

**Paper Number:** PN042039

**Paper Title:** Building Nonprofit Capacity through Partnerships and Applied Research: Collaborations between Universities and Nonprofits

**Author(s):**

Roseanne Mirabella, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, USA

**Description**

Nonprofit management outreach programs provide opportunities for building capacity and effecting change within the community. In the instance of university outreach to the nonprofit sector, the goal is to strengthen the infrastructure of the sector and enhance the management practices of community leaders. This panel focuses on collaborative efforts between universities and nonprofit organizations to build nonprofit capacity through partnerships and applied research.

**Paper Number:** PN042039.1

**Paper Title:** Building Analytical Capacity through Collaborative Research

**Author(s):**

Alnoor Ebrahim, Alexandria Center, Virginia Tech, Alexandria, VA, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper details the efforts of Virginia Tech's new NonProfit Excellence Initiative, which aims to bridge applied research with capacity building. The emphasis of the paper is on two questions: How can universities bridge research on the nonprofit sector with outreach? What capacities for research and analysis does the nonprofit sector need?

**Description**

This paper details the efforts of Virginia Tech's new NonProfit Excellence Initiative, which aims to bridge applied research with capacity building. The emphasis of the paper is on two questions: How can universities bridge research on the nonprofit sector with outreach? What capacities for research and analysis does the nonprofit sector need?

I begin with a discussion of the challenges that university research programs face in developing applied and collaborative research with the nonprofit sector. Relatedly, I discuss the analytical capacity needs of the nonprofit sector, drawing from the literatures on NPOs in the global "North" and on NGOs in the global "South". This will also involve a discussion of how perceptions of useful research vary significantly among academics, nonprofits, and foundations.

I then examine the resources and comparative advantages that universities possess, and how these might best be applied towards a bridging of research with capacity building. As examples, I will discuss what we are doing at VT, especially with "action-research" projects undertaken by graduate students in collaboration with local nonprofits. Finally, I touch upon the challenges facing land-grant universities as they move towards a heavier focus on traditional forms research, often creating tensions with their outreach missions.

**Sample References**

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blumenthal, B. (2001). Improving the Impact of Nonprofit Consulting. *Journal of Nonprofit Management*(Summer), 1-17.

Connolly, P., & York, P. (2003). *Building the Capacity of Capacity Builders: A Study of Management Support and Field-Building Organizations in the Nonprofit Sector*. Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago: The Conservation Company.

De Vita, C. J., Fleming, C., & Twombly, E. C. (2001). Building Nonprofit Capacity : A Framework for Addressing the Problem. In C. J. D. Vita & C. Fleming (Eds.), *Building Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations* (pp. 5-30). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Eisinger, P. (2002). Organizational Capacity and Organizational Effectiveness Among Street-Level Food Assistance Programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 115-130.

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a Learning Organization. *Harvard Business Review*(July-August), 78-91.

Smillie, I. (Ed.). (2001). *Patronage or Partnership: Local Capacity Building in Humanitarian Crises*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

**Paper Number:** PN042039.2

**Paper Title:** University/NPO Partnerships for Program Evaluation Studies: Bridging the Gap between Funding Requirements and Limited Nonprofit Capacity

**Author(s):**

Siegrun Freyss, California State University, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Sergio Gonzalez, City of South Pasadena, South Pasadena, CA, USA

**Summary of Research**

Grantmakers increasingly ask for an analysis of program outcome, in addition to the traditional monitoring of output. Since nonprofit organizations may not have the research expertise or resources to conduct an impact evaluation, the paper explores collaborative efforts between universities and nonprofits. The paper documents the nature of program evaluation studies required by the community foundations in the state of California, the respective research expertise at the universities in the state, as well as the role management support organizations and foundations can play in bringing researchers and nonprofit organizations together for designing and conducting meaningful evaluation studies.

**Description**

Major grant-making foundations increasingly require outcome research, not just output monitoring, as a condition for funding (Fine, Thayer, & Coghlan, 1998, 10-11; Carson, 2000; Gonzalez, 2001). But nonprofit organizations, especially in the social services, may not have the expertise to design a program evaluation study based on the scientific research protocol; or they may not have the staff time to conduct comprehensive research that will lead to valid findings. Moreover grantors may not give much credence to in-house evaluations. As a solution to the resource scarcity and credibility issue, the paper will explore research partnerships between academic institutions and community organizations.

The Topic's Relation to the State of Knowledge in the Field (including relevant literature)

A 1998 study supported by the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund (NSRF) found that the measurement of program outcomes was a growing practice among nonprofit organizations, primarily to satisfy funding requirements. The study also found that about half of the evaluations were conducted by internal staff and that a majority of grantmakers considered the findings credible. Acceptance of the findings improved when they were supported by multiple measures, when outside evaluators were involved, and when stakeholders participated in the assessment of the program. (Fine, Thayer, & Coghlan, 1998, 16-19, 36-38).

The NSRF study focused on program evaluation practices and on nonprofit organizations that had positive evaluation experiences. It did not in any systematic way research the capacity of nonprofit organizations to conduct credible evaluation studies, but it did find that lack of financial support and lack of qualified staff were the greatest barriers to conducting assessment of program outcomes (Fine, Thayer, & Coghlan, 1998, 11). The case study by Connor, Kadel-Taras, and Vinokur-Kaplan (1999) explores the role that nonprofit management support organizations can play in improved service delivery, for instance, through program evaluations.

Some nonprofit management support organizations are addressing the issue of expertise by publishing evaluation manuals tailored to nonprofits of various sizes (Castle, 1991; Hatry & Lampkin, 2001; W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1998; Braverman, Constantine, & Slater, 2004). Another resource is the Outcome Measurement Resource Network maintained by the United Way of America (n. d.). The trend toward professionalism in nonprofit management is also increasing the number of employees with advanced degrees and knowledge of research methods (Mirabella & Wish, 1999). But most nonprofit entities suffer under such resource scarcity that they cannot set staff time aside for sustained research. The lack of resources also tends to preclude contracting with a professional research firm.

Being aware of the financial constraints, grantmakers may include funding for program evaluation in their grants. Research by the Foundation Center found an increase in this trend, with 1.2 percent of the

total grants given by large foundations in 1996 intended for program evaluations (Renz, Mandler, and Treiber, 1998, 92-93). This practice, however, does not meet all the evaluation needs of nonprofit organizations:

- In the first place, to secure a grant, a need assessment study or a cost-benefit analysis may be necessary.
- Also to be successful in the competition for funding, a professionally designed evaluation study may have to be included with the grant application.
- Finally, the issue of credibility of the evaluation findings has to be addressed.

In these and other cases a research partnership between academia and community organization seems to make sense. The proposed paper will draw attention to the gap between funding requirements and limited nonprofit capacity in the area of program evaluation.

#### The Approach This Paper Will Take (including data sources)

First, the paper will illustrate what type of program evaluation studies grantmakers require by analyzing the grant application instructions of the 45 community foundations in the state of California. The Council on Foundations provides the names and websites at [www.cof.org/Locator/](http://www.cof.org/Locator/). Second, the study will show the extent to which universities in the state offer courses on nonprofit management or public administration as well as courses in program evaluation or research methods. The websites of academic programs show whether they also offer technical assistance to community organizations. Third, the management support organizations will be surveyed concerning their offerings in program evaluation. A preliminary review showed them all holding workshops on grantwriting, but not specifically on program evaluation. Nonprofits attending these grantwriting workshops will be asked about their expertise in research designs that fall under program evaluation studies, including needs assessment, cost-benefit analysis, monitoring of activities and of output, as well as impact or outcome analysis.

#### The Intended Contribution of Our Work to the Field

The research will draw attention to the gap between funding requirements and the limited capacity of nonprofit organizations in the area of program evaluation. The study also aims to document the actual or potential expertise in program evaluation among university faculty. The paper will suggest that management support organizations and grantors can act as bridge builders to bring evaluation researchers and resource-poor nonprofits together.

#### References and Bibliography

- American Evaluation Association (n. d). Guiding principles for evaluators. Retrieved 3/18/04 at [www.eval.org](http://www.eval.org).
- Braverman, M. T., Constantine, N. A., & Slater, J. K. (2004). Foundations and evaluation: Contexts and practices for effective philanthropy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brudney, J. L. & Kluesner, T. M. (Fall 1992). Researchers and practitioners in nonprofit organization and voluntary action: Applying research to practice? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 21, 3, 293-308.
- Carson, E. D. (Sep. 2000). On foundations and outcome evaluation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29, 3, 479-481.
- Castle, A. L. (1991). Evaluation essentials for small private foundations. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.
- CenterPoint Institute. (n.d.) Building bridges between practice and knowledge in nonprofit management education. A W. K. Kellogg Foundation initiative. Retrieved 9/16/2002 at [www.centerpointinstitute.org/bridges/](http://www.centerpointinstitute.org/bridges/).
- Connor, J. A., Kadel-Taras, S. & Vinokur-Kaplan, D. (Winter 1999). The role of nonprofit management support organizations in sustaining community collaborations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 10, 2, 127-136.
- Council on Foundations (2002). Recommended principles and practices for effective grantmaking." Retrieved 3/18/04 at [www.cof.org](http://www.cof.org).
- Feeney, S. ed. (March 2000). Symposium: Authority, legitimacy, voice and the scholar-practice question. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29, 1, 5-110.

Fine, A. H., Thayer, C. E. & Coghlan, A. (1998). Program evaluation practice in the nonprofit sector. A study funded by the Aspen Institute Nonprofit Sector Research Fund and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Washington, DC: Innovation Network, Inc.

Gonzalez, S. (2001). Top ten foundations of 2000: A look at their funding requirements in relation to a program evaluation. California State University, Los Angeles, Summer 2001 (Graduate Directed Study Paper).

Hatry, H. & Lampkin, L., eds. (2001). Outcome management in nonprofit organizations. An agenda for action. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Houchin, S. & Widmer, C. (1998). The "scholar" and the practitioner (Can this marriage be saved?). Paper presented at the ARNOVA conference, Seattle, Nov. 1998.

Ivancevich, J. M. & Gilbert, J. A. (Spring 2000). Diversity management: Time for a new approach. *Public Personnel Management* 29, 1, 75-92.

Larson, R. S. & Barnes-Moorhead, S. (2001). How center work: Building and sustaining academic nonprofit centers. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Nissan, L. G. & Burlingame, D. F. (n.d.). Collaboration among institutions. Strategies for nonprofit management education programs. Indianapolis: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Maurrasse, D. J. (March 2002). Higher education-community partnerships: Assessing progress in the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31, 1, 131-139.

Macduff, N. & Netting, F. E. (March 2000). Lessons learned from a practitioner-academician collaboration. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29, 1, 46-60.

Mirabella, R. M. & Wish, N. B. (Spring 1999). Educational impact graduate nonprofit degree programs: Perspectives of multiple stakeholder. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 9, 3, 329-341.

Palumbo, D. ed. (1987). The politics of program evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Renz, L., Mandler, C. & Treiber, R. (1998). Foundation giving. New York: Foundation Center.

Schuman, C. H. and Abramson, A. J. (March 2000). Collaborating for usable knowledge: A work in progress by the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29, 1, 11-23.

United Way of America. (n.d.) Outcome measurement resource network. Retrieved 3/18/04 at <http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/>.

Vidal, A. et al. (2002). Lessons from the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program. Final report. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Office of Policy Development and Research. Retrieved 3/18/04 at [www.huduser.org:80/Publications/PDF/lessons\\_complete.pdf](http://www.huduser.org:80/Publications/PDF/lessons_complete.pdf).

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (1998). Evaluation handbook. Retrieved 3/18/04 at [www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub770.pdf](http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub770.pdf).

**Paper Number:** PN042039.3

**Paper Title:** Leadership Development for Human Service Managers: Collaboration Between a University Nonprofit Academic Center and a Human Services Agency Network

**Author(s):**

Kathleen Fletcher, University of San Francisco, San Anselmo, CA, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This paper reports on the development and implementation of a collaborative effort between a university nonprofit academic center and an association of over 130 human services agencies to provide leadership and management education for mid-level managers from the association's member agencies. The collaborative planning process and the beginning of the implementation process are described, along with lessons learned in making this kind of university-community partnership successful.

### **Description**

This paper will describe the collaboration between the Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management at the University of San Francisco (the Institute) and the San Francisco Human Services Network (HSN), an organization made up of over 130 nonprofit social service agencies that contract with the City and County of San Francisco. The purpose of the collaboration is to develop and implement a management and leadership training project for mid-level managers of HSN agencies that will involve managers with their peers from other agencies in a cohort-based, integrated program. The idea for the program was put forth by an HSN member who is executive director of a large human service agency and also an advisory board member of the Institute. His interest grew from his involvement, while in a previous public sector job, in an executive development program sponsored by the Bay Area Social Service Consortium (BASSC) in partnership with the School of Social Work at the University of California, Berkeley. The BASSC program has been in place for 10 years and has provided extensive management training for over 225 mid-level public sector social service managers in ten Bay Area counties (Bay Area Social Services Consortium, 2003).

□ After two initial meetings between a small group of HSN leaders and Institute staff to determine if there was interest in proceeding, a larger steering committee of executive directors of HSN agencies began meeting with Institute staff to plan the program. The steering committee members were selected to reflect the diversity of size and service areas in the organization. Reasons they expressed for their interest in developing such a program for their mid-level management staff include (a) the need for clinicians who become managers to build basic management skills, such as planning, running effective meetings, and dealing with personnel issues; (b) the need to understand the particular public policy environment in San Francisco; (c) the desire to target certain populations, such as African Americans, to bring them into management positions; and (d) the desire of executive directors of human service agencies to "grow people who care about what we care about."

□ The program is being planned in a truly collaborative way. The steering committee is suggesting topics and formats that will work for them. Their discussion is facilitated by the Institute's director of education and outreach, who then takes their suggestions and creates a draft educational plan based on their input and the Institute's knowledge of pedagogy and resources. This suggested plan is expected to go through several iterations until it is finalized. At the time this proposal is being written, the suggested format is to have cohort groups of managers from different agencies meet together three different times, each for one week, during a one-year period. In subsequent years, they will provide peer support for each other in a variety of ways. As for the curriculum, the program will include topics deemed most important by the planning committee and will use executive directors and other top managers from HSN agencies as faculty, along with nonprofit and public sector leaders and faculty from the university.

This collaborative effort between HSN and the Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management is a first-

time effort for both groups and is representative of the outreach programs nonprofit management education programs in colleges and universities may want to develop in order to bridge the gap between the university and the community. In the San Francisco Bay Area, there are several management support organizations that provide training for nonprofit staff, and the Institute has never tried to be in direct competition with them. In fact, participants at a joint meeting of leaders from academic and training institutions in the Bay Area saw the work of these two types of organizations as very different: Academic institutions were seen as combining theory and practice and helping people understand the scope of the sector and the issues people in the sector face, while training institutions were seen as providing short-term, how-to training and focusing on technical skills or specific tasks (Fletcher, 2003). This program will provide both by teaching mid-level managers practical skills but also giving them a broader perspective on leadership, policy making, and nonprofit management.

Human Services Network members are interested in this program not only to improve the skills of their own staff but also because they believe there is intrinsic value for the whole field in providing this type of training. Furthermore, they are concerned about employee retention. In research conducted for HSN by the San Francisco Urban Institute at San Francisco State University, 42.9% of the 169 human service agencies responding to a survey reported serious problems in finding and retaining staff (San Francisco Urban Institute, 2001). HSN members believe that this program will help them retain staff by improving the satisfaction levels of managers and increasing their skills so that they provide better management for their departmental employees. HSN members are also concerned about developing leaders that will be able to take over when the current group of executive directors, many of whom are of the baby boomer generation, retire from their positions.

The paper to be presented at the 2004 ARNOVA conference will be a case study of this collaborative project between an academic center and a consortium of nonprofit agencies in an urban community. The program is now (March 2004) in the planning stages, and a full report on the collaborative process and the resulting curriculum and format will be provided in the paper. Progress on implementation and plans for evaluation of the program will be reported as well. The author is the Institute's staff person with principal responsibility for all of the project work so will be reporting firsthand on the program's development and implementation through September 2004. The paper will illustrate a possible model for other academic centers to consider when reaching out to nonprofit organizations in their community to develop management education programs that meet their specific needs. As such, it will contribute to the sparse literature on nonprofit management education in general and academic center outreach programs in particular.

## References

Bay Area Social Services Consortium. (2003) BASSC 15th Anniversary 1987-2002.  
<http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/site/uploadedfiles/npcontractingtf/CNPCTF-REPORT-ATTACHMENT-A.pdf>

Fletcher, K. (2003). Report on stage one of the nonprofit management curriculum revision project. Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management, University of San Francisco.

San Francisco Urban Institute/Policy Research Institute. (2001) A comprehensive profile of San Francisco's nonprofit human service providers.  
<http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/site/uploadedfiles/npcontractingtf/CNPCTF-REPORT-ATTACHMENT-A.pdf>

**Paper Number:** PN042039.4

**Paper Title:** Getting Grad Students on Board: Successful Outreach to Build Community Nonprofit Capacity

**Author(s):**

Diane Kaplan Vinokur, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Elizabeth Schepmann Peinter, Nonprofit Enterprise at Work, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper describes a new, successful collaboration between a nonprofit management support organization and a university nonprofit academic center to recruit graduate students from the Schools of Public Policy and Social Work to become regular board members of local nonprofits. The recruitment, training, matching processes using a computerized BoardConnect program, and the board placement outcomes for the first group of 12 selected students are described, and the opportunities and challenges in replicating such a program on other campuses are discussed.

**Description**

Much has been written about the necessity to get more, young individuals involved in nonprofit leadership positions in the United States. This need is especially critical given the growing absolute number of nonprofits, and the complex service and technological challenges nonprofit face today. One key constituency that could help fulfill this need are graduate students in professional schools. These well-educated, technologically-savvy, and high energy individuals often reside in communities for at least two to three years while they complete their higher education, and doctoral students may be located in campus areas for even longer periods.

This paper describes a new, successful collaboration between a nonprofit management support organization and a university nonprofit academic center to recruit graduate students from the Schools of Public Policy and Social Work to become regular board members of local nonprofits. The recruitment, training, matching processes using a computerized BoardConnect program, and the board placement outcomes for the first group of 12 selected students are described, and the opportunities and challenges in replicating such a program on other campuses are discussed.

□

**Paper Number:** PN042042

**Paper Title:** Implementing an Evaluation Plan for a Multiple-Program Social Service Organization

**Author(s):**

Roland J. Kushner, Kushner Management Advisory Services, Bethlehem, PA, USA

**Description**

This panel describes a project that was carried on at the Community Service Society of New York (CSS). CSS decided to invest in program methodology for its diversified human service offerings, ranging from public interest litigation to direct social service provision. Within CSS, this fell into the portfolio of David Campbell, Vice President for Programs. Kushner Management Advisory Services was engaged to develop the evaluation methodology in late 2002. Paul-Brian McInerney was engaged by Kushner as a research assistant, and then subsequently retained by CSS to help implement the methodology.

Consequently, the three of us have perspectives and experiences of strategy, structure, theory, design, and implementation within the same project. David Campbell will initially present the perspective of strategy and structure. Roland Kushner will present the development of the methodology; Paul-Brian McInerney will describe the implementation challenges; and David Campbell will wrap it up by describing the effect that the evaluation project has had.

While the project is set in one organization, we are planning our presentations so that they will be of benefit both to practitioners and to evaluation researchers, those with interests in human service provision in urban settings, in the management of diversified human service organizations, and in the ongoing challenge of measuring organizational performance.

**Paper Number:** PN042042.1

**Paper Title:** Implementing an Evaluation Plan for a Multiple-Program Social Service Organization: The Impact of Strategy and Structure

**Author(s):**

David Campbell, Community Service Society, New York, NY, USA

### **Summary of Research**

In 2002, the Community Service Society began an effort, prioritized in its strategic plan, to measure program effectiveness. CSS sought to know whether it was using its resources (many of which are discretionary) most effectively. The purpose of the effort was both to determine individual program performance and the collective effect of that performance across programs on the organization's mission. Results of the effort were to be used to assess the organization's strategy for accomplishing its mission and to provide information that would lead to modifications to strategy, both within and across programs.

### **Description**

Systemic Evaluation for a Multiple-Program Social Service Organization:  
The Impact of Strategy and Structure

The Community Service Society of New York (CSS), like many long established social service organizations, has provided a diverse array of programs over the course of its 155 year history. The organization's mission is to ameliorate conditions of poverty in New York City through service provision and advocacy. At present, the organization delivers program activities in eight discrete areas, including volunteer mobilization, community organizing, policy research, technical assistance, and others. The sum total of these programs represents the organization's strategy for accomplishing mission.

In recent years, there has been significant attention to nonprofit organizational performance. Often that effort has focused on the measurement of outcomes in individual programs. The United Way of America has been a notable leader in that effort, and we have also been influenced by work of Sawhill & Williamson (2001). For multi-service organizations with diverse program offerings, outcome measurement often does not provide a complete assessment of the organization's overall success in accomplishing its mission, particularly when it is focused on individual programs.

In 2002, the Community Service Society began an effort, prioritized in its strategic plan, to measure program effectiveness. CSS sought to know whether it was using its resources (many of which are discretionary) most effectively. The purpose of the effort was both to determine individual program performance and the collective effect of that performance across programs on the organization's mission. Results of the effort were to be used to assess the organization's strategy for accomplishing its mission and to provide information that would lead to modifications to strategy, both within and across programs.

CSS' approach to this was unique, for three reasons. First, the Board chose to fund the program evaluation out of unrestricted net assets, rather than from specific grant or program funding. Second, the commitment to conduct program evaluation came from within the organization, and was not a matter of compliance with any external contract or mandate. Third, CSS sought an evaluation methodology that would not only span its programs but would synthesize information from them.

As part of the ARNOVA panel, this presentation would describe the underlying strategy that motivated the evaluation efforts, the planning activities that led to the commitment to performance measurement, the CSS structure and its impact on the evaluation process, challenges associated with implementation, and what the organization has learned to date from this effort. The findings will be presented in such a way as to provide guidance to other multi-program social service agencies, and to provide experience-based insights that will be helpful to researchers.

David Campbell, Ph.D.  
Vice President, Programs  
Community Service Society of New York

References:

Sawhill, J. C. & D. Williamson (2001) "Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 11(3), Spring.

United Way of America "Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach"

**Paper Number:** PN042042.2

**Paper Title:** Implementing an Evaluation Plan for a Multiple-Program Social Service Organization:  
Developing A Systemic Methodology

**Author(s):**

Roland Kushner, Roland J. Kushner Management Advisory Services, Bethlehem, PA, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This paper illustrates some practical challenges in developing a methodology for evaluating programs in an organization with a diversified program strategy in a dynamic environment. CSS' eight program departments illustrate how wide-ranging the evaluation methodology had to be: Community Health Access, Community Development, Legal (i.e., public interest litigation), Policy Research and Advocacy, Political Development, Public Benefits Resource Center, Social Services, and Voluntary Initiatives. A systemic approach was adopted which incorporates five components of performance: satisfying constituents and stakeholders, mobilizing resources, effective internal business process, setting and attaining appropriate goals, and responding to external change.

