

Paper Number: PA051215

Paper Title: The Financial Impacts of Welfare Reform on the Nonprofit Human Service Organizations

Author(s):

Yihtsu Hahn, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA

Sue Pearlmuter, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI, USA

Summary of Research

This study will use a national tax data set with nonprofit financial variables in a longitudinal scheme from 1990 to 2001 to capture the impacts of welfare reform on nonprofit human service organizations. The proposed empirical study can further an understanding of the ways in which policy elements of welfare reform applied among states may be connected to changes in the financial situations of nonprofit human service organizations. It will permit an examination of longitudinal trends of financial variables in nonprofit human service organizations before and after welfare reform implementation of 1996. The implication of nonprofit-government relations will be discussed.

Description

Introduction & Research Questions--

□ Known as welfare reform, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) (P.L. 104-93) brought some of the most important changes in public policy in many decades. This study will explore the financial impacts of welfare reform on nonprofit human service organizations. A great amount of research had been conducted to evaluate the effects or impacts of the PRWORA, but relatively limited attention has been paid to the work of nonprofit human service organizations. Several fundamental and unresolved research questions are: 1) Has welfare reform increased or decreased government financial support of nonprofit human service organizations? 2) How have the diverse PRWORA policies influenced the organizations? and 3) What other financial changes have occurred in this process and how have they influenced nonprofit human service organizations? This study attempts to examine these three fundamental questions.

Research Data-

□ The nonprofit human service organizations sample for this study is from the IRS/SOI sample files for 1990-2001 of the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) at The Urban Institute. The IRS/SOI data are created annually by the Statistics of Income (SOI) division of the United States Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and include information from Form 990-Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax, which most tax-exempt organizations are required to file under Section 501 (c) of Internal Revenue Code. NCCS then receives the SOI sample files from the IRS and makes the data for these organizations under 501(c)(3) (public charities) available for research purposes and for developing other data sets. There are 6,481 organizations available in the combined data set of 1990-2001. The proposed study will applied welfare reform data from Fender, McKernan, & Bernstein's (2002) research. They use factor analysis to summarize Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and related policies that are hypothesized to affect TANF recipients' job entry most directly. The database they apply, the TANF Typologies Database, is built by the same research team (Fender et al., 2002). It is comprised of 57 TANF related policy variables/elements measured in 1999, after most states had submitted their policies for implementing welfare reform.

Statistical Analysis Plan--

□ I propose to apply General Linear Models including one-way ANOVA, correlations, multiple regression, and Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992, 2002) as my statistical analysis plan.

Summary of the Paper--

□ This study will use a national data set with nonprofit financial variables in a longitudinal scheme from 1990 to 2001 to capture the impacts of welfare reform on nonprofit human service organizations. The

proposed empirical study can further an understanding of the ways in which policy elements of welfare reform applied among states may be connected to changes in the financial situations of nonprofit human service organizations. It will permit an examination of longitudinal trends of financial variables in nonprofit human service organizations before and after welfare reform implementation of 1996. The implication of nonprofit-government relations will be discussed.

References

Fink, B., & Widom, R. (2001). Social service organizations and welfare reform: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
Raudenbush, & Bryk (Eds.). (1992, 2002). Hierarchical linear models (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Paper Number: PA051220

Paper Title: Compensation Environments in the Illinois Nonprofit Arts Labor Market

Author(s):

Diane M. Grams, Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Summary of Research

Summary: This study of executive compensation to arts leaders in Illinois summarizes key employment statistics and presents results from a factor analysis showing four models of compensation environments found within arts organizations. The story told by this study is first, one of small nonprofit businesses, and, second how these small businesses balance resources to compensate their staff. The study is based on results of a custom survey sent to 655 Illinois arts nonprofits.

