermediary organizations' to manage its local grantmaking activities, and the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning was contracted by the Pew Fund to serve as the intermediary organization with responsibility for the vulnerable adult program: for the 2001 – 2002 grant cycle, this program consisted of 17 capacity building grants to area nonprofit human services agencies. Individual grants ranged from $11,000 to $95,000 for two years, for a total of $1,048, 000.

OMG has gathered data from these 17 grantees over the past year through a variety of means: initial site visits to grantees; periodic updates on the grantees' fiscal and programmatic progress in required reports for the foundation; an extensive telephone interview, six months into the grant period, to assess problems and accomplishments; and two focus groups at the end of the first year to further explore implementation issues.

These extended contacts with the grantees have led to some very preliminary observations about the experiences of human services nonprofits undertaking capacity building activities. It should be highlighted, however, that these observations – given the small sample size, the limited timeframe of the study, and the targeted nature of the funding – are valuable primarily in identifying the kinds of questions about how nonprofit capacity building progresses. These questions, then, can prove useful in establishing a future research agenda for the capacity building field.

In general, however, much of the initial experience of grantees indicates both that while the grateful recipients of many capacity building grants are successful in addressing often long-standing organizational issues, many other agencies have found the process of implementation to be more difficult and costly than anticipated. Capacity building is frequently not the straightforward opportunity to reap organizational, client, or community benefits: it is, in one sense, an investment in the future that, like any investment, has real costs in the present.

Preliminary Findings

The proposed presentation will focus on a series of six central issues on which further research is needed to more thoroughly understand the capacity building experience from the perspective of human service nonprofit agencies themselves.

. The Role of Preplanning / The Difficulties of Start-Up. Many of the capacity building grantees in this study had substantial initial difficulty moving their projects forward, often because there had been little pre-grant (un-reimbursed) planning that would allow them to move quickly once the grant had been awarded. How important, then, is it for agencies to plan carefully before undertaking more substantial capacity building actions, and how well does pre-planning anticipate the roadblocks many agencies encounter during the start-up weeks and months?

. The Importance of Board, Staff, and Consultant Buy-in. Implementation relied heavily on the enthusiasm and availability of a wide range of actors: in some cases, the interest of board members was key; in other instances, changes in leadership – at the Executive Director or Program Manager level – slowed implementation; and in yet other projects the difficulty of finding the right organizational development or software consultants derailed implementation plans. How critical is the buy-in, tenure, or availability of key actors to the success of these projects?

. Hidden Costs / Opportunity Costs. Grantees repeatedly emphasized that while they accurately predicted out-of-pocket costs, the 'hidden costs' of staff time – the involvement of the agency director, key managers, or direct service personnel –were far grater than anticipated. This suggests not only that the field needs to study these hidden costs more thoroughly, but also that there may be 'opportunity costs' (that is, the program issues or development activities that weren't attended to while the focus was on capacity building) that nonprofits would be wise to understand ahead of time.

. Developing Capacity Building Skills. The grantees in this study sometimes felt that they had only the

most rudimentary understanding of how to best engage in the capacity building process: for instance, a number of grantees needed advice and training in how to recruit, choose, and contract with consultants for the assistance they needed. Agencies need to know more about the management skills they must develop even before they undertake more ambitious capacity building activities.

. Management Information Systems (MIS) Projects Pose Special Problems. The problems outlined above apply to many different types of capacity building projects, but are especially difficult for MIS activities: buying or upgrading hardware; developing or customizing software; staff training; or report development. Other foundations have found that MIS capacity building requires extraordinary patience, yet the field needs to know more about the normative process for these technologically challenging initiatives.

. Comprehensive Vs. Targeted Capacity Building. How many competing capacity building activities can an agency undertake at one time, and are targeted efforts more likely to be successful than more comprehensive initiatives? Do agencies do a better job when they select the focus, control the process, and select the consultants, or do foundations bring to capacity building a level or expertise and support that should not be discarded? Much more information is needed about the benefits of both approaches.

The paper seeks to initiate a dialogue on possible research approaches – key research questions and methodologies – that can provide the field with a broader understanding of the experiences of nonprofit human service agencies as they seek to implement capacity building initiatives, leading to foundation programs, consultant services, and self-directed initiatives from within nonprofits themselves that move more effectively toward durable community institutions.

Paper Number: PA021646

Paper Title: Human Service Organizations . . . The Larger They Grow

Author(s):

 Dr. David J. Tucker, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
 Mr. David Sommerfeld, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Summary of Research

Although systematic studies on trends in the size distributions of private human service organizations do not exist, most observers assume that the dominant trend parallels that of the US economy's movement to a higher proportion of smaller organizations. This paper investigates this assumption and finds evidence that calls its validity into question. Explanations of the trend to larger organizations is offered and it is suggested that more attention needs to be given to the repercussions of the presence in the private human services sector of higher numbers of large organizations.

Description

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades the private human services sector in the United States has grown substantially in size and in value (The Independent Sector, 2001). Moreover, with the emergence of increasing numbers of for-profit organizations, it has also changed in composition (Salamon, 1993, 1999; Weisbrod, 1997). Because such conditions are associated with increased competition, and consequently the need for strategies to manage it (Alexander, 2000; Skloot, 2000), it is plausible that one important result of this change is increasing numbers of larger private human service organizations. After all, increasing size, either through internal expansion or interorganizational merger, is construed in the literature as one of the more fundamental ways in which organizations seek to reduce the heightened uncertainty they face as a result of increased competition (Perrow, 1986; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

Asking whether there is a higher proportion of larger organizations in the human services sector is important because the structure of human service organizations is likely to have a strong effect on how well they provide their services, and variation in organizational size is a key correlate of variation in organizational structure. While researchers have documented the occurrence of change in the structure of individual human service organizations, and associated it with the recent changes in the context of the human services sector, there has been less attention to the role size may play as a mediating factor in shaping structure more generally. This prompts three obvious but nonetheless important questions for this research: Is there a trend toward a higher proportion of larger organizations in the private human services sector? If so, how might it be explained and, finally, what are the implications?

BACKGROUND

Since Weber's (1946)studies of the character and processes of bureaucracy, researchers have acknowledged the influence of size on organizational structures and outcomes, resulting in a large and rich body of literature. Kimberley (1976) provides an earlier comprehensive review of this literature. Based on an analysis of 80 empirical studies conducted between 1950 and 1974, he concluded that although there were certain conceptual and empirical problems in how it was used, size nonetheless had been demonstrated as a centrally important variable in the study of organizational structure, with ubiquitous effects. More recently, writers such as Daft (1998), Scott (1998) and Pfeffer (1997) also discuss size as a significant variable that "interfaces between the organization and the environment."(Scott, 1998:259) In this sense, organization size can function as an independent or dependent variable depending upon the focus of the research endeavor. As an independent variable, it has been shown to be related to a variety of organizational characteristics such as formalization, centralization, complexity, differentiation of jobs, and having full-time employees (Scott, 1998; Kalleberg & Vanburen, 1996). Conversely, it also has been studied as a factor reflected the influence of larger economic and social pressures such as levels of resource availability and degree of competition (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000).

The influence of organizational size has also been studied on a longitudinal and dynamic basis, particularly by organizational ecologists who mainly have focused on understanding its role in explaining the differential survival of organizations. Generally, findings support the liability of smallness hypothesis, meaning that organizational failure rates decline monotonically with increasing size (Baum, 1996). An interesting exception is Wholey, Christianson and Sanchez (1992) study of the survival rates of health maintenance organizations (HMOs) where they found that for one type of HMO, increasing size was associated with an initially increasing and subsequently decreasing pattern of failure. Referring to this finding as a "liability of middleness," they interpreted it as indicating that for some types of small organizations, strong social and even moral commitments by members to an organization's mission and clientele may act as a buffer against organizational demise.

Generally, this pattern of findings concerning the descriptive and explanatory import of organization size has been replicated in studies focused specifically on private human service organizations. From a structural perspective, earlier studies by Aiken and Hage (1968) and Tucker (1981) found consistent relationships between size and various characteristics of nonprofit social service organizations such as complexity, decentralization of decision-making, and formalization. More recently, a study of Massachusetts nonprofit organizations found size to be correlated with factors such as staff composition and proportion of governmental funding received, with size alone accounting for 20% of the variation in government funding (Stone, Hager & Griffin, 2001). Other recent studies have found smaller nonprofit human service organizations less capable of adapting to the new opportunities created by the funding and programmatic structures of welfare reform and devolution (Gronjberg, 2001; Reisch & Sommerfeld, 2001; Alexander. 1999). Ecologically, a study by Twombly (2001a) found that while the human service field grew substantially in the 1990's, it also demonstrated a high level of volatility as evidenced in high rates of births and deaths of nonprofit human service organizations between 1992 and 1996. Specifically, over 25 percent of the organizations failed within this time period, with smaller nonprofits being significantly more likely to close (Twombly, 2001b. See also Hager, Galaskiewicz, Bielefeld, & Pins , 1996).

Because the private human services sector is similar to the US economy as a whole in the sense that it is dominated by a relatively small number of very large organizations, with the vast majority classified as small (Aldrich, 1999; Boris, 2000), it seems that we take for granted that it also is following the US economy in the trend toward a higher proportion of smaller organizations (Granovetter, 1984; Carroll, 1994). But, is this the case? Our introduction gives a theoretical reason for doubting it, and our brief review of the literature points to the importance of examining it.

DESIGN AND DATA SOURCES
The design of this research is longitudinal, using data from archival sources. These sources primarily include, but are not limited to, the Business Information Tracking Series (BITS). BITS is a database developed and maintained by the Center for Economic Studies, US Census Bureau. It was constructed using data from a variety of sources and currently spans the years 1989-90 to 1998-99. It provides dynamic information organized by SIC/NAIC codes on nearly all non-farm establishments in the US, including information on numbers of establishments, employment, and revenue and how they change one year to the next due to processes of organizational birth and death and the hiring and termination of employees. Consequently, it can be used to track changes in proportion of organizations by size categories and therefore is ideal for the purposes of this research. We are focusing on the four-digit SIC code classifications 8300 (Social Services) and 8000 (Health), with primary emphasis on the former.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND EXPLANATIONS
Thus far, our findings are both tentative and paradoxical. Defining size as the average number of employees per establishment, we do see a trend toward proportionally more large organizations. At the same time, larger organizations are showing a propensity to decrease in size whereas smaller organizations have tended to stay more or less the same size. We find the number of larger organizations are increasing at a substantially higher rate than is the case for smaller organizations, with the highest rate being for organizations with 500 or more employees. We also find that larger organizations are being formed at a more or less constant rate whereas smaller organizations are being

formed at a declining rate. Larger organizations have maintained a generally constant rate of annual failures but smaller organizations show a small but consistently increasing rate of failure. Currently, we are using economic efficiency arguments (Scherer, 1970) as well as arguments from resource partitioning theory (Carroll, 1985) to interpret these findings and to plan directions for future analysis

IMPLICATIONS

To the extent that our preliminary findings hold, there are likely to be important repercussions for the private human services sector. To understand one of a number of possible reasons why, consider that, contrary to the prediction from Gibrat's Law, it has been found that an organization's rate of growth and its size do not change independently (Ranger-Moore, Breckenridge, & Jones, 1995). That is to say, small organizations do not have equal prospects of growing in size as compared to larger organizations. With decreasing numbers of smaller organization entering the human services sector, and their increasing death rate, the propensity toward a higher proportion of larger organizations in the private human services sector could well be augmented by the process of change itself. Following from this, a sector comprised of larger organizations is likely to be quite different from one comprised of smaller ones. For one thing, it is likely to be less flexible and more inert (Ranger-Moore, 1997) with perhaps increased ability to keep innovative outsiders and local grass-roots organizations from mounting viable challenges to established ways of doing things. At the same time, it could also mean greater employment stability for employees, due to less organizational volatility. Finally, because larger human service organizations are likely to have greater resources and more lucrative incentive structures than smaller ones, they are likely to be more attractive sites for employment by outsiders. Thus, it is possible that there will be a change in the nature and composition of the managerial class, a speculative observation that could help explain the increased presence of MBAs in the private human services sector (Cupaiuolo, Loavenbruck, & Kiely, 1995), as well as the proliferation of nonprofit management programs.

SELECTED REFERENCES
Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1968). Organizational Interdependence and Intra-Organizational Structure. American Sociological Review, 33(6), 912-930.
Alexander, J. (1999). The Impact of Devolution on Nonprofits: A Multiphase Study of Social Service Organizations. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 10(10), 57-40.
Alexander, J. (2000). Adaptive Strategies of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in an Era of Devolution and New Public Management. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 10(3), 287-303.
Baum, J. A. C. (1996). Organizational Ecology. S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (eds.), Handbook of Organization Studies (pp. 77-114). London: Sage.
Carroll, G.R. (1985). Concentration and Specialization: Dynamics of Niche Width in Populations of Organizations. American Journal of Sociology (6) (90), 1262-1283.
Carroll, G. R. (1994). Organizations ... The Smaller They Get. California Management Review, 37(1), 28-41.
Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry. American Journal of Sociology, 106(3), 715-762.
Cupaiuolo, A., Loavenbruck, G., & Kiely, K. (1995) Is There a Degree of Choice for Human Service Organizations? L. Ginsberg & P. Keys (eds.), New Management in Human Services (pp. 45-56). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
Daft, R. L. (1998). Organization Theory and Design (6th ed.). Cincinnati, Ohio: South Western College Publishing.
Granovetter, M. (1984). Small Is Bountiful - Labor-Markets and Establishment Size. American Sociological Review, 49(3), 323-334.
Grønjberg, K. (2001). The U.S. Nonprofit Human Service Sector: A Creeping Revolution. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30(2), 276-297.
Hager, M., Galaskiewicz, J., Bielefeld, W., & Pins, J. (1996). Tales from the Grave: Organizations' Accounts of Their Own Demise. American Behavioral Scientist, 39(8), 975-994.
Kalleberg, A. L., & Vanburen, M. E. (1996). Is Bigger Better? Explaining the Relationship between Organization Size and Job Rewards. American Sociological Review, 61(1), 47-66.
Kimberly, J. R. (1976). Organizational Size and the Structuralist Perspective: A Review, Critique, and Proposal. Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (4), 321-347.
Perrow, C. (1986). Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Pfeffer, J. (1997). New Directions for Organization Theory: Problems and Prospects. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York: Harper & Row.

Ranger-Moore, J. (1997). Bigger May Be Better, but Is Older Wiser? Organizational Age and Size in the New York Life Insurance Industry. American Sociological Review, 62(6), 903-920.