### **Description**

This paper will illustrate some of the challenges in developing a methodology for evaluating programs in an organization setting characterized by a dynamic environment and a diversified program strategy. In 2002, the Community Service Society of New York solicited firms that could develop a program evaluation methodology. Kushner Management Advisory Services was selected to develop the methodology, and the project was carried out from December 2002 until June 2003.

The focus of the project was on methods for evaluating CSS' program activities within each of its eight program departments and across CSS as a system. The context for the program evaluation ("PE") included internal, external, mediating, and moderating factors. Internal factors included the willing participation of CSS managers and staff, and the structure. External factors included the dynamic environment and CSS' diverse constituencies. Intermediating and moderating forces include CSS financial circumstances at the time, as well as its on-going strategy as a diversified service provider.

The titles of the eight program departments illustrate how wide-ranging the evaluation methodology had to be: Community Health Access, Community Development, Legal (i.e., public interest litigation), Policy Research and Advocacy, Political Development, Public Benefits Resource Center, Social Services, and Voluntary Initiatives. While the primary focus of the project was to develop techniques and methods for evaluating the departments as service providers, and their impacts on the populations they serve, a second focus was on integrating or synthesizing all of these impacts across CSS.

Inevitably, given CSS' diversified strategy, different goal structures operated in CSS, including single goal and social construction approaches. Consequently, it was difficult to use any single model or approach for all of the program areas. Instead, a systemic approach was adopted which incorporates five components of performance:

Satisfying constituents and stakeholders,  
Mobilizing resources,  
Effective internal business process,  
Setting and attaining appropriate goals, and  
Responding to external change. (Kushner and Poole 1994, Kushner 2001).

This presentation, as one part of the ARNOVA panel, will build on this context. Specifically, it will document how measures of both outcome (at the program level) and system impact (more global) were developed for each of these programs in the five areas of performance, as well as via other measures connected to specific elements of CSS' strategy. The presentation will be geared towards evaluation scholars and practitioners. The companion piece by David Campbell will show the strategic context,

while the presentation by Paul-Brian McInerney will document the realities of translating the evaluation plan into a practical tool.

References:

Kushner, Roland J. and Peter P. Poole (1996) "Exploring Structure-Effectiveness Relationships in Nonprofit Arts Organizations" *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 7(2).

Kushner, Roland J. "Action Research Validation of an Inventory of Effectiveness Measures," to the Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness & Performance. Challenges & Advances in Theory and Practice conference, Kansas City, MO, April 2002, and to Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, Miami, FL, 2001

**Paper Number:** PN042042.3

**Paper Title:** Implementing an Evaluation Plan for a Multiple-Program Social Service Organization:  
From Abstract Plans to Situated Actions

**Author(s):**

Paul-Brian McInerney, Columbia University, Astoria, NY, USA

### **Summary of Research**

In this presentation, I will discuss issues surrounding the implementation of sophisticated, multi-department evaluation plans. The design stage was headwork, moving from skills of abstraction and generalization into a design and plan for a feasible set of measures. Once CSS approved the evaluation plan, it had to be translated into sustainable, actionable sets of procedures within the organization. This presentation contributes to the panel by grounding the discussion of evaluation in organizational practices. I will reflect on the role I played in bridging design and implementation, demonstrating how to create spaces for evaluation in the everyday activities of organizational members.

### **Description**

Plans are always neat. Actions are always messy. What happens when you implement a systemic evaluation plan across multiple programs in a social service organization? How do you translate abstract plans into real activities? In this presentation, I will discuss issues surrounding the implementation of sophisticated, multi-department evaluation plans.

Over the last year, I have been working on two sides of an evaluation fence. The design stage, working with Kushner Management Advisory Services, was headwork, moving from skills of abstraction and generalization into a design and plan for a feasible set of measures. Once Community Service Society (the client) approved the evaluation plan, it had to be translated into sustainable, actionable sets of procedures within the organization. During the implementation stage, procedures had to conform to several criteria and remain flexible enough to handle the exigencies of everyday practice across programs and departments. Bridging the design and implementation phases of evaluation presented a host of challenges and opportunities. The challenges took place as the plan met with obstacles like internal resistance and resource constraints. The opportunities occurred as the evaluation plan was modified to more accurately represent the full scope of departmental activities.

This presentation will contribute to the panel by grounding the discussion of evaluation in organizational practices. I will reflect on the unique role I played in bridging design and implementation, demonstrating how evaluators can help create spaces for evaluation in the everyday activities of organizational members.

**Paper Number:** PN042012

**Paper Title:** Philanthropic Foundations and Legitimacy: US and European Perspectives

**Author(s):**

Stefan Toepler, George Mason University, Arlington, VA, USA

**Description**

As private institutions working in the public sphere, the legitimacy of philanthropic foundations in modern democratic societies remains contested. As Waldemar Nielsen (1973, 3) has put it quite succinctly in the past: “Private foundations are ... aristocratic institutions living on the privileges and indulgence of an egalitarian society; aggregations of private wealth which, contrary to the proclaimed instincts of the Economic Man, have been conveyed to public purposes. Like the giraffe, they could not possibly exist [in democracy and capitalism], but they do.” Despite the recent growth of policy interest in foundations on both sides of the Atlantic, these fundamental contradictions have not been solved.

This panel brings together selected contributors to a cross-national research project titled “Philanthropic Foundations and Legitimacy: US and European Perspectives.” The purpose of the project and this panel is to bring into focus the core arguments that have—implicitly or explicitly—served as legitimization base for foundations in the past.

As essentially pre-modern institutions in structure, foundations are privately controlled and generally outside the typical accountability mechanisms that are the hallmark of all other types of organizations and institutions in democratic society. Their legitimacy thus cannot derive from conformity with democratic processes, but must rest on the performance of special roles or functions that are societally useful and broadly acceptable. A number of such functions have been proposed in the past, although rarely in a cohesive way and much less in a broadly comparative fashion. Against this background, the papers in this panel explore key foundation roles and functions in the US and Europe.

**Reference:**

Nielsen, W. A. (1972). *The Big Foundations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

**Paper Number:** PN042012.1

**Paper Title:** Foundation Legitimacy at the Community Level: The case of Community Foundations in the US

**Author(s):**

Kirsten Gronbjerg, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This paper discusses the specific legitimacy issues arising for community foundations that derive from their structural differences to other grantmaking foundations.

### **Description**

Community Foundations occupy a strategic place among U.S. foundations in the role they play in local communities, especially in recent years. While they are grant-making charities like other types of private non-operating foundations (e.g., family, independent, and corporate foundations) they differ from the latter in that they raise funds on an ongoing basis from donors from donors (usually those with special connections to a community) and then pool these funds for the benefit of that community. While other grant-making foundations may also restrict their grant-making to particular regions, community foundations are generally expected to pursue broad community benefits rather than specific program areas and to include community representatives on their boards of directors rather than the donors themselves as in the case of family and corporate foundations.

As a result of these features, community foundations are likely to face more explicit challenges to document their community legitimacy than other grant-making institutions. Indeed, available research shows that community foundations tend to make more explicit efforts to determine community needs in order to prioritize their grant-making than other types of grant-making foundations. Similarly, they tend to structure their grant-making processes on an open competitive basis than many other foundations. Community foundations also face explicit expectations about representing community interests on their boards and exhibiting good stewardship and management practices (e.g., managing investment portfolios, meeting donor interests, marketing their activities).

At the same time, community foundations face increasing competition from other fund-raising structures, such as women's and other special funds, and various charitable gift or donor advised funds now offered by major investment companies (such as Fidelity, Citibank, Merrill Lynch). United Way organizations, themselves facing major challenges, may also present increasing competition as they seek to establish endowments, not just repeat annual gifts. On the other hand, the decline of locally owned businesses may create enough of a leadership vacuum to allow community foundations to take on more prominent roles in their communities.

To develop these arguments, I will first briefly highlight some of the major legal differences between community foundations and other grant-making foundations (and compare them to other community fund-raising institutions, most notably the United Way and the various donor advised funds). I will then review the historical development of community foundations in the U.S. (relying in part on histories of two of the oldest and most established community foundations: The Cleveland Foundation and the Chicago Community Trust) ending with an overview of the number and size of community foundations in the U.S. and of their primary competitors (United Way, donor advised funds). I will include here an analysis of the recent significant growth in their numbers and a description of several special initiatives to build and strengthen these institutions (e.g., the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, Inc.)

I will then turn to the specific mechanisms by which community foundations establish legitimacy in their local communities and review the available research literature on whether and how they do meet expectations about community legitimacy. I will focus on how community foundations (1) assess community needs and establish priorities for addressing these needs, (2) establish linkages to the

community in other ways (board membership, outreach and communication efforts), (3) structure the grant-making process, and (4) participate in external planning and networking. I don't know yet whether there will be research that specifically examines the legitimacy of community foundations relative to other institutions in the community – except to the extent that the growth in their numbers and assets document de facto legitimacy.

This analysis will build in part on two projects where I have direct access to key data (only a small portion of which has been published already). I completed the first of these projects in the mid-1990s. This project, the “Structure of Public and Philanthropic Funding for Human Services in Chicago,” consisted of in-depth interviews with 46 philanthropic funders representing a stratified sample of four types of foundations (independent, family, corporate, and public/community foundations) across four size categories (large, medium, small, tiny). The interviews focused on three broad topic areas: assessments of the human service environment, relationship with funded agencies, and participation in planning structures. (There were corresponding interviews with government funders that will not be included here.)

The second project includes several rounds of assessment and evaluation of the Lilly Endowment Inc's (LIE) community foundation initiative for the state of Indiana. LIE has made two rounds of challenge grants and one round of organizational development grants available to community foundations in the state, as a result of which Indiana has one of the broadest coverage of community foundations (92) of any state in the union – virtually every county has a community foundation, although several are managed jointly by the same executive director. The evaluations are based on criteria for community foundation management practices and show the extent to which these institutions meet the criteria.

**Paper Number:** PN042012.2

**Paper Title:** American Debates on the Legitimacy of Foundations: Historical Perspectives

**Author(s):**

David Hammack, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper discusses the evolution of legitimacy issues of foundations in the US against the larger historical background of the nonprofit sector and offers new perspectives on the current legitimacy debate.

**Description**

Two often-ignored factors should shape our understanding of American responses to philanthropic foundations.

First, before free-standing philanthropic foundations appeared on the American scene early in the twentieth century, the United States had one hundred years of experience with nonprofit organizations that stood independent from government and that accepted responsibility for their own funding. Nonprofit organizations had not been compatible with the institutional arrangements that prevailed under the British Empire, but they began to proliferate after Independence. By the beginning of the twentieth century, nonprofit corporations employed about 1% of the US labor force and throughout much of the U.S., especially in the Northeast and Great Lakes regions, played central roles in secondary and higher education, health care, social service, and the arts as well as in religion. The nonprofit sector grew more rapidly between 1900 and the 1960s; foundations reflected and played sometimes significant roles in that growth. The sector as a whole has grown much more rapidly since the 1960s, in ways that have sometimes challenged foundations.

Because foundations make almost all of their grants to nonprofit organizations in the United States, the American response to foundations has been profoundly shaped by American attitudes to nonprofits in general.

Second, in relation to the nonprofit sector as a whole, the resources of American foundations have always been quite limited. In recent years, for example, all private gifts of money have accounted for only about one-sixth of all nonprofit income. Foundation grants add up to a small share of all such private gifts -- only about 7%.

This paper will explore the implications of these factors for an understanding of debates over the legitimacy of foundations. One key point is this: because American foundations have never had sufficient resources to control other institutions, ambitious foundations have always sought to use their funds to leverage action by others. ( It is important to note that many, perhaps most, American foundations have not been very ambitious, but have served only to manage some of the wealth and some of the charity of wealthy people.) Critics of American foundations have, in turn, also emphasized not so much their actions as the possible implications of their actions. Interestingly, the reality of limited resources has led both foundations and their critics to exaggerate the significance of foundations in the United States.

**Paper Number:** PN042012.3

**Paper Title:** Roles and Visions of Foundations in Europe

**Author(s):**

Helmut Anheier, Center for Civil Society, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

### **Summary of Research**

The paper draws on the results of the project Visions and Roles of Foundations in Europe, which conducted a systematic analysis of the current and future role of foundations in Europe. This analysis includes a mapping and appraisal of foundation visions, policies and strategies, and an overall assessment of the current and future policy environment in which they operate. The project goes beyond a quantitative profile of foundations in Europe, and probes deeper into their role and contributions in meeting the economic, cultural, environmental and educational needs of European societies. The paper presents the comparative findings of the project.

### **Description**

Although they maintain a principal focus on the United Kingdom, Anheier and Leat (2002) pinpoint the salient issues, such as the emergence of new policies, demands for greater accountability and transparency, and professionalism and managerialism, which have the potential to impact upon the position and functioning of foundations in other European countries (and beyond). Thus, we will draw upon these factors to explore some of the key issues and challenges that are of particular importance to foundations in Europe. In so doing, we draw on the findings from the project Visions and Roles of Foundations in Europe. Through innovative primary research in over twenty European countries, this project supplies useful and thorough insights into how foundations perceive these issues and, more broadly the policy environments in which they are set. Below we briefly review four key factors in light of the project's findings.

#### **New policies, new roles**

New policy approaches, such as new public management (Osbourne and McLaughlin, 2002) have forced foundations to reconsider their relationship vis-à-vis the state. This involves rethinking the roles foundations have fulfilled in different countries. In the UK, for instance foundations have tended to see themselves as functioning independently of the state, engaged in “doing what the state doesn't do”, but acting in a way that supplements the government, often by “filling the gaps” left open by the state (Anheier and Leat, 2002). In other European countries, our findings suggest that the majority of foundations identify this complementarity role as the most salient and common role fulfilled by foundations. However, the changing policy environments in which foundations operate have made it increasingly difficult for them to clarify where the boundaries between complementing the state end and those of substituting the state begin. Foundations in countries such as the UK and Sweden have criticised governments for persistently changing the “rules of the game”, which often has the effect of forcing foundations to assume responsibilities that were previously the domain of the government.

Overall, we have found that foundations like to see themselves as forward-thinking, innovative entities that exist parallel to the government as representatives of an alternative to the mainstream— consistent with the liberal model. However, foundations encounter significant internal and external obstacles in maximising their potential to occupy such a position – not least the fluctuating policy environment that is characteristic of European countries at present. Above all, foundations face a salient challenge in (re)defining their role(s), whilst maintaining their objectives and autonomy in this ever-changing policy context.

#### **Governance: accountability, transparency, professionalism and managerialism**

Growing trends towards the contracting out of public services by governments to non-profit organisations has generated increased demands for better transparency and accountability within the non-profit sector (Anheier and Leat 2002). The need for greater efficiency, effectiveness and

responsibility, which are central to many definitions of governance (Kumar and Nunan, 2002, p. 32) are key priorities for the foundations across Europe. Improved transparency and accountability is about improving both practices and public perceptions of foundations. For some foundations in Germany, it is also about giving legitimacy to the initiatives and activities of foundations. In practice, providing for better transparency and accountability has involved activities such as the development of 'codes of practice' by trans-European bodies such as the European Foundation Centre (EFC) and in individual countries. For instance, in Spain, the Fundación Lealtad's principles for Transparency and Good Practice represent one initiative which aims to demystify the activities of foundations in the eyes of the public and, indeed of politicians. (Similarly, in Portugal the Portuguese Centre for Foundations has played a key role in lobbying for improvements to the legal framework in which foundations operate as this is seen as integral to the improvement of governance and transparency. Yet, although these initiatives present a very positive picture of efforts to improve governance amongst foundations, they are not wholly representative of all foundations. In the Netherlands, for example, our research has found that some Dutch foundations remain reluctant to "go public" for fear of being unable to deal with the number of grant applications likely to follow the publicising of their activities! The improvement of transparency, accountability and the increased professionalisation of foundations are high on the agenda of many foundations across Europe, but there is still some way to go before "good governance" constitutes the norm amongst all foundations.

### Globalisation

The impact of globalisation on organised philanthropy is still unclear, as is the role of foundations in globalisation (Anheier and Leat 2002; Johnson 2001). Despite the fact that the global environment for organised philanthropy is more conducive to cross-border activity than ever before in terms of resources and access (Clark 2001; Kriesberg 1997), with some exceptions (such as the Bertelsmann Foundation in Germany, the Jacobs Foundation in Switzerland) foundations tend to be domestic rather than international actors (see also the discussion of 'Europe' below). Nonetheless, as Giddens (2001) has argued, globalisation envisages new roles for third sector organisations in areas such as community renewal, social entrepreneurship and the "activation" of social capital. As discussed earlier, this takes place in the context of a policy environment which seeks to redefine the role of the state in the provision of public benefit (see Anheier and Leat 2002). In this way, policy debates that affect the role of foundations at the international level are likely to be connected to domestic debates about welfare reform (Anheier and Kendall 2001; Deakin 2001).

### Europe

Developing a more European or international outlook is not without its challenges for foundations. The difficulties encountered in cross-border giving remains a salient issue for many foundations (see Gallop, 2001, pp. 744-795). In addition to legal barriers, foundations encounter difficulties in identifying suitable partners, meeting objectives and in assessing whether goals have been achieved. What is more, although the European Union has placed some emphasis on the need for greater collaboration and partnership with foundations and non-profit organisations (European Commission, 1997, 2000), our research suggests that most foundations tend to see themselves as national, rather than European or international actors. There are some indications of changes in this domestic-oriented outlook. Some foundation representatives in Switzerland and Italy underline the need to maximise the potential that Europe provides in the form of collaboration and the transfer of knowledge and best practices. However, overall the potential to be derived and, indeed the implications of trans-national cooperation and collaboration within Europe has not been maximised by European foundations.

**Paper Number:** PN042012.4

**Paper Title:** Philanthropic Foundations and The Innovation Function: Evidence from a Survey of University Researchers

**Author(s):**

Stefan Toepler, George Mason University, Arlington, VA, USA

Maryann P. Feldman, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, CAN

**Summary of Research**

Recent asset growth has lately increased the interest in foundations among policy analysts. At the same time, criticism of the performance of foundations in terms of fostering social innovation has been growing as well. Against this background, this paper presents data comparing researchers' perceptions of different types of funding institutions. We find that foundations appear far more likely to take on risky, cutting-edge projects than any other type of funding institutions; to be flexible and not overly demanding in considering grant proposals; and to be reasonably timely in their decision-making, especially when compared to government support in particular.

**Description**

Recent asset growth and the philanthropic engagement of prominent business leaders, such as Bill Gates and Ted Turner, have lately increased the interest in foundations among policy analysts. At the same time, criticism of the performance of foundations in terms of fostering social innovation has been growing as well. For example, Dowie (2001) sees risk-taking and willingness to experiment with new ideas as mostly myth. Some observers have argued that the professionalization of foundation management has undermined risk-taking and innovation (Nielsen, 1972; Frumkin, 1998). The argument is that over the past thirty years, foundations have substantially increased their staffs and with the resulting emergence of a 'program officer profession,' foundations have become more risk-averse and less innovative. Frumkin (1998) finds that professional foundation managers prefer to fund smaller and safer programs so as not to have to take personal responsibility if larger and riskier projects fail. Freund (1996) suggests that foundation staff tend to follow funding fads while abandoning the risky search for excellence. In order to address these concerns, the Council on Foundations, an umbrella association, launched a communications initiative in the mid-1990s to encourage member foundations to make greater efforts to promote and publicize innovative grants and projects (Ridings, 1996).

Curiously, given the centrality of the innovation function as well as the severity of criticism, empirical studies of the innovativeness of foundations are few and limited in scope. Examples include Mahoney and Estes (1987), who attempted to measure innovativeness by asking foundations whether they had been engaged in out of the ordinary activities in response to the cutbacks in government funding in the early 1980s. Knott and Weissert (1995) analyzed the timing and patterns of four large health foundations' involvement in six health care issues vis-à-vis the timing of congressional hearings on these issues. Weissert and Knott (1995) surveyed one-hundred Washington policy-makers to determine perceptions of the role of three large health foundations. In addition, there are currently a number of projects underway attempting to measure the performance and effectiveness of foundation projects (e.g., Center for Effective Philanthropy, 2002).

An alternative approach, and one that we employed, is to survey grantees (i.e., researchers in this case) about their perceptions of foundation support vis-à-vis other types of funding institutions including government agencies, industry, and other nonprofit organizations, such as the American Heart Association. This permits a comparative assessment of the innovativeness and flexibility of foundations from the perspective of the principal investigators who received research funding and had to comply with the administrative requirements. To the extent that foundations pursue an innovation function, the preferences and experiences of researchers as the funding beneficiaries should reflect this emphasis.

We conducted our survey at a major, private American research university in September 2002. We mailed a four-page questionnaire to 106 principal investigators who had received a research grant from

a philanthropic foundation in 1998 as identified through the records of the Office of Sponsored Research and who were still employed at the university. We received 57 completed questionnaires for a response rate of 53.8%

Against this background, this paper presents data comparing researchers' perceptions of different types of funding institutions.

We find that foundations appear far more likely to take on risky, cutting-edge projects than any other type of funding institutions; to be flexible and not overly demanding in considering grant proposals; and to be reasonably timely in their decision-making, especially when compared to government support in particular.

#### References

Center for Effective Philanthropy (2002). *Indicators of Effectiveness: Understanding and Improving Foundation Performance*. Boston: Center for Effective Philanthropy.

Dowie, M. (2001). *American Foundations: An Investigative History*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Freund, G. (1996). *Narcissism and Philanthropy: Ideas and Talent Denied*. New York: Viking.

Frumkin, P. (1998). The Long Recoil From Regulation: Private Philanthropic Foundations and the Tax Reform Act of 1969. *American Review of Public Administration* 28, 266-286.

Knott, J. & Weissert, C. (1995). Foundations and Health Policy: Identifying Funding Strategies in Health Programming. *Policy Studies Review* 14, 149-160.

Mahoney, C. & Estes, C. (1987). The Changing Role of Private Foundations: Business as Usual or Creative Innovation? *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 16, 22-31.

Nielsen, W. (1972). *The Big Foundations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ridings, D. (1996). Do Tell. *Foundation News & Commentary*, September-October 1996, 18-20.

Weissert, C. & Knott, J. (1995). Foundations' Impact on Policy Making: Results from a Pilot Study. *Health Affairs*, 14, 275-286.