Description

As the arts represent only 10 percent of the universe of nonprofits in the United States, arts organizations are typically not the focus of studies of executive compensation. This study of executive compensation to arts leaders in Illinois summarizes key employment statistics and presents results from a factor analysis showing four models of compensation environments found within arts organizations. The story told by this study is first, one of small nonprofit businesses, and, second how these small businesses balance resources to compensate their staff. The study is based on results of a custom survey sent to 655 Illinois arts nonprofits. While the majority of arts organizations have at least one full-time staff member, 40 percent of the arts organizations in Illinois do not have full-time staff and nearly one fifth have no paid staff at all. Of those organizations that do have paid staff, 90 percent have less than 11 staff members. Furthermore, over 50 percent of new executive directors are coming to the their position after turning 40 years old, 25 percent are between ages 50 and 65, and 3 percent are over 65 years. In most organizations, employee benefits are limited. Only 10% of the respondents report their organization contributed to a retirement fund; 28 percent report their organization contributed to health insurance. Factor analysis of survey data reveals four distinct organizational compensation environments that balance the governance, volunteer labor, budget, executive pay, and benefits. These four benefits environments are: 1) a competitive environment; 2) a generous environment; 3) a restrained environment; 4) and a hard-working, struggling environment. Variation in compensation environments — from competitive or generous to restrained or struggling — shows how budget is not the only predictor of compensation. In addition, several sets of figures point to the exceptional nature of the nonprofits arts labor market.

Bibliography

- Abbing, Hans. 2002. *Why are Artists Poor: The Exceptional Economy of the Arts*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Barbarito, Carol L. and Jack P. Bowman 1998. *Nonprofit Compensation and Benefit Practices*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beatty, Randolph P. and Edward J. Zajac. 1994. "Managerial Incentives, Monitoring and Risk Bearing: A Study of Executive Compensation, Ownership and Board Structure in Initial Public Offerings." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39 (2):313-335.
- Bryce Herrington J. 1992. *Financial and Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Courtney Roger. 2002. *Strategic Management for Voluntary Nonprofit Organizations* London and New York: Routledge.
- Frank, Robert H. 1996. "What Price the Moral High Ground?" *Southern Economic Journal* 63 (1):1-17.
- Grams, Diane and Michael Warr. 2003. *Leveraging Assets: How Small Budget Organizations Benefit Local Neighborhoods*." Chicago, IL: MacArthur Foundation.
http://www.macfound.org/documents/docs/small_budget_arts_activities.doc (3/6/2003).

GuideStar Philanthropic Research, Inc. 2004. "2004 GuideStar Nonprofit Compensation Report, National Edition." Williamsburg, VA: Guidestar.

Hallock, Kevin F. 1997. "Reciprocally Interlocking Boards of Directors and Executive Compensation." *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 32 (3):331-344.

Hallock, Kevin F. 2002. "Managerial Pay and Governance in American Nonprofits." *Industrial Relations* 41 (3): 377-406.

Hammack, David C and Dennis R. Young, editors. 1993. *Non-Profit Organizations in a Market Economy: Understanding New Roles, Issues and Trends 1993*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Internal Revenue Service. 2002. "2002, Instructions for Form 990 and Form 990 EZ." Washington, D.C.: Internal Revenue Service. <http://www.irs.gov/formspubs/lists/0,,id=113965,00.html> (12/27/04)

Twombly, Eric. 2002. "Executive Compensation in the Nonprofit Sector." Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.

Paper Number: PA051224

Paper Title: The Impact of Organizational Culture on Human Service Worker's Performance

Author(s):

Maria D. Vasquez, Florida Atlantic University, Delray Beach, FL, USA

Penina Mungania, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA

Summary of Research

Nonprofit human service agencies assist individuals and families with economic, health, and social needs. Assessing organizational culture and “the shared understandings that pattern the interactions of people within the organization” (Mulhare, 1999, p.327) may provide useful feedback for practitioners, nonprofit managers, and directors to know how workers see their organization. This study is unique in providing some evidence about the different perceptions human service workers have when assessing their organizational culture. Organizational culture is important to study because it provides a first-hand diagnosis of how things are working inside an organization.

Description

Problem

Nonprofit human service organizations are characterized for having a direct-person related jobs which means that their primary role is to assist their clients physically, mentally, or socially (Dollard, Dormann, Boyd, Winefield, & Winefield, 2003). To be able to assist others, a human service worker should be surrounded theoretically by an organization that provides support, guidelines, and resources. Little empirical information exists on how human service workers perceive the culture and if they think they are supported and given enough information to perform well.