Ranger-Moore, J., Breckenridge, R. S., & Jones, D. L. (1995). Patterns of Growth and Size-Localized Competition in the New- York-State Life-Insurance Industry, 1860-1985. Social Forces, 73(3), 1027-1049.

Reisch, M., & Sommerfeld, D. (2001). Assessing the Impact of Welfare Reform on Nonprofit Organizations in Southeast Michigan: Implications for Policy and Practice. Washington DC: Aspen Institute

Salamon, L. M. (1993). The Marketization of Welfare - Changing Nonprofit and for- Profit Roles in the American Welfare State. Social Service Review, 67(1), 16-39.

Salamon, L. M. (1999). America's Nonprofit Sector. 2nd ed. New York: The Foundation Center.

Scherer, F. M. (1970). Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance. Chicago: Rand McNally

Scott, W. R. (1998). Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.

Skloot, E. (2000). Evolution or Extinction: A Strategy for Nonprofits in the Marketplace. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29(2), 315-324.

Stone, M. M., Hager, M. A., & Griffin, J. J. (2001). Organizational Characteristics and Funding Environments: A Study of a Population of United Way-Affiliated Nonprofits. Public Administration Review, 61(3), 276-289.

Twombly, E. C. (2001a). Human Service Nonprofits in Metropolitan Areas during Devolution and Welfare Reform. (Report No. 10 Charting Civil Society). Washington DC: The Urban Institute: Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy.

Twombly, E. C. (2001b). Welfare Reform's Impact on the Failure Rate of Nonprofit Human Service Providers. (Report No. 9 Charting Civil Society). Washington DC: The Urban Institute: Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy.

Tucker, D. J. (1981). Voluntary Auspices and the Behavior of Social-Service Organizations. Social Service Review, 55(4), 603-627.

Weber, M. (1946). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Trans. H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New York: Oxford university press.

Weisbrod, B. (1997). The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Its Entwining with Private Enterprise And Government. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 16(4), 541-555.

Wholey, D. R., Christianson, J. B., & Sanchez, S. M. (1992). Organization Size and Failure among Health Maintenance Organizations. American Sociological Review, 57(6), 829-842.

Paper Number: PA021399

Paper Title: Social capital and non-profit accountability: beyond the 3Es

Author(s):

 Mr. Andrew Passey, Office for National Statistics, London, UK

Summary of Research
This paper outlines the need for voluntary organisations to engage with work on social capital, especially in relation to organisational performance and accountability. The premise is that focussing on social capital might point up some forms of 'added value' for voluntary organisations. After briefly reviewing the literature, the paper details analysis of government and other surveys that include measures of social capital. The data are assessed in terms of their quality, i.e. validity and reliability, and their fitness for the purpose of providing an evidence base for voluntary sector managers seeking to assess their organisations' role in building social capital.

Description
Social capital and non-profit accountability: beyond the 3Es

Keywords: accountability, social capital, performance measurement, UK Office for National Statistics, equity, agency, transparency, evidence base, survey matrix, fitness for purpose.

Introduction
The concept of social capital has entered the academic and political lexicon since the early 1990s. Multi-disciplinary analyses and political interest have led to a plethora of definitions and operationalisations of the concept leading to some confusion about what social capital might be. However, within the social sciences there is an emerging consensus towards a definition that emphasises the role of networks and civic norms (and attitudes). From this stem a number of key indicators of social capital, including social relations, formal and informal social networks, group membership, trust, reciprocity and civic engagement (Harper, 2001). What is more, social capital is generally understood as the property of the group rather than the property of the individual.

Might a group possibly include a voluntary organisation ? Research focussing on how voluntary organisations could help build social capital (or indeed, whether they might undermine it) has been relatively limited in the UK. Much of it has focused on how voluntary organisations foster voluntary action and associational activity, and constitute arenas of trust relations (cf NCVO, 2000; Putnam, 2000 in the US, Tonkiss and Passey, 1999). Research here is made more difficult as a result of a limited evidence base on which to develop and test theory specific to the voluntary sector.

Aims
This paper outlines the need for voluntary organisations to engage with work on social capital, especially in relation to organisational performance and accountability. The premise is that focussing on social capital might point up some forms of 'added value' for voluntary organisations. After briefly reviewing the literature, the paper details analysis of government and other surveys that include measures of social capital. The data are assessed in terms of their quality, i.e. validity and reliability, and their fitness for the purpose of providing an evidence base for voluntary sector managers seeking to assess their organisations' role in building social capital.

Defining social capital
The plethora of definitions of social capital, along with the range of terms used to refer to it, have led to confusion as what it is (and as importantly, what it isn't). Academics have though taken up the concept with relish – between 1996 and early 1999 the number of articles in academic journals listing social capital as a key word totalled 1003, compared with 109 between 1991 and 1995 (Baum, 2000).

Davies (2001) suggests two theoretical models underpin social capital, which embrace a neo-Marxist

and a neo-Liberal perspective. The former, she suggests, is typified by Bourdieu (1986), and places greater emphasis on access to resources and issues of power in society. The latter is evident in the work of Putnam (1993, 1995, 2000).

Coleman (1988) took rational action as a starting point, and his work pointed to differential outcomes from links between human and social capital. He envisaged social capital taking on different forms: obligations and expectations; the capacity of information to flow through the social structure; and, norms accompanied by effective sanctions. This multi-dimensionality has made a concise definition difficult, although Putnam (2000) and Woolcock (2001) have attempted to pare down to a focus on social networks.

Putnam has also emphasised social capital as an attribute of communities, in contrast to Coleman and Bourdieu who considered it an attribute of the individual. Social capital as community resource underpins Putnam's definition: "networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam, 2000). Woolcock (2001) has highlighted a 'content view' of social capital, i.e. what social capital is as opposed to what it does (Woolcock, 2001). This suggests that social capital is a researchable concept, which might lead or contribute to particular policy outcomes (e.g. increased employment, better health).

Thinking of social capital as a community resource that can facilitate different outcomes opens up a focus on the role of institutions in building and maintaining it. Institutions such as the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have considered the definition of social capital. The OECD defines it as "networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups" (Cote and Healy, 2001:41). The World Bank is more expansive and suggests:

"Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Social capital is not just the sum of the institutions which underpin a society - it is the glue that holds them together."

Social capital and organisational performance: beyond the 3Es
There has been only limited work in linking social capital with the performance of voluntary organisations, despite its potential in pointing up 'added value'. Kendall and Knapp (1999) discussed the role of voluntary organisations in building participation, as one of a range of 'performance domains'. Putnam (2000) emphasised the link between associational activity and social capital (especially trust). In critiquing simplistic notions of voluntary organisations as arenas of trust relations, Tonkiss and Passey (1999) suggested changing funding relations were undermining resources of trust within and between organisations. Forthcoming qualitative research adds emphasis to this concerns (Passey et al, 2002). Externally imposed accountability regimes can also indirectly limit social capital, through lessening networks and interlocking relations (Onyx, 1998).

Links between accountability, organisational performance, and social capital therefore appear important for voluntary organisations to understand. Voluntary organisations increasingly provide information to stakeholders for monitoring and evaluation purposes, within a growing regime of accountability. The focus here remains stubbornly on the three Es: economy, efficiency and effectiveness. There are however, other resources that voluntary organisations can draw upon when attempting to illustrate their performance, such as their role in empowering individual and communities, in building trust, in community development, and in facilitating social networks. All relate to social capital, and should take accountability beyond the 3Es into transparency, equity and agency. But to get there, voluntary sector managers need evidence.

Researching a new evidence base
One of the criticisms of work on social capital is much of it has been based on secondary analyses of datasets not primarily established for social capital (Sixsmith et al, 2001). However, these readily available data potentially provide baselines against which voluntary organisations can assess their performance. In so doing they might minimise the resources expended on data gathering. Research in

the UK Official for National Statistics is attempting to make such information more widely available and readily understood by a range of users, including voluntary organisations. One outcome is a survey matrix, which summarises elements of government and other surveys conducted in the UK where the information collected includes measures of social capital. The matrix summarises the relevant questions asked in each survey, grouping them into different domains of social capital, and showing which facets these surveys include or do not include. The domains are: (i) participation, social engagement, commitment; (ii) control, self-efficacy; (iii) perception of community level structures or characteristics; (iv) social interaction, social networks, social support: and, (v) trust, reciprocity, social cohesion. To date, each survey has been reviewed in terms of:

 Validity: issues here are about how well the measures have been theorised and their contingent validity in relation to other research.
 Reliability: inquiry here focuses on the context in which the data were captured; whether questions or answer categories have changed through time; and the size and robustness of samples.

This paper develops this analysis of data quality into one of 'fitness for purpose', by critically assessing the data on the survey matrix in terms of their potential for informing three organisational 'performance domains' (Kendall and Knapp, 1999): transparency, equity and agency. The survey matrix is itself cross-related with these three performance domains, to provide a high quality and actionable data resource for voluntary sector managers.

References
Baum, F. (2000) Social capital, economic capital and power: further issues for a public health agenda Journal of Epidemiological Community Health 54:409-410.
Bourdieu, P (1986) The Forms of Capital in Baron, S. Field, J. Schuller, T. (eds.) (2000) Social Capital - Critical Perspectives. Oxford University Press.
Cote S, Healy, T. (2001) The Well-being of Nations. The role of human and social capital. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
Coleman, J. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital American Journal of Sociology 94 Supplement S95-S120. University of Chicago.
Davies, A. (2001) But we knew that already! - A study into the relationship between social capital and volunteering. Conference paper. Anne Davies. Home Start. Sheffield.
Hall, P. (1999) Social Capital in Britain. British Journal of Political Science 29:417-461
Jas, P., Wilding, K., Wainwright, S., Passey, A., and Hems, L. (2002) The UK Voluntary Sector Almanac 2002. London: NCVO.
Harper, R. (2001) Social Capital: A review of the Literature. London: Office for National Statistics
Kendall, J. and Knapp, M. (1999) Measuring the Outcomes of Voluntary Organisation Activities. Belfast: Voluntary Action Unit.
Kendall, J. and Almond, S. (1999) The Voluntary Sector in the UK. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
NCVO (2000) Coming Apart or Coming Together? New findings on social participation and trust in Great Britain. Research Quarterly 11. London: National Council for Voluntary Organisations.
Onyx, J. (1998) Social Capital, the Third Sector, and the Relative Importance of Strong and Weak Ties. Paper presented at ISTR Fourth International Conference, Dublin July 5-8, 2000.
Passey, A., Naoko Pilgrim, A., and Tonkiss, F. (2002) Voluntary Sector Stakeholder Analysis: report of a joint Goldsmiths College - NCVO research project. London: NCVO
Putnam, R. (1993) The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life The American Prospect, no 13.
Putnam, R (1995) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital Journal of Democracy 6 (1) 65-78
Putnam, R. (2000) Bowling Alone - The Collapse and Revival of American Community New York: Simon & Schuster
Sixsmith, J. Boneham, M. Goldring, J. (2001) The Relationship Between Social Capital, Health & Gender: A case Study of a Socially Deprived Community. Health Development Agency, London.
Tonkiss, F. and Passey, A. (1999) Trust, Confidence and Voluntary Organisations: Between Values and Institutions. Sociology 33(2) 257-74.

World Bank social capital web site: http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/index.htm

Woolcock, M.. (2001) The place of social capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research 2 (1) 11-17.

Paper Number: PA021432

Paper Title: The Snakes and Ladders of Accountability: Sliding between Accountability and
Collaboration in Canada

Author(s):

 Dr. Susan Phillips, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

 Ms. Karine Levasseur, Carleton University, Winnipeg, Manitoba, CAN

Summary of Research

This paper explores the tension in government accountability regimes between the demands produced
by a contract culture for more stringent reporting and the pressures created by new forms of
collaboration for greater flexibility in funding. Analysis of the impact of very strict accountability measures
recently imposed in Canada reveals that they severely tax the capacity of voluntary organizations and
make them less innovative in the projects they undertake. As a means for squaring accountability with
collaboration, the potential for the creation of new funding instruments and codes of best practices which
facilitate more "elastic" accountability is discussed.

Description

There is a growing mismatch in government accountability regimes. On the one hand, the shift toward a
contract culture and the philosophy of New Public Management has produced an 'explosion' in auditing
(Power, 1997) that is demanding more, and more specific accountability and reporting requirements. On
the other hand, the move toward working in new forms of partnership arrangements between
governments and voluntary organizations had created pressure for more elastic forms of accountability
that leave enough flexibility for collaboration to unfold. How can government accountability regimes
square these two competing demands? How do recent pressures for increased accountability impact
voluntary organizations seeking funding from governments?

This issue is being played out in dramatic ways in Canada following a major scandal in 2000 in the
largest federal funding department over alleged mismanagement of grants and contributions. In
response to this scandal, the Government of Canada has imposed an extremely strict set of
accountability requirements on the contracts and contribution agreements it enters into with voluntary
sector organizations. Under this new regime, the emphasis in on demonstrating accountability, not
necessarily on making accountability more effective. At the same time, the Government of Canada has
been working in partnership with the voluntary sector to improve their relationship and to develop a code
of best practice for government funding. This paper explores the tension between the demand for
increased accountability and that for increased flexibility in funding. It draws upon both the literature on
contracting regimes (Alexander et al., 1999; Morris, 1999) and accountability in the voluntary sector
(Brown and Moore, 2001; Taylor, 1996; Phillips, 2000), and contributes to the emerging discussion of
how to build more effective collaboration.

The paper begins by examining the impact of the tighter federal accountability regime on the capacity of
voluntary organizations to comply and on their willingness to be innovative and take risks in the kinds of
contracts and projects they pursue. Interviews with senior staff of a random sample of 20 voluntary
organizations that have been funded for at least three years by two major federal departments and
examination of the contracts they have undertaken allow us to investigate changes in organizational
behaviour before and after the new regime came into effect. Additional interviews with a broad array of
key informants in the voluntary sector and in the federal government provides an overview of the
accountability process from different perspectives. The analysis reveals that the effects on voluntary
organizations have been significant, and overwhelming negative. Four major impacts are discussed.

The first is an increase in resources needed to prepare, negotiate, manage and report on contracts and
contribution agreements. There is no evidence, however, that this has resulted in more effective
reporting and oversight. Rather, it has simply produced more of it and this has come at a considerable
cost to voluntary organizations. Second, the content of applications for contracts and projects that are

made by voluntary organizations are becoming more conservative and less risk-taking, creative or experimental. The need to specify and establish frameworks for the measurement of outcomes, not just outputs or activities, is limiting the capacity to be innovative because there is no tolerance for making mistakes or missing targets. The third impact concerns time delays for receiving grants and contribution funding due to the new layers of review and rules that are being imposed as proposals move through the governmental approval process. Indeed, it is not uncommon for such lengthy delays to occur that projects are approved only after they were to have been completed, forcing the applicants to return the money. This culture of accountability inculcates a mentality amongst public servants that projects do not be approved in a timely manner and reinforces a climate of unresponsiveness. The final impact concerns the changing nature of the position of 'Project Officer' within the public service. Given the new emphasis on demonstrating accountability, Project Officers spend more time monitoring and auditing than building projects and responding to clients. This is an anathema to many and consequently, there is a very high turnover rate, further exacerbating problems of delays and lack of trust.