**Paper Number:** PN042013

**Paper Title:** Organizational Culture: Metaphor or Causal Factor?

**Author(s):**

Carl Milofsky, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, USA

### **Description**

This panel offers a review of the concept of organizational culture, a discussion of how relevant it is for explaining organizational behavior, and examples of how the concept might be applied. We are drawn to this theoretical explanation by our interest in religious life, faith-based organizations, and the ways that the culture of religion interfaces with the organizational life of congregations and social service organizations. But we also are interested in how culture relates to processes of bureaucratization that tend to create closed, hierarchical, deterministic organizations. This is one of the important themes in the way social movement theory has been applied to understanding the development of democratic nonprofit organizations. It also has been one of the important themes in the way theology has been used to structure church life to be open to critique and reform. Four papers make up this panel.

#### **1. Organizational Culture: Anticipating the Effects of Religion**

Carl Milofsky, Bucknell University

Suzanne Feeney, Portland State University

This paper is a review of the concept of organizational culture with an eye to anticipating how faith-based organizations might be affected by their affiliations with formal religious organizations. The motivation for the paper is our beginning work on a series of in-depth ethnographic case studies of organizations or situations where religious bodies have undertaken work to address social problems. What are called faith-based organizations, funded by government or private grant programs, are the clearest examples. We also have encountered less formal projects organized within congregations or religious networks. To understand how faith affects social service activities we believe a detailed review of the concept of organizational culture is necessary. While our larger goals are to study how religious bodies affect social service programs with which they are affiliated, this paper will be primarily concerned with the concept of organizational culture rather than with research on how religion is expressed in social service organizations.

Our plan in the paper is to begin with the list of ten definitions of organizational culture provided by Schein (1992). We intend to do literature reviews to document the diversity of research examples and conceptual elaborations related to each of those definitions. In our review we will look as well for additional definitions of organizational culture that ought to be on the list. We also would offer short case examples both to illustrate the definitions and to suggest how the definitions relate to organizational challenges encountered with faith-based organizations.

We come into this research review with the general idea that organizational culture is a somewhat hidden but influential feature of many organizations that influences choices about structure and practices in ways that seem inexplicable or counter intuitive. Church traditions might bring to faith-based organizations certain values or standard operating procedures that have profound implications for practice even though the source of these influences might not be recognized by participants.

Organizational culture in this sense might be understood as the “deep structure” of an organization. This deep structure might strongly influence the way faith-based organizations function but this might happen in ways that require deep ethnographic study to reveal.

As we have thought about organizational culture, however, it is clear that there are other important meanings that we must consider. For example, there is an important anthropological literature about how bureaucratic organizations, informed by Western cultural traditions, function in non-Western cultural settings. Similarly, secular social service organizations might function as though they were embedded in a different culture when they work with religious organizations. Other understandings of organizational culture will provide other angles for understanding the special challenges that arise in faith-based organizations.

Schein, E.H. (1992), *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## 2. Congregational Helping the Needy: An American Cultural Norm Ram Cnaan, School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania

Of the last eleven studies to assess the extent to which congregations assist people in need, ten found that at least nine-in-ten congregations do so. Furthermore, all indicated that congregations are interested in helping the needy, perceive it as their mandate, and wish they could have done more. Studies of needy people suggest that the first line of help is understood to be the loose network of congregations. This is where one goes for a warm meal, for a bag of food, and if needed for shelter. New emerging data show that some social service agencies inform clients that they are eligible for care only when they exhaust available help from local religious congregations. Clearly, many people in these congregations are motivated by religious teaching that I will show are calling upon them to act charitably. But these teachings are insufficient to motivate European congregants to act in the way American congregations do. The lack of adequate public welfare state services leaves the door open (crowding out) for congregations to be an active player in the welfare field. But, this argument is also insufficient, as it does not explain why local religious congregations are so involved in social care rather than fraternal organizations, Rotary clubs, or youth groups. My contention is that the cultural mandate of joining a religious congregation includes a strong expectation of doing "good" in society. New members accept it as part of the membership norms, new clergy are trained in seminaries to develop social ministries, and society at large sees it as the congregational norm. The media routinely cover this aspect of congregational life and public policy accepts it as a given. Consequently, clergy and members alike do not ask: "why we are responsible for welfare services?" but rather they apologize for not doing more for the needy. This presentation will discuss the above issues and will conclude with an analysis of how this norm was perpetuated and why it is convenient to all stakeholders to voluntarily sustain this cultural mandate.

## 3. Narrative, Idiom, and Culture in Congregational Life John Messer, Susquehanna Institute and Bloomsburg University

This paper is a comparative analysis of patterns of idiomatic expression found in several parishes within one denomination located in the same geographic region. The analysis is based upon extensive ethnographical data gathered from each parish. This material includes collective story-telling about the history and life of the congregation, one-on-one interviews, focus groups, participatory and observational research. We begin our analysis viewing each parish through Hopewell's (1987) lens of idiomatic styles.

There is an identifiable pattern in a congregation's words, gestures and works. This pattern finds partial articulation in the repeated stories told of the congregation's history, and through the interpretation of events and circumstance which order collective congregational life. This localized grammar typically draws its form and stories from a larger treasury to create its own local outlook, patterns of action and values. The embodiment of practice that this narrative expresses identifies change and continuity in a narrative that is unique to the congregation. Individual members' personal narratives --stories about their own journey of faith -- align, complement, or otherwise reflect the same idiom, thus reflect a shared history, and often a sense of shared destiny.

In some congregations the collective and individual idiom matches. Other congregations embody one of several forms of a patterned heterogeneity. These patterns vary with the size, location, history, health, and capacity for change and growth of the congregation. The various distinctive idioms, their patterned relations within a given congregation, and the resulting dynamics that are engendered by each are the focus of this study.

## 4. Avoid, Talk, or Fight: Alternative Cultural Strategies in the Battle Against Oligarchy in Collectivist-Democratic Organizations Joyce Rothschild, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Darcy Leach University of

## Michigan

In 1979, when “collectives” and “alternative institutions” were first developing in the US, Rothschild introduced a model of the collectivist-democratic organization, positing the substantive logic and the essential elements of these organizations. Since then, many thousands of such organizations have developed in the US, in Europe and even in the less developed regions of the world. Indeed, today in many not-for-profit organizations, non-governmental organizations and social movement organizations it is almost assumed that they will adopt, or at least aspire, to a collectivist-democratic form.

In the ensuing 25 years, as the collectivist-democratic form has spread to organizations with many different purposes and in a wide variety of political contexts, we find that these organizations have come to develop a number of different ways of retaining their democratic form. In other words, they are not all alike in the internal organizational cultures they develop. Grounded in our observation of German and American social movement organizations, we find that we can now identify three different methods or cultural strategies that collectivist-democratic organizations use to try to contain and dissolve concentrations of power that arise before they become entrenched oligarchic formations. We call these cultural choices, respectively, a culture of avoidance, a culture of candor and a fight culture. Although each represents a different way that democratic organizations have developed to try to counter oligarchic tendencies, we find that they are differentially effective at doing so. This article will set forth the cultural choices that real-life collectivist democratic organizations have evolved—when conflict and differential influence come up, they can avoid, talk or fight—and shows that these various strategies may lead to organizations with very different “feels” and with very different outcomes.

**Paper Number:** PN042013.1

**Paper Title:** Organizational Culture: Anticipating the Effects of Religion

**Author(s):**

Carl Milofsky, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, USA

Suzanne Feeney, Institute for Nonprofit Management, Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper is a review of the concept of organizational culture with an eye to how it may be used in research on how religious bodies and faith-based organizations interact.

**Description**

This paper is a review of the concept of organizational culture with an eye to anticipating how faith-based organizations might be affected by their affiliations with formal religious organizations. The motivation for the paper is our beginning work on a series of in-depth ethnographic case studies of organizations or situations where religious bodies have undertaken work to address social problems. What are called faith-based organizations, funded by government or private grant programs, are the clearest examples. We also have encountered less formal projects organized within congregations or religious networks. To understand how faith affects social service activities we believe a detailed review of the concept of organizational culture is necessary. While our larger goals are to study how religious bodies affect social service programs with which they are affiliated, this paper will be primarily concerned with the concept of organizational culture rather than with research on how religion is expressed in social service organizations.

Our plan in the paper is to begin with the list of ten definitions of organizational culture provided by Schein (1992). We intend to do literature reviews to document the diversity of research examples and conceptual elaborations related to each of those definitions. In our review we will look as well for additional definitions of organizational culture that ought to be on the list. We also would offer short case examples both to illustrate the definitions and to suggest how the definitions relate to organizational challenges encountered with faith-based organizations.

We come into this research review with the general idea that organizational culture is a somewhat hidden but influential feature of many organizations that influences choices about structure and practices in ways that seem inexplicable or counter intuitive. Church traditions might bring to faith-based organizations certain values or standard operating procedures that have profound implications for practice even though the source of these influences might not be recognized by participants. Organizational culture in this sense might be understood as the "deep structure" of an organization. This deep structure might strongly influence the way faith-based organizations function but this might happen in ways that require deep ethnographic study to reveal.

As we have thought about organizational culture, however, it is clear that there are other important meanings that we must consider. For example, there is an important anthropological literature about how bureaucratic organizations, informed by Western cultural traditions, function in non-Western cultural settings. Similarly, secular social service organizations might function as though they were embedded in a different culture when they work with religious organizations. Other understandings of organizational culture will provide other angles for understanding the special challenges that arise in faith-based organizations.

Schein, E.H. (1992), *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Paper Number:** PN042013.2

**Paper Title:** Congregational Helping the Needy: An American Cultural Norm

**Author(s):**

Ram Cnaan, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

**Summary of Research**

Of the last eleven studies to assess the extent to which congregations assist people in need, ten found that at least nine-in-ten congregations do so. Furthermore, all indicated that congregations are interested in helping the needy, perceive it as their mandate, and wish they could have done more.

**Description**

Of the last eleven studies to assess the extent to which congregations assist people in need, ten found that at least nine-in-ten congregations do so. Furthermore, all indicated that congregations are interested in helping the needy, perceive it as their mandate, and wish they could have done more. Studies of needy people suggest that the first line of help is understood to be the loose network of congregations. This is where one goes for a warm meal, for a bag of food, and if needed for shelter. New emerging data show that some social service agencies inform clients that they are eligible for care only when they exhaust available help from local religious congregations. Clearly, many people in these congregations are motivated by religious teaching that I will show are calling upon them to act charitably. But these teachings are insufficient to motivate European congregants to act in the way American congregations do. The lack of adequate public welfare state services leaves the door open (crowding out) for congregations to be an active player in the welfare field. But, this argument is also insufficient, as it does not explain why local religious congregations are so involved in social care rather than fraternal organizations, Rotary clubs, or youth groups. My contention is that the cultural mandate of joining a religious congregation includes a strong expectation of doing good in society. New members accept it as part of the membership norms, new clergy are trained in seminaries to develop social ministries, and society at large sees it as the congregational norm. The media routinely cover this aspect of congregational life and public policy accepts it as a given. Consequently, clergy and members alike do not ask: why we are responsible for welfare services? but rather they apologize for not doing more for the needy. This presentation will discuss the above issues and will conclude with an analysis of how this norm was perpetuated and why it is convenient to all stakeholders to voluntarily sustain this cultural mandate.

**Paper Number:** PN042013.3

**Paper Title:** Narrative, Idiom, and Culture in Congregational Life

**Author(s):**

John Messer, Susquehanna Institute, Lewisburg, PA, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper is a comparative analysis of patterns of idiomatic expression found in several parishes within one denomination located in the same geographic region. The analysis is based upon extensive ethnographical data gathered from each parish.

**Description**

This paper is a comparative analysis of patterns of idiomatic expression found in several parishes within one denomination located in the same geographic region. The analysis is based upon extensive ethnographical data gathered from each parish. This material includes collective story-telling about the history and life of the congregation, one-on-one interviews, focus groups, participatory and observational research. We begin our analysis viewing each parish through Hopewells ( 1987) lens of idiomatic styles.

There is an identifiable pattern in a congregation's words, gestures and works. This pattern finds partial articulation in the repeated stories told of the congregations history, and through the interpretation of events and circumstance which order collective congregational life. This localized grammar typically draws its form and stories from a larger treasury to create its own local outlook, patterns of action and values. The embodiment of practice that this narrative expresses identifies change and continuity in a narrative that is unique to the congregation. Individual memberspersonal narratives --stories about their own journey of faith -- align, complement, or otherwise reflect the same idiom, thus reflect a shared history, and often a sense of shared destiny.

In some congregations the collective and individual idiom matches. Other congregations embody one of several forms of a patterned heterogeneity. These patterns vary with the size, location, history, health, and capacity for change and growth of the congregation. The various distinctive idioms, their patterned relations within a given congregation, and the resulting dynamics that are engendered by each are the focus of this study.

**Paper Number:** PN042013.4

**Paper Title:** Avoid, Talk, or Fight: Alternative Cultural Strategies in the Battle Against Oligarchy in Collectivist-Democratic Organizations

**Author(s):**

Joyce Rothschild, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA, USA

Darcy Leach, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This article will set forth the cultural choices that real-life collectivist democratic organizations have evolved when conflict and differential influence come up, they can avoid, talk or fight and shows that these various strategies may lead to organizations with very different feels and with very different outcomes.

### **Description**

In 1979, when collectives and alternative institutions were first developing in the US, Rothschild introduced a model of the collectivist-democratic organization, positing the substantive logic and the essential elements of these organizations. Since then, many thousands of such organizations have developed in the US, in Europe and even in the less developed regions of the world. Indeed, today in many not-for-profit organizations, non-governmental organizations and social movement organizations it is almost assumed that they will adopt, or at least aspire, to a collectivist-democratic form.

In the ensuing 25 years, as the collectivist-democratic form has spread to organizations with many different purposes and in a wide variety of political contexts, we find that these organizations have come to develop a number of different ways of retaining their democratic form. In other words, they are not all alike in the internal organizational cultures they develop. Grounded in our observation of German and American social movement organizations, we find that we can now identify three different methods or cultural strategies that collectivist-democratic organizations use to try to contain and dissolve concentrations of power that arise before they become entrenched oligarchic formations. We call these cultural choices, respectively, a culture of avoidance, a culture of candor and a fight culture. Although each represents a different way that democratic organizations have developed to try to counter oligarchic tendencies, we find that they are differentially effective at doing so. This article will set forth the cultural choices that real-life collectivist democratic organizations have evolved when conflict and differential influence come up, they can avoid, talk or fight and shows that these various strategies may lead to organizations with very different feels and with very different outcomes.

**Paper Number:** CO043402

**Paper Title:** Similarities and Differences in the Research Landscape of Faith-Based Organizations

**Author(s):**

John Orr, USC, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Robin Rogers, Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

Marye Thomas, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

Jon Singletary, Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

**Summary of Research**

This colloquy will discuss the regional differences and similarities that emerged through a national study of exemplary programs of faith-based organizations addressing the problems of urban poverty. Conducted by the Faith and Service Technical Education Network (FASTEN) Research Team, this qualitative study is part of a larger research project sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The presenters will discuss local findings from Los Angeles, Central Virginia, and Central Texas, noting the differences and similarities of the areas' faith-based landscape, the landscape's influence on the research process, and the research findings.

**Description**

In the summer of 2002, the Research Team of the Faith and Service Technical Education Network (funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts) began conducting multi-phased research on exemplary programs of faith-based organizations that address problems of urban poverty. In the initial qualitative phase of the research, FASTEN researchers interviewed administrators, staff, clients, and collaborators from fifteen programs of faith-based organizations. Research questions focused on promising and exemplary practices, models of collaboration, institutional factors for their collaboration and services, types of services for which faith-based organizations are best-suited, and the role of faith in these services. In four regions across the United States (in Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and California), 64 interviews were conducted in 15 programs. Using Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), the research team conducted analysis emphasizing constant comparison throughout the process. This allowed for four rounds of data collection and analysis and the creation of 1,000 distinct units of data, 1,200 codes, and 65 core networks depicting the overall research results. This qualitative phase, with its focus on theory building, became the basis of a nation-wide survey of 15,000 faith based organizations and congregations.

This colloquy is based on constant comparison analysis of local site codes and networks, as well local understandings of promising and exemplary practices compared to that of other sites within the overall research project. Team members will briefly discuss the emergent grounded theory expressed in the core codes and networks, followed by a discussion of regional similarities and differences in Central Texas; Richmond, VA; and Los Angeles, CA. A particular focus of the discussion will be on the multiple faith-based landscapes that provided the context for the national research. Presenters will note how the various landscapes affected how faith-based organizations were selected and engaged during the research process as well as findings distinctive to particular regions. Drawing from both the findings and the presenters' regional understandings, implications for future research, practice, and policy will be discussed. As time allows, colloquy attendees will be encouraged to compare and contrast their regional understanding with that of the presenters.

**References**

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Paper Number:** PA041042

**Paper Title:** What difference does a sector make? Comparing nonprofit and governmental Bureaus of Efficiency in early 20th century American cities

**Author(s):**

Mordecai Lee, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

### **Summary of Research**

Municipal Bureaus of Efficiency (BOEs) were sometimes established as part of the American Progressive Movement in the early 20th century. BOEs were a permutation of the better-known Bureaus of Municipal Research. However, the latter were always nonprofit, while BOEs were either nonprofit or governmental agencies. This paper is an historical comparison of nonprofit and governmental BOEs in the Midwest. Besides historical research, the results also permit some interesting intersectorial comparisons. Were nonprofit and governmental BOEs largely similar or different in organization, mission, work and results? Answers might suggest some intriguing perspectives about nonprofit organizations when they have public sector equals.

### **Description**

One of the major goals of the Progressive Movement at the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries was to 'clean up' government. Business leaders, academics and women activists coalesced to press for significant reform of the public sector. They sought to end corruption, patronage, bosses and machines in city government. Yet American Progressivism was also a reflection of Scientific Management, the effort to make 'efficiency' the paramount value in all aspects of modern society, whether in industrial production, agriculture, corporations and government bureaucracies. Efficiency was a value that supposedly transcended the normal left-right ideological divisions of American society and politics. Everyone could seemingly agree on the need for efficiency, especially in government.

A prominent example of this reform effort was the creation of local nonprofit organizations that would advocate for 'good government.' (That's why these citizen activists were sometimes called, derisively, goo-goos.) In most major cities, citizens joined to incorporate nonprofit agencies that were called 'municipal research bureaus' (or variations on that title), the most prominent of which was in New York City. Historians have extensively studied these nonprofit organizations. (Unfortunately, this literature gives little attention to the nonprofit status of these bureaus.)

However, as part of this municipal research bureau reform movement, there was a sub-genre of such bureaus called bureaus of efficiency (BOEs). An arresting, but so far ignored, difference between municipal research bureaus and bureaus of efficiency was that the former were always nonprofit organizations, while the latter straddled the boundary between the nonprofit and public sectors. Some BOEs were nonprofit organizations while others were units within municipal government. Whether inside government or outside it, the purpose of an Efficiency Bureau was to push for increasing efficiency and reducing waste in government operations.

The bi-sectoral identity of BOEs appears to be an unusual phenomenon; little noted by historians of early 20th century America or researchers affiliated either with nonprofit studies or public administration. Here was an organizational entity that could seemingly exist on either side of the dividing line between government and the nonprofit sector and still have the same organizational goals and work processes. Yet, a central premise underlying the theory of each of the three sectors in American society is that every sector is unique and qualitatively different from the others. For example, the traditional rationale used to justify the distinction between the practice and study of business administration and that of public administration has been that their respective sectoral affiliation inherently created such significant qualitative differences between them that each was truly a different genus. Increasingly in contemporary times, a similar argument is used to advocate for the distinct existence of the profession and academic field of nonprofit management, in contradistinction to business administration and/or public administration. With both nonprofit and governmental bureaus of efficiency having existed, such

an argument of distinctiveness between these two sectors would appear to be challenged, at least for this particular time, place and purpose.

Therefore, this paper reviews in detail the activities of nonprofit and governmental BOEs in the Midwest in the first half of the 20th century. Two cities had both kinds of BOE, simultaneously or sequentially. Chicago had nonprofit and governmental BOEs that overlapped in existence. The Chicago Bureau of Public Efficiency was a nonprofit agency that existed from 1910 to 1931, when it merged into the Civic Federation. Meanwhile, the municipality's Civil Service Commission had an Efficiency Division that existed from 1909 to (about) 1915. In Milwaukee (WI), from 1910 to 1912 there was a Bureau of Economy and Efficiency in city government. Then, from 1913 to 1921, Milwaukee-area civic leaders established and supported a nonprofit Citizens Bureau of Municipal Efficiency. (It was then renamed and continues to operate to this day [2004].)

Another example of a municipal BOE in the Midwest was the City of Toledo (OH) Commission on Publicity and Efficiency that existed from 1916 to 1963. Conversely, in 1914, local citizens in Kansas City (MO) established a nonprofit Bureau of Research and Efficiency that was primarily interested in educational issues. These six BOEs, three nonprofit and three governmental, are the case studies used in this paper to analyze the existence of this unusual cross-sectoral organizational entity.

The social science research methodology for this project is triangulation, i.e. the use of three independent and reliable sources of historical information. For this topic, the three historical sources are (1) the modest amount of published academic and professional literature, (2) publications and reports issued by these BOEs as well as other relevant public records (such as newspaper coverage) and (3) archival materials.

The first part of the paper presents short research-based histories of each of these nonprofit and governmental BOEs. This provides scholarly information that has virtually not been available up to now. Then, the second part of the paper analyzes the degree of similarity and difference between these nonprofit and public Bureaus of Efficiency. Similarities would suggest that the premise about the distinctiveness of the sectors is not automatically a valid one. Differences would appear to indicate that notwithstanding seemingly identical titles and missions, the inherent differences of the two sectors dictated an inevitability to significant differences in nonprofit versus governmental Bureaus of Efficiency.

The purpose of the paper is to contribute to the growing historical and theoretical literature on the inherent nature of the nonprofit sector and its interrelationship with other sectors.

Note: At the time of submission of this proposal (March 2004), the proposer of this paper was in the midst of his field research. Therefore, at this stage, this summary of the proposal is unable to state the results of the research. However, since the grant that is funding the field research for this project requires that a final written report with the research results be submitted to the grantor in September 2004, it is expected that the paper proposed here will be completed comfortably by the deadlines for the ARNOVA conference.

**Paper Number:** PA041176

**Paper Title:** Lady Boards of Managers: Governance of Charities in Post-Civil War Richmond, Virginia

**Author(s):**

Russell Cargo, Nonprofit Enterprise Institute, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

**Summary of Research**

Charitable organizations such as the Richmond Female Humane Association and the Retreat for the Sick were formed following the Civil War. The pattern appears to be that women founded and operated those organizations. One of the structures used was the Lady Board of Managers. This research examines this structural form, gender roles in nineteenth century charities, the evolution of governance patterns, and the relationship between Boards of Trustees and Women's Auxiliary groups.