Method

To provide a thorough examination of perceptions of worker's perceptions in human service organizations, this study included all full-time workers of 13 human service organizations including management, administrative support staff, and front-line workers. A convenient sample of 607 workers completed a self-rated scale on their perceptions of organizational culture. Data were collected using the Organizational Culture Survey (OCS) (Glaser, Zamanou, & Hacker, 1987). Six dimensions composed OCS: teamwork conflict, climate-morale, information flow, involvement, supervision, and meetings. Participation in the study was anonymous and voluntary.

Topic's relations to the states of knowledge in the field

Organizational culture is important to study because it provides a first-hand diagnosis of how things are working inside an organization. In the case of a nonprofit organization, if communication between supervisors and workers is not effective, positive, and clear, this may cause information gaps, conflicts, and ultimately poor performance organizational culture has been found to influence important aspects of worker behavior (Hatto, Rivers, Mason, Emerson, Kiernan, Reeves, & Alborz, 1999). Therefore nonprofit decision makers need to consider having an assessment of how the organization is perceived by workers since sharing such information about these perceptions will assist in the understanding of job expectations (Wright, 2000), and may encourage workers to stay, as well as to perform better. Further, if an organization expects innovative behavior from its workers, it should have supportive policies (Kanter, 1983; Kaufman, 1974; Potosky & Ramkrishna, 2002).

Contributions to the Field

□ Results of this study provide recommendations and implications of studying organizational culture and its impact on organizational information, workers' interactions, and performance within nonprofit human service organizations, particularly since research in this particular setting has shown that support at work is a very significant aspect of the psychological environment linked to strain (Dollard, Winefield & Winefield, 2000).

□ Benefits of examining perceptions of organizational culture can “provide a basis for improving

processes and enhancing outcomes such as customer service and return on investment” (Muldrow, Buckley, & Schay, 2002, p.341). Previous research has shown that if workers know more about their organizational culture, this knowledge may guide their behavior towards performing well.

□ Learning what aspects of organizational culture are perceived as positive or negative can help guide nonprofit human service decision makers in their training procedures and operational policies.

Examples of specific organizational cultures dimensions can be used to construct scenarios for staff training and improve the work atmosphere. This study adds to the literature of nonprofit human resource development (HRD) by providing empirical accounts of workers’ perceptions on organizational culture.

Discussion of nonprofit organizational culture could contribute significantly to organizational theory and its application to the nonprofit human service sector considering that this sector “holds a particular set of values in regard to social justice, social welfare, and human well-being that distinguish it from other sectors” (Gibelman, 2000, p.266). As the number of nonprofit human service organizations continues to grow, this research addresses a critical gap in the literature and may help employees and employers better understand the predictors of positive job performance, which may be also linked to better quality community services (Drucker, 1989).

□

References

Dollard, M.F., Dormann, C., Boyd, C.M., Winefield, H.R., & Winefield, A.H. (2003, July). Unique aspects of stress in human service work. *Australian Psychologist*, 38, (2), 84-91.

Drucker, P.F. (1990). *Managing the Non-Profit Organization*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Gibelman, M. (2000). The nonprofit sector and gender discrimination: A preliminary investigation into the glass ceiling. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10(3), 251-269.

Glaser, S.R., S. Zamanou, & Hacker, K. (1987). Measuring and interpreting organizational culture. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 1(2), 173-198.

Hatto, C., Rivers, M., Mason, H., Mason, L., Emerson, E. Kiernan, C., Reeves, D., Alborz, A. (1999, June). Organizational culture and staff outcomes in services for people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 43(3), 206-218.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The Change Masters: Innovations for productivity in American corporations*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kaufman, H.G. (1974). *Obsolescence and professional career development*. New York: AMACOM.

Muldrow, T.W., Buckley, T., Schay, B.W. (2002, Fall). Creating high-performance organizations in the public sector. *Human Resource Management*, 41(3), 341-354.

Mulhare, E.M. (1999). Mindful of the future: Strategic planning ideology and the culture of nonprofit management. *Human Organization*, 58(3), 323-330.