Within both the voluntary sector and the federal government, there is a growing recognition that such a strict accountability regime is neither healthy nor sustainable. The quandary is how to create more flexible instruments of accountability in a political environment that is highly risk averse. The second part of the paper focuses on new developments in funding arrangements. One is the concept of a new "strategic investment" instrument that offers greater flexibility than the standard contract. The second is an attempt to develop a code of funding practices, modelled after those in the UK, that would be agreed to by the whole of government and the whole of the sector. Although such a code is in draft form, it is likely to encounter major problems in its adoption and implementation, we suggest, given the existing accountability regime. For many voluntary organizations, then, the governmental accountability regime increasingly seems to be akin to a game of snakes and ladders in which some progress is made, only to slide further behind than ever.

The paper has implications beyond the Canadian context. While its empirical focus is on Canada, its conceptual foundation and findings are intended to contribute to the literature on the development of accountability and funding regimes suitable for the kind of collaborative arrangements that are emerging in many countries.

Paper Number: PA021472

Paper Title: An Evaluation and Nonprofit Partnership Conundrum: Handling Competing Demands

Author(s):

 Dr. Elizabethann O'Sullivan, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

 Dr. Edwin P. Miller, Research and Evaluation Associates, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Summary of Research

The paper examines the difficulties nonprofits encounter in evaluating programs, which have both multiple funders and several partners. The nonprofit may have to reconcile competing evaluation requirements and expectations. It has to find ways to work with its partners to implement an evaluation. The paper studies youth offender programs in three states. Each program is operated by a nonprofit and funded by federal, state, and local governments, and foundations. The paper identifies competing evaluation demands and their consequences. It also examines how nonprofit and public agency partners interact in designing, conducting and using an evaluation.

Description

Problem addressed:

The paper will examine two aspects of the difficulties nonprofits encounter in evaluating a program, which has both multiple funders and several partners. First, a nonprofit may have to reconcile competing evaluation requirements and expectations. Second, a nonprofit has to decide how to work with its partners to conduct an evaluation and use its findings.

Topic's relation to the state of knowledge in the field:

The paper goes beyond an existing literature that advises nonprofits on how to conduct evaluations, which meet funders' demands or build capacity. The literature on meeting funders' demands does not explicitly consider multiple funders. Furthermore, the literature often assumes that the organization has the capacity and freedom to design and implement an evaluation. Beyond merely meeting external demands, the literature encourages nonprofits to conduct evaluations that enhance the organization's learning and capacity building.

The literature on evaluating a partnership is sparse. It tends to ignore the logistics involved in moving beyond evaluating a single partner's activities and outcomes. It does not consider factors other than outcomes that might be evaluated, e.g., sustainability of the partnership, organizational learning, or creation of new approaches to addressing the problem at hand. The literature does not address the need for assessing how the individual organizations contribute to the partnership as a whole.

The paper will begin with a summary of the nonprofit evaluation literature, i.e., definitions of evaluation, its purpose, criteria for judging its quality, and methodological recommendations. This will provide a context for studying three nonprofit programs. The studies will describe (1) the complex network of interorganizational relationships maintained by some nonprofits, (2) any problems in accountability posed by having multiple funders, (3) how nonprofit programs handle competing accountability requirements and expectations, (4) the impact of competing accountability demands on efforts to evaluate a program's effectiveness, the costs of evaluation, and the use of evaluation findings. The paper will search for patterns to categorize and link funder characteristics and evaluation expectations with evaluation design, implementation, and use. The paper should contribute to the literature on nonprofit program evaluation and document its adequacy, improve knowledge of how nonprofits actually conduct and use evaluations, imply strategies that enable both funders and funding recipients to be accountable to their separate constituencies, and suggest themes deserving further research. Although limited to the specific cases, chosen because they have diverse funders and participate in partnerships, the paper will set the stage for future studies. Without case studies the dynamics underlying evaluation requirements and decisions

may be overlooked.

The case studies should naturally lead to a better understanding of partnerships and their evaluation. The paper will identify how the partners participate in evaluating the program, their objectives for the program and the partnership, and their use of evaluation findings. It will also suggest criteria for judging a partnership's merit and strategies for examining the role of each partner in a partnership's outcomes.

The approach:

The paper will study three on-going youth offender programs (one each in Illinois, Florida, and Kentucky) operated by non-profit organizations. Each program is funded by at least two U.S. federal agencies, one or more state and local government agencies, and at least one foundation. Furthermore, each program is expected to work with other nonprofits and public service providers to deliver comprehensive services.

The case studies will use interviews and agency materials to map out each agency's programs, each program's funders, and each program's partners. This information will establish a context for understanding each youth offender program, its relationships to funders and partners. The information will also document the nonprofit's other relationships with the funders and partners. The remainder of the study will focus on the youth offender programs. First, we will examine documents specifying evaluation requirements and expectations, research designs, and evaluation findings. In-person staff interviews will be held to verify or fill in the gaps in the information on how each evaluation was designed and implemented, what data were generated and reported, and how the nonprofit used the data. Information on evaluation costs will gathered. Staff will be asked: how other partners participated in the evaluation design and implementation, and how the evaluation information was shared with the other partners. Staff in partnering organizations may be interviewed to verify or identify how they participated in the evaluation design and implementation, and how they used the evaluation. They will also be asked about competing evaluation demands experience by their program.

The contribution to the field:

This paper will enrich the understanding of the complexity of evaluating nonprofit human services. The paper should move the nonprofit evaluation literature away from the how-to-do-it focus. While the paper may document the inadequacy of the existing literature it will provide a research design and a beginning point for further studies on the fragmentation of funding and its effect on programs and their development. The papers should identify if individual funders design evaluations to satisfying their own constituents and how this burdens nonprofits. The paper will add further empirical information on partnerships, which are widely advocated to reduce duplication and to increase the quality of services.

Keywords: partnerships, program evaluation, youth offender programs, interorganizational relations

Paper Number: PA021653

Paper Title: A little bit of give and take: Voluntary Sector Accountability within Cross-Sectoral Partnerships

Author(s):

Ms. Sally L Cooke, NCVO, London, UK

Summary of Research

In the context of the UK response to social exclusion and the development of partnerships designed to address the issues encapsulated by this concept, our study will look at how issues of accountability are tackled within cross-sectoral partnerships. The study will take a qualitative, case study approach to examining the accountability relationships of a number of different partnerships in which the voluntary sector is involved. We will focus particularly on how accountability and regulatory mechanisms impact on partnership relationships (and vice versa) and what this means for the effectiveness of the voluntary sector partners within them.

Description

Voluntary Sector Accountability in the Context of Cross-Sectoral Partnerships

Summary:

In the context of the UK response to social exclusion and the development of partnerships designed to address the issues encapsulated by this concept, our study will look at how issues of accountability are tackled within cross-sectoral partnerships. The study will take a qualitative, case study approach to examining the accountability relationships of a number of different partnerships in which the voluntary sector is involved. We will focus particularly on how accountability and regulatory mechanisms impact on partnership relationships (and vice versa) and what this means for the effectiveness of the voluntary sector partners within them.

Keywords: accountability, partnership, cross-sectoral partnership, social exclusion, community need, user involvement, legitimacy, trust, evaluation, social auditing, performance measurement, added value, efficiency, effectiveness, outcomes, impact.

Introduction

Government policy over the two last decades in the UK and elsewhere has resulted in an increasing number of initiatives being delivered through cross-sectoral partnerships at a local level. In the UK this trend has accelerated significantly following the election in 1997 of the New Labour government. With this change of administration came a change in attitude towards issues of social exclusion and an explicit recognition that tackling some of our more intractable social problems at the community level would require public sector agencies to work in greater partnership with the private and voluntary sectors. As a result a range of initiatives targeting deprived client groups and communities have engaged organisations from all sectors in a variety of partnerships addressing issues such as child poverty, health inequalities and crime. Partnership now also plays a significant part in some mainstream services including employment and legal services .

The stated reasons for involving the voluntary sector in these partnerships include:

· expertise in service delivery;
· knowledge of client and community needs;
· ability to reach those who are either excluded by, or exclude themselves from, mainstream provision delivered via traditional public sector agencies; and
· ability to work flexibly and innovatively to address complex and changing needs.

Despite the best of intentions it has frequently proved difficult for voluntary sector partners to establish themselves as equal players within these relationships, in part because they are neither democratically accountable nor the financially accountable body (NCVO 2000). However, the rationale behind the

creation of partnerships and the reasons for engaging the voluntary sector within them suggest that democratic and financial accountability alone have in the past proved insufficient in ensuring effective use of public money, especially in relation to outcomes for client groups and communities. The pressure to form partnerships and spend allocated funds within short time periods has often meant little time for partnerships to develop. As a result the establishment of sound governance arrangements, shared risk and clear lines of accountability can be overlooked (Glendinning 2002).

The aim of this paper is to address a number of questions:
· Who is accountable for what and to whom within cross-sectoral partnerships?
· How should these lines of accountability be established within partnerships?
· And how is accountability to be demonstrated?
Accountability mechanisms

The increasing complexity of the public sector operating environment has resulted in an increase in the number of regulators and inspectorates to which agencies have to report. As agencies come together some of these may be seen to overlap or conflict (Glendinning 2002).

Government has also introduce a range of targets and performance measurement frameworks (eg. local Public Service Agreements , best value) which are designed to demonstrate public sector accountability and drive performance improvement. Voluntary sector organisations themselves utilise a number of mechanisms (eg. codes good of practice, quality standards, social auditing) which help to demonstrate their own accountability and contribute to public trust and confidence.

Earlier research (NCVO 2000, 2002) suggests that where targets and evaluation measures, are imposed centrally (on partnerships or via contracts) they can limit the potential of the partnership to make the most of local expertise and to act in a way that is responsive to the needs of clients or communities. In other words they limit precisely the 'added value' that is so often stated as the driver behind the involvement of the voluntary sector.

It has been suggested that evaluation of voluntary sector activity needs to move away from narrow process measures of efficiency towards broader measures of effectiveness in terms of program outcomes and impact (Frumkin 2001, Kendall & Knapp 1999). This paper extends such arguments to focus on broader measures of effectiveness within cross-sectoral partnerships.

A framework for accountability

Having set out the context and rationale for the research, the paper goes on to develop a concept of accountability that is encapsulated in a number of different 'activities' :

· Being held to account – by stakeholders, or on their behalf, via sanctions or other methods of redress which enforce the right to effect change.

· Giving an account – providing stakeholders with an explanation or information to report what has taken place and the outcomes of that activity.

· Taking account - of stakeholder's needs and views and responding to these by examining and, if necessary, revising practices or enhancing performance.

Fundamental to this notion of accountability is the definition of a stakeholder, or group of stakeholders, to whom voluntary organisations are accountable. Voluntary organisations' stakeholders will include at the very least users/members, funders, Charity Commission and possibly the wider community. The legal, financial and governance structures of the organisation and its policies and practices in relation to its mission, vision and values (eg. client protocols, methods of user involvement and/or consultation) will combine a range of these activities.

The balance of activities required to demonstrate accountability to each of the organisation's

stakeholders will vary. Literature in this field has suggested that organisations operate within an 'accountability environment' which has to be 'negotiated'. This negotiation takes place between two types of 'pulls' experienced by organisations, 'downward' to their stated constituency or client group and 'upward' to their various funders and regulators (Ospina et al 2002). In partnerships there will also be horizontal or 'sideways' pulls between different partner agencies.
Accountability within partnerships

Each organisation within a partnership will have a different range of stakeholders and a different accountability environment. By coming together in partnership each partner will also be adding the other partners to their list of stakeholders. And somewhere amongst the many stakeholders of the combined partners will be the subset or sum who are the intended beneficiaries of the partnership's activity. Through a number of case studies, this paper builds up and then examines the webs of accountability of voluntary organisations engaged in partnerships from three different angles:

· The organisation's own accountability to its various stakeholders including those (organisations, groups or individuals) they seek to represent on the partnership and how this contributes to the partnership's representational accountability or legitimacy.
· The internal accountability that members of the partnership have to one another and to the partnership itself. This internal accountability is fundamental to the development of trust within the partnership which enables partners to discuss 'sensitive' or 'confidential' information which might potentially impact on the work of the partnership as a whole.
· The external accountability that the partnership has to central government, auditing and regulatory bodies and the electorate as a whole for the spending of public funds and in particular how the voluntary sector contributes to this.

The research adopts a qualitative, case study approach, and draws upon a range of data sources. These include formal documents, such as partnership plans, organisational plans, annual reports, and contracts, plus a series of interviews with voluntary organisations, their partners, and other stakeholders. Having first established the accountability environment of the voluntary sector (and other partners) the research then goes on to look at how these are (or indeed are not) negotiated by the partnership, and what impacts they have upon the effectiveness of voluntary organisations engaged in cross-sectoral partnerships. The aim is to generate a better understanding of how accountability issues are, or should be, tackled within cross-sectoral partnerships.

References:
ACEVO (2000) Charitable Trust? Social auditing with voluntary organisations
Barbaris, P. (1998) The New Public Management and a New Accountability, Public Administration (Autumn 1998)
Edwards, M. (2000) Participatory Governance into the Future: Roles of Government and the Community Sectors
Frumkin, P. (2001) Going beyond efficiency, Non-profit Quarterly, 8(2) pp.20-23
Glendinning, C. (2002) Partnerships between health and social services: developing a framework for evaluation, Policy & Politics Volume 30, p115-27
Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1997) Accountability in a Contracting State
Kendall, J. and Knapp, M. (1999) Measuring the Outcomes of Voluntary Organisation Activities
NCVO (2000) Co-operation, Participation and Complexity: Local Partnerships and Public Policy
NCVO (2001) Welfare to Work: a voluntary sector perspective
New Economics Foundation, Centre for Participation. Valued Voices: The Representativeness of Voluntary and Community Groups – Report for the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
Ospina et. al. (2002) Negotiating Accountability: Managerial Lessons From Identity-Based Nonprofit Organisations, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Volume 31, p. 5-31
Report by Lord Sharman of Redlynch (2001) Holding to Account: The Review of Audit and Accountability for Central Government
Unwin, J. and Westland, P. (2000) Health Action Zones – the engagement of the voluntary sector

Paper Number: PA021338

Paper Title: Volunteers in Government: An Analysis the Social and Economic Impact of Volunteers on Selected State Agencies in Texas

Author(s):

Dr. Sarah Jane Rehnborg, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Summary of Research

The public sector has historically utilized volunteers to extend the reach of government services, however little scholarly attention has been given to documenting the social and economic impact of this service, or to the identification of obstacles that impede the delivery of services through volunteers within state government. This study provides an in depth analysis of the social and economic impact of volunteers and national service participants in four state service/agencies (education, parks and wildlife, mental health/mental retardation and youth criminal justice.) Attention is given to the infrastructure requirement, obstacles encountered and service delivery outcomes.