**Description**

Lady Boards of Managers: Governance of Charities in Post-Civil War Richmond, Virginia

Russell A. Cargo, F. Ellen Netting, Mary Katherine O'Connor, and David Fauri  
Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia

The Confederate States of America declared all able-bodied men between eighteen and 35 eligible for service in April 1862. Mary Greenhow Lee of Winchester, Virginia, wrote in response to the lack of men left in communities all over Virginia, "I propose that we shall declare ourselves a separate & independent sovereignty, & elect a Queen to reign over us."

Women were forced to take on work that had previously been solely the domain of men. Even after the war, many men who returned were physically or mentally disabled or, if they were healthy, they were occupied with re-building a horribly damaged infrastructure -- factories, railroads, businesses, farms, and homes. Social problems were rampant and the women who had served so admirably both behind the lines during the war and on the home front, stepped up to initiate and manage the charitable organizations formed out of the urgent post-war need.

Drew Gilpin Faust writes in *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*, that women's organizations:

"...flourished in the South as they never had in antebellum years. Not just associations to support suffrage or the Lost Cause, but temperance societies, educational and civic reform groups, church and missionary organizations, literary leagues, and women's clubs involved ladies in a variety of efforts aimed at personal and social uplift. The power of associations, Anne Scott has written, 'had its own inner dynamic,' propelling women into public life as well as into closer bonds with one another."

It appears that Lady Boards of Managers were an intermediary form of governance positioned between the Board of Trustees and the Staff. Several organizations describe this structure as an "Executive Board of Managers" or as the "Executive Committee" and imply that this was both a subordinate extension of the Board of Trustees and an upward extension of the executive function of the organization. They formed a type of "working board" that had broad, but not complete, authority over the organization and ensured the day-to-day operations ran smoothly.

A description of the Board of Women Managers of Richmond's Crippled Children's Hospital is illustrative:

“The Board of Women Managers shall have the care of the patients and the charge of the hospital grounds; it shall have power to designate the duties of the officers and employees of the hospital connected with the above objects, with full authority to employ and discharge all such officers and employees. It shall also have charge of all purchases made in connection with the management and maintenance of the hospital.”

Using city directories, organizational histories, obituaries, and contemporary accounts, this paper traces the evolution of charitable organizations in Richmond, Virginia, formed after the Civil War. Of particular interest is the governance of those organizations that employed Lady Boards of Managers. Surprisingly, there are very few references to Lady Boards of Managers in the literature. The sparse mentions of this phenomenon focus on northern organizations near the turn of the twentieth century.

This paper will link earlier studies that have touched on both women’s roles as well as structural issues such as “shadow boards” and the various forms of women’s auxiliary groups. We believe this research will add significant new information to the subject of nonprofit governance, gender roles in charitable organizations, and the evolution of nonprofit enterprise in the later nineteenth century.

Footnotes were eliminated in conversion to plain text.

**Paper Number:** PA041136

**Paper Title:** Congregational Volunteers in Community Service Programs: What Motivates, Sustains, and Limits Their Involvement?

**Author(s):**

Diana R. Garland, Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

Dennis Myers, Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

Terry Wolfer, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, USA

**Summary of Research**

Explores the motivations of congregational volunteers and the difficulties and challenges of initiating, sustaining, and enhancing their involvement in community service programs. Reports findings from a survey of 7403 church members from 32 Christian congregations, an additional survey of 946 active volunteers, as well as in-depth interviews with 29 congregational leaders, 25 individual volunteers, and 16 families involved in community service. Draws implications for congregational leaders and social service professionals who lead volunteers.

**Description**

Congregations have the greatest source of volunteers in the nation, and church attendance is the best general predictor of involvement in volunteer service (Gerard, 1985; Wuthnow, 1995). Sheie (1994) points out that it is very difficult to distinguish between “religious” and “community-based” social service programs, since many community-based organizations originated in church basements and are staffed and contributed to by church members. Even congregational programs often serve more members of the surrounding community than the congregation’s own members (Cnaan, 1997; Hall, 1998; Unruh, 1999a, b; Wuthnow, 1995; Boddie, Cnaan, & Dilulio, 2001). Putnam (2000) asserts that “faith communities in which people worship together are arguably the single most important repository of social capital in America” (p. 66). Volunteers involved in congregationally sponsored community ministry provide the social capital—the supportive relationships and resources—that assist a wide variety of vulnerable groups. The National Congregations Study, a 1998 survey of 1236 randomly selected religious congregations, found that 57% of congregations had participated in or supported a social service, community development, or neighborhood organizing project within the past 12 months (Chaves, Konieczny, Beyerlein, & Barman, 1999).

Despite increasing research attention to the role of congregations in a community’s array of social services, somewhat less interest has been directed to understanding the volunteers themselves. Based on the Congregational Giving Study, Hoge et al. (1996) found that volunteering is very closely associated with other forms of church participation (see also Park & Smith, 2000; and Greeley, 1997) but is not predicted by attitudes about the primary duties and responsibilities of the Christian life (Hoge et al., 1996). Wuthnow studied the development of caring that leads to voluntarism and concluded that it is learned, beginning in family life, and that it must include exposure to the needs of others and identification with their suffering (Wuthnow, 1995). Wuthnow’s qualitative research was the first in-depth exploration of the complexities of volunteer motivation (Wuthnow, 1991), motivations that are not usually simply to “feel good.” Clary and Snyder (1996) concluded from their national survey that there are multiple layers to the motivation to volunteer, and that long-time volunteers differ in their motivations from those with less experience. The most important motivation for volunteering, according to their research, was to express and act on humanitarian values. Unruh has noted that there are ranges of religious meanings invested in church-based social services that involve volunteers. She has suggested “modes of religious meaning” in faith-based service: gratitude (a response to what God has done for the person), obedience (a response to God’s will), and discipleship (a means or motivation for encountering God) (Unruh, 1999).

There appear to be at least two sets of variables at work in volunteers’ motivation and sustained involvement. First, there are characteristics of the serving congregation and its volunteers, such as theological belief systems, predispositions to serve, systemic strengths and resources, and previous

experiences. Second, there are characteristics of the service activity—what volunteers do and how and in what context. These may include whether or not the volunteer works alone or with others in the volunteer's family and/or congregation, the length and extent of the commitment required by the activity, the psychological or social distance between the volunteer and the recipient of service, and the intensity of the relationship. For example, do those experiences of service in which the volunteer has the opportunity to form a relationship with those served (tutoring, or mentoring, or leading a children's activity group) have a more profound effect on the volunteer's sustained motivation than other less interactional forms of service (preparing meals to be delivered by others, gathering goods or funds for missions in other places by other persons)? Finally, in what ways do these two sets of variables interact with one another? What motivates congregations and their volunteers to serve through particular programs and activities? What characteristics of the service sustain or deplete their motivation?

The "Service and Faith" project was designed to examine these variables and explore these questions about congregational volunteering. The project limited its focus to one subset of service activity, that of "organized community caring." Organized community caring connotes service that takes place through the programs of congregations and other community organizations. It excludes acts of kindness or charity that take place in informal human interaction.

The project was based in four research sites representing different regions of the United States-- Michigan, South Carolina, Texas, and Southern California. The sample consisted of 36 Christian congregations with diverse denominational affiliations and whose participants were predominantly Anglo, Hispanic, or African-American. All congregations were involved in at least one form of volunteering in the community. Following a survey of the entire congregation, members currently involved in community service were invited to complete an additional survey about their volunteer work and its relationship to their congregation and their personal beliefs, attitudes, and values (n=946). A subsample of 25 individual volunteers participated in qualitative interviews, and another 16 families who volunteered as family units participated in qualitative family interviews. Finally, researchers conducted qualitative interviews with 29 congregational leaders. The interviews were fully taped and transcribed. The research team created new protocols for group coding using the software package Atlas-Ti designed to support the development of grounded theory addressing the research questions. This paper will include findings from both the quantitative survey and the qualitative interviews to describe the challenges of initiating, enhancing, and sustaining volunteer involvement across a variety of community and congregational settings. It concludes with implications for congregational leaders and social service professionals who recruit, train, and lead volunteers, and attempt to sustain their long-term involvement.

## References

Boddie, S. C., Cnaan, R. A., Dilulio, J. J. (2001). Philadelphia census of congregations and their involvement in social service delivery: Methodological challenges and findings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Social Work and Research, Atlanta, GA, January 20, 2001.

Chaves, M., Konieczny, M. E., Beyerlein, K., & Barman, E. (1999). The national congregations study: Background, methods, and selected results. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38(4), 458-476.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(4), 485-505.

Cnaan, R. A. (1997). Social and community involvement of religious congregations housed in historic religious properties: Findings from a six-city study. Final Report to Partners for Sacred Places. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Gerard, D. (1985). Values and voluntary work, Values and social change in Britain (pp. 201-226). London: Macmillan.

- Greeley, A. (1997). The other civic America: Religion and social capital. *The American Prospect*, May/June, 68-73.
- Hall, P. D. (1998). Faith traditions, public engagement, and organizational preferences in America, 1800-1998. Paper of the Program on Non-Profit Organizations, Yale Divinity School, Yale University.
- Hoge, D. R., Zech, C., McNamara, P., & Donahue, M. J. (1996). The value of volunteers as resources for congregations. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Nashville, TN.
- Park, J. Z., & Smith, C. (2000). "To whom much has been given...": Religious capital and community voluntarism among churchgoing Protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 39(3 (September)), 272-286.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Scheie, D. M. (1994). *Better together: Religious institutions as partners in community-based development*. Minneapolis: Rainbow Research, Inc.
- Unruh, H. R. (1999a). Perceptions of religious meaning in faith-based social services. Paper presented at the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Boston MA, November 5, 1999.
- Unruh, H. R. (1999b). Saving souls, saving society: The role of evangelism in church-based social ministries. Paper presented for the Religious Research Association Conference, Boston, November 6, 1999.
- Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wuthnow, R. (1995). *Learning to care: Elementary kindness in an age of indifference*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Paper Number:** PA041155

**Paper Title:** Institutional Capacity for Volunteer Roles: Perceptions of Older Adults

**Author(s):**

Prema Thirupathy, Global Service Institute, Center For Social Development, Washington University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Madhura Nagchoudhuri, Global Service Institute, Center For Social Development, Washington University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Amanda Moore McBride, Global Service Institute, Center for Social Development, Washington University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Fengyan Tang, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

Nancy Morrow-Howell, Global Service Institute, Center for Social Development, Washington University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

**Summary of Research**

This paper examines the relationship between institutional capacity and volunteering from the perspective of older volunteers. Surveys were first conducted to determine the level of institutional capacity offered by service-based organizations when attracting and retaining older volunteers. Focus groups were then conducted with volunteers to determine if their decision to volunteer was influenced by institutional factors. Findings suggest that informal incentives and facilitation played a significant role in the older volunteer's decision to serve. Implications are drawn for volunteer program design, including motivational and support strategies that may maximize volunteer participation among older adults.

**Description**

Introduction:

As the population demographic continues to gray in the United States and worldwide, there is a growing pool of older adults with time and talents to offer. They can be a resource to many nonprofit and voluntary sector organizations, especially those facing budgetary constraints in running their programs and services. Just as organizations stand to benefit from the participation of older adults as volunteers, the volunteers also stand to gain from the experience.

Volunteering among older adults is associated with a range of positive outcomes (Morrow-Howell, 2000). Possible outcomes among older adults include better health, greater life satisfaction, and extended longevity (Moen, Dempster-McClain, & Williams, 1992; Musick, Herzog & House, 1999; Oman, Thoresen, & McMahan, 1999; Van Willigen, 2000). Moreover, volunteering provides older adults with opportunity for personal growth and a sense of purpose and productivity in later life (Morrow-Howell, Kinnevy, & Mann, 1999; Bundens & Bressler, 2002). Recent research also indicates that volunteering results in positive outcomes for the recipients of services provided by older volunteers (Wheeler, Gorey & Greenblatt, 1998).

Volunteering should be encouraged, given the benefits associated with volunteering and the rising participation rates among older adults. It is proposed that the development of institutional capacity can be an effective way to maximize volunteer participation among older adults.

Purpose:

This study addresses the relationship between institutional capacity for volunteer roles and the decision to volunteer. Institutional dimensions are defined as structures that link the individual to the volunteer role. The dimensions of institutional capacity include access, information, expectations, incentives, and facilitation (Sherraden et. al, 2001; Morrow-Howell et. al, 2003). This paper focuses on whether and how organizations address these features, the older adults' perceptions of these features and the perceived influence it has on their decision to volunteer.

### Methodology:

This study was conducted in two stages. First, surveys were conducted with volunteer managers from 22 service-based organizations in the St. Louis Metropolitan area that recruited older adults as volunteers. The questionnaire captured information on the dimensions of institutional capacity in relation to organizations ability to attract and retain older volunteers. Second, four focus groups were held with a total of 43 older volunteers to explore their perceptions of institutional factors and the influence of those factors on their decision to volunteer. Volunteer managers from 13 organizations nominated participants, who were 60 years of age and above and who had volunteered for at least one year. The focus groups were audio-taped, transcribed, and analyzed for key themes. Inter-coder reliability checks were conducted.

### Findings and Conclusions:

From survey findings, dimensions of institutional capacity varied among organizations. Many of the organizations had organizational mechanisms in place to formally offer volunteer roles and were successful in attracting and retaining older volunteers. However, findings from the focus group suggest that most respondents perceived informal means as central to their motivations to volunteer.

Although organizations formally offered information on volunteer roles, the majority of respondents reported that they obtained the information about volunteer roles primarily through informal networks - family and friends who were volunteers or were working with organizations that had volunteer roles. The willingness to volunteer was reinforced by the credibility of the referral. Respondents' decision to volunteer seemed to relate more to personal motivations, rather than the level of detailed information presented by the organization about the task.

Again, many of the organizations provided some form of facilitation for the duration of the volunteer activity. Although respondents acknowledged the formal forms of facilitation provided by the organizations (such as training, guidance etc.), they were most appreciative of the support from their fellow volunteers and the gestures of appreciation from the clients they served. Respondents acknowledged that the support enriched the overall volunteer experience.

The decision to continue volunteering from the participant's perspective had little to do with the formal incentives offered by the organization. Participants felt motivated to continue volunteering because they were satisfied with the volunteer experience. The level of satisfaction was tempered by the perceived positive effects (social, psychological, emotional and physical) experienced, which added to the incentive to continue volunteering. Facilitation played a moderating role in influencing the relationship between volunteer experience and perceived positive effects from the volunteer experience. Where facilitation was found to be high, respondents reported that they perceived greater levels of positive effects from the volunteer experience. This in turn created a higher level of satisfaction, which then contributed to a greater level of motivation to continue volunteering.

### Implications for the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector:

This research highlights the importance of informal incentives and the structure of the work environment for older adult volunteers. What motivates and sustains interest in volunteering from the volunteer's perspective is directly related to the volunteer tasks and the nature of the work environment. The facilitation provided to the volunteer then becomes a form of incentive for the individual to continue volunteering. This has implications for the design and marketing of volunteer roles. Findings from this study can help organizations understand that maximizing the volunteer experience for older adults may require unique institutional approaches. From this study, it is apparent that older adults respond better to more informal forms of information dissemination, incentives, and facilitation. This knowledge can be used to inform changes to institutional design that can better support older volunteers. More research is needed regarding effective recruitment and retention strategies, but these findings provide fodder for hypothesis development and theory building.

References:

Bundens, J., & Bressler, J. (2002, November 23). Assessment of older adults volunteers' subjective well-being over one year. Paper presented at the Gerontological Society of America, Boston, MA.

Moen, P., Dempster-McClain, D., & Williams, R. (1992). Successful aging: A life-course perspective on women's multiple roles and health. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1612-1638.

Morrow-Howell, N., Kinnevy, S., & Mann, M. (1999). The perceived benefits of participation in volunteer and educational activities. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 32 (2), 65-80.

Morrow-Howell, N., Proctor, E., Rubin, E., Li, H., & Thompson, S. (2000). Service needs of depressed elders following acute psychiatric care. *Aging and Mental Health*, 4, 330-338.

Morrow-Howell, N., Hinterlong, J., Sherraden, M., Tang, F., Thirupathy, P., & Nagchoudhuri, M. (2003). Institutional capacity for elder service. *Social Development Issues*.

Musick, M. A., Herzog, A. R. and House, J.S. (1999). Volunteering and mortality among older adults: findings from a national sample. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 54B, S173-S180.

Oman, D., Thoreson, C., & McMahon, K. (1999). Volunteerism and mortality among older adults: Findings from a national sample. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 4, 301-316.

Van Willigen, M. (2000). Differential benefits of volunteering across the life course. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 55B, (5), S308-S318.

Wheeler, J. A., Gorey, K. M., & Greenblatt, B. (1998). The beneficial effects of volunteering for older volunteers and the people they serve: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 17(1), 69-79.

**Paper Number:** PA041313

**Paper Title:** Volunteering for All? Exploring the link between volunteering and social exclusion

**Author(s):**

Angela Ellis, Institute for Volunteering Research, London, United Kingdom

Steven Howlett, Institute for Volunteering Research, London, United Kingdom

**Summary of Research**

This paper draws on findings of a research project undertaken on volunteering and social exclusion in the UK, which explored: the barriers to participation in volunteering for people from black and minority ethnic groups, disabled people and ex-offenders; the existing and potential routes into volunteering; and the benefits of volunteering for individuals from these three groups. At a time in which the question of whether volunteering is fully inclusive has become increasingly central to both the volunteering movement and policy makers, the papers adds to a growing body of knowledge on the broader link between volunteering and social exclusion.

**Description**

**Abstract**

The question of whether volunteering is inclusive, and the broader link between volunteering and social exclusion, has been a key theme for the volunteering movement in the UK over recent years. It has caught the attention of practitioners, researchers and policy-makers alike, particular in light of the growing research evidence which suggested that while all types of people volunteer, some people are more likely to volunteer than others - at least as far as formal volunteering is concerned (see for example, Davis Smith 1998; Obaze, 2000; RSVP, 2000).

This paper draws on findings of a two-year research project, undertaken by the Institute for volunteering Research with financial support from the Community Fund, which set out to explore this issue. By focusing on participation in formal volunteering among individuals from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups, disabled people, and people with a record of offence - all of whom have been identified as being under-represented in formal volunteering and as being at risk of social exclusion – the research looked at what volunteering can do to reduce social exclusion, the challenges faced in making volunteering more inclusive and at steps taken by organisations in overcoming these barriers.

The research was conducted in a number of phases, and used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods:

- A review of the literature;
- Consultation and interviews with key stakeholder organisations;
- Questionnaire surveys with volunteers, non-volunteers, and organisations in three regions of the UK;
- Case studies with selected organisations in the three regions, including in-depth interviews with staff and volunteers;
- Focus groups with volunteers and non-volunteers.

The paper will draw on findings from all stages of the research.

**Is volunteering too exclusive?**

The first part of the paper will look at the barriers to involvement in volunteering, and argue that volunteering is not yet fully inclusive. A number of both psychological and practical barriers exist which inhibit people from volunteering. Many of these factors are crosscutting issues, common to all three groups under-study, and many overlap and reinforce each other.

The psychological barriers that will be discussed in the paper include:

□

- The image of volunteering.
- People's perceptions of time.
- People's perceptions of themselves and their confidence to get involved.
- Prejudices and stereotypes held by staff, other volunteers and service users.
- A fear of losing welfare benefits.

The practical barriers include:

- A lack of knowledge about volunteering.
- Over-formal and inefficient recruitment and selection procedures.
- Physically inaccessible environments.
- The 'costs' of volunteering.

Routes into volunteering and the benefits gained

The second half of the paper will discuss steps taken by organisations, and individuals, to overcome the barriers to volunteering, before explore how, where the barriers to involvement had been overcome, individuals were benefiting considerably from their volunteering. The paper will argue that through volunteering various aspects of social exclusion were being addressed:

- Helping to combat feelings of personal isolation.
- Empowering individuals.
- Enhancing people's sense of self-worth.
- Leading to the acquisition of a range of hard and soft skills.
- Providing a route to employment, or an alternative to employment.

Conclusions and implications

The paper will conclude by arguing that while volunteering is an effective way for many people to alleviate the symptoms of social exclusion, and can help to address some of the causes, it is not yet fully inclusive. There are a number of underlying barriers that are stopping people getting into volunteering. These barriers need to be addressed, but it needs to be acknowledged that the volunteering-movement alone cannot address the structural causes of exclusion. The capacity of organisations to involve volunteers from marginalised groups, for example, needs to be considered more seriously, as does the need for more joined-up thinking whereby the micro-policies of volunteering work in unison with the macro-policies for tackling social exclusion.

As such, this paper hopes to contribute both to growing (but limited) body of knowledge on diversity in volunteering, while also stimulating debate on the barriers that exist to participation in civic activities.

References:

- Davis Smith, J. (1998) The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering, The National Centre for Volunteering: London.
- Obaze, D. (2000) Noticeable by their absence, National Coalition for Black Volunteering: London.
- Retired and Senior Volunteers Programme (2000) Disability Need be no Handicap: Creating opportunities in volunteering, RSVP, Community Service Volunteers: London.

**Paper Number:** PA041034

**Paper Title:** Exploring the Factors That Promote Risk Taking, Innovativeness, and Proactiveness Among Managers and Employees in Nonprofit Organizations: The Influence of Trust, Motivational, and Enabling Mechanisms

**Author(s):** Michael Stull, Case Western Reserve University, Yucaipa, CA, USA

Michael Stull, Case Western Reserve University, Yucaipa, CA, USA

### **Summary of Research**

With increasing demands and challenges facing their organizations, many executives in medium to large nonprofits indicate that one of the biggest tasks they are facing is the promotion of entrepreneurial practices among their staff, leading to managers and employees that are proactive, innovative in their approaches, and embrace risk taking in order to further the mission of the organization. The purpose of this paper, based on a preliminary conceptual model and qualitative, semi-structured interviews with nonprofit managers and employees, is to attempt to understand what the potential factors are that promote or discourage entrepreneurial behaviors among staff in non-profit organizations.

### **Description**

Organizations today – both for-profit and nonprofit – are facing a continually changing and challenging operating environment that has fundamentally altered the way they approach their respective missions. In the for-profit world, the increasing competition of the global economy, rapid discontinuous change, and demands from multiple stakeholders have forced companies to continually seek new ways to maintain their competitive advantage. In a similar fashion, organizations in the nonprofit sector have undergone a dynamic transformation over the last two decades and face significant challenges – increasing competition, decreased funding sources, and rising demand for services – that will make their quest to continue playing an effective role in society a difficult task.