Potosky, D. & Ramakrishna, H. V. (2002). The moderating role of updating climate perceptions in the relationship between goal orientation, self-efficacy, and job performance. *Human Performance*, 15(3), 275-297.

Wright, C. L. (2000). A multiple constituency analysis of the relationship between employee commitment and job performance. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tulsa, 2000). *Dissertations Abstracts International*, B61, 09.

Paper Number: PA051233

Paper Title: Current trends in the 'privatization' of welfare services

Author(s):

Karin Heitzmann, Vienna University of Economics & Business Administration, Vienna, AUSTRIA

Summary of Research

The paper examines two recent examples of change between public and private responsibilities in the provision of welfare: the 'privatization' of statutory welfare services in Vienna/Austria, and the formalization of relations between government and the voluntary sector in the UK. The examples are embedded in a theoretical framework on privatization. The analysis will allow understanding whether current shifts between public and private actors fit into the traditional logic of privatization, or whether notions of 'privatization' are no longer suitable to describe the shifting boundaries between public and private welfare responsibilities.

Description

For some decades now, virtually all welfare states are being reformed. Some argue that change is necessary because of demographic developments and the financial feasibility of matured welfare systems. Others are convinced that reforms are based primarily on ideological rather than objective grounds. The proposed paper focuses on a specific path often chosen in terms of restructuring, and most notably retrenching, welfare states in the European Union: the inclusion of private actors in welfare provision. Political initiatives and recommendations on public-private partnerships or corporate social responsibility are among the measures implemented by the political elites of the European Union to follow this fashionable track.

The commitment of private actors in welfare provision is, of course, not a new phenomenon. Private actors – and especially voluntary organizations – have been engaged in the alleviation of poverty for centuries. Only the last century has seen a remarkable rise of statutory provision of welfare – often, but not always, accompanied by rolling back private engagement. Since the 1980s, however, privatization has become an important trend to relieve governments from the burdens of statutory welfare. The resulting mix of actors in welfare provision often leads to confusion: it is often unclear to stakeholders (e.g. clients, volunteers etc.) whether a specific service is provided 'publicly' or 'privately'. This confusion is also a result of shifting boundaries between public and private responsibilities in welfare provision.

The proposed paper examines two recent examples of change between public and private responsibilities in the provision of welfare: the 'privatization' of statutory welfare services in Vienna/Austria, and the formalization of relations between government and the voluntary and community sector through so-called 'Compacts' in the UK. These two examples are embedded in a theoretical framework on different dimensions of privatization. The many forms of partial privatization (e.g. contracting, deregulating) that play a particular role with regard to welfare services will be contrasted with the empirical evidence collected. This type of analysis will allow understanding whether current shifts between public and voluntary actors fit into the traditional logic of privatization, or whether notions of 'privatization' are no longer suitable to describe the shifting boundaries between public and private welfare responsibilities, which take place nowadays.

Paper Number: PA051234

Paper Title: Volunteering in Europe: Effects of human capital, religiosity and social capital and macro-structural explanations of cross-national variations in volunteering

Author(s):

Lean McMahon, University College Dublin, Dublin, IRELAND

Summary of Research

The paper presents evidence from the European Social Survey (ESS) relating to volunteering in Europe. The results show cross-national variations in volunteering, with higher rates in northern Europe. The results show cross-national variations in volunteering, with higher rates in northern Europe and Scandinavia and lower rates in southern/eastern Europe and countries in the Mediterranean region. The overarching 'bottom-up' argument presented in this paper is that, while people make decisions on an individual level to volunteer, their decisions are influenced by external macro-structural factors, such as the country's economic wealth, political regimes, traditional religious background and cultural values (Curtis, Baer and Grabb 2001; Inglehart and Baker 2000).

Description

It is a long-established finding that people of different countries and regions vary in their associational involvement. From as far back as Tocqueville ([1835], 1961), who observed that Americans have exhibited more involvement in voluntary associations than Europeans, research consistently shows that country of residence appears to be an important predictor of voluntary association joining (Curtis, Baer & Grabb 2001).