Description

Through an interagency funding agreement with the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service, the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin will gather and analyze survey and focus group data to explore the social and economic impact of volunteers and national service projects on selected state government services within Texas State Government. Specially data will be collected from the Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife; the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation; the Texas Youth Commission and national service programs operating within K-12 public education.

Preliminary analysis of the volunteer workforce in these state agencies indicates that fully 15% of the FTE workforce at the Department of Parks and Wildlife is comprised of community members contributing their time to the 119 state parks in Texas. Documenting 836,287 hours of volunteer service in 2000, the Parks and Wildlife volunteerism director noted, "our parks right now could not function without our volunteer programs" yet the infrastructure necessary to secure this resource is rarely documented. A comparable story is told with the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. A comprehensive data collection system which gathers standardized information from the state's twenty-one state schools and hospitals revealed a volunteer contribution valued in excess of $2,740,688 for FY 2000. This study will gather this information, explore and quantify the infrastructure required to implement such programs and identify obstacles that impede service delivery.

The terms of this contract require a completed report to the Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service by August 31, 2002, a date that assures project completion prior to the deadlines established by ARNOVA

Paper Number: PA021375

Paper Title: Volunteering, the State and Democracy

Author(s):

Dr. Justin P Davis-Smith, Institute for Volunteering Research, London, UK

Summary of Research

An examination of the complex relationship between volunteering, the state and democracy, drawing upon both theoretical and empirical research. Seeks to address three inter-linked questions: Can volunteering exist outside the democratic process? Is volunteering an indicator of the level of democracy? And what is the legitimate role of the state in promoting volunteering? The paper will include data from a recent un-published evaluation of the International Year of Volunteers conducted by the author for the United Nations.

Description

This paper examines the complex relationship between volunteering the state and democracy, drawing upon both theoretical and empirical research. It seeks to address three inter-linked questions: Can volunteering exist outside the democratic process? Is volunteering an indicator of the level of democracy? And what is the legitimate role of the state in promoting volunteering?

The paper begins with an historical analysis of the state of volunteering under totalitarian regimes arguing that, despite the hostile political climate, independent voluntary activity did not completely disappear from the communist countries of eastern and central Europe during the Cold War era.

But voluntary action, in a different guise, can also be seen to have sustained the pro-democracy movements in those countries leading to the question of whether it is only certain forms of volunteering – those deemed to be hostile to the state – that find it hard to exist outside the democratic process? Drawing upon the experience of such countries as Spain and South Africa, the paper points to a paradox: certain forms of civic participation and political engagement seem to thrive better under conditions of tyranny.

Moreover, new research into the history of voluntary action in Inter-War Germany has raised the uncomfortable spectre that the relative strength of the non-profit sector may have had a role to play in sustaining and legitimising the rise to power of the National Socialists.

The second part of the paper attempts to place these historical analyses in the context of the theoretical debate about civil society and social capital. With public confidence in political institutions at an all-time low, volunteering may offer a way of re-engaging citizens with the broader political process.

Within this debate the paper looks at what if any is the legitimate role of the state in promoting volunteering. Drawing on new research undertaken by the author for the United Nations as part of a global evaluation of the 2001 International Year of Volunteers, the paper concludes that the state can play a valuable role in creating a favourable environment in which volunteering can flourish but can also damage volunteering by usurping its independence.

The paper concludes with a few tentative conclusions for governments, non-profit agencies and academics.

References
Berman, S. (1997), 'Civil society and the collapse of the Weimar Republic', World Politics, 49.
Dangor, Z. (1997), The non-profit sector in South Africa, Charities Aid Foundation.
Dekker, P., and Van den Broek, A., (1998), 'Civil society in comparative perspective: involvement in voluntary associations in North America and Western Europe', Voluntas, 9 (1) pp 11-39.
Encaracion, O. (2000), 'Tocqueville's missionaries: civil society, advocacy and the promotion of

democracy', World Policy Journal, 22 (1).

Habib, A., and Taylor, R. (1999), 'South Africa: anti-apartheid NGOs in transition', Voluntas, 10 (1), pp 73-82.

Rose, R. (1998), Getting things done in an anti-modern society: social capital networks in Russia, Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 6, The World Bank.

Paper Number: PA021486

Paper Title: The Acquisition of the Walker Telescope by the DeMiguel Elementary School in Flagstaff, Arizona: An Example of Voluntary Action in the Ancient Tradition of Amateur Astronomy

Author(s):

Dr. David E Mason, Mason Enterprises, Corpus Christi, TX, USA

Dr. Paul A Mason, New Mexico State University and University of Texas at El Paso, Las Cruces, NM, US

Summary of Research

This paper is a study of the three-year (1999-2002) voluntary action of an elementary school teacher and the community of Flagstaff, Arizona. They elicited the contribution of a telescope, purchase of a site, construction of a building, moving the 16" telescope to their school and equipping it with a modern solar filter system and computer. The effort included fifty volunteers and twenty-five organizations and corporations. This paper puts this activity in the context of thousands of years of volunteerism in astronomy.

Description

The voluntary sector has ignored some of its noblest brothers and sisters. Amateur astronomers have been among us since the dawn of civilization, but compared with welfare agencies and the church, they have been neglected in the literature. Much is known about voluntary activity in astronomy in the scientific literature, but almost nothing appears in the voluntary sector journals. We will attempt to start the ball rolling with this paper in the "language" that is familiar to ARNOVA members.

Kenneth Walker, an amateur astronomer living in Holbrook, Arizona, learned he had a terminal illness. His granddaughter, Kara Lee, wanted to make sure that his telescope was donated before her grandfather became too ill. As a result of a search, Kara called Mary Lara who was a schoolteacher in Flagstaff, ninety miles away. Mary said she would most definitely be interested in taking it if she could move the telescope to Flagstaff. She went to her principal, who was very enthusiastic and supportive, but told her she had no money to help her. She then spoke with the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction, Lee Hagerand. He, too, was very enthusiastic and supportive, but also told her she was on her own to make this happen.

Mary Lara relied upon advisers and she would get on the phone and call people and businesses and ask for donations and volunteers to do labor. Only one business said no during the whole project! She said, "It was so heartwarming to see our community rally around this project!" The process included choosing a site, getting the land, choosing architects, getting the money to pay the architects, building the structure, getting a flatbed truck, paying for the flatbed, and affixing the telescope into the observatory.

Mary Lara's third graders wrote letters to local businesses asking for donations so that they could purchase a CCD (charged coupled device – an image capturing device, much like a camera, only digital). With those donations and a grant they were able to purchase the CCD. Someone donated a computer to operate the CCD. Arizona Public Service (their local electric company) donated money to run fiber lines to the observatory for the computer.

The Observatory broke ground in February of 2000. From the very beginning of the project, until the ribbon cutting, it took three years to complete, but on October 19, 2001, they had their ribbon cutting. The mayor declared October 19, 2001 Kenneth Walker Observatory Day. Mary observed, "Then we went out to the observatory and looked through the telescope. It truly was a magical night!"

Astronomy is considered to be the oldest of the sciences. With the dawn of civilization came the need to plan the agricultural cycle, requiring the knowledge of the seasons obtained from careful astronomical observations. Interesting and unusual astronomical events were recorded in ways as varied as cave paintings to meticulous records kept by astronomer-priests. Those that could predict the seasonal flooding of rivers, changes in the duration of daylight, and eclipses, were indeed held in high regard.

Astronomy as a profession began when these, here to fore voluntary, observers were hired by rulers who could use this information to help control the populace. Eventually, they were expected to do more than just make observations. They were required to divine interpretation of them. For instance, the appearance of a comet might be an omen for a king or suggest that it was time to attack a neighboring society. Throughout history the voluntary actions of amateur astronomers and those that supported astronomy far preceded the desire for society as a whole to hire professional astronomers to provide this kind of information.

In Mesopotamia, the cradle of civilization, astronomers developed a lunar calendar and a system of mathematics, elements of which are still in use today. Where as, the Egyptians relied on the more agriculturally useful solar calendar. The Greeks added philosophy to astronomy. Thales described the universe as being composed of only four elements: air, earth, fire, and water. Ptolemy's geocentric model of the universe, with circular orbits and epicycles, was the prevailing paradigm for 1500 years until it was overthrown by the Copernican revolution. While the Greek astronomer Aristarcus, relied more on astronomical observations, proposed the sun-centered planetary system and correctly determined the relative sizes of the sun and moon. His observations were the result of voluntary action, while working as a military advisor. He won fame by blinding naval invaders with the sun using mirrors.

Modern astronomy begins with Copernicus, a 16th century Polish astronomer who proposed that the sun was in the center of the universe. The greatest technological advance in astronomy came with the invention of the telescope. Although Galileo did not invent the telescope, he is reported to be the first to use one for astronomical observations. His discovery of four moons of Jupiter, the phases of Venus, and sunspots formed the evidence supporting the Copernican view. The Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe was a professional astronomer in the modern sense. His father saved the life of the Danish king. As a reward, Brahe was given a substantial stipend and had an observatory built from which he made many important observations. The Chec astronomer Kepler later used Tycho's observations of Mars to formulate laws of planetary motion. Kepler worked as an astrologer, calculating horoscopes, and solving mathematical problems such as the determination of the volume of wine barrels. Kepler's astronomical work was primarily voluntary action. In the 17th century, Newton's laws of motion and universal gravitation ushered in a new era for voluntary action in astronomy. The British astronomer Halley convinced Newton to apply his theory of gravity to explain the periodic return of a comet, now known as Halley's comet, seen for hundreds of years. Amateur astronomers, including Charles Messier and John Bevis, raced to be the first to observe the predicted return of Halley's comet.

As far as telescopes go, bigger is better and astronomical discoveries were made by those who could afford the biggest telescopes. Astronomers such as William Herschel, a musician and discoverer of Uranus, and Lord Rosse who discovered the spiral nature of galaxies, built the largest telescopes in the world in the 18th and 19th centuries. The American astronomer Percival Lowell founded a not-for-profit institution called Lowell Observatory near Flagstaff, Arizona. His support funded the discovery of Pluto, by Clyde Tombaugh, in 1930.

The modern system of governmental funding of research through universities and government laboratories is a relatively new phenomenon. Historically, most of the progress in astronomy has been made by those willing to perform voluntary action or by philanthropists supporting the work of others for the sake of science. Today, amateur astronomers contribute to the progress of science in those fields for which the number of dedicated observers is more important than the sophistication of equipment, since there are far more amateur astronomers than professionals. High-tech equipment such as charged-coupled device (CCD) cameras are accessible to amateur astronomers. Observations of variable stars, the discovery of novae and supernovae, and the discovery of comets are the rewards of the voluntary astronomy workforce. The actions of those who made possible the donation of the Walker telescope to the DeMiguel Elementary School should be commended for continuing the rich tradition of volunteerism in astronomy.

Author(s):

Ms. Nancy Macduff, Macduff/Bunt Associates, Washington State University, Walla Walla, WA, USA

Dr. F. Ellen Netting, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

Nancy Gaston, Gifts Differing, Vancouver, WA, USA

Summary of Research

There is ample literature on the organization and management of volunteers programs in secular agencies or programs. However, the strategies for managing volunteers in the faith-based group are rarely studied. This paper examines research on three areas of managing volunteers most likely to impact the efficacy of faith-based programs.

Description

Key Words: Volunteerism, Volunteer Management, Congregations, Faith-based, Motivation, Accountability

Managing Volunteers: The Faith-Based Wild Card
Nancy Macduff, Dr. Ellen Netting, Nancy Gaston
The Issue To Be Addressed

Most members of religious congregations can be identified as volunteers. In fact, clergy, staff and leadership volunteers are "volunteer managers." Theirs is an associational structure in which people come to the congregation as members, donate to both operational and mission causes, and assume administrative or supportive roles within their local congregations. Paid staff, if they are available, manage numerous volunteers who perform roles on a weekly, even daily, basis.

As political agendas have moved further into devolution, localizing social services in community-based programs has become an accelerating part of the process. Given the internal and external nature of volunteering by members of religious congregations, it is important to explore the fundamentals of operating a program with volunteers as the work force. Does managing religious volunteer work differ from secular volunteer management? And does the use of volunteers to deliver services change the nature and identify of a congregation? This is especially germane when faith-based organizations are viewed as resources by external organizations, which believe they have a "value-added" element that traditional providers do not have.
Topic In Relation To the State of Knowledge in the Field

There is ample literature on the organization and management of volunteer programs in secular nonprofit and governmental agencies or programs. However, the strategies for organizing and managing volunteers in the faith-based group, like churches, synagogues, mosques, and the like is rarely studied. (Wilson, 1983) There are studies on the delivery of service to seniors, as an example, by religious congregations (e.g. Kimble, McFadden, Ellor, & Seeber, 1995; Tobin, Ellor, & Anderson-Ray, 1986). Only recently has social service volunteering through congregational auspices been studied in-depth.

Practitioner literature (Connors, 2001; Ellis 1994; Macduff 1996; McCurley, 1998; Vineyard, 1999) abounds with information on how to organize and manage a volunteer program. There are managerial and recognition strategies that work especially well with volunteers, especially in secular organizations. Today the average volunteer is likely to encounter paper work, criminal record background checks, and interviews before he/she is cleared to volunteer. This is hardly the norm in faith-based congregations.
The Approach

Given these trends it is only natural that the strategies so prevalent in the secular world will eventually

migrate to that of the faith-based congregation. This paper examines three areas of managing volunteers most likely to impact the efficacy of faith-based volunteer programs: (1) the types of volunteer positions for which volunteers seem suited (the tasks or jobs available); (2) what motivates those in faith-based congregations to volunteers in the first place; and (3) accountability to an array of stakeholders inside and outside the faith-based congregation. Each of these factors will be considered in light of what is known about effective volunteer management on the one hand and faith-based organizations on the other.