In both realms, practitioners and scholars alike have called for responses in operating practices that meet these challenges head-on. Morris and Kuratko (2002) argue that the implementation of entrepreneurial practices within organizations, often called intrapreneurship or internal entrepreneurship, will not only help organizations to meet their challenges but will also transform them into revolutionary firms. Others have observed that internal entrepreneurial practices are an effective approach that can improve competitive positioning and revitalize organizations (Guth & Ginsberg, 1990; Kemelgor, 2002). Even among smaller entrepreneurial firms, moving from entrepreneurial practices to organization wide entrepreneurial management as they grow in size becomes a key issue (Timmons & Spinelli, 2003).

In the nonprofit sector, there is growing sentiment that nonprofit organizations must adopt entrepreneurial practices if they are to meet client and community needs, achieve financial sustainability, and survive the profound change taking place in the nonprofit sector. The concept of social entrepreneurship, which seeks to integrate for-profit entrepreneurial principles and practices into the nonprofit operating environment, while maintaining the underlying social mission of the nonprofit organization (Dees, 1998; Schuyler, 1998) is seen by many as an essential characteristic of successful nonprofit organizations (Brinckerhoff, 2000). However, informal interviews with a diverse sample of nonprofit executives in medium to large organizations indicates that one of the biggest tasks they are faced with is the promotion of entrepreneurial practices among their staff, leading to managers and employees that are proactive, innovative in their approaches, and embrace risk taking in order to further the social mission of the organization. Regardless of the size of their organizations, many executives believe that in order to effectively meet the challenges facing them and achieve their mission, entrepreneurial thinking and practices must permeate the organization. As Stevenson & Jarillo (1990) noted, the crux of internal entrepreneurship is that organizational opportunities must be identified and pursued by individuals within the firm. The authors also conceptually identify a number of factors that could be barriers and enablers to promoting entrepreneurial behavior among employees, including issues such as motivation and specific inducements or rewards for breaking the status quo. In this context, this paper posits that in order for a nonprofit organization to develop a more entrepreneurial

approach among its managers and employees, it will be critical for top executives to have a greater understanding of the practices and conditions that promote or discourage entrepreneurial behaviors. Ultimately, the knowledge gained from the research underlying this paper will help to generate a conceptually grounded model that will assist organizations to better understand the factors and processes they need to develop and sustain in order to facilitate entrepreneurial behavior among employees; specifically, this paper seeks to create relevant and actionable knowledge for managers that will impact their practice.

A preliminary conceptual model has been developed that seeks to provide a parsimonious explanation for how specific factors – most notably managerial characteristics and practices, individual characteristics and orientations and organizational characteristics – may promote or discourage entrepreneurial behaviors among staff in a nonprofit organization. The model proposes that managerial attributes and practices, individual employee characteristics and orientations, as well as organization structure characteristics, as the independent variables, will influence the level of entrepreneurial behaviors of risk taking, innovativeness, and proactiveness, which serve as the dependent variables. These managerial, individual and organizational characteristics and orientations will be mediated by the multiple mechanisms (both economic and social) of an employee's trust in their supervisor and reciprocity of that trust, intrinsic motivation of the employee, extrinsic motivation factors, organizational practices, and resource availability. These mediating variables may work both independently and interdependently as mechanisms that ultimately influence the entrepreneurial orientation of managers and employees.

The purpose of this paper, based on the preliminary conceptual model developed and semi-structured field interviews with nonprofit managers and employees, is to attempt to understand “what are the potential factors that either promote or discourage entrepreneurial behaviors among staff in nonprofit organizations?” Special attention will be paid to the relationship and interaction between managers and employees, i.e. what managerial and individual actions and characteristics may influence these behaviors. This paper also seeks to answer the question “what specific role do the constructs of trust, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and organizational structure play in influencing risk taking, innovativeness, proactiveness among employees?” In addition, this paper will seek to address the question “what additional factors, previous unexplored in the literature and explicitly anchored in the practitioner experience, are at work in the process of promoting or deterring entrepreneurial behaviors? Lastly, this paper aspires to determine whether there are any conceptually meaningful patterns, relationships, or interactions between the variables groups presented in the conceptual model and the unidentified variables that may surface during the ongoing research process. Preliminary data gathered for this paper indicates that trust, intrinsic motivation, and organizational practices and culture are key constructs that influence whether individuals will engage in entrepreneurial behavior.

The qualitative field research for this paper has been finished and the paper will be completed in May 2004. While the preliminary conceptual model demonstrates that some assumptions have been made a priori (based a significant review of relevant literature as well as exploratory interviews with nonprofit practitioners), an explicit goal of the research is to continue work in building a grounded conceptual model, which forces the study to remain open to data that is arising during the research process, resulting in revisions to the preliminary version of the conceptual model. Thus, a significant part of the research is inductive in order to understand the meaning of events, situations, and unidentified phenomena and influences that reflect the experiences of organizational members in their particular context (Maxwell, 1996). In order to facilitate this inductive approach and further refine the preliminary conceptual model, semi-structured interviews have been utilized and conducted in three nonprofit organizations which range in size from 50 to 400 employees. Since the focus of this study is on individual entrepreneurial behaviors, various participants have been interviewed at multiple levels in the organization to gain unique perspectives on entrepreneurial behaviors. This has allowed the study to explore the possibility that different dynamics may occur in different levels of relationships in the organization.

## References

- Brinckerhoff, P. C. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship: The art of mission based venture development*. New York City: John C. Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Dees, G. J. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
- Guth, W. D., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest editor's introduction: Corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(Summer), 5-16.
- Kemelgor, B. H. (2002). A comparative analysis of corporate entrepreneurial orientation between selected firms in the Netherlands and the USA. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14, 67-87.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design - An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morris, M. H., & Kuratko, D. F. (2002). *Corporate Entrepreneurship - Entrepreneurial development within organizations*. Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt, Inc.
- Schuyler, G. (1998). *Social entrepreneurship: Profit as a means, not an end* (No. 98-7): Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership - Clearinghouse on Entrepreneurial Education (CELCEE).
- Stevenson, H., & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17-27.
- Timmons, J. A., & Spinelli, S. (2003). *New Venture Creation - Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century* (6 ed.). New York City: Irwin/McGraw Hill.

**Paper Number:** PA041055

**Paper Title:** Social Enterprise Strategy: A Proposed Effectuation Decision Framework for Nonprofit Organizations

**Author(s):**

Amy Klemm Verbos, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, New Berlin, WI, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This paper sketches an effectuation decision process framework for use by nonprofit managers and other stakeholders to formulate social enterprise strategies. Conceptually, the framework permits nonprofit managers to keep mission effectiveness as the central goal, encourages strategic alliances to assist in balancing and reconciling the competing needs and demands of stakeholders, and promotes creative and innovative solutions from a perspective of reduced resource dependency and decreased environmental uncertainty. Effectuation processes invert the logic of causation processes and appear as a feasible alternative framework for identifying and evaluating social enterprise strategies intended to diversify nonprofit organization revenues.

### **Description**

Revenue is the lifeblood of any organization. The traditional revenue sources for nonprofit organizations (donations, grants, and government contracts) are outside the direct control of the nonprofit organization (Frumkin, 2002; Stone, Bigelow & Crittenden, 1999). Managers of nonprofit organizations increasingly seek revenue diversification to stabilize or increase revenue flows (Froelich, 1999; Frumkin, 2002; Zietlow, 2001). One strategy for revenue diversification is social enterprise or social entrepreneurship (Froelich, 1999). This strategy is not free from controversy, as commercialization in the nonprofit sector raises questions related to mission and values that should be addressed by the nonprofit manager in the decision process (Frumkin, 2002; Weisbrod 1998a; Zietlow, 2001). While social enterprise literature has proliferated in recent years, it has not focused on decision processes.

This paper sketches an effectuation decision process framework for use by nonprofit managers and other stakeholders to formulate social enterprise strategies. For many nonprofit organizations, the decision to commence a social enterprise strategy calls for inspirational decision processes--the end is not specific (i.e., the type of enterprise to start) and the means are not identified. The inspirational decision process is one of four decision processes identified by Thompson (1967) and developed further by Nutt (2002). I propose using effectuation theory as a decision framework when a social enterprise strategy calls for an inspirational decision approach.

Effectuation theory was developed by Sarasvathy (2001) in the context of entrepreneurial creation processes. Where causation processes are helpful in evaluating alternatives in which there are specific alternatives, such as what type of telephone system to purchase, effectuation processes are useful when neither the end nor the means are known. An effectuation process involves an analysis of the foundations, values, resources, and network of the organization to generate a large set of alternative "effects" which are then evaluated according to the aspirations and mission of the organization (Sarasvathy, 2001). As outlined by Sarasvathy, this process inverts causal reasoning using nonlinear thinking to provide flexible alternatives for the organization to consider and evaluate under a broader set of criteria than simply profit maximization. This process permits the effectuator to place mission effectiveness front and center in the evaluation of opportunities. It encourages coalitions with and commitments from stakeholders to bring about any appropriate change, or to determine that social enterprise is not a good fit with the organization.

In this paper, I define social enterprise as earned revenue strategies, extract important elements of the earned revenue diversification strategy decision from social enterprise and commercialization literature, and literature concerning the nonprofit funding environment and nonprofit decision processes (Stone & Brush, 1996; Weisbrod, 1998b; Young, 1999; Zietlow, 2001). Then, I discuss Thompson's (1967) typology of decision processes and characterize the attributes of the earned revenue diversification

strategy decision as one requiring an inspirational decision process. Next, I examine Sarasvathy's (2001) effectuation decision theory and posit reasons why this theory holds promise as an inspirational decision framework for social enterprise strategies. I summarize relevant survey findings from a descriptive, exploratory survey that assessed interest in earned revenue enterprises by nonprofit organizations in a major Midwestern city to further consider the appropriateness of the effectuation decision framework. Finally, I put the elements of the social enterprise strategy decision into a revised framework encompassing the elements identified through literature and the survey. Through this framework, I hope to advance nonprofit literature in strategic decision processes, and extend effectuation theory from entrepreneurship to nonprofit organization strategy formulation.

## REFERENCES

- Brooks, A.C. 2000. Public subsidies and charitable giving: crowding out, crowding in, or both? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 19(3): 451-464.
- Cain, L. P., & Meritt, Jr., D. A. 1998. The growing commercialism of zoos and aquariums. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2): 298-312.
- Cordes, J. J., & Weisbrod, B. A. 1998. Differential taxation of nonprofits and the commercialization of nonprofit revenues. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2): 195-214.
- Dean, Jr., J. W., & Sharfman, M. P. 1996. Does decision process matter? A study of strategic decision-making effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2): 368-396.
- Dees, J. G. 1998a. Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(1): 54-67.
- Dees, J. G. 1998b. The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Stanford Graduate School of Business: <http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/services/news/DeesSoцентrepPaper.html>. Accessed February 13, 2003.
- Froelich, K. A. 1999. Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3):246-268.
- Frumkin, P. 2002. *On being nonprofit: Conceptual and policy primer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gentile, M. C. 2002. Social impact management and social enterprise: Two sides of the same coin or a totally different currency? The Aspen Institute Discussion Paper Series, Discussion Paper IV. <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/AspenInstitute/files/CCLIBRARYFILES/FILENAME/000000223/SocImpactSocEnt.pdf>. Accessed February 18, 2003.
- Hibbert, S., Hogg, G., & Quinn, T. 2002. Consumer response to social entrepreneurship: The case of the Big Issue in Scotland. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3): 288-301.
- Lee, M. 2002. Non-profits and social entrepreneurship: Taking the good, avoiding the bad. *P.A. Times*, August: 4.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. 1995. Simplicity as a strategy-making process: The effects of stage of organizational development and environment on performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5): 1386-1407.
- Mintzberg, H. & Waters, J. A. 1985. Of strategies, deliberate and emergent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6: 257-272.
- Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. 2003. Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1): 76-87.

- Nielsen, R. P. 1986. Piggybacking strategies for nonprofits: A shared costs approach. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 201-205.
- Nutt, P. C. 2000. Decision-making success in public, private and third sector organizations: Finding sector dependent best practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(1): 77-108.
- Nutt, P. C. 2002. Making strategic choices. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1): 67-96.
- Oster, S. 1995. *Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations: Theory and Cases*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prabhu, G. 1999. Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career Development International*, 4(3): 140-145.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. 1996. Altruism, nonprofits, and economic theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2): 701-728.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. 2001. Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2): 243-263.
- Sharfman, M. P., & Dean, Jr., J. W. 1997. Flexibility in strategic decision making: Informational and ideological perspectives. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(2): 191-217.
- Smircich, L., & Stubbart, C. 1985. Strategic management in an enacted world. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4): 724-736.
- Stone, M. M., Bigelow, B., & Crittenden, W. 1999. Research on strategic management in nonprofit organizations: Synthesis, analysis, and future directions. *Administration & Society*, 31(3): 378-423.
- Stone, M. M., & Brush, C. G. 1996. Planning in ambiguous contexts: The dilemma of meeting needs for commitment and demands for legitimacy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17: 633-652.
- Takahashi, L. M., & Smutny, G. 2002.
- Collaborative Windows and Organizational Governance: Exploring the Formation and Demise of Social Service Partnerships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(2): 165-185.
- Thompson, J. D. 1967. *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Toepler, S., & Kirchberg, V. 2002. Museums, merchandising, and nonprofit commercialization. National Center on Nonprofit Enterprise working research papers. <http://www.nationalcne.org>. Accessed April 10, 2003.
- Tuckman, H. P. 1998. Competition, commercialization and the evolution of nonprofit organizational structures. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2): 175-194.
- Wallace, S. L. 1999. Social entrepreneurship: The role of social purpose enterprises in facilitating community economic development. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 4(2): 153-174.
- Weisbrod, B. A. 1997. The future of the nonprofit sector: Its entwining with private enterprise and government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 16(4): 541-555.
- Weisbrod, B. A. 1998a. Guest editor's introduction: The nonprofit mission and its financing. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2): 165-174.
- Weisbrod, B. A. (Ed.). 1998b. *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, D. R. 1998. Commercialism in nonprofit social service associations: Its character, significance and rationale. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2): 278-297.

Young, D. R. 1999. Economic decisionmaking by nonprofit organizations in a market economy: Tensions between mission and market. National Center on Nonprofit Enterprise working research papers. <http://www.nationlcne.org/papers/tension.htm>. Accessed April 10, 2003.

Zietlow, J. T. 2001. Social entrepreneurship: Managerial, finance and marketing aspects. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 9(1): 19-43.

**Paper Number:** PA041363

**Paper Title:** Lessons from the Field: Entrepreneurial Nonprofit Information Technologies

**Author(s):**

Ralph S. Brower, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Simon Andrew, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Frances S. Berry, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

**Summary of Research**

Our earlier analysis partially refuted the existence of a digital divide among nonprofits, noting that some resource-poor organizations act very resourcefully with their limited technology resources. The upshot is that alternatives exist to merely throwing money at technology deficiencies, such as technology resource centers and partnerships with other nonprofits, for-profits, local government, and educational institutions. Entrepreneurial examples from our surveys and focus groups illustrate a two-dimensional array of nonprofits' a) possession of in-house resources, and, b) their networking behavior to offset deficient in-house resources. We conclude with practical recommendations from our focus groups and from business and government leaders.

**Description**

Our earlier analysis (author identities concealed for review, 2003) showed that organizational size is not the major predictor of sophisticated information technology (IT) usage in nonprofit organizations that many observers assume. Our findings partially refuted the traditional "digital divide" hypothesis and suggested that other factors may explain how nonprofits that are relatively poor in terms of IT resources may be resourceful in using the limited resources they do have and seeking and using other IT resources in their external environments. In particular, we illustrated how organizations' "weak ties" (Granovetter, 1973) to vendors, professional associations, other nonprofit organizations, and IT publications were significantly associated with their level of effective IT usage.

In this paper we offer a two-dimensional array of nonprofits' a) possession of in-house IT resources, and, b) their behavior in using network relations to offset what they do not themselves possess. We illustrate the 4-quadrant framework with actual examples from organizations that participated in our survey and focus groups (authors concealed, 2003; authors concealed, 2004).

The practical difficulty that nonprofits face is that government decision makers, foundations, and potential donors tire of hearing requests for more financial resources to repair the nonprofits' IT deficiencies. Moreover, as our focus group participants pointed out, government and philanthropic funding sources no longer consider requests for IT as "sexy" budget items in proposals for program grants or contracts.

The upshot of our framework and our findings is that alternatives exist to merely throwing money at IT deficiencies. Specifically, nonprofits may substantially improve their IT capabilities by enhancing their network relations through such practical solutions as collaborative arrangements with other nonprofit organizations and for-profit partners, community IT resource centers, and partnerships with local governments and educational institutions. In other words, human resources, especially networking skills and managerial creativity are important in partially offsetting the lack of financial resources for purchasing IT.

We conclude with two types of practical recommendations gleaned from focus groups with nonprofit leaders and meetings with policy makers and business leaders. First, on the human relations side we offer practical examples from our focus groups about entrepreneurial strategies that nonprofit managers have employed to overcome their organizations' IT deficiencies. Second, we formulate policy recommendations based on a two-pronged argument: Public officials, business leaders, and technology professionals need to be sensitive to the practical difficulties that nonprofit organizations face in

implementing IT; and, technology is not an administrative luxury but a necessity to effective nonprofit service delivery.

#### References:

Author identities concealed (2003). "Digital Divide" And Information Technology Capabilities: Opportunities and Challenges for North Florida's Nonprofit Organizations. Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, Denver, Colorado, November 19-22, 2003.

Auhtor identities concealed (2004). Is There a Digital Divide within the Nonprofit Sector: Assessing Information Technology Use in Nonprofit Agencies within 19 North Florida Counties. Presented at the 16th Annual Southeastern Evaluation Association Conference, Tallahassee, FL, January 29, 2004.

Granovetter, Mark (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360-1380.

**Paper Number:** PA041415

**Paper Title:** Case Studies Of Commercial Ventures In Nonprofit Organizations: Determining Probability For Success

**Author(s):**

Agnes Meinhard, Ryerson University, Toronto, CANADA

Louise Moher, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, CAN

Susan Fitzrandolph, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, CAN

**Summary of Research**

Despite an abundance of anecdotal articles giving “how to” advice, undertaking a commercial venture remains a daunting challenge for nonprofit organizations. The purpose of the current study is to identify indicators of success for entrepreneurial venturing through the empirical examination of ten Canadian nonprofit organizations engaging in commercial ventures. Our findings provide nonprofit organizations with a basis for deciding whether they should be directing organizational capacity to undertaking a venture, and if so, with an understanding of the questions and issues they need to consider to increase their chances of success with entrepreneurial ventures.

**Description**

The voluntary sector in Canada has recently begun to feel the impact of the shift to a neo-conservative policy that includes wide-scale devolution of services and massive budget cuts. Consistent with this philosophical shift, voluntary social service organizations are increasingly identifying a need to become more competitive, to learn marketing and entrepreneurial skills, and to streamline management practices in order to increase organizational efficiency (Foster & Meinhard, 2000a). Voluntary organizations are also searching for ways to make up for the lost revenues that resulted from decreased government funding. Meinhard & Foster (2003) report that, in light of the increasing demand for services, few organizations are able to resort to cutting services or reducing staff. Rather, they adopt more business-like strategies and attempt to diversify their sources of revenue (Meinhard & Foster, 2003; Foster & Meinhard, 2000b). These strategies include: seeking grants or donations from foundations, corporations or businesses; increasing fundraising efforts for individual donations; instituting or increasing user fees; generating revenue through special events; engaging in partnerships with other nonprofits or for-profit organizations in order to share resources; and engaging in commercial ventures of various sorts such as sales of goods or services or renting space.

In recent years there has been an increased interest in commercial ventures, both by voluntary organizations and among researchers. However, indications are that commercial ventures are not the first choice of nonprofit organizations when it comes to diversifying income generation. Although more than two thirds of the organizations sampled by Meinhard & Foster (2003) report an increase in revenue diversification strategies in response to decreased government funding, fewer than one third of them intend to initiate or increase engagement in commercial ventures. As Zimmerman and Dart (1998:6) point out in their groundbreaking Canadian study, “there is more rhetoric about doing commercial activities than actual shifts in behaviour in the sector.”

Despite an abundance of articles discussing the risks and benefits of commercial ventures and giving “how to” advice, undertaking a commercial venture remains a daunting challenge for nonprofit organizations. In all, fourteen risks and sixteen benefits were identified in our review of the literature. However, only one third of the 81 articles surveyed were based on empirical evidence. The rest were anecdotal and speculative. How well do the prescriptions for engaging in entrepreneurial commercial ventures mirror the actual experience of organizations? How good is the advice they offer to a nonprofit interested in considering a commercial venture?

The purpose of the current study is to identify indicators of success for entrepreneurial venturing through the empirical examination of nonprofit organizations engaging in commercial ventures. We

focused on ten nonprofit organizations in Canada, ranging in age from 23 years to 110 years. The ventures undertaken began at different points in their life cycle and lasted for as little as 9 months to as long as 69 years. Two organizations were conceived with commercial ventures as integral to their mission (training programs). Four different types of ventures were identified: training social enterprises; ventures utilizing existing expertise; ventures undertaken to directly support the social mission; and ventures tapping unused organizational resources. Information about the organizations and their ventures were gleaned from organizational documents and interviews with managers of the venture and/or the executive directors of the organization. The interviews, lasting from one to one and half hours, were taped, transcribed and are presently being content analyzed. The following topics were probed: the history of the organization and the motivation and genesis of the commercial venture; the relationship of the venture to the mission and culture of the organization; leadership and skills set needed for the venture; stakeholder support; social and financial capital requirements; successes and challenges of the venture.

Results of the analysis will be presented in light of current literature. Do these empirical findings of actual organizational behaviour support the "rhetoric" of the predominantly anecdotal literature? Attention will also focus on different "benchmarks" of success for the different kinds of enterprises identified. How do organizational characteristics affect the success of the venture? Our findings will provide nonprofit organizations with a basis for deciding whether they should be directing organizational capacity to undertaking a venture, and if so, with an understanding of the questions and issues they need to consider to increase their chances of success with entrepreneurial ventures.

#### References

Foster, M. & Meinhard A. (2000a). "Strategic Responses of Voluntary Social Service Organizations to Funding Changes: The Ontario Situation." CVSS Working Paper Series Number 15.

Foster, M. & Meinhard A. (2000b). "Revenue Diversification Among Canadian Voluntary Organizations: A Response to the External Environment." CVSS Working Paper Series Number 16.