However, few serious efforts have been made to explain these national variations in voluntary activity. It is only in recent years, as comparative data has become available, that tentative explanations of national variations have begun to be suggested, and the general consensus of these studies appears to be that no single country-level predictor of volunteering stands out; rather, several macro-structural factors are involved in explaining national variations in volunteering, including economic development, democratic ruling, religious composition, cultural histories and social origins (Salamon & Anheier 1996). In addition, many individual-level factors help explain these variations, including education level, socio-economic status, religiosity, social networks and civic engagement (Dekker & Halman 2003).

This paper focuses on the association between individual religiosity and involvement in voluntary organisations. Using empirical evidence from the European Social Survey (ESS), it is clear that religiosity is related to voluntary involvement. For example, countries with historically Protestant backgrounds, such as Scandinavian and other northern European countries, have high rates of volunteering, while historically Catholic countries, for example Ireland and countries in Eastern/Southern Europe and the Mediterranean region, have markedly lower rates.

The paper compares countries with different historical religious backgrounds and examines the impact of religiosity on voluntary involvement. The main argument is that it is not just religiosity per se that has an impact on voluntary involvement, but a salient factor is how religiosity operates in conjunction with social capital. Logistic regression is used to predict and to determine the amount of variance in involvement in voluntary organisations on the basis of so-called 'dominant status' variables, including human capital and social capital variables.

References

- Curtis, J., D. Baer and E. Grabb. 2001. "Nations of Joiners: Explaining Voluntary Association Membership in Democratic Societies" *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 66: 783-805.
- Dekker, P. and L. Halman. 2003. (Eds). *The Values of Volunteering: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Salamon, L.M. and H.K. Anheier. 1996. *Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally*. Working Papers of The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. 1835, 1840. *Democracy in America*. London: Oxford University Press. Translated by Henry Reeve.

Paper Number: PA051236

Paper Title: Access to Social Service Nonprofits: Evidence from Food Pantries in the Kansas City Metropolitan Area

Author(s):

Laura Tiehen, ERS-USDA, Washington, DC, USA

Jane Mosley, Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO, USA

Summary of Research

Policy discussions regarding the devolution of responsibility for social service provision to nonprofit organizations often cite the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. The effectiveness of social service nonprofits partially depends on whether they are accessible to those who need them. In this study, we examine the accessibility of one type of social service nonprofit, food pantries, at the neighborhood level in the Kansas City metropolitan area. We construct a food pantry access measure, using detailed information on their location and operating characteristics. We then compare the level of access in each neighborhood to measures of need, such as the poverty rate.

Description

Policy discussions regarding the devolution of responsibility for social service provision from the federal government to nonprofit organizations often cite the greater effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. An important aspect of the effectiveness of social service nonprofits is whether they are accessible to those who need them. In this study, we examine the accessibility of one type of social service nonprofit, food pantries, at the neighborhood level in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

The accessibility of social services nonprofits is largely influenced by their location in a community. Bielefeld, et al.(1997) find that many social service nonprofits choose their locations, in part, to be near potential clients. There are other factors that influence the accessibility of nonprofit services, such as their operating hours and the availability of resources they need to provide services to potential clients.

Food pantries and other emergency food providers are important social service providers in many communities, helping low-income households meet their food needs. However, a number of researchers (Eisinger, 1998; Poppendieck, 1998; Ohls et al., 2002) have noted that there is no guarantee that emergency food assistance will be available to all households who may need it. In particular, these studies have focused on the geographic mismatch between the location of food pantries and the location of the poor households that are likely to need them.

We construct a measure of access to food pantries, using data collected by the Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC), a non-profit agency in Kansas City, Missouri that coordinates the work of social service organizations in the Kansas City metropolitan area. MAAC oversees the MaaLink database, a system that collects and maintains information about private assistance provided in the community. Its database (MaaLink) contains information on approximately 225 community-based organizations, including virtually all the food pantries. We construct the food pantry access measure, using information on the location of food pantries, hours/days of operation, restrictions on how often food is distributed, and other services offered. We then examine whether neighborhoods in which a high proportion of households are likely to be in need of emergency food