Research on faith-based communities shows a consistent value of putting faith into action that dictates the types of jobs or tasks volunteers from religious institutions are willing to tackle. (Schneider), 1999; Harris, 1994; Wineberg, 2001) Personal motivations of volunteers from religious organizations impact everything from the choice of task or job they will do to their ongoing relationship with the institution. (Black & Jirovic, 1999); Harris, 1998) The issue of accountability to stake holders may be driven by new sources of funding (i.e., the US government) and ranges from clarity about roles for the volunteers to infrastructures that include such things as personal interviews, applications from each person, and criminal record background checks. In many cases faith-based volunteers indicate these are not used or desired in their setting (Harris, 1995, Schneider, 1999).

Contribution to the Field

The current debate surrounding faith-based volunteer programs cries out for reliable information on how "managing" a program might influence the capacity of organizations to attract faith based volunteers. It also can provide a road map for congregations who are considering the "leap" into a social service program (homeless out reach, soup-kitchen, etc.). This paper can also give researchers the foundation from which studies of greater depth might begin.

References

Black, B. & Jirovic, R.L. (1999) Age Differences in Volunteer Participation The Journal of Volunteer Administration XVII (2), 38-47.

Connors, Tracy (ED.) (2001) The Nonprofit Handbook (3rd Ed.) New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ellis, Susan (1994) The Volunteer Recruitment Book. Philadelphia, PA ENERGIZE, Inc.

Harris, Margaret. (1994). Care by Congregation, Working Paper 15, London, England, Centre for Voluntary Organisations at the London School of Economics.

Harris, Margaret. (1995). The Church is the People, Working Paper 16, London, England, Centre for Voluntary Organisations at the London School of Economics.

Harris, Margaret. (1998). Organizing God's Work. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press

Macduff, Nancy (1996). Volunteer Recruiting and Retention: A Marketing Approach, (2nd ed.) Walla Walla, WA, MBA Publishing,

McCurley, Steve (1998) Essential Volunteer Management (2nd ed.) London, England, Directory of Social Change

Schneider, J. (1999) Trusting That of God in Everyone, Nonprofit and Volunteer Center Quarterly, 28 (3) 269-295

Seeber, J.J. (1995) Congregational Models. In Kimble, M.A., McFadden, S. H., Ellor, J.W., & Seeber J.J. (Eds.) (1995) Aging, Spirituality, and Religion: A Handbook, pp.253-269. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press

Tobin, S.S., Ellor, J.W., & Anderson-Ray, S.M. (1986) Enabling the Elderly: Religious Institutions Within

the Community Service System. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vineyard, Sue, (1999), Marketing for Volunteer Managers. Washington, DC: the Points of Light Foundation

Wineberg, Robert. (2001) A Limited Partnership. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Paper Number: PA021188

Paper Title: Should We Rely on Philanthropy to Meet Basic Social Welfare Needs?

Author(s):

 Ms. Angela M. Eikenberry, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE, USA

Summary of Research

The inherent beneficial value of philanthropy is often assumed. Yet, at a time when the United States increasingly relies on philanthropy to meet basic needs, it is essential to question what has been taken for granted. Is it viable to rely on philanthropy to meet welfare needs? Is it democratically and ethically valid to rely on philanthropy to meet these needs? These questions are addressed through an analysis of existing scholarly literature.

Description

Issues, Approach and Contribution

The current literature on philanthropy generally falls into one of two categories. It either celebrates the "good works" of philanthropic voluntarism in American society or imparts ways in which philanthropic organizations can improve their efficiency and accountability to provide more of this goodness. The inherent beneficial value of philanthropy is often assumed. Yet, at a time when the United States increasingly relies on philanthropy to meet basic human needs, it is essential to question what has frequently been taken for granted. Is it viable to rely on philanthropy and philanthropic organizations to meet basic social welfare needs? Is it democratically and ethically valid to rely on philanthropy to meet these needs? This paper addresses these questions through an analysis of existing scholarly literature. The major conclusion is that we cannot and should not rely upon philanthropy as the sole means for meeting basic social welfare needs. This analysis is a first step for further research that critically challenges assumptions within the field and may serve as a catalyst for increased dialogue among scholars and practitioners about these assumptions.

Relation to State of Knowledge

The United States increasingly relies on philanthropy to meet basic human needs. These are needs that, at a minimum, must be met for personal survival. They certainly must be met for people to develop their potential richly and fully (Addams, 1902). Are philanthropic organizations up to the task? More to the point, who benefits from philanthropy? In recent decades, it has been observed that philanthropy and philanthropic organizations do not redistribute resources or tend to the basic needs of the poor to the degree previously assumed (Clotfelter, 1992; Odendahl, 1990; Ostrower 1995; Salamon, 1993; Wolpert, 1994).

Even in cases where a charitable "cause" enjoys popularity among donors and organizations provide needed services, there are difficulties associated with meeting the basic needs. Take for example the emergency food relief system, considered by many to be a "success" in helping the poor with basic survival needs.   Even with widespread support, there are problems with the system, which are also found in many social service arenas that depend on philanthropic voluntarism. According to May (2000), voluntarism is parochial, episodic, and "too dependent upon the moral imagination of its affluent members" (p. xx). It also has the vice of "inconstancy" because philanthropists usually only give out of surplus and out of a doctrine of "love without ties" (May, 2000, p. xxii). For emergency food programs, these traits lead to difficulties such as: insufficient quantity and quality of food, inadequate nutritional value of donated food, and problems with accessibility (Poppendieck, 1998).

On a practical level, evidence suggests we should not rely primarily on philanthropy to meet basic social welfare needs. Yet, reliance on philanthropy continues. Why? Perhaps the very existence of a philanthropic sector, perceived by many to provide needed services and solve societal problems, deters the sector from actually providing the most needed services and solving underlying problems.

Poppendieck (1998) provides excellent support for this assertion. She finds deteriorating economic security and accelerating inequality as the underlying problem of food relief in the United States. The solution to these problems requires major social and economic change; yet, the sum of giving and volunteering in the emergency food system reduces the pressure for such fundamental change. In addition, it is difficult to address the underlying problems of economic insecurity and poverty even if advocates and philanthropic organizations wanted to do so. Their dependence on philanthropic support often keeps them from implementing social change. Donors, especially major donors such as foundations and corporations, generally do not have policies that seek to create social change or alter the status quo (Brilliant, 2000; Eisenberg, 1997; Nielsen, 1972; Odendahl, 1990).

Even if philanthropists and philanthropic organizations provided adequate support to those in need and advocated for social change, would Americans want these groups to decide which programs exist, in what direction social change should take place, and who should benefit from these? Philanthropic organizations are viewed by some as undemocratic because they are seen as vehicles through which individuals and groups can bypass government and the scrutiny of the people (Odendahl, 1990; Wagner, 2000). Elite philanthropic foundations have historically been criticized in the United States for their undemocratic nature and use of assets to bring about change in their own interest (Brilliant, 2000; Nielsen, 1972). More recently, scholars have observed the hegemonic control asserted by foundations and corporations through philanthropy (Arnove, 1980; Fisher, 1983, Roelofs 1984-1985, Roelofs 1995).

On the level of ethics, do we want to create and perpetuate a society of benefactors and beneficiaries? Perhaps the fundamental problem with relying on philanthropy is the indignity and "us versus them" dichotomy it creates (May, 2000, p. xxv). When the social world becomes divided into givers and receivers, "haves' and "have-nots," a conceit or moral superiority is encouraged among the benefactors and a feeling of demeaning inferiority among the beneficiaries (Menninger, 2000). This "inhibits direct, aggressive action by poor people on their own behalf, which is essential to the initiation of political reform" (Katz, 1989, p. 194). If the homeless organize and make demands, they lose appeal as a charitable cause. Furthermore, scholars like Jane Addams believe relying on philanthropy serves to erode "the cultural prerequisites for a vigorous democracy [because] we become a society of givers and receivers, rather than a commonwealth of fellow citizens" (Poppendieck, 1998, p. 255).

References

Addams, J. (1902). Democracy and social ethics. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Arnove, R. F. (1980). Introduction. In R. F. Arnove (Ed.), Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad (pp. 1-24). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Brilliant, E. L. (2000). Private charity and public inquiry: A history of the Filer and Peterson Commissions. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Clotfelter, C. T. (1992). The distributional consequences of nonprofit activities. In C. T. Clotfelter (Ed.), Who benefits from the nonprofit sector? (pp. 1-23). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Eisenberg, P. (1997). A crisis in the nonprofit sector. National Civic Review, 86(4), 331-341. Retrieved December 10, 2001, from EBSCO database (Academic Search Elite) on the World Wide Web: http://www.ebsco.com

Fisher, D. (1983). The role of philanthropic foundations in the reproduction and production of hegemony. Sociology, 17, 206-233.

Katz, M. B. (1989). The undeserving poor, from the war on poverty to the war on welfare. New York: Pantheon Books.

May, W. F. (2000). Introduction. In W. F. May & A. L. Soens, Jr. (Eds.), The ethics of giving and

receiving, am I my foolish brother's keeper? (pp. xvii-x1). Dallas: The Cary M. Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility and Southern Methodist University Press.

Menninger, R. W. (2000). Observations on the psychology of giving and receiving money. In W. F. May & A. L. Soens, Jr. (Eds.), The ethics of giving and receiving, am I my foolish brother's keeper? (pp. 202-215). Dallas: The Cary M. Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility and Southern Methodist University Press.

Nielsen, W. A. (1972). The big foundations. New York: Columbia University Press.

Odendahl, T. (1990). Charity begins at home: Generosity and self-interest among the philanthropic elite. New York: Basic Books.

Ostrower, F. (1995). Why the wealthy give: The culture of elite philanthropy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Poppendieck, J. (1998). Sweet charity? Emergency food and the end of entitlement. New York: Penguin.

Roelofs, J. (1984-85). Foundations and the Supreme Court. Telos, 17(4), 59-87.

Roelofs, J. (1995). The third sector as a protective layer for capitalism. Monthly Review, 47(4), 16-25. Retrieved December 10, 2001, from EBSCO database (Academic Search Elite) on the World Wide Web: http://www.ebsco.com

Salamon, L. M. (1992). Social services. In C. T. Clotfelter (Ed.), Who benefits from the nonprofit sector? (pp. 134-173). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Wagner, D. (2000). What's love got to do with it? A critical look at American charity. New York: New York Press.

Wolpert, J. (1994, Spring). The structure of generosity in America. Working Paper Series. Nonprofit Sector Research Fund. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Paper Number: PA021335

Paper Title: Donors and Short-term Grants: Bridging the Sustainability Problem

Author(s):

 Ms. Beth Gazley, University of Georgia, Dahlonega, GA, USA
 Dr. Jeffrey Brudney, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

Summary of Research

Little direct empirical research exists on the impact of short-term grants on nonprofit performance. Although short-term grants help to expand services and test new ideas, they also contribute to revenue instability. This paper reports on a random survey of 100 private foundations and federal agencies to examine the extent to which donors engage in the conventional practice of time-limited grant-making. The survey assesses their perception of benefits, risks, and the value they place on long-term nonprofit health; how internal or external policies constrain funding commitments, and the scope of activities that help recipients to build long-term sustainability.

Description

   It is a common practice among both government agencies and foundations to restrict a portion of their grants to short-term funding, typically limited to between one and five years. When this kind of funding is used to initiate or expand programs, or to establish the feasibility of a new project, it is known as a "pilot," "seed," or "demonstration" grant (White, 1975). Aside from a few internal foundation evaluations, little, if any, empirical research has been conducted to analyze the relative success of short-term grants as vehicles for investment in promising new initiatives (Kroll, 2001; Prager, 2001). Short-term funding is included only by inference in discussions about nonprofit financial vulnerability (Tuckman and Chang, 1991). Grantors and grantees have only recently acknowledged that funding strategies in themselves deserve critical assessment (Wickizer, 1998; Lake; 2000; Carson, 2000). Thus, short-term grants appear to continue in nonprofit use because they are traditional rather than empirically proven practices. Since research on this subject is weak compared with how helpful it might be to considerations of nonprofit performance, this area of study has great relevance to ARNOVA's 2002 conference focus on organizational accountability.

   What attention has been given to this area suggests that although short-term grants provide obvious benefits to nonprofits in helping to expand service areas and test new ideas, they may also be problematic, contribute to revenue instability and fail to support long-term goals (Froelich, 1999; Gronbjerg, 1993). According to the staff of one foundation, "the widespread practice of supporting … initiatives through short-term grants almost guarantees programmatic and organizational instability and works counter to the goal of institutionalizing … programs and activities" (Wickizer et al, 1998). Another foundation executive states, "there is a growing recognition that the traditional three-year grant-making cycle cannot adequately support the longer life cycles of system reform movements, and will have to be extended. …Sustainability is a key area of expertise that may need to be available … as a new impact service. Such a service could help … build exit strategies early on – a glaring deficit in foundation planning nationally" (Lake, 2000).

   Despite the willingness of a few foundations to attempt new strategies to help nonprofits sustain initiatives, the available literature suggests that such efforts are still relatively rare. The process by which donors evaluate programs has been described as a mix of the "rational" and "political," where on average, donors appear to pay relatively little attention to outcomes (Gronbjerg, 2000; Tassie, 1996; Tassie, 1998). Somewhat alarmingly, those private donors who do not believe that any grant monitoring is necessary cite the fact that the grant is non-renewable as one reason for less attention to outcomes (Clarke and Ashford, 1996). Although some donors profess an interest in "stability," a disconnect may occur between program goals and the specific strategies that donors use to achieve them (for example, by not tying processes to outcomes) (Tassie, 1998). Apparently, not yet measured is the importance

donors give to supporting the continuation of a successful project, and how this ties into evaluation considerations.

Beyond the limited internal evaluations cited above, the scholarship is frustratingly blank on several key questions: the extent to which donors engage in the convention of time-limited grant-making, their frequency and duration, the extent to which they share an understanding of the perceived benefits and risks of short-term grants, the value they place on long-term program health beyond their own funding commitment; the perceived impact of internal or external policies (e.g., federal statutes, program shifts, trustee preferences) on their ability to make long-term funding commitments, and whether (and how) they have adjusted their policies to help recipients build "exit strategies."