Meinhard, A. & Foster, M. (2003). Responses of Canada's voluntary organizations to shifts in social policy: A provincial perspective [Online]. ISTR Conference Working Papers, Vol. III. Available: <http://www.jhu.edu/~istr/conferences/capetown/volume/meinhard.pdf>

Zimmerman, B. & Dart, R. (1998). Charities Doing Commercial Ventures: Societal and Organizational Implications. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

**Paper Number:** PA041271

**Paper Title:** Evidence of Philanthropic Sector Responsiveness in Community Foundations

**Author(s):**

Elizabeth Graddy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Don Morgan, University of Southern California, San Gabriel, CA, USA

**Summary of Research**

The role of the philanthropic sector in the provision of public goods and services continues to gain prominence in new governance environments. Community foundations have been pushed to fill the void left by changing governmental funding priorities. The capacity of the philanthropic sector to respond, however, is unclear. This paper will inform our understanding of how community foundations are responding to the growing demands on their resources made by the public sector. In addition, this paper will inform policy makers by providing more realistic expectations about the role of community foundations in community development.

**Description**

Over the past decade, expectations about an expanded role for private philanthropy in the solution of social problems have increased. Much of these expectations are centered on the ability of philanthropic organizations to enhance capacity of communities to solve the complex and challenging problems they face. This community level focus suggests that community foundations can potentially play a pivotal role.

Despite substantial growth in the 1980's and 1990's, and their unique potential, the nature and extent of the role of community foundations in enhancing the capacity of communities to solve the critical problems they face is unclear. An essential first step is to determine how well community foundations are positioned to play a pivotal role – in terms of their strategic focus, and how they interact with other key elements in their communities. This paper presents newly collected empirical evidence on the strategic models of community foundations and how they balance multiple competing interests – including the interests of their funders/donors, and community needs.

The strategic model of a community foundation refers to its organizational focus and the purpose of its activities – e.g. does it focus on providing philanthropic services to donors or on community building. The choice of strategic direction is modeled as a function of asset distribution, community characteristics, organizational characteristics, and the nature of the philanthropic sector in which it operates.

These variables are best explored with a detailed analysis of a set of community foundations and the communities they serve. Our study analyzes the population of community foundations in the State of California. The demographic and geographic diversity of California is such that the state offers a robust set of communities to study. Moreover, California foundations are a significant and growing proportion of the country's philanthropic landscape. Their relative newness, as well as California's history of leadership in social phenomena, suggests that the behavior of the philanthropic sector in the state may presage behavioral changes in the rest of the country.

Although based on California data, the implications of the findings have been developed for the general population of community foundations. As such, this work will be of interest to public policymakers and to the broader philanthropic community (including donors, foundations, and associations of foundations) as they seek to effectively partner with community foundations to reach community-based nonprofits and service recipients, and scholars interested in understanding the role of the different components of the philanthropic sector.

**Paper Number:** PA041303

**Paper Title:** What is the Effect of Corporate Mergers on Corporate Giving in a Large Midwestern City?

**Author(s):**

Eugene Tempel, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Patrick Rooney, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

**Summary of Research**

It is often asserted that corporate mergers have had a deleterious effect on corporate giving. There is not, however, any empirical evidence that has been generated to demonstrate whether or not corporate mergers are a positive, negative, or zero sum game. This paper addresses this research gap by examining micro level files for ten large NPOs in Indianapolis over the last decade, which was a period of notable corporate mergers. Furthermore, corporate mergers may have changed the very nature of corporate giving to greater emphasis on corporate sponsorships and a lower commitment to corporate giving.

**Description**

Corporate mergers and acquisitions have had a profound impact on the US economy both in terms of the distribution of income and wealth, as well as jobs at all levels. It is often asserted that corporate mergers have had a deleterious effect on corporate giving and, occasionally, anecdotal evidence is given to support this notion. There is not, however, any empirical evidence that has been generated to demonstrate whether or not corporate mergers are a positive, negative, or zero sum game. This paper addresses this research gap by examining micro level files for ten large NPOs in Indianapolis over the last decade, which was a period of notable corporate mergers and relocations. Furthermore, corporate mergers may have changed the very nature of corporate giving to greater emphasis on corporate sponsorships and a lower commitment to corporate giving.

Depending on the expected effects and the new corporate headquarters, one might reasonably conjecture that corporate mergers might lead to increased efficiencies and profitability, which might generate increased corporate giving. Conversely, the corporate mergers may lead to increased attention to profitability and costs which might reduce corporate giving. Finally, corporate mergers might lead to a zero-sum game in which total corporate giving may remain the same but the amounts may or may not be reallocated among the cities involved. This type of pecuniary externality may not impact corporate giving nationwide, but it may have disparate effects on each place.

We plan to conduct ten in depth case studies of large NPOs in the greater Indianapolis area. For each case study, we will examine corporate giving by specific organizations to examine any patterns on corporate giving before, during and after discussions about and any actual mergers or relocations. We will also examine whether corporate mergers have any discernable impact on the nature of corporate giving vs. corporate sponsorships. This information will be useful to fundraisers, scholars, policy makers, and economic development specialists.

**Paper Number:** PA041309

**Paper Title:** Is All Giving Local?

**Author(s):**

Patrick Rooney, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

**Summary of Research**

One frequently hears the claim that “all giving is local.” However, this is not readily tested for several reasons. First, IRS data do not track this. Second, most surveys don’t address this issue. Finally, most local studies have such divergent methodologies that comparisons across communities are inherently difficult. The Center on Philanthropy will have conducted (at least) three studies of giving in three different communities but using the same research methodology. This data enables us to conduct interesting comparisons. We can compare local-non-local differences between household and institutional donors, as well as differences in local giving by various household characteristics.

**Description**

One frequently hears the claim that “all giving is local.” However, whether giving is in fact all or even mostly local is not readily tested for several reasons. First, national data from the IRS do not track or report this. Second, most national surveys do not ask this question. Third, most (all?) surveys of cities or states do not ask that question. Finally, even if local studies of philanthropy included this type of question, these local studies have such wildly divergent methodologies that comparisons across communities are inherently difficult, if not impossible.

The Center on Philanthropy will have conducted (at least) three studies of giving in three different communities but using the same research methodology in each case. In these studies of philanthropy in Memphis, St. Louis and Indianapolis, we asked households, corporations, and foundations to estimate how much of their total giving was local, regional, or national. This data enables us to conduct some interesting comparisons. For example, we can compare local-non-local differences between household and institutional donors (corporations and foundations). We can also expand this analysis by subsector for foundations and finally, we can compare differences in giving locally by various household characteristics such as race, gender, income, age, and education attainment. We can also use various household demographic characteristics to try to explain their marginal effects on the share of all giving which is local.

**Methodology**

Using large random samples from three (or more) metropolitan areas we will use standard statistical techniques to compare the local share of giving by various characteristics of households, corporations, and foundations. We will also use Tobit to estimate the marginal impact of income, age, education, race, gender, etc. on the shares of giving that remains in the local community.

**Paper Number:** PA041375

**Paper Title:** Tycoons have to share with people! Reviewing corporate philanthropy in Russia over 1991-2003

**Author(s):**

Svetlana V. Ivchenko, Russian Aluminum, Moscow, Russia

### **Summary of Research**

The practice of corporate philanthropy in Russia is very diverse: from the community investment initiatives of the leading national companies to the half-voluntary-half compulsory philanthropy imposed on regional companies by the authorities. Research identifies current corporate giving patterns impacting the social and economic growth within the country and tracking changes in fast transforming field of the indigenous corporate philanthropy since 1991 until 2003. It describes the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of corporate philanthropy and identifies the major constraints that hamper the progress toward strategic social investing.

### **Description**

At the glance corporate philanthropy in Russia seems to be booming, however, not everyone can look under the surface and see internal problems of and constrains to the indigenous corporate philanthropy development. The practice of corporate philanthropy within Russia is a part of a challenging political and public discussion, key questions of which are: To what extent is business responsible for solving the country's social problems? How strategic and independent in designing and implementing social and philanthropic programs the business can be today?

The research, conducted by the Institute for Urban Economics identifies current trends and tracking changes in fast transforming field of the indigenous corporate philanthropy since 1991 until 2003. Research methods included analysis of primarily data obtained from the business entities directly (not available to public); interviews with top managers Russian leader of corporate philanthropy and of regional business sector; content analysis.

Russian citizens for the most part feel that privatization was conducted in a unfair way (ROMIR, 2003) so that people associate social responsibility as: "Tycoons have to share with people!" (ROMIR, 2003) and they should now take on all the social problems of the country. Corporate social programs are often viewed by governmental officials as compulsory involvement of companies in local development, not as an act of good will. Business community is emphasizing that companies cannot "replace the government" (AMR, 2003) and compensate for the inefficient spending of budget funds, derived from taxation. Thus, the right balance between the interests of business, state and local self-government sectors still remains to be found.

The development of corporate philanthropy among Russian companies has happened in three stages: (1) 1991-1998 – restructure of social infrastructure of companies during privatization, revival of philanthropic traditions; (2) 1999-2001 – gradual transfer from one-time assistance to individual beggars to financing NGO's projects; formation of concept of social responsibility; (3) 2002 - present – beginning of institutionalization of corporate philanthropy, social giving becomes more professional, more active discussions overall on social investing (Belyaeva, 1995; SCISC, 1999; Simpson, Turkin, 2001; Liborakina, 2001; AMR, 2001; CAF, 2002;).

The practice of corporate philanthropy in Russia exists in three forms: traditional charity, strategic charity, and social investing (Ivchenko, Liborakina, Sivaeva, 2003). Essentially, social investing holds a low position, although in 2002-2003 there was noticeable growth of interest in social investment among the leading companies. These companies have special departments for administering their social and charitable programs and development standards for their social activities; conduct performances measurement (Ivchenko, 2002); attract outside consultants and use outsourcing. There is a tendency of increased transparency in social programs of companies. BAT-Russia became the first

company in 2002 to release a standardized social report. (IUE, 2003-2004).

Among successful models of social investing are competitions for projects that develop social infrastructure, NGO-delivery of social services (YUKOS, LUKOIL-Perm, ROSBANK), programs to assist the municipality in optimizing its budget resources (Norilsk Nickel, SUAL Holding), participation in the development of programs for the socio-economic development of the territory (YUKOS), small-business development programs (YUKOS) (Ivchenko, Liborakina, Sivaeva, 2003; Liborakina, 2004). However, all the above practices have exceptional features; they are not used in a systemic way, and did not become a part of corporate decision-making and corporate culture.

The practice of corporate philanthropy of regional large and medium size business the most popular forms remain traditional and strategic charity. They not always clear understand the essence of philanthropy and its benefit for business, it is still being considering as non-connected with the core business; corporate motives and actions are mixed with the personal; desion-making is emotional rather than business rational; management is very poor, planning, evaluation, reporting are often missing. The lack of donor's incentives, the authority's paternalistic approach, lack of professionalism still remains the biggest constrains to the development of corporate philanthropy. (IUE, 2002; Ivchenko, 2003)

The research helps international business and academic community get a better understanding of the problems of and trends of development corporate philanthropy in Russia. It provides applicable data to private and corporate donors operating and/or planning to operate in Russia on the external environment as well as on internal culture of corporate philanthropy and make it easy to adjust to the fast growing.

#### References

- AMR (Association of Managers) (2001) Social role of the business sector: corporate philanthropy, charity and sponsorship available at [www.amr.ru](http://www.amr.ru)
- AMR (Association of Managers) (2003) Conference Social strategy of Russian business sector: the conditions of success, March 28, 2003
- Belyaeva N. (1995) Charity of Strangers? Philanthropy of the Russian Commercial Sector available at [www.sivilsoc.org/resource/chrtyststr.htm](http://www.sivilsoc.org/resource/chrtyststr.htm)
- CAF (Charities Aid Foundation) (2002) Corporate philanthropy: Myths and Reality Moscow, CAF Press
- IUE (Institute for Urban Economics) (2002) The Factors of Corporate Social Responsibility Development at the Local Level
- IUE (Institute for Urban Economics) (2003-2004) Achieve of Interviews
- Ivchenko S. (2002) International practice of measuring business value added of corporate philanthropy and Russian initiatives Researches of Philanthropy in Russia Annual, Vol. 2, St Petersburg pp. 482-490
- Ivchenko S. (2003) Corporate social programs: Conservation of Inefficient Social Policy or Making Investments into Its Further Improvement? A presentation at the conference "Innovative technologies for social shere", Perm, April 5, 2003
- Ivchenko S., Liborakina M., Sivaeva T. (2003) City and Business: Development of social responsibility of Russian companies Moscow, The Institute for Urban Economics Press
- Liborakina M (Ed.) (2001) Corporate Social Responsibility in Newly Independent States Moscow, The Institute for Urban Economics Press
- Liborakina M. (2004) 'An overview of the most effective models of company-community engagement in Russia' a presentation at the conference "Corporate social responsibility: How to manage social and philanthropic programs effectively", Moscow, March 18-19, 2004
- SCISC (Siberian Civic Initiatives Support Center) (1999) Corporate Philanthropy in Siberia
- Simpson S., Turkin S. (2001) Social Measures in Business
- ROMIR (Russian public opinion and market research company) (2003) Russians about possibility of reviewing results of privatization available at [www.romir.ru](http://www.romir.ru) web posted July 2003

**Paper Number:** PA041145

**Paper Title:** Widow's Mite or Widow's Might? The relative giving of rich and poor in the UK

**Author(s):**

Beth Breeze, Institute for Philanthropy, University College London, Rainham, Kent, United Kingdom

**Summary of Research**

The understanding of charitable giving as an agent of redistribution from rich to poor is widely accepted in British society. That conception is challenged by this research which analyses data on over 1000 current British donor. It reveals that people on lower incomes consistently give away a higher percentage of that income to charity than do people on higher incomes. This finding remains constant when we control for age, gender, household size, attitudes, behaviours and charitable sub-sector preference. The paper concludes with implications for measuring philanthropic generosity as a relative, rather than absolute, amount.

**Description**

This paper presents secondary analysis of data on over 1000 current British donors. It demonstrates that poorer donors make more generous gifts than richer donors, with the bottom quarter of the sample, by income, giving away over 2% of income compared to average gifts of under 1% of income by the top quarter of the sample. A series of graphs demonstrates that this topline trend of regressive giving is consistent even when the sample is divided, by age, gender, household size, attitudes, behaviours and charitable sub-sector preferences.

British charities are not constitutionally bound to be redistributive. Organisations acquire charitable status by fulfilling one of four 'heads' of charity - relief of poverty, advancement of education, advancement of religion and other benefits to the community - as defined in the 1601 Charitable Uses Act and by accepting certain constitutional arrangements, such as a principle of nondistribution of profit and governance by voluntary trustees.

British charity is thus currently defined more by structure than by action or outcome. But popular understanding of, and attitudes towards, charity rests largely on the belief that they are funded by those who have, in order to assist those who have not (Ortmann 1996). Many charities act, and are treated, as if they are a vehicle by which the more advantaged in society are able to meet indigent need (Odendahl 1990, Wagner 2000).

Earlier studies, in both Britain and the US, have shown that in reality the poor give a greater percentage of their income to charity than the rich (Banks and Tanner 1997, Clotfelter 1992, Hodgkinson 1990) and that only a small percentage of charitable benefit is directed to the needy (Clotfelter 1992).

Prochaska's historic review of British charity (1990) shows that the absence of charitable redistribution is not a modern phenomenon. The small contributions of the poor were a significant part of their total personal income and their 'mites' combined in aggregate to constitute the greater part of charitable income (Prochaska 1990).

This paper argues that the reality gap concerning the perceived and true redistributive role of charities is important. If the general belief that charities are pro-poor underlies the sector's success in obtaining tax breaks and voluntary support then it may be argued to be operating in a disingenuous, if not misleading, manner. The significant contribution of poorer donors and the destination of much charitable income also warrants investigation because of the prevalence with which the proponents of philanthropy invoke it as an argument against greater intervention and redistribution by government (Odendahl 1989). If relaxations in the tax and regulatory regime are awarded to charities for reasons that are not clear, or clearly understood, then there is a danger of undermining the necessary contract of trust between the public and the nonprofit sector.

The paper concludes that we need a more accurate understanding of donative behaviour across socio-economic groups, a clearer appreciation of generosity as a relative concept in the context of disposable incomes and a review of the overall redistributive capacity of charity.

- Banks, J. & Tanner, S. (1997) *The State of Donation: Household Gifts to Charity 1974-96*. London: The Institute for Fiscal Studies
- Clotfelter, C. (1992) *Who Benefits from the Nonprofit Sector?* Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Hodgkinson, V. (1990) *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*. Washington DC: The Independent Sector
- Odendahl, T. (1990) *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-interest among the philanthropic elite*. New York: Basic Books
- Ortmann, A. (1996) Book review in *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 25, no.2
- Prochaska, F. (1990) *Philanthropy in Thompson F.M.L. (ed.) The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wagner, D. (2000) *What's Love got to do with it?* New York: the New York Press

**Paper Number:** PA041333

**Paper Title:** Donor Research Project--Final Report

**Author(s):**

Felinda Mottino, Donor Research Project, C.U.N.Y., New York, NY, USA

Eugene D. Miller, Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society (new name), C.U.N.Y., New York, NY, USA

**Summary of Research**

The Donor Research Project examines philanthropic practices, motivations, and intentions among people of color and women in New York City. Objectives are: (1) To understand contemporary giving patterns and motivations. (2) To explore ways nonprofit organizations can better partner with donors. More than 180 interviews with donors of color and women were completed using an interview guide designed to ensure consistency but also capture donors' modes of expressing philanthropy. The analysis compares donors across age and ethnic groups, gender, and levels of income; it compares actual giving to philanthropic motivations and dreams; and it indicates types of advice sought by donors.

**Description**

Donor Research Project--Final Report

The three-year Donor Research Project (DRP) will conclude in the Fall of 2004. The DRP examines philanthropic history, practices, motivations, and intentions among people of color and women in the New York metropolitan region. This research is funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation and by the Coalition for New Philanthropy in New York. Results from preliminary stages of research were presented at ARNOVA conferences in 2002 and 2003; in 2004 we will present the final report.

Introduction--In New York City communities of color now constitute the majority of the population. The white population has fallen to slightly over one-third; nearly one-tenth of New Yorkers are Asian American. The African American population remains stable at 25 percent, and the Latino population has risen to parallel that of the black community. Many suburban counties reflect the same patterns of change.

Objectives--The research has two overriding objectives:

- To understand contemporary giving patterns (including volunteer work as well as monetary giving) and motivations of donors of color and women.
- To explore ways in which nonprofit organizations can reach potential donors more effectively and be more effective partners for their donors' philanthropic aspirations.

Research Questions--The research is guided by three categories of research questions:

- What is the intent of donations made by people of color and women? Is it to sustain existing programs and projects or to generate social and structural change?
- What do prospective donors respond to in an appeal? What are the emotional/psychological components of giving?
- What contributes to a donor's decision-making process? To what extent is the gift discussed with family, friends, business associates, or professional advisors?

Research Stages--The research has three stages: (1) literature review, (2) quantitative overview of demographic and economic data, (3) face-to-face interviews with donors. This presentation for ARNOVA 2004 will present findings and conclusions from Stage 3 (interviews with donors).

Data--We have completed more than 180 interviews with donors of color and women (58 African American, 55 Asian American, and 53 Latino men and women; 20 mainstream women). Interviews were conducted using a structured interview guide/data collection instrument so as to ensure the

greatest possible consistency while still allowing the flexibility to capture donors' own ways of thinking and speaking.

ARNOVA Presentation--At the 2002 ARNOVA conference we presented initial findings, including the literature review, demographic analysis, and preliminary observations from the interviews. At the 2003 ARNOVA conference, we presented preliminary findings for two groups of donors: older Latinos and young professional people of color. Using the complete set of respondents, we are currently conducting analyses to reveal patterns of giving and we are using and interpreting words and expressions of donors to understand their inspirations, motivations, and intentions.

The analysis compares donors across age and ethnic groups, gender, and levels of income.

Individual Donor Motivation; conceptual:

- How are donors' philanthropic ideas formed?
- When and where does their philanthropy begin?
- What inspires people to sustain their giving?
- What community are they intending to help?
- What are donors' philanthropic intentions and dreams?

Donors' Relationships with Nonprofit Organizations; conceptual:

- What do donors think of nonprofit organizations and how can organizations more effectively reach and partner with donors?
- What are donors' likes and dislikes regarding what organizations do and do not do, and how they make appeals?
- What are donors' passions regarding previous giving?
- What do donors see as their most successful gifts?
- What, if any, are donors' regrets about previous giving?
- What is the decision-making process donors use before making contributions?
- What is the need for financial planning advice and assistance?

Actual Giving In The Previous Year:

- How much time did donors volunteer during the previous year?
- How much money did donors give during the previous year?
- To what types of organizations did they give their largest monetary gifts?
- How much of their giving was charitable? How much political?

A Comparison Of The Conceptual And The Actual:

We will compare the actual giving to statements made by donors concerning their philanthropic motivations and dreams.

Contribution To The Field--In our paper for the 2002 ARNOVA conference we presented a full discussion of the relevant literature. Here is a brief summary:

There have been a number of noteworthy projects that have increased our understanding of donor motivation in communities of color and among women. These include the Cultures of Caring project, Independent Sector surveys, the work of the Urban Institute and the efforts of such scholars as James Joseph, Emmett Carson, and Michael O'Neill.

Though sharing a common focus on communities of color with the above works, the DRP is specifically focused on communities of color and women in the New York metropolitan area. The important work of Emmett Carson and James Joseph has helped lay the conceptual and historical groundwork. The multicultural curricula developed by the Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society helps extend that broad definition of philanthropy to a range of racial, religious, and ethnic groups in the U.S. and is inclusive of women.

In sum, the DRP is designed to build on current work in the field and to systematize an area of knowledge, which is characterized by anecdotal information. It is our objective to utilize the substantial number of completed interviews to produce a detailed picture of donor practices and motivations, meaningful and useful to both practitioners and scholars.

#### Partial Bibliography:

- □ Carson, Emmett. 1993. *A Hand-up: Black Philanthropy and Self-Help in America*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press.
- □ Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, 1999. *Multicultural Philanthropy Curriculum Guides* .
- □ Chao, Jessica. 1999. *Asian-American Philanthropy: Expanding Circles of Participation*; *Cultures of Caring: Philanthropy in Diverse Communities*. Washington, DC: A special report funded by The Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, and the Council on Foundations.
- □ Independent Sector. 2001. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector.
- □ Joseph, James A. 1995. *Remaking America: How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures Are Transforming Our National Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- □ O'Neill, Michael. 2001. *Research on Giving and Volunteering: Methodological Considerations*; *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30, 505-514.
- □ Ramos, Henry A.J. 1999. *Latino Philanthropy: Expanding U.S. Models of Giving and Civic Participation*; *Cultures of Caring: Philanthropy in Diverse Communities*. Washington, DC: A special report funded by The Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, and the Council on Foundations.
- □ Schervish, Paul. 2001. *Agent-Animated Wealth and Philanthropy: The Dynamics of Accumulation and Allocation Among High-Tech Donors*. Website: Association of Fundraising Professionals.
- □ Smith, Bradford, Sylvia Shue, Jennifer Lisa Vest, and Joseph Villarreal. 1999. *Philanthropy in Communities of Color*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

**Paper Number:** PA041383

**Paper Title:** African American Philanthropic Giving Capacity - Strategies for Educational Use by Professional Associations

**Author(s):**

Pier C. Rogers, National Association of Social Workers - NYC, New York, NY, USA

### **Summary of Research**

A national African American foundation has initiated a project to increase philanthropic giving within the African American community in Chicago. One of the first stages involved gathering data to demonstrate the philanthropic giving capacity of Chicago's African American communities. It was envisioned that the data would be used to educate potential donors. The foundation was asked to help develop "giving circles" within Chicago's African American community as the final stage of its work there. The question examined in this paper is how this data can be used to encourage giving by individual members of professional associations.

### **Description**

African American Philanthropic Giving – Strategies for Educational Use by Professional Associations

A national African American foundation has initiated a project to increase philanthropic giving within the African American community in Chicago. One of the first stages involved gathering data to demonstrate the philanthropic giving capacity of Chicago's African American communities. It was envisioned that the data would be used to educate potential donors. The foundation was asked to help develop "giving circles" within Chicago's African American community as the final stage of its work there. The question examined in this paper is how this data can be used to encourage giving by individual members of professional associations.

There is limited research about the giving capacity within African American communities in particular. It was learned that a tool had been developed by the Southern Research Development Institute (SRDI) called the "Philanthropic Giving Index". That index set out to assess philanthropic giving potential in targeted rural areas of the southern United States. It was determined that this tool would be adapted for use in an urban community, namely Chicago.

The African American foundation believed that this SRDI index could be adapted by adding a number of selectively chosen variables that would sufficiently expand the needed portrait of Chicago's African American community and their philanthropic behaviors and possibilities. Simultaneous to the data collection, the foundation set out to conceptualize an approach to cultivating potential donors.

This paper will discuss the data, rationale and approach to soliciting individuals that comprise professional membership associations. The notion is that individuals who belong to these associations present a particular set of interests and motivations that can be tapped in developing a solicitation approach. In addition, the data that comprises the African American Philanthropic Giving Index is thought to offer sufficient information to further motivate giving on the part of African Americans in Chicago.

The outcome of this work will be an added understanding of what sorts of data are more or less useful in educating potential donors who are African American professionals, about their giving possibilities. The work further addresses this year's conference themes about philanthropic practices within diverse communities, as well as those practices that may be associated with diverse needs (those of targeted professional groups).

**Paper Number:** PA041396

**Paper Title:** Engaging African Americans in Philanthropy: A Study of the Atlanta Metro Area

**Author(s):**

Shena R Ashley, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

David Van Slyke, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

**Summary of Research**

The data for this analysis was gathered from two surveys conducted in the Atlanta Metro Area that span the years 2000-2003. The Individual Philanthropy Patterns Survey was conducted in the year 2000 and is based on a random sample of over 2500 individuals in 22 metro area counties. The Community Foundations Trends Survey is a quarterly survey conducted in years 2002-2003 which includes a random sample of 450 respondents in 22 metro area counties. Bivariate and multivariate analysis were employed to analyze the data.

**Description**

Engaging African Americans in Philanthropy  
A Study of the Atlanta Metro Area

African Americans give, but their methods, patterns, and motivations for giving appear to be different from that of other racial and ethnic groups. Smith et. al. (1999) have identified the African American church as the “focal point” of much charitable giving in the black community, while also noting that “direct giving to individuals is more valued in the African American community than giving to nonprofit organizations” (p.9).

In the studies to date of African American philanthropy several findings are consistent (Carson 1999). First, African Americans historically and generally trust their religious organizations and use them as vehicles to express their religiosity as well as their philanthropic spirit. Second, giving by African Americans has not been bound by formal organizational structures, but rather has occurred through other forms of expression, such as family members at a reunion agreeing to collect donations to support another family, group, or organization. Third, giving has been motivated by the desire to “share and help” while also advancing important social justice principles, such as access and equality.

Yet, there is much about African American philanthropy that remains elusive. Previous statistical and case studies provide an invaluable foundation for understanding the unique features of African American philanthropy. However, some of the data utilized is now five to ten years old. Some of the sample sizes were relatively small. Perhaps most notable is the fact that the studies portrayed national observations, or observations for a specific community. This paper addresses distinguishing features of the Atlanta African American community, with its unique cultural, regional, and religious heritage, that have not been previously highlighted.

This paper provides the results of a comprehensive study of current day African American philanthropy in Atlanta. It presents data on African American attitudes toward giving, motivations for giving, and their patterns and methods of giving and volunteering in the Atlanta metro area in comparison to whites in the region. Among other things, we found that after controlling for sociodemographic characteristics, the level of African American giving was lower than that of whites and that being African American did not significantly effect secular hours volunteered but increased religious volunteering. Another focus of the paper is on the methods of solicitation, reciprocity incentives, and sources of information on charitable organizations that African Americans find most important- elements that are not addressed in other empirical studies, but are essential for philanthropic organizations looking to engage members of this group. In relation to solicitation methods we found that both African Americans and whites were most likely to respond to requests through a friend or relative and least likely to respond to requests through organization websites.

## Bibliography

"A Changing Palette. The Nations's Minority Population is Reshaping the Nonprofit Landscape," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 10, 2002, 4-57.

"Among Friends or Strangers? Approaching Fundraising in the Black Community," *Philanthropy Matters*, 2, 2, Fall/Winter 2002.

Abbe, M. Ann. "The Roots of Minority Giving. Understand the philanthropic traditions of different cultures to solicit them more effectively," *Case Currents*, July/August 2000.

Carson, Emmett D., *A Hand Up: Black Philanthropy and Self-Help in America*, (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press, 1993).

Carson, Emmett D., "Black Philanthropy: Shaping Tomorrow's Nonprofit Sector," *The NSFRE Journal*, Summer 1989, 23-31.

Carson, Emmett D., *A Charitable Appeals Fact Book: How Black and White Americans Respond to Different Types of Fund-Raising Efforts*, (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1989).

Collison, Michele. "The Changing Face of Philanthropy," *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 17, 7, May 25, 2000.

Conley, Dalton, "The Racial Wealth Gap. Origins and Implications for Philanthropy in the African American Community," in Pier C. Rogers, "Philanthropy in Communities of Color, Traditions and Challenges," *ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series*, 1, 1, 2001.

Council on Foundations, *Culture of Caring: Philanthropy in Diverse American Communities* (Washington, DC: Council on Foundations, 1999).

Fairfax, Jean E., "Black Philanthropy: Its Heritage and Its Future," *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 8, summer 1995, 9-21.

"Giving Strength. Understanding Philanthropy in the Black Community," *Philanthropy Matters*, 2, 1, 2001.

Gumbs, Juliet, "African American Donors: An Untapped Resource," *Connections*, 9, winter 1998, 4-5.

"Minority Homeowners Give More to Charity than Whites, Study Finds," (National Center for Charitable Statistics), *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 10, 2002.

Schervish, Paul, "Inclination, Obligation, and Association. What We Know and What We Need to Learn About Donor Motivation," in Dwight F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Fundraising* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997).

Smith, Bradford, Sylvia Shue, Jennifer Lisa Vest, and Joseph Villarreal, *Philanthropy in Communities of Color* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1999).

Winters, Mary-Frances, "Reflections on Endowment Building in the African American Community," in *Cultures of Caring, Philanthropy in Diverse American Communities*, (Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundation, 1999).

**Paper Number:** PA041094

**Paper Title:** The Emerging Role of Private Philanthropy in Local Government Finance

**Author(s):**

Renee Irvin, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, USA

**Summary of Research**

This article uses a survey of 165 city managers to evaluate efforts to raise funds from private individuals. We introduce the phenomenon of private giving to local governments and describe how local governments can initiate private resource development programs. Our research results show that philanthropy has caught the attention of government administrators, yet few public managers endorse any prescriptive action on the part of governments to approach private donors, and virtually no cities have developed guidelines for donor solicitation or policies for accepting gifts.

**Description**

The following study of private fundraising in public agencies shows how common techniques employed in nonprofit organizations can prove to be very useful for the government sector as well. Alternatively, the study previews for the nonprofit sector an upcoming source of competition for charitable funds.

Since 1975, the distribution of personal wealth in the United States has undergone a substantial shift toward high-wealth households (Wolff 2002). At the same time, the current generation of elders in the U.S. holds far more wealth than previous elders held. The anticipated “bequest wave” from transfer of wealth from these elders to succeeding generations has been cited to be anywhere from \$10 trillion to \$146 trillion (Avery and Rendall 1990, Havens and Schervish 1999). Although cities and counties with measurably older populations will experience wealth outflow soonest, all local governments should be aware of the implications of wealth transfer in the near future, as some of the most generous charitable gifts come from elderly individuals and from estate bequests.

The implications of these demographic and economic trends have not been lost on large nonprofit organizations, which are aggressively courting major donors for large current gifts and estate gifts. Local governments, however, are not systematically pursuing philanthropic sources for revenue generation. Gifts to local governments come in a piecemeal and sporadic fashion, and are often initiated by the donor herself. Examples include estate gifts of land for parks and endowment for libraries (Steele and Elder 2000). Unfortunately, the community economic development literature provides no mention of private philanthropy as a source of revenue (for example, Giles and Blakely 2001, Green and Haines 2002). America has a rich but unacknowledged tradition of giving to government institutions, from Andrew Carnegie’s 3000 municipal libraries to a present-day fundraising event to purchase equipment for a rural fire department.

This article examines motivation of local governments to generate new revenue via philanthropy, provides evidence of growing initiatives in local government (especially at the agency level) to target private donors, and outlines a blueprint for operationalizing a local government strategy to increase privately donated funds. We review the more common destinations for philanthropy to local governments – libraries, parks and recreation, and cultural amenities – and suggest strategies for obtaining philanthropic gifts for other types of publicly provided goods and services. Key strategies involve effective communication of philanthropic “products” and construction of transparent financial control systems so that donors can easily monitor the destination of their gift. We also urge caution, to mitigate the potentially harmful effects of extreme donor influence on the democratic process and allocation of scarce government resources. Gifts from donors can never replace the broad-based tax revenue from residents, but can greatly enhance local government efforts to improve quality of life, whether that be from preserving and restoring an historic train depot, building a skate park, strengthening a loan fund, or simply providing more services for families in need.

Avery, R.B. and M.S. Rendall. 1993. "Estimating the Size and Distribution of the Baby Boomers' Prospective Inheritances." Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, pp. 11-19.

Giles, Susan L. and Edward J. Blakely. 2001. Fundamentals of Economic Development Finance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Green, Gary Paul and Anna Haines. 2002. Asset Building & Community Development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Steele, V. and S. Elder. 2000. Becoming a Fundraiser: The Principles and Practice of Library Development. Chicago: American Library Association.

Wolff, Edward N. 2002. Top Heavy: The Increasing Inequality of Wealth in America and What Can Be Done About It. New York: The New Press.

**Paper Number:** PA041304

**Paper Title:** Charitable Death: The use of nonprofits as funding sources for terrorist organizations.

**Author(s):**

Edward L. Queen, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

**Summary of Research**

While much of the training, research, and discussion about fundraising has focused on issues related to accountability, little of this work has examined seriously the use of charitable fundraising for illegal purposes, particularly the use of charitable organizations as venues for providing monies to terrorist organizations. This paper examines the issues associated with using nonprofits as fundraising vehicles for illegal purposes, especially for terrorist organizations. It explains the operative legal definitions that lead to organizations being labeled "terrorist" and the administrative rubrics that result in sanctions of charities and other organizations that are deemed to be supporting such terrorist organizations.

**Description**

While much of the training, research, and discussion about fundraising has focused on issues related to accountability, little of this work or research within the wider nonprofit world has examined seriously and in detail the use of charitable fundraising for illegal purposes. For many, the events of 11 September 2001 brought this issue into focus for the first time. The use of charitable organizations as venues for collecting money for and transferring monies to terrorist organizations resulted in expanded legal and administrative constraints upon charities, particularly those undertaking to work or transfer money internationally.

□ This paper will examine the conceptual, analytical, and legal issues associated with the use of nonprofit organizations as fundraising vehicles for illegal purposes, especially for terrorist organizations. It begins by detailing the facts known about the use of charities as such fundraising vehicles, including the recent and current legal and administrative proceedings against individuals and corporations. The paper then explains the operative legal definitions that lead to organizations being labeled "terrorist" and the administrative and executive rubrics that result in freezing the assets of charities and other organizations that are deemed to be funding or providing material support to such terrorist organizations. Particular attention will be paid to the recently adopted "USA PATRIOT Act" other relevant legislation such as the "Antiterrorism & Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996" and the "International Emergency Economic Powers Act", as well as administrative rules and executive orders, including Executive Order 13224 blocking terrorist property. The first section will conclude by discussing the legal cases currently filed or recently settled in federal courts. These will include the case in Chicago regarding Benevolence International Fund and the recently filed case against Sami Amin al-Arian.

□ The second section of the paper will elaborate the implications of the extant legislation, administrative rules, and executive orders for nonprofits generally. This will include some of the "fuzzier" elements of the laws such as those relating to providing material support to terrorists, the use of federal anti-racketeering laws against nonprofits, and individual liability for criminal acts, including murder, that may be funded with the monies raised. The potential affects of other provisions such as the "Crimes Against Charitable Americans Act of 2001" also will be discussed.

□ The final substantive section of the paper will discuss how these problems have been addressed by governmental, advocacy, and industry organizations. Close attention will be paid to the United States Department of the Treasury's "Anti-Terrorist Financing Guidelines: Voluntary Best Practices for U.S.-Based Charities" and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering's "Combating the Abuse of Non-Profit Organisations: International Best Practices" and "The Forty Recommendations."

In this section the paper also will discuss in detail how organizations as diverse as the Treasury Department, the Islamic Society of North America, and concerned industry groups have been struggling to find ways to solve the problems caused by the fear that donor monies may be misused or that innocent individuals would be caught up unwittingly in legal action. Some of the issues that these

organizations have attempted to address include creating a process for establishing a list of “approved” or vetted charities, determining a way, through some version of cy pres to move frozen assets to purpose intended by their donors, and easing some of the fears surrounding transferring funds to international recipients, international money transfers to the United States, and liability for the use of these funds.

In conclusion the paper will discuss the potential challenges that the new legislation presents to nonprofits, not only practically but also conceptually. What is the balance between law enforcement and the right to association? Where does constitutionally protected speech end and criminal activity begin? To what extent can the failure of an individual to undertake due diligence prior to making a donation make her susceptible to criminal liability? When and under what conditions is an organization (and its officers and administrators) liable for activities undertaken by its branches or chapters? These are important and difficult questions that potentially present powerful challenges to the work undertaken by nonprofit organizations in the United States and for those who study these organizations.

**Paper Number:** PA041428

**Paper Title:** The True Impact of Conservative Philanthropy in the Public School Reform Movement

**Author(s):**

Julia Andrews, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

**Summary of Research**

Many have lauded the ability of conservatives to effectively advance their policy agendas. This strength extends to the field of conservative philanthropy, where strategic funding is among the dominant tools used to affect policy (NCRP, 1997 and 2004). Using data from sources such as 990-PF federal tax returns, nonprofit education initiatives, and foundation interviews, this paper aims to link the efforts of conservative grantmakers to the strides made toward making school choice universal.

**Description**

Issues to be addressed:

This exploratory paper will attempt to reveal if and how conservative grantmaking has been effective in garnering support for school choice initiatives by studying the ways in which they engage in education-focused philanthropy. All efforts will be made to trace the amounts of, types of, and recipients of grants made to pro-voucher nonprofits and schools. In addition, the school-choice initiatives undertaken by these nonprofits (made possible due to these conservative-based grants) will be tracked. This will help uncover the reach of conservative philanthropic dollars in terms of affecting public school reform.

Specific questions intended to guide this study are as follows: In what types of organizations did the foundations in question invest? What was the duration of and the amount of the grant(s)? What type of grant(s) did they provide—e.g., general operating support or program-specific support? Which geographic areas received these grants? Were the grants targeted for research or operation of schools?

Relationship to the state of knowledge to the field:

Since its seminal publication in 1997 on conservative philanthropy and its effect on policy, the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy (NCRP) has been at the forefront of identifying the links between grantmakers on the right and their strategic funding of policy projects. Its most recent report, *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy* (2004), profiles 79 conservative grant-making institutions and the policy-oriented nonprofits they fund. The Report identifies the strategies used to successfully translate ideas into policy, focusing on such broad issues as education, business, and defense. This paper will narrow the lens by concentrating on conservative philanthropy within the context of public education reform.

Source of data:

Beginning with both the 990-PF federal tax forms of foundations and the education reform initiatives of nonprofits, a database for each of these types of institutions will be created to identify the depth and breadth of support for school choice. In addition, this paper will take advantage of information previously gathered from other groups, such as NCRP, to help identify nonprofits and foundations involved in promoting school choice.

By using these data to analyze how school-choice groups are funded (e.g., level, duration, and geographic distribution of funding), a detailed account of the way conservative philanthropic aid has advanced the movement will evolve.

In addition, interviews will be solicited from the heads of major conservative foundations, such as the Hudson Institute, in order to develop a well-rounded perspective. Nonprofits that support school choice, such as the American Enterprise Institute, will be approached for comparable reasons.

Contribution to the field:

This paper will contribute to the knowledge of the proliferation of, rather than the value of, school choice programs nationwide. This in turn serves two purposes. The first is that proponents and opponents of vouchers can glean knowledge of ways to effectively promote or combat this growth of school choice programs through use of strategic philanthropy. The second contribution is that of general applicability. The knowledge of these conservative strategies can be extrapolated for use in other fields where effective leveraging of assets can be used to yield tangible results.

Preliminary bibliography:

Covington, Sally. *Moving a Public Policy Agenda: The Strategic Philanthropy of Conservative Foundations*. Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. 1997.

Ferris, James M. *Foundations & Public Policymaking: Leveraging Philanthropic Dollars, Knowledge, and Networks*. Los Angeles: The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy. 2003.

Krehely, Jeff, Meagan House, and Emily Kernan. *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy*. Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. 2004.

Miller, John J. *How Two Foundations Reshaped America*. Washington, D.C. The Philanthropy Roundtable. 2003.

National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. *The State of Philanthropy*. Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. 2002.

**Paper Number:** PA041434

**Paper Title:** Can Private Foundations Impact State Governments' Policies: The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Spread of Consumer Choice for People with Developmental

**Author(s):** Disabilities

Ann Breihan, College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore, MD, USA

### **Summary of Research**

This paper offers a model for using empirical data to track the effectiveness of private foundation actions on state public policy in the US. The model is tested using data related to the efforts of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to encourage states to empower consumers and their families to choose their nonprofit service provider(s) themselves. The paper explores the extent to which the spread of this innovation can be attributed to the Foundation's efforts, rather than to other independent variables.

### **Description**

The effectiveness of private philanthropy has been coming under increased scrutiny (Porter & Kramer, 1999; Letts, et al, 1997). The basic question emerges: can philanthropic organizations demonstrate their effectiveness? One element of effectiveness is influence. Can private foundations influence state government policy on a nationwide basis? The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation offers a model for accomplishing this in the field of Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities (I/DD) policy.

Through the beginning of the 1990s, states tightly controlled decision-making about who would provide funded care for adults with I/DD. In some cases the only option was to enter an institution. More frequently, states contracted with nonprofit service providers for specific numbers of slots. When adults received services outside their family home, state officials offered no choice about who would provide those services. This began to change. From 1992-95, eight states received limited federal funding for small pilot projects offering some degree of consumer choice in ancillary support services, such as assistive technology (Brown, et al. 1997). In 1993, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation supplemented this initiative by funding a pilot program in New Hampshire giving adults with I/DD and their families the authority to choose most of their support services (Menehan, 1995). Two years later RWJF used small grants to encourage states to empower individuals with I/DD to choose their service providers themselves (Sunderland, 2004). The Foundation has since partnered with the federal government to fund states' pilot projects increasing personal choice in ancillary services for both people with disabilities and elders.

The goal of this paper is to ascertain the impact of RWJF funding in this policy area. How many states do give adults with developmental disabilities the ability to select their nonprofit service provider? To what extent can the spread of this innovation be attributed to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation? This paper tracks the spread of the innovation of consumer choice of care provider. Using an ordered logit approach, I ascertain the amount of variation that can be explained by RWJF activities. To demonstrate the impact of this private foundation activity, I also track other explanations usually offered for policy innovation. These include the state's previous track record in the area, in this case deinstitutionalization (Braddock et al, 2002; Lakin et al., 2002) and the role of the judiciary (Glick, 1999; Lightcap, 2003). In addition, I analyze internal state variables frequently associated with innovation, such as state wealth, size and degree of urbanization (Walker, 1969; Berry & Berry, 1992); interest group size (Gray, et al., 2002); ideological and partisan orientations (Elazar, 1984; Wright, Erikson & McIver, 1987; Holbrook & Percy, 1992; Daley & Garand, 2002); and regional practices (Mooney & Lee, 1995; Jacoby & Schneider, 2001). My model offers a means of using empirical data to track the effectiveness of private foundation actions on state public policy in the US.

\* \* \* \* \*

## References

Berry, F. S. and W. D. Berry (1992). "Tax innovation in the states: Capitalizing on political opportunity." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 715-742.

Braddock, D., R. Hemp, et al. (2002). *The State of the States in Developmental Disabilities: 2002 Study Summary*, Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities and the Department of Psychiatry, The University of Colorado.

Brown, S. L., K. C. Lakin, et al. (1997). "Beneficiary centered care in services to persons with developmental disabilities." *Health Care Financing Review* 19(2): 23-46.

Daley, D. M. and J. C. Garand (2002). *Determinants of State Hazardous Waste Programs: A pooled cross-sectional time series analysis*. Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Elazar, D. J. (1984). *American federalism: A view from the states*. New York, Harper & Row.

Glick, H. R. (1999). *Courts: Politics and the judicial process*. *Politics in the American states*. V. Gray, R. L. Hanson and H. Jacob. Washington, DC, CQ Press: 232-266.

Gray, V., D. Lowery, et al. (2002). *The opinion-policy linkage in the American states: Professional legislatures, organized interests, and policy responsiveness*. State Politics and Policy Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Holbrook, T. M. and S. L. Percy (1992). "Exploring variations in state laws providing protections for persons with disabilities." *Western Political Quarterly* 45(1): 201-220.

Jacoby, W. G. and S. K. Schneider (2001). "Variability in state policy priorities: An empirical analysis." *The Journal of Politics* 63(2): 544-568.

Lakin, K. C., R. Prouty, et al. (2002). "Indicators of change in service for persons with intellectual disabilities: Decade ending June 30, 2000." *Mental Retardation* 40(1): 90-96.

Letts, C.W. et al. (1997). "Virtuous capital: What foundations can learn from venture capitalists." *Harvard Business Review* 75 (2): 8-44.