This paper will analyze the results of a random sample survey of approximately 100 private foundations and federal agencies engaged in competitive demonstration grants. Using regression analysis, approximately 45 variables will be compared according to measures of grant-maker perception, grant policies and practices, and organizational dimensions such as size, public or private authority, and grant characteristics. The study will examine (a) the extent to which the practice of short-term grant-making continues in public and private grant-making institutions, (b) whether grant-makers report a change in their rate of use; and (c) what reasons public and private grant-makers give for continuing the practice of short-term grant-making (e.g., what perceived benefits they identify). The final and key area of study will examine (d) the roles grant-makers have been willing to assume to help recipients continue programs beyond the initial funding source. Activities that expand on the traditional grant-maker role and involve new models of grant-making will be examined, including: more stringent requirements on applicants to provide matching funds or to develop "exit strategies;" willingness to assist grant recipients in financing various "exit strategies"; assistance with other forms of capacity-building such as training; more willingness to provide indirect support to grant recipients by paying for overhead, evaluation or collaborative efforts; willingness to extend a time-limited grant beyond its initial funding period; and willingness to abandon time-limited grants altogether (e.g., the "venture capitalist" model) (Backer, 1995; Lake, 2000; Wickizer, 1998; Barbeito, 1999; Leat, 1995; Letts, Ryan and Grossman, 1999; Young, 1993; Easterling, 2000; Forbes, 1998; Tassie, 1998).

Much research has been conducted in recent years to understand how organizational effectiveness is shaped by internal or external circumstances. Those who have conducted research in the area of nonprofit resource acquisition present a strong case for approaching the issue of grant sustainability from the perspective of both donors and grant recipients. On the donor side, new models of grant-making deserve further attention, and some may require substantial changes in the donor/recipient relationship. This paper will contribute to our understanding of how donor perceptions regarding these new models vary, the conditions under which donors operate and their implications for nonprofit sustainability.

Backer, T.E. (1995). Dissemination & utilization strategies for foundations: adding value to grantmaking. Kansas City: The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

Barbeito, C. (1999). Access to management assistance in the United States. A research report of the applied research & development international (ARDI). Used with permission of the author.

Carson, E.D. (2000). On foundations and outcome evaluation. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2000, 479-481.

Clarke, J. & Ashford, K. (1996). Grant monitoring by charities: the process of grant-making and evaluation. Voluntas,7:3, 279-299.

Easterling, D. (2000). Using outcome evaluation to guide grant making. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 29, no. 3, September 2000, 482-486.

Forbes, Daniel P. (1998). Measuring the unmeasurable: empirical studies of nonprofit organization effectiveness from 1977 to 1997.   Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 27, no. 2, June 1998,

183-202.

Froelich, K. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 28, no. 3, September 1999, 246-268.

Gronbjerg, K. (1993). Understanding nonprofit funding. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kettner, P.M. (1999). Designing and managing programs: an effectiveness-based approach. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kroll, J. (2001). From a communication by e-mail 1/23/01 with Judith Kroll, Director of Research at the Council on Foundations.

Lake, K., Reis, T., Spann, J. (2000). From grant making to change making: how the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's impact services model evolved to enhance the management and social effects of large initiatives. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 29, no. 1, Supplement 2000, 41-68.

Leat, D. (1995). British foundations: the organisation and management of grant-making. Voluntas, 6:3, 317-329.

Letts, C., Ryan, W. & Grossman, A. (1999). High performance nonprofit organizations: managing upstream for greater impact. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Netting, F.E. and Williams, F.G. (1997). Is there an afterlife? How nonprofits move toward self-sufficiency as foundation dollars end. Nonprofit Management & Leadership, Vol. 7, No. 3, Spring 1997, 291-304.

Prager, J. (2001). How U.K. grantmaking foundations that seek to influence policy evaluate success. Unpublished manuscript used with permission of the author.

Tassie, B.; Murray, V. & Cutt, J. (1998). Evaluating social service agencies: fuzzy pictures of organizational effectiveness. Voluntas, vol. 9, no. 1, 59-79.

Tassie, B.; Murray, V. et al. (1996). Rationality and politics: what really goes on when funders evaluate the performance of fundees? Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 25, no. 3, September 1996, 347-363.

Tuckman, H.P. & Chang, C.F. (1991). A methodology for measuring the financial vulnerability of charitable nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 20, no. 4, Winter 1991, 445-460.

White, V. (1975). Grants. New York: Plenum.

Wickizer, T., Wagner, E., Cheadle, A. et al. (1998). Implementation of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation's community health promotion grant program: a process evaluation. The Milbank Quarterly, vol. 76, no. 1, 121-147.

Young, D., Hollister, R., Hodgkinson, V. (Ed.). (1993). Governing, leading, and managing nonprofit organizations: new insights from research and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paper Number: PA021561

Paper Title: Financial Security, Financial Planning, and Financial Care: The Effect of New Forms of Financial Planning on Charitable Giving by the Wealthy

Author(s):

Professor Paul G. Schervish, Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Mr. John J. Havens, Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Ms. Mary A. O'Herlihy, Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Relatively new approaches to financial planning for wealth holders are being developed that help them identify financial security at a more realistic (and lower) material level and that highlight the opportunities and advantages of charitable giving. In this paper we present the findings from our research on the nature and impact of these new approaches. We expect that the findings will show that we may be on the cusp of a major shift by the very wealthy from trying to maximize gifts to heirs and from focusing on charitable bequests to a growth instead in inter-vivos charitable giving.

Description

Research Background

According to the Survey of Consumer Finances for 1998, a large and disproportionate share of charitable giving (more than 40%) and a large and disproportionate share of transfers to friends and relatives (more than 35%) is contributed by less than 5% of the families with net worth of $1 million or more (see Schervish and Havens, 2001). Since this relatively small fraction of wealth holders makes such a large fraction of charitable contributions and interpersonal transfers, they deserve special attention. One important economic factor is that this group tends to have redundant financial resources (income and net worth) in the sense that they can meet their material needs, fully furnish themselves with their desired standard of living, and still have financial resources remaining (See Havens and Schervish, 1999). Hence, they have the ability to make inter-vivos charitable contributions and inter-personal transfers as well as plan bequests to heirs and charity without reducing other consumption expenditures or precautionary savings. This ability is different from most of the population who are constrained by their income and wealth and whose primary financial goal is to attain a higher standard of living. For the majority of families, charitable contributions and inter-personal transfers come at the expense of some foregone consumption or foregone precautionary savings (see Murphy, 2001; Schervish and Havens forthcoming).

Not only is there statistical evidence that the very wealthy are willingly shifting gifts from their children toward charity. There is also evidence that there are new financial planning approaches that enable and encourage them to do so. The wealthiest individuals have always availed themselves of financial planners and advisors. Relatively new approaches to financial planning among the wealthy are being developed that help wealth holders identify financial security at a more realistic (and lower) material level and highlight the opportunities and advantages of charitable giving. In this paper we present the findings from our research on the nature and impact of these new approaches. We expect that the findings will show that we may be on the cusp of a major shift by the very wealthy from trying to maximize gifts to heirs and from focusing on charitable bequests to a growth instead in inter-vivos charitable giving.

The New Physics of Philanthropy and New Forms of Financial Planning

Over the past ten years a new emphasis on planned giving has coincided with new methods of financial planning that more actively generate charitable giving by wealth holders. More wealth holders are achieving financial security at younger and younger ages and are inclined to contribute substantial portions of their wealth during their life-times rather than waiting to make gifts from their wealth at their

death in the form of charitable bequests. Our research over this period has found that part of what has spurred on this process is the recognition by wealth holders that they have more wealth than they need to support the standard of living they desire for themselves, and accompanying this is the desire of these wealth holders to embed deeper meaning and happiness in their life by allocating their wealth to meet the needs of the people and causes with which they identify. We view this new terrain of wealth and philanthropy as bringing into play several identifiable forces affecting wealth holders that are changing the supply-side or donor-side of philanthropy so as constitute what we call the new physics of philanthropy. The new physics entails an innovative way of thinking, feeling, and acting in regard to philanthropy. In the new physics, wealth holders seek out rather than resist greater charitable involvement, approach their philanthropy with an entrepreneurial disposition, and make philanthropy a key ingredient of the financial morality they observe and impart to their children (cite New Physics 1 and 2).

Up to this point in our research we have identified those vectors of the new physics having to do with wealth and financial security, on the one hand, and motivation and purpose, on the other. However, we believe that a discernment process of financial planning is emerging as a complementary, intermediate variable that further advances the positive relationship between wealth and philanthropy. In addition to the direct effects of material wealth and motivations is the intermediate variable of new forms of financial planning. These new approaches are encouraging wealth holders to devote greater amounts of wealth to charity, at an earlier point in their life, in a way that involves their children, and through the various planned giving vehicles by which wealth holders allocate gifts to charities in their life-time in view of their potential estate (see Fithian, 2000). Increasingly, due to such discernment methods of self-reflective decision making, planned giving has become more than merely a technical financial arrangement, but a process of life-planning as well. In this comprehensive planned-giving process, individuals identify their life-time stream of financial resources, a stream of desired expenditures for themselves and their children, and a strategy for allocating to charity the resources that exceed their anticipated expenditures. The result of this process is to advance the philanthropic inclination of donors by making the amounts and purposes of philanthropic gifts more likely to be: self-determined and self-directed; chosen in an environment of liberty and inspiration; conducted with an entrepreneurial disposition; and designed to incorporate children and other heirs.

Overview of the Paper

The purpose of the research on which we will base our proposed paper is to investigate just what the new directions in financial planning are, how they are changing the decision-making process by which wealth holders choose their philanthropic practices, and how this affects the amount, timing, topics, methods, and family partnerships of their philanthropy. In short, we explore whether and in what ways the new directions in financial planning, planned giving, and fundraising are leading to more self-chosen, more informed, more highly motivated, and more highly endowed charitable giving (see National Committee on Planned Giving, 2001).

In the first section of the paper, we summarize the financial and motivational vectors that we have already found to be forces that generate charitable giving by wealth holders. In the second section we discuss the meaning of planned giving as both a biographical and a charitable event. Technical planning around the amounts, timing, and vehicles of charitable giving is becoming simultaneously a more fundamental set of decisions for the broader plans wealth holders have about the prospects and purposes of their lives. In the third section, we review the new methods of financial planning that help wealth holders plan their financial future as a biographical and philanthropic legacy and not just an economic one. We discuss how these new methods enable wealth holders to discover earlier in life, at lower levels of wealth, with greater confidence, and clearer philanthropic purpose how much and for what purposes to deploy their wealth.

In the fourth section we present the data sources and empirical findings of our research on the effects of the new forms of planned giving on how wealth holders allocate their wealth. We will base our findings a set of approximately 100 actual estate plans of millionaires who have used the new forms of financial

planning to determine their objectives. The plans are being provided by financial planners who have received permission from their clients to give us the   financial data and statements of personal objectives we need for this research.   The findings will enable us to provide the first systematic look at the decision-making dynamics by which people plan their planned giving, and how the new planning methods affect financial and personal decisions. We will also examine the relative portions wealth holders allocate to family, taxes, and charity; the rationale for those choices; and how, in general, the new methods of financial planning galvanize the supply-side effects we have previously analyzed.

In the conclusion, we discuss the implications of our findings for theory, the measurement of charitable giving, and fundraising practice.   First, we discuss the theoretical implication that the positive potential of new forms of financial planning and planned giving are to be understood as supply-side interventions that assist wealth holders in discerning rather than being told their financial potential and purposes. Second, we discuss how the increased use of planned-giving vehicles makes it imperative to construct a composite measure charitable giving that takes into account the reality that it is no longer possible to neatly divide charitable transfers into the categories of inter-vivos giving and charitable bequests. Life-time and estate giving, both in timing and amount, are increasingly carried out in the light of each other, for example, charitable remainder trusts. Such a new measure would be particularly useful in studies of wealth transfer where the interest is to measure total transfers to charity, taxes, and heirs and not just those made via estates.   Finally, we examine whether and in what ways such planning methods make wealth holders more inclined to transfer larger proportions of their wealth to charity and away from taxes and heirs, and, if (as we expect) they do, what this implies for how fundraisers craft their work with wealth holders.

References

Fithian, Scott C. Values-based estate planning: A step-by-step approach to wealth transfer for professional advisors, Wiley, New York, 2000.

Havens, John. J, and Schervish, Paul G. "Millionaires and the Millennium: The Forthcoming Transfer of Wealth and the Prospects for a Golden Age of Philanthropy," Report, Boston College Social Welfare Research Institute, October 1999.

Murphy, Thomas B., "Financial and Psychological Determinants of Donor's Capacity to Give." In New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising. Understanding the Needs of Donors: The Supply-Side of Charitable Giving. Edited by Eugene R. Tempel and Dwight F. Burlingame. Number 28, fall 2001, pp.33-49.

National Committee on Planned Giving. Planned Giving in the United States 2000: A Survey of Donors. Indianapolis, IN, 2001. http://www.ncpg.org/surveydonors.html

Schervish, Paul G. and John J. Havens. "The New Physics of Philanthropy: The Supply-Side Vectors of Charitable Giving. Part 1: The Material Side of the Supply Side." The CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement, vol 2, no. 2 November 2001, pp. 95-113.

Schervish, Paul G., and John J. Havens. "The New Physics of Philanthropy: The Supply-Side Vectors of Charitable Giving—Part 2: The Spiritual Side of the Supply Side." Forthcoming, 2002, The CASE International Journal of Higher Education Advancement.

Paper Number: PA021242

Paper Title: Accountability Issues in Crisis Giving

Author(s):

Dr. Louella Moore, Arkansas State University, State University, AR, USA

Summary of Research

With today's technology the initial surge of donations after a major crisis can tax the organizational structure of nonprofit organizations and raise different accountability issues than those in traditional charitable campaigns. This paper will examine issues faced by the American Red Cross after 9-11 and the 1998 Westside [Arkansas School Shooting] Crisis Fund to build a tentative theory of differences in crisis donors' expectations of accountability compared to those of traditional donors.

Description

KEY WORDS: Crisis donations, public relations, accountability

Crisis giving is emotion driven. Major crises such as school shootings and terrorist attacks leave the public feeling insecure and they want to do something to make a difference now. Modern technology allows donors an opportunity to respond more quickly than ever before. Rapid telecommunications get the problem out to the public on a real-time basis.   Web-based donation systems may exist already or can be placed on line very quickly. Use of credit cards means that donation patterns can surge dramatically for affected nonprofits. While modern technology speeds up the donation process,   it still takes time to respond to the crisis, particularly where existing response systems have to be modified, victims' identities are unclear, or the family's needs are subject to interpretation. Yet emotion driven donors may have high expectations that response time will be as rapid as their donations. How do nonprofits manage the accountability issues and public relations problems in such a crisis environment?

Even the Red Cross, which is accustomed to responding to crises, found its organizational structures severely taxed in dealing with the monetary and blood bank donations following the 9-11 crisis. Westside School district, on the other hand, had no general systems in place to deal with surges of donations after a crisis and had to develop a management structure from the ground up. This paper will compare the donor psychology and accountability issues that had to be faced by the two organizations. The analysis of the Red Cross issues will be primarily from print sources. The Westside School analysis will come primarily from transcripts of the fund coordinating committee meetings. The paper will compare the types of issues faced by the two organizations in order to synthesize conceptual issues that must be addressed by both large crisis-oriented organizations and by smaller nonprofits drawn into a crisis situation.

The classic economic literature on motives for giving emphasizes tax benefits, prestige, signalling, and altruism. These do not appear to be the primary reasons underlying crisis giving. Further, the issues in crisis donation situations are directly impacted by technology that did not exist on a wide scale ten years ago. In comparing the two cases, the paper will be a first step in formulating practical guidance and new theory that explains the crisis donation psychology and accompanying accountability expectations.

A Short List of Classic Literature that May Need to Be Modified Based on New Evidence from Crisis Donation Situations

Fisher, F. M. (September 1977). On Donor Sovereignty and United Charities. THE   AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW, Vol. 67(4), pp. 632-638.

Glazer, A., & K. Konrad. (September 1996). A Signaling Explanation for Charity. THE   AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW, Vol. 86(4), pp. 1019-1028.

Harbaugh, W. T. (May 1988). The Prestige Motive for Making Charitable Transfers. THE   AMERICAN
ECONOMIC REVIEW, Vol. 88(2), pp. 277-   282.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (June 1996). Altruism, Nonprofits, and Economic Theory. JOURNAL OF
  ECONOMIC LITERATURE. Vol. 34(2), pp. 701-728.

Schwartz, R. A. (November-December 1970). Personal Philanthropic Contributions. THE   JOURNAL
OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. Vol. 78(6), pp. 1264-1291.

Paper Number: PA021304

Paper Title: The Impact of the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, on Nonprofit Fundraising

Author(s):

Dr. Karen King, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Summary of Research
The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon prompted an outpouring of donations for victims and their families that exceeds $900 million, and is still growing. But, as relief money pours in, some charities fear the negative impact on their own fundraising efforts. The question of how (or if) nonprofit leaders in Albuquerque, New Mexico, adapted their fundraising strategies in the wake of the terrorist attacks was explored by analyzing from responses of surveys administered to 80 nonprofit organizations in early 2002.

Description
The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001,prompted an outpouring of donations for victims and their families that exceeds $900 million (and is still growing). Nobody is saying that such generosity is unwarranted but as relief money pours in, some charities fear the negative impact on their own fundraising efforts. This is particularly true of nonprofit organizations not traditionally associated with disaster relief or social services, such as museums and environmental protection agencies. Anxiety is running high on nonprofit boards as directors and staff members assess the short-and long-term impacts of this crisis on their financial stability. Organizational leaders worry that donors will give proportionately less to their favorite charities because they have already given to help victims of the terrorist attacks.

There is historical evidence to support this prediction yet there are also indications that charitable giving in the U.S., over the long run, is rarely depressed political turmoil, military confrontations, or economic turbulence. There are so many separate and unique factors influencing giving during 2002, however, that extrapolating from historical data must be done cautiously because the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, coupled with an national commitment to eradicate terrorism worldwide, are not like earlier crises and, therefore, the impact on donor behavior is essential unknown. The fact that the U.S. economy was already slipping toward recession may explain some changes in giving in the near future that were likely to happen because giving typically slows down during financial downturns.

What historical research does suggest, however, is that there may be changes in the distribution of charitable gifts even if the overall rate does not decrease. In all likelihood, many nonprofit organizations will experience a short, or perhaps long-term, decline in revenue because their missions do not appear to have a direct connection to helping victims of the attack. How their leaders respond to this possible decline may determine organizational survival in this time of uncertainty.

Another aspect of nonprofit fundraising that must be addressed by nonprofit leaders is the degree to which the events of September 11, and the war on terrorism, are to be incorporated into appeals for donations. Too much referral to them might appear to be callous attempts to capitalize on the suffering of the victims; too little or no reference to them might suggest indifference. An ill-chosen approach might offend contributors resulting in serious negative consequences for a nonprofit organization for a long period of time.

The question of how (or if) nonprofit leaders in Albuquerque, New Mexico, adapt their fundraising strategies in the wake of the terrorist attack and succeeding events is being explored through self-administered surveys. The goals of this project are to

1. determine the percentage of nonprofit organization in Albuquerque that have
changed their fundraising strategies as a result of the events of September 11.
2. identify the ways in which these organizations have changed their funding

strategies
3. ascertain whether these changes are short- or long-term
4. discover the degree to which these organizations incorporate references to the attacks in their fundraising literature
5. describe the nature of the references to the attacks

A data base was compiled consisting of eighty 501c(3) organizations in Albuquerque and Bernalillo County that 1) are not disaster relief organizations, 2) are public-serving rather than member-serving, 3) are not religious nonprofits, and 4) have annual revenue of $100,000 or more. In early 2002, the executive directors of the nonprofit organizations in the sample were mailed a four-page survey form composed of open-and closed-ended questions. The researcher is coding the information in the surveys and the data will be analyzed using standard statistical methods. An executive summary of the findings will be made available to all participants either in hard copy or online.

This study is a retrospective study in which data was analyzed with the specific aim of finding something, but with only a vague idea of what to look for. It was essential to conduct this research while recollections were still clear in the minds of nonprofit executives because of its potential to shed light on decision-making styles during a crisis period when information was inadequate and the future uncertain. While using empirical data to determine the actual impacts of the terrorist attacks on nonprofit fundraising over time will be an important exercise in the future, analyzing actions based on immediate perceptions was the focus of this study.

Paper Number: PA021391

Paper Title: Giving, Volunteering, and Social Capital: Changes Post-911

Author(s):

Dr. Janet Johnson, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA
Dr. David Van Slyke, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Summary of Research

Since September 11, 2001, many in the nonprofit community have questioned the tragedy's potential impact on giving, volunteering, and social capital. Using benchmark data collected in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2000, compared to a set of quarterly surveys conducted in 2002, we look at changes in social capital and philanthropy that may be attributable to this cause. We look at changes in social and racial trust, examine the determinants of giving and volunteering by sub-sector, and test for evidence of "crowding out." Our findings suggest a number of implications for nonprofit managers, fundraisers, and scholars studying philanthropy and social capital.

Description

There has been an increased focus in recent years on examining determinants of charitable giving, and the impact philanthropy has on the ability of nonprofit organizations to respond to community need (Independent Sector's Giving and Volunteering, AAFRC Giving USA, and O'Neil 2001). In addition to empirical studies on charitable giving and philanthropic behavior (Steinberg 1990, Schervish and Havens 1995, Clotfelter 1997, Brown 1999, Andreoni 2001, and Brooks 2001), Putnam (1995) and others have explored social and racial trust, two characteristics of social capital, and whether there is a link between social capital and philanthropy. It is hypothesized that as people become more connected to their communities and more trusting of other individuals, that giving and volunteering will increase. However, few causal linkages have been empirically shown.

Since September 11, 2001, many in the nonprofit community have raised questions about the tragedy's potential impact on giving, volunteering, and social capital. Three issues have consistently been sounded. The first is that there will be new, first-time donors contributing to charitable organizations as a result of the tragedy, who may or may not become sustained donors. Second, giving to charitable organizations charged with assisting those affected by the tragedy will "crowd-out" financial contributions to non-disaster relief charities, such as arts and culture organizations. And third, individuals will become more connected to their communities and trusting of individuals because of the tragedies mobilizing effect.

This study analyzes changes in individual giving and volunteering since September 11, 2001. We analyze benchmark data collected in the Metropolitan Atlanta region on individual level charitable giving in 1999 and on social capital in 2000, and compare this to 2002 quarterly public opinion survey data being collected on giving, volunteering, and trust. By using individual level data in a metropolitan region, we are able to control for a number of variables that are not as easily controlled for in national samples. We compare results not only for the sector as a whole, but also for major sub-sectors. By looking at sub-sectors we are able to test for evidence of "crowding out" in certain areas of giving versus others.

In addition to a pre vs. post- 9-11 comparison, the analysis by sub-sector is also used to analyze whether individuals' giving and volunteering is highly correlated by sub-sector, or whether individuals display substitution effects with respect to time and money. We also use multivariate analysis to assess predictors of giving and volunteering by sub-sector based on giving and volunteering in other sub-sectors.   Finally, our examination of changes in levels of social and racial trust provides the opportunity to test hypothesized relationships between social capital and philanthropy. Our overall findings will have a number of implications for nonprofit managers, fundraisers, and scholars studying philanthropy and social capital.

Author(s):

 Dr. Robin A. Kroft, Union Institute & University, Baltimore, MD, USA

Summary of Research

America's academic research centers are at a critical crossroad. They were nurtured by Industrial Age philanthropists and matured under 20th century federal grant programs that produced our leading scientists. Today the centers have outgrown the federal funding system that created them. Although foundations were leaders in developing the nation's health research infrastructure, the role of nonprofit grantmakers is widely diffused today. This paper reports on a survey project exploring renewed philanthropic leadership to safeguard the public interest and enhance biomedical research as funding evolves from a government-sponsored model to one of increasing reliance on the private sector.

Description

The Problem

  America's academic research centers are at a critical crossroad. They were nurtured in their early years by Industrial Age philanthropists and matured during the second half of the twentieth century under a federal patronage system that produced the current generation of leading scientists with grants from agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Today these academic research centers have outgrown the funding system that created them as their financial needs far exceed the appropriations level of current legislative desires. While the federal government has reduced its array of grant funding for scientific research, it also promotes for-profit investment through the transfer of taxpayer-funded new technology from university laboratories to commercial applications that are patented and marketed by private industry. There are a host of new challenges to established scientific-educational norms and values as our institutions of higher education adjust to their contemporary role in economic development and at the same time search for definitive answers to pressing international concerns ranging from the health consequences of global warming to threats of biological terrorism. Although philanthropic foundations were significant leaders in developing America's health research infrastructure in the first half of the twentieth century, the role of nonprofit grantmakers is widely diffused today.

Relation to State of Knowledge in Field
The first half of the twentieth century could be considered the golden age of philanthropic funding for scientific research. New areas matured into sophisticated sciences, as foundation dollars enabled scientists to move from simply describing problems to offering theoretical solutions to those problems. Foundation dollars were used to conquer diseases throughout the world such as malaria, yellow fever, and hookworm. The Rockefeller Foundation can be credited with elevating public health to a science and mobilizing scientific interests to create the field of molecular biology.

Kenneth Prewitt, in his highly useful monograph, "Foundations and the Funding of Science," maintains that original motivation for the industrial barons to pursue science and technology was to generate wealth. Prewitt calls this "purposive science" (1996, 5). In the earlier part of the century, companies such as Standard Oil were leaders in using research to advance the petroleum industry. According to Prewitt, Rockefeller understood the importance of recruiting the most talented chemists and geologists to his company. Prewitt suggests that Rockefeller applied his understanding of the importance of science in his transformation from oil baron to philanthropist, "having used science to create his wealth, it took no great leap of imagination to appreciate the ways in which science could realize other human purposes, especially that of improved health" (Prewitt 1996, 5–6).

Medical education was one of the greatest beneficiaries of the new philanthropy. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reshaped medical education in North America through its funding of Abraham Flexner's comprehensive study, Medical Education in the United States and

Canada. In it Flexner observed that universities have a greater function than simply maintaining an educational institution. He invoked a call for "loyalty to the standards of common honesty, of intellectual sincerity, or scientific accuracy," saying that "a university with educational patriotism will not take up the work of medical education unless it can discharge its duty by it" (Flexner 1910).

World War II changed the character of research programs at America's colleges and universities. Research conducted by academic scientists was so important to the war effort that research programs were continued after the war to enhance American industry and continue defense research during the Cold War. Federal support was institutionalized through the creation of the National Science Foundation and the modern version of the National Institutes of Health. Passage of the National Defense Act in 1958 was another critical step towards creating a strong federally based national research enterprise at the country's colleges and universities, particularly for the funding of basic research, graduate fellowships, as well as grants and contracts for applied research. Scholars such as Prewitt and David C. Hammack assert that by the mid–twentieth century, as greater amounts of research dollars flowed from government and industry, foundations stepped back and tended to fund initiatives aimed at influencing federal science policy or helping to direct the generous federal funding streams (Prewitt 1996; Hammack 1999).

Recently the call for policy funding by foundations has been renewed. A 1998 report by The Pew Charitable Trusts entitled, "Trends in Biomedical Research Funding," addressed the changing environment for health research and proposed some solutions that may come from the philanthropic community: "As the system of support for scientific inquiry changes, the first impulse will be to make up for federal shortfalls or redirections by tapping the private sector to support the traditional programs of research. This is a shortsighted impulse. It is important that the increment of resources represented by foundations be directed to the task of leading the transition in science and science policy" (Pew 1998, 37).

In 1998 four major foundations convened a three-day meeting of leaders representing over 100 private foundations, voluntary research and medical research organizations to consider threats and opportunities to health research. The sponsoring foundations, which included the American Cancer Society, Burroughs Wellcome Fund, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and The Pew Charitable Trusts, issued an important report entitled, Strengthening Health Research in America: Philanthropy's Role. In 2000, the grantmakers convened another meeting on private sector support for biomedical research training entitled, "The Role of the Private Sector in Training the Next Generation of Biomedical Scientists."

These recent conferences, workshops, and resulting publications are precious but few information sources in an area starving for data. There are many other important constituents in the biomedical research community who have useful insights to contribute to this dialogue but little voice. Rarely does the scientific community have the opportunity to raise questions about widely held generalizations among foundation leaders to ensure that nonprofit grantmakers are devoting their valuable resources to the areas where they are most needed in this very complex funding environment. This paper reports results from a dissertation survey project exploring a leadership role for nonprofit grantmakers to safeguard the public interest and enhance the biomedical research enterprise as our nation's system of funding scientific research evolves from primarily a government supported model to increasing reliance on the private sector's funding for purposive science.

Approach
The research was conducted in two stages that included 1) textual analysis of recent foundation publications, including conference reports, to identify key interests among nonprofit biomedical research grantmakers, and 2) creation of surveys assessing attitude agreement toward these issues through the use of Likert-type statements and open-ended questions. The surveys were submitted to a) biomedical researchers based at academic institutions, b) National Institutes of Health program officers, c) biotechnology/pharmaceutical industry managers, and d) nonprofit grantmakers.

Contribution to Field

The survey project found that while the ratio of philanthropic dollars devoted to biomedical research may be small compared to government, the significance is critical in three areas where societal needs are often overlooked by the larger federal and industry research agendas. These areas are: a) Enhancing the work of the scientific community through activities such as facilitating collaborative research initiatives or funding programs to increase public understanding of scientific issues; b) Funding in areas overlooked by American government and industry such as the health concerns of underserved populations worldwide; c) Strengthening the innovative potential of nonprofit research funders such as encouraging greater program flexibility.

   In much the same way that Flexner stated a case for "educational patriotism," the survey project found that nonprofit grantmakers have an important opportunity to invoke a call for philanthropic patriotism that instills the highest standard of regard for the public good. Nonprofit grantmakers, with their ability to permeate the workings of government and commerce, have demonstrated the power -- in the past -- to influence the shape of research and encourage inquiry that aims to eliminate the root causes of pressing problems. The issue is a matter of national concern that calls for a dynamic exchange among the public, private, and nonprofit sectors to help balance what we value as a nation.

References
Burroughs Wellcome Fund. "Strengthening Health Research in America: Philanthropy's Role." Report by American Cancer Society, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Burroughs Wellcome Fund, and The Pew Charitable Trusts, February, 1998.
Flexner, Abraham. Medical Education in the United States and Canada: a Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Bulletin Number 4.   Boston: D.B. Updike. The Merrymount Press, 1910.
Hammack, David C. "Foundations in the American Polity." In Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities. Ellen Condliffe Langemann, ed. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1999, 43–68.
Pew Charitable Trusts. "Trends in Funding for Biomedical Research." Report. Philadelphia: The Pew Charitable Trusts, 1998. Available from: http://pewtrusts.com.
Prewitt, Kenneth. American Foundations and the Funding of Science. Essays on Philanthropy, no. 21. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 1996.

Key Words: Foundations, Philanthropy, Biomedical Research, Technology Transfer, Science Funding

Paper Number: PA021227

Paper Title: Key Findings from a Comparative Study of University Civic Engagement

Author(s):

 Professor Susan A. Ostrander, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Data from this five-university study comes from site visits; interviews of staff, faculty, students, and community partners; and review of documents and literature. Key findings argue for a perspective that includes: (1) varying emphases and changing dimensions (e.g. student-learning, knowledge-production) suited to local conditions and state of development; (2) understanding of local factors that may impede or facilitate; (3) an underlying intellectual rationale and set of intellectual projects: (4) new and innovative organizational structures that link campus and community as equal partners.

Description

KEY FINDINGS FROM A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
     UNIVERSITY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AT FIVE SCHOOLS

University civic engagement is receiving more and more attention inside the academy, at academic meetings, and in professional academic publications.While neither the historic guiding philosophies nor the on-the-ground activities of higher education institutions in society are new - tracing origins at least back to John Dewey and Jane Addams --, university civic engagement is presently increasing and expanding rapidly. Some current advocates have even argued that universities very survival in the present context depends on their linking more closely with local communities, society, and the pressing issues of the day (Drucker cited in Overton and Buckhardt 1999; Lerner and Simon 1998).

A rich and rapidly-growing literature provides a philosophical and practical foundation for why and how universities might - and should - engage civically. (Boyer 1987; Checkoway 1997; Cox 2000; Ehrlich 2000; Harkavay and Benson 1998, 2000; Matthews 1997; etc.) Reasons include a rising cry that higher education do more to meet what many see as their social responsibility to contribute to solving pressing issues and problems of the day. This is compounded by the growing cost of a university education and corresponding calls for a higher return. Other reasons are a growing consensus that education is more effective if grounded in "real world" issues and active citizenship (Kraft and Krug 1994), and the increased need for better town-gown relations as many schools reach the boundaries of their current physical plant and seek new space outside it. A practical knowledge base about "how-to" engage civically includes the long-standing work of Campus Compact (www.compact,org).

Missing from the knowledge base about university civic engagement, however, is comparative research that examines what different universities are actually doing, why, how, and what can be learned from them. (For one exception, see Maurrasse 2001.) The research reported in this paper addresses this gap.

The author conducted two-day site visits; interviewed staff, faculty, students, and community partners; and reviewed numerous documents during summer 2001 to learn about civic engagement activities at Bates College, Brown University, University of Minneapolis, Portland State University, and University of Pennsylvania. Selection of schools sought geographic size and diversity, both public and private, and variation in how long each school had emphasized civic engagement.

Key findings from this five-university study argue for a perspective on civic engagement in higher education that includes: (1) a set of varying and changing dimensions of emphasis that are suited to a school's particular history, culture, stage of development of engagement with local communities, and other campus and community circumstances; (2) an understanding of specific local factors that may pose obstacles to civic engagement, as well as factors that may facilitate it; (3) an underlying intellectual

rationale for civic engagement embedded in the intellectual life of a particular campus and its faculty and student that includes a defined set of intellectual projects; and (4) the development and sustaining of new and innovative organizational structures aimed at linking campus and community as equal partners.

The paper discusses each of these four key findings and provides examples from the research. For example, in relation to the first finding that argues for varying and changing dimensions of emphasis depending on the particular context, the work of Brown University's Swearer Center for Public Service emphasizes a student-learning approach which derives from the university's overall mission to "provide students the opportunity to become architects of their own educational experience" (www.brown.edu). Bates College presently emphasizes community-defined priorities in developing their approach to civic engagement, which developed out of the particular history of the towns of Lewiston and Auburn, Maine approaching Bates' President and asking for assistance in determining how the two communities might work together.

In relation to the second finding, the paper identifies five local factors whose presence appears to facilitate university civic engagement and whose absence likely poses obstacles: (a) historic founding commitment of the university to public benefit; (b) supportive mission statement with concrete strategic objectives connected to civic engagement; (c) compelling reasons to alter curriculum and use of educational theory and research in doing so; (d) a faculty that participates actively in the work and governance of the university through established governance structures; and (e) surrounding neighborhood conditions that press the school to become actively involved in improving them and provide community partners with whom to work.

The value of an underlying intellectual rationale and related intellectual projects, the third key finding, seems especially important to engage faculty through connecting civic engagement to academic scholarship. U. Penn and University of Minnesota, perhaps because of the longevity of their civic engagement activities and the exceptional intellectual leadership of key figures there, both have moved in the direction of civic engagement as intellectual work. Ira Harkavy has defined the work of U. Penn's Center for Community Partnerships as fundamentally about "working on the intellectual problem of how to create modern, cosmopolitan local communities" which he and his colleagues see as "the strategic problem of our time" (Benson, Harkavay and Puckett, 2000:26). Harry Boyte at U. of M's Center for Democracy and Citizenship defines their work around the question of how to create "public work", by which he and his colleagues mean people coming together in a "sustained, visible, serious effort…that creates things of lasting civic or public significance" (Boyte 1999:viii)>

Finally, the fourth key finding, points to the importance of new and innovative organizational structures that connect campus and community in equal partnerships. These included independent mediating associations that join university and community, and the presence of central bridge-persons who come from the community hired on-staff. U. Penn, for example, has three different organizational components to its work: a university-based office, a neighborhood-based entity that pre-dates the campus office, and a free-standing off-campus nonprofit association combining the university and the West Philadelphia neighborhood.

These key findings are useful both in explaining the forces that are propelling universities to become more civically engagement and more connected to "real world" issues and problems; and for understanding and providing direction for the organizational processes and structures that higher education institutions might put into place to carry out such work. Exploration of university civic engagement also has potential for increasing our knowledge about civic engagement and active citizenship in general.

KEY WORDS: civic engagement, active citizenship

Paper Number: PA021381

Paper Title: Service-Learning in Competing Spheres

Author(s):

 Dr. JoAnn L Campbell, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA
 Dr. Robyn Gibboney, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Summary of Research

This research examines how students integrate a familiar campus with the unfamiliar local community. Of course, this linkage between experience and academic knowledge provides service-learning its power. However, at this point of integration the service-learning's efficacy can break down, so that the needs of the partners remain unmet. Focusing on students' sense of place as a connecting link, we seek to understand how students imagine themselves as members or outsiders of a given community in order to allow faculty and community partners, who are important educators, to create orientation sessions, instruction, and reflection activities that bring the two spheres together.

Description
ARNOVA Proposal
by JoAnn Campbell, Indiana University Bloomington
and Robyn Gibboney, IUPUI

Service-Learning in Competing Spheres

1. Problem or issue to be addressed

One of the most useful community-building efforts to develop in the past ten years has been the partnership between nonprofits and colleges and universities. Through the vehicle of service-learning, an experiential pedagogy, students in higher education have begun to understand the importance of the third sector in meeting many community needs. The purpose of this study is to better understand the ways students enrolled in service-learning classes perceive both the campus community and local community. We wanted to explore how students make connections between course content and their community service by examining their sense of place, asking questions such as the following:
· With which communities do they associate themselves?
· What are the perceived responsibilities of being a member in a community?
· How do students define the communities to which they belong?
· How might their sense of place and belonging evolve through participation in a service-learning class?
· What kinds of civic skills have they developed as a result of their service experience?
· How has their experience working in service in connection to a course affected their understanding of the issues facing communities and their sense of agency in addressing those issues?
· What has been the effect on their understanding of the value of their discipline in addressing community needs and challenges?

Yet the more students engage in their local communities, the greater the challenge to integrate the activities experienced in community with the sphere of the classroom and campus. It is, of course, this linkage between experience and academic knowledge that provides service-learning its power. It is also, however, at this point of integration where the efficacy of service-learning can break down, so that the needs of some, or none, of the partners—student, faculty, nonprofit organization—may not be met. Without this integration, service-learning remains an academic exercise rather than a means of civic empowerment serving nonprofits and students alike.

2. State of Knowledge in the Field

Since the early 1990s, there has been an explosion of research to increase educators' understanding of

service-learning by study of its effect on 1) students, 2) institutions of higher education and the educational system, and 3) the community and creation of a democratic society. A review of the literature since the first Wingspread conference (Giles, Honnet, Migliore, 1991) reveals an emphasis on students and the kind of learning they experience—e.g. their academic grasp of discipline-specific material (Markus, Howard, King, 1993) moral development (Boss, 1994), and civic awareness (Loeb, 1994, 1999). Eyler and Giles (1999) provided a comprehensive look at many aspects of student learning in Where's the Learning in Service-Learning? What has been in far shorter supply is thoughtful exploration of how students' perceptions of service-learning might inform service-learning faculty's practice and how both of these have an impact on the communities being served.

Giles and Eyler's study, based on a survey of over 1500 service-learners and interviews with 66 students at six colleges before and after the semester of service, found that students felt more connected to the campus community after this semester, yet only service-learning programs that had strong community input into the service projects were significant in helping students feel more connected to the local community. This finding is an important starting point for a number of questions pertaining to nonprofits: What do nonprofits, as service-learning partners, need for a successful service-learning experience? What kind of orientation and training best prepares students to engage with a local community? How could students' perceptions of the service-learning experience influence the way it is taught both on campus and off?

3. Approach

We conducted 30 minute individual interviews with 18 college students enrolled in service-learning classes Fall, 2001. Students ranged from first year to senior and came from a number of towns within and outside of Indiana. Using grounded theory techniques required us to ask broad, open-ended questions, such as "Tell me about your service-learning experience." Responses were initially grouped into three areas: perceptions of the specific local community, definitions of community more generally, and effects of service-learning on their lives. We also drew upon written reflections and researched papers the students wrote for their service-learning courses. As often as possible, we will use the students' words to describe their experiences within the community and the classroom, their perceptions of the role of nonprofits in building a healthy society, and their own responsibility in the civic arena.

4. Contribution to the field

"Tell me about your SL experience" invariably elicited the community-based part of the students' experience rather than the classroom-based portion. Because faculty are primarily concerned with the integration of the students' community service with the academic content of their courses, they might lose sight that before students can integrate the two spheres, they must be thoroughly introduced to the new, unfamiliar sphere, the local community. Students indicated that they too want an integrated experience. A service-learning experience failed, they said, when they didn't see the relevance of their nonprofit work to the course at hand. This finding suggests some of the differences among the needs and goals of the three chief participants in a service-learning experience: faculty, student, community partner. Students want a body of knowledge and a satisfying experience in the local community; faculty want academic concepts or skills conveyed effectively; and nonprofits want useful, quality work done.

Although some work has been done on integrating the academic and service component, none has focused on students' sense of place as the connecting link. As we better understand the ways students imagine themselves as members or outsiders of a given community, faculty and staff involved in service-learning, along with community partners who serve as important educators to college and university students, will be able to devise better orientation sessions, on-site instruction, and reflection questions that bring the two spheres together.

Paper Title: Learning from Service-Learning: Assessing and Evaluating Community Awareness and Involvement Among College Freshmen

Author(s):

 Dr. Javier Stanziola, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Meyers, FL, USA

 Dr. Maria F Roca, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, FL, USA

Summary of Research

The two major goals of this study are to: 1) explore whether service learning requirements affect the level of and attitude about community awareness and involvement among college freshmen; and, 2) identify factors that can facilitate civic participation among young adults.

Description

   Justification: In response to calls to alleviate the social capital deficit among teenagers and young adults, many colleges and universities around the nation have included service learning projects as part of their curricula. The literature on how these projects affect learning has concentrated on measures of academic performance and how they benefit the service organizations they serve.   Researchers now face the challenge of finding ways to design assessment tools that not only help them identify whether these programs are effective, but also contribute to the understanding of how the perceived deficit of civic engagement among young adults can be eliminated .

   Research Goal: The two major goals of this study are to: 1) explore whether service learning requirements affect the level of and attitude about community awareness and involvement among college freshmen; and, 2) identify factors that can facilitate civic participation among young adults.

   Method: In Fall 2001, qualitative data were collected from close to 300 freshmen college students at Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU). Approximately 67% of these students attended the regular freshman gateway course; 20% took this course as part of FGCU's first Learning Community; 13% were taking an alternative gateway course that included remediation. As part of the course, all students were required to complete at least ten service learning hours and actively participate in one student organization.   To assess and evaluate the impact of these requirements, students were asked to complete two projects. First, students answered a "Community Awareness and Involvement Questionnaire" the first day of classes. This questionnaire assessed, among other things, the current level of student's civic engagement, previous leadership opportunities, and their friends and relatives' level of civic involvement. After completing their requirements, students were asked to address the same questions in the form of a reflection essay. Students were asked to place emphasis on 1) reflecting if their views had evolved since the beginning of the semester; 2) the effect the requirements had on their knowledge and understanding of the relationships between the individual and the communities in which they live and work; and 3) identifying factors that facilitated the completion of their projects.

Expected Results: The structure of our assessment tools and the diversity of our pool of respondents will allow us to make significant comparisons that will contribute to the understanding of how service learning projects impact students' lives. Based on the literature, we are expecting previous exposure to community activities to significantly affect the impact of these requirements and their level of understanding of community awareness and involvement. Specifically, we expect: 1) students from the Learning Community will report more significant improvements in their understanding and involvement of community issues; and 2) service-learning activities to have a more significant impact on the student's understanding of civic engagement than participation in student organizations.