Lightcap, T. (2003). "Issue environments and institutionalization: Structural change in U.S. state judicial institutions, 1975-1995." *The Justice System Journal* 24(2): 183-203.

Menehan, K. (1995). *Project for Long-Term Supportive Services for Developmentally Disabled Residents of New Hampshire*. Princeton, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation: 9.

Mooney, C. Z. and M.-H. Lee (1995). "Legislating morality in the American states: The case of pre-Roe abortion regulation reform." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(3): 599-627.

Porter, M.E. and M.R. Kramer (1999). "Philanthropy's new agenda: Creating value." *Harvard Business Review* 77 (6): 121-131.

Sunderland, A. (2004). *Self-Determination for People with Developmental Disabilities*. Princeton, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation: 17.

Walker, J. L. (1969). "The diffusion of innovations among the American states." *American Political Science Review* 63(3): 880-899.

Wright, G. C., Jr., R. S. Erikson, et al. (1987). "Public opinion and policy liberalism in the American states." *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 980-1001.

**Paper Number:** PA041063

**Paper Title:** Indigenous education: partnership and intergovernmental relation in the Indigenous Park of the Xingu

**Author(s):**

Silvia da Silva Craveiro, Fundação Getulio Vargas, São Paulo, Brazil

### **Summary of Research**

This paper is about the implementation and development of an educational system in the Indigenous Park of the Xingu, an important indigenous area in Brazil. The initiative started in 1994, and presently, it has 68 teachers from 14 ethnic groups who teach in 36 schools, serving 1,258 students. This system contributes to preservation of the indigenous traditions and the rights of the people of this area. The objective of this document is to analyze the educational system, focusing on the dynamics of the partnerships, and the intergovernmental relations that result from the development of an educational public policy.

### **Description**

This paper is about the implementation and development of an educational system in the Indigenous Park of the Xingu (PIX), an important indigenous area in Brazil. The Park area is located in the southern part of the Brazilian Amazon and has 14 indigenous groups, each with its own language, with a total of 4,043 individuals.

The main objective of this paper is to analyze the indigenous educational system of the PIX, focusing on the dynamics of the partnerships, and the intergovernmental relations that result from the development of an educational public policy at the regional level. Furthermore, the study intends to discuss the function and the impacts of this system, in terms of institutional design and results in the community. This case was chosen because this educational system is considered a success. This educational system contributes highly to preservation of the indigenous traditions and the rights of the indigenous people of the Park. Moreover, in a place it is very difficult to find motivated and adequate qualified staff to work with these indigenous populations in the national public administration.

All the development process of this educational initiative are a result of a large partnership among the indigenous association (Xingu Indigenous Land Association – ATIX), a non governmental organization that is non indigenous (Social Environmental Institute – ISA), municipalities, state government (State of Mato Grosso), federal government and private companies. The educational system is utilized as a model for public policy by the Education Ministry of Brazil and inspires other similar initiatives throughout the country.

The initiative started in 1994 as a teacher training course for indigenous people that wanted to teach their young students. Shortly afterwards, the indigenous professors created schools for their communities. Presently, the Park has 68 teachers from 14 ethnic groups who teach in 36 schools located throughout villages and indigenous posts, serving 1,258 students. The teachers composed the Pedagogical Political Project for their schools, from the 1st to 4th stages (equivalent to the first four grades of basic education), with a specific cultural differentiated program, which was developed with consultants from the education staff of the ISA. Since 1994, indigenous alphabets have been developed by teachers, with the help of linguists, in all the languages. The teachers write their own didactic books in the indigenous languages and in Portuguese.

Nowadays, most of the schools are under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Education of the State of Mato Grosso. However, there are seven schools connected to municipalities around the Park.

The analysis of this system covers different knowledge fields, such as, partnership between public and private institutions, intergovernmental relations and public policy. The study intends to show how partnerships started and evolved over time. In this case it is necessary to analyze the partnerships, since they are one of the main reasons for the success of the experience within poor groups and interlocution within the dominant society. The intergovernmental relations are discussed mainly at the sub-national, municipalities and state level, a complex arena where the policies from the federal level are put into practice. It is interesting that in the Xingu area, the system is built in an environment where there is confrontation between some of municipalities that are against indigenous people and between

municipalities which support indigenous people. Finally, is discussed how the indigenous people developed an educational public policy, that includes ethnics and cultural factors in response to their needs.

The literature is mainly composed of Brazilian authors who study these themes related to reality of Brazilian society. In reference to partnership, I referred to authors that analyze the partnership of public and private institutions. Furthermore, in the study of intergovernmental relations, these theories discuss the impact of federalism in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies. The third knowledge field, public policy, is analyzed through theories that examine the decentralization process and its consequences in all areas. The focus here is the educational public policy.

The approach of this paper is based on a qualitative methodology. The data collected was mainly through documents and texts related to these themes. Moreover, schools in Xingu area were visited and interviews were conducted with key actors, such as: professors, directors of schools, students, community leaders, parents of students, project coordinator, educators professor's assistants, some municipal education office staffs and the General Secretary of Indigenous Education of the Education Ministry.

This work covering diverse knowledge fields, makes contributions in the following areas: the need for different public policy aimed at minority populations that are ethnically differentiated (teaching methodology, administrative trials and legislation); the importance of involving the community in the entire process of the initiative (in this case, it is possible to see the importance and the need for the indigenous protagonism); to understand the consequences of the trial of decentralization of the indigenous politics of education in Brazil for the sub-national levels; the impact of the partnership between NGOs and companies for educational politics; the education as propellant spring for other areas: health (native agent of health); environment (environmental agents, campaigns of preservation of the ecosystems); protection of the territory; contact with the dominant society and all of the impacts of this contact (garbage, illnesses, among others).

## References

- ALMEIDA, Maria Hermínia Tavares de. Federalismo e políticas sociais. In: AFFONSO, Rui de Britto Álvares e SILVA, Pedro Luiz Barros (orgs.). Descentralização e políticas sociais. São Paulo: FUNDAP, 1996.
- CACCIA-BAVA, Silvio, PAULICS, Veronika & SPINK, Peter – organizadores. Novos contornos de gestão local: conceitos em construção. São Paulo, Pólis; Programa Gestão Pública e Cidadania/FGV-EAESP, 2002
- GRUPIONI, Luís Donisete Benzi. Do nacional ao local, do federal ao estadual: as leis e a educação escolar indígena. Belo Horizonte. In: Fórum Mineiro de Educação 2002 Anais.
- LAUMMAN, E. e KNOKE, D. The organizational state: social choice in the national policy domains. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press. 1987
- LIMA, Antonio Carlos de Souza; BARROSO-HOFFMANN, Maria, orgs. Etnodesenvolvimento e políticas públicas: bases para uma nova política indigenista. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa Livraria/Laced, 2002.
- MARQUES, Eduardo C. Notas Críticas à literatura sobre Estado, políticas estatais e atores políticos. BIB, Rio de Janeiro, n.º 43, 1997. pg. 67-102
- RICARDO, Carlos Alberto. Povos Indígenas no Brasil 1996-2000. São Paulo, Instituto Sócio Ambiental, 2000

**Paper Number:** PA041184

**Paper Title:** Reengineering the European Research Area for Universities in Small EU countries: The Case of Cyprus

**Author(s):**

Soulla Louca, Intercollege, Nicosia, CYPRUS

Marios Katsioloudes, Intercollege, Nicosia, CYPRUS

### **Summary of Research**

The creation of the Cyprus research area can be a key component and a critical contributor to the creation of the European Research Area (ERA), and the strategy defined at Lisbon for making the European Union the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy. Researchers in every country, contribute towards this economic growth through the industrial exploitation of the results of their research not only within their countries, but also on a European basis, and thus enhancing the European economy as a whole. Private universities and colleges have a lot of human potential for research that remains "unexplored".

### **Description**

Abstract

This paper seeks to propose a framework for research in academia that complies with the EU framework. Emphasis is given on the human potential, and infrastructure that exists within the tertiary educational institutions of Cyprus. A survey has been carried out with the aim of identifying problems and potential solutions in giving new momentum to the academic research initiatives, by strengthening efforts where necessary, and defining new perspectives which will provide the initiatives with more means of implementation. In addition, it aims to raise awareness of the academic dimension of research at the national and international levels, and stimulate a process for bringing together all the parties involved including faculty, industry, administration, and policy makers to launch new cooperation initiatives among them for both applied and theoretical research. Results from the survey indicate that mobility of researchers, networking, academia-industry-government collaboration, private investment in research, better research infrastructures, policies for intellectual property, activities to increase research output of the faculty such as providing for faculty development and life long learning, and other initiatives will enhance the research area.

In March 2000, the European Council in Lisbon, set the goal for making the European Union (EU) the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge based economy. To this end, Europe requires a new impetus, to which research and development contributes in an essential way and leads us towards to the creation of the European Research Area (ERA). Boosting investment in research is pivotal to the creation of ERA. Thus, in March 2002, the European Council in Barcelona decided that the research expenditure should rise from 1.9% to 3% of GDP. More explicitly, by 2010 two-thirds will be financed by the private sector, in order to close the gap with the current levels of research investment by the major competitors, such as the United States and Japan. Meeting the 3% objective is expected to create 0.5% additional GDP growth and 400,000 additional jobs in Europe annually after 2010. EU spends 1.9% of its GDP on research and development as compared to 2.7% for USA which is still rising and 3% for Japan. Cyprus, on the other hand, spends a mere of 0.26.

Research and development activities play an extremely important role in the comprehensive promotion of science and technology, and the promotion of scientific study. It is important to implement consistently such activities, and to ensure that the results garnered are used to benefit society as a whole. Researchers in every country, contribute towards this economic growth through the industrial exploitation of the results of their research not only within their countries, but also on a European basis, and thus enhancing the European economy as a whole. Private universities and colleges in small countries such as Cyprus, have a lot of human potential for research that remains "unexplored". This is

due to various reasons such as lack of time (due to heavy teaching load in the private sector), lack of an environment to stimulate research, inadequate infrastructure, and lack of funding for research.

This paper seeks to propose a framework for research in academia that complies with the EU framework. Emphasis is given on the human potential, and infrastructure that exists within the tertiary educational institutions of Cyprus. A survey has been carried out with the aim of identifying problems and potential solutions in giving new momentum to the academic research initiatives, by strengthening efforts where necessary, and defining new perspectives which will provide the initiatives with more means of implementation. In addition, it aims to raise awareness of the academic dimension of research at national and international level, and stimulate a process for bringing together all the parties involved including faculty, industry, administration, and policy makers together to launch new cooperation initiatives among them for both applied and theoretical research.

Results from the survey indicate that mobility of researchers, networking, academia-industry-government collaboration, private investment in research, better research infrastructures, policies for intellectual property, are activities that will increase faculty's research output and enhance faculty development and life long learning.

## References

1. □ The European Research Area: Providing new momentum, Strengthening, Reorienting, Opening up new perspectives, Communication from the Commission, Brussels, 16 October 2002, COM(2002) 565
2. □ Overcoming Barriers to Collaborative Research, Report of a Workshop Government –University –Industry – Research Roundtable, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. , 1998
3. □ SEC 2003 489 – investing in research an action plan for Europe
4. □ Beach, A., Salerno, C. S., & Colbeck, C. L. How and why teachers change: A case study of research university faculty. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (April, 1999).
5. □ "Registration, Inspection, and Accreditation of Cypriot Institutions of Higher Education." A series of three workshops with recommendations conducted for the Ministry of Education, Nicosia, Cyprus. March 1998.
6. □ Werner Z. Hirsch and Luc E. Weber (eds) Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium, . Oxford, UK: Pergamon, 2000.
7. □ Busquin, P. Euroabstracts. The next step towards a free market for knowledge, science, and innovation; October, 2002.
8. □ Cresson, E. Euroabstracts. S & T Indicators Show Europe the Way Forward. June, 1998.
9. □ European Commission. Directorate-General for Education and Culture. EU Cooperation in Higher Education; Jan. 2004.
10. □ SOCRATES. European Commission. Key Topics in Education in Europe. (Vol. 2), Jan. 2004.
11. □ Sarah Guri-Rosenblit and Ronald G. Sultana (eds.) Higher Education in the Mediterranean: A special issue of the Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies,. Vol. 4, No. 2, 1999.

**Paper Number:** PA041387

**Paper Title:** You can bring a horse to water, but...: Unnatural Acts, Collaboration and Curriculum

**Author(s):**

David G. Garvey, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

**Summary of Research**

Grant funding strategies are most often structured to encourage collaboration between nonprofits. Collaboration is an unnatural act of a loosely-coupled system. This paper posits that the nonprofit sector should be understood as a loosely coupled system. With acceptance of this conceptual framework, this paper posits that training for nonprofit practitioners (from short course to degree), beyond the primary objective of the transfer of technical skills, should have a secondary goal, through pedagogic approach and curriculum design, of supporting the nonprofit professional in the art, science and nature of collaboration.

**Description**

**Problem Statement**

Grant funding strategies are most commonly structured to encourage collaboration between nonprofits (Murray, 1994). Collaboration is an unnatural act of a loosely coupled system (Wieck, 1976; Orton & Weick, 1990; Marion, 1999; Beekun & Glick, 2001). This paper posits that the nonprofit sector should be understood as a loosely coupled system. With acceptance of this conceptual framework, this paper posits that training for nonprofit practitioners (from short course to degree), beyond the primary objective of the transfer of technical skills, should have a secondary goal, through pedagogic approach and curriculum design, of supporting the nonprofit professional in the art, science and nature of collaboration.

**State of Knowledge in the Field**

American philanthropy and nonprofit sector is nearly 200 years old (Tocqueville, 1999 [1835]), yet focus on the educational needs of the sector by higher education is relatively new. The average age of a university-based education center targeted to the organizational needs of the nonprofit sector is just over 11 years old (Renz & Mirabella, 2002)—a literal pre-teen. And as a pre-teen, we might be inclined to think we know (Pinar et al., 1995) a great deal, as my 11 year old daughter can attest to, but as an academy we can expect a wonderful learning curve ahead of us.

Many scholars and practitioners are asking the question of how we—as practitioners, scholars and pracademics (Schneider, 2004)—desire and need the field of nonprofit organizational learning to evolve and to what ends (Smith, 2000; Rosenman, 2002). This paper posits that beyond the transfer of technical skills, nonprofit education leaders should also be developing a research agenda that investigates the uses and advantages of curriculum design and pedagogy to meet the sector's future.

There is a growing body of research concerning the justification for (Larson & Barnes, 2001; Larson & Barnes Moorehead, 2002), academic content needs (e.g. Tschirhart 1998; Dolan, 2002; Larson, 2002; NACC, 2003), and location (Mirabella & Wish, 2000) of higher education centers of learning and professional development focused on nonprofit management. However, there has been minimal inquiry into promising pedagogies for delivering that content (e.g. Katsiloudes & Tischio, 2001). This limited inquiry into pedagogy has left a gap of investigation and understanding of how curriculum design can be used as a method for supporting nonprofit practitioners in grasping the culture, nature and process of collaboration along with other “soft knowledge” (Anand, Manz and Glick, 1998) skills.

This paper will:

1. □ Provide data to support the conceptual framework of the nonprofit sector as a loosely coupled system, and the implications of that nature.
2. □ Reflect on nonprofit curriculum through the lens of the diversity of the sector; as a racial (e.g. McCarthy, 1990); gender (e.g. Grumet, 1988); reproductive (e.g. Apple, 1979); economic (e.g. Stout, 1997); social structure (Mclaren, 1994; Giroux, 1981) autobiographical (e.g. Morris, 1981; Grumet, 1976) and post-modern (e.g. Fillmore and Meyer, 1992) text.
3. □ Posit an “aesthetic” (Grumet, 1978) argument for curriculum design for the transfer of technical skills, that also supports the development of collaboration and other soft skills amongst learners within the nonprofit sector.

□

#### Method

- □ Investigation of relevant literature concerning organizational culture and learning (eg. Choo, 1998), the diverse operating environments (e.g. Peters & Wolfred, 2001; Bode, 2003; Te’eni & Young, 2003; Twombly, 2003) and changing roles (e.g. Chieco, 1996; Fosler, 2002) of nonprofit organizations, the nature of loosely-coupled systems (e.g. Wieck, 1976; Orton & Weick, 1990; Marion, 1999), and relevant curriculum design theory (e.g. Pinar et al, 2001).
- □ Interviews with nonprofit practitioners.

#### Contributions to the Field

This paper will contribute to the understanding of organizational culture, systems theory, curriculum design and collaborative activities within the nonprofit sector. In addition, it may provide knowledge that can be utilized in the fields of nonprofit evaluation, executive turnover and human resources, innovation, information transfer and communication along gender, social, economic, ethnic and other demographic lines within the sector

#### References

- Anand, V.; Manz, C., Glick, W. (1998). An organizational memory approach to information management. *Academy of Management Review*, 1998, Vol. 23, No. 4, 796-809.
- Apple, M. (1979). Curriculum and reproduction. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 9 (3), 231-252
- Beekun, R. & Glick, W. (2001). Organizational Structure from a loose coupling perspective: A multidimensional approach, *Decision Sciences*, spring 2001, Vol. 32, No. 2, 227-250.
- Bode, I. (2003) Flexible response in changing environments: The German third sector model in transition. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 32. No. 2, June 2003, 200-210
- Chieco, Kate, et al. (1996) *Mission possible: 200 ways to strengthen the nonprofit sector's infrastructure*. Washington, DC: Union Institute Press.
- Choo, C.W. (1998). *The knowing organization: How organizations use information to construct meaning, create knowledge, and make decisions*. 298 pages, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Dolan, D (2002). Training needs of administrators in the nonprofit sector: What are they and how should we address them, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, vol. 12, no.3, spring 2002, Wiley Periodicals, San Francisco.
- Fillmore, L. and Meyer, L. (1992) The curriculum and linguistic minorities. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum*, 626-658. Macmillan: New York.

Fosler R.S. (2002), *Working better together: How government, business and nonprofit organizations can achieve public purposes through cross-sector collaboration, alliances and partnerships.* (2002), Independent Sector et al. Washington, D.C.

Giroux, H. (1981). Hegemony, resistance and the paradox of educational reform. *Interchange*, 12 (2-3), 3-26

Grumet, M. (1976). Existential and phenomenological foundations. In W. Pinar & M. Grumet, *Toward a poor curriculum*, 31-50. Kendall/Hunt: Debuque, IA.

Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching.* University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, MA.

Grumet, M. (1978). Songs and situations. In G. Willis (Ed.), *Qualitative Evaluation*, 274-315, McCutchan: Berkley, CA.

Katsioloudes, M. and Tischio, V (2001). Critical thinking in nonprofit management education, *Human Systems Management*, Vol. 20, pgs 47-57.

Larson, R. Sam (2002). *Building Bridges Initiative Cluster Evaluation: Survey of Nonprofit Management Alumni*, a publication of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, March 2002, Published by CenterPoint Institute, San Francisco, (Obtained online on September 12, 2002 at [www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm](http://www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm)).

Larson, R.S., and Barnes, S (2001). *Building Philanthropy and Nonprofit Academic Centers: A View from Ten Builders: Prepared as part of the Building Bridges Initiative Cluster Evaluation*, May 2001, Report to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Published by CenterPoint Institute, San Francisco, (Obtained online on September 12, 2002 at [www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm](http://www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm)).

Larson, R.S., and Barnes Moorehead, S (2002). *How Centers Work: Building and Sustaining Academic Nonprofit Centers*, a publication of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Published by CenterPoint Institute, San Francisco, (Obtained online on September 12, 2002 at [www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm](http://www.CenterPointInstitute.org/Bridges/Papers&Reports/Papers.htm)).

Marion, R. (1999). *The edge of organization: Chaos and complexity theories of formal social systems*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA., 1999, 357 pages.

McCarthy, C. (1990). *Race and curriculum.* Falmer: London, England

Mclaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* [2nd edition.] Longman: New York

Mirabella, R., and Wish, N (2000). The 'Best Place' Debate: A Comparison of Graduate Education Programs for Nonprofit Managers. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 60, no.3, May 2000, 219-230.

Morris, W. (1981). *Terrains of the heart.* Yoknapatawpha Press: Oxford, MS.

Murray, V. (1994). Factors affecting the development of interorganizational collaboration among nonprofit organizations. Contributed paper presented to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA).

(NACC) Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (2003). *Curricular Guidelines: for Graduate Study in Philanthropy, the Nonprofit Sector and Nonprofit Leadership*, Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, Cleveland, Ohio.

- Orton, J.D. & Weick, K. (1990). Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pgs 203-223
- Peters, J. & Wolfred, T. (2001). *Daring to lead: Nonprofit executive directors and their work experiences*, CompassPoint, San Francisco, CA.
- Pinar, W.; Reynolds, W.; Slattery, P. and Taubman, P. (1995) *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. Lang: New York.
- Rosenman, M., Union Institute (2002). *Nonprofits, values, democracy and justice*. Presentation at the New Haven Nonprofit Forum, William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund, New Haven Friends Meeting House, Fair Haven, CT, October 4, 2002.
- Renz, David O., and Roseanne Mirabella. *Legitimacy, Location, and Leadership: A Report on the Organization and Role of Nonprofit Management Outreach Centers*. Contributed paper presented to the 31st Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA); Montreal, Quebec, Canada; November 14-16, 2002.
- Schneider, J. A. (2004). Re: Teaching Credentials. Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action's listserv, ARNOVA-L@LISTSERV.WVU.EDU, March 26, 2004, 12:25pm.
- Smith, J.P. (2000). Management is not management: Nonprofit education in the United State. *Vital Speeches*, Jan 1, 2000 vol. 66, (6), pg. 182, City News Publishing Company. (Obtained online on December 12, 2002 at [www.infotrac.galegroup.com](http://www.infotrac.galegroup.com).)
- Stout, L (1997). *Bridging the class divide and other lessons from grassroots organizing*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Te'eni, D. & Young, D. (2003) , *The changing role of nonprofits in the network economy*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 32. No. 3, September 2003, pg s. 397 - 414
- Tocqueville, A de. *Democracy in America*, Vol.II. New York:Knopf, 1999. In Stevenson, D., Pollack, T., and Lampkin, L. (1997) *State nonprofit almanac 1997: Profiles of charitable organizations*. Urban Institute, Maryland, University Press of America
- Tschirhart, M (1998). *Nonprofit management education: Recommendations drawn from three stakeholder groups*. In *Nonprofit Management Education: U.S. and World Perspectives*, O' Neill, M. and Fletcher, K.(Eds) Prager: New York
- Twombly, E. (2003). What factors affect the entry and exit of nonprofit human service organizations in metropolitan areas, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 32. No. 2, June 2003, 211-235.
- Wieck, K. (1976), *Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Volume 21, Issue 1 (March 1976), pgs 1-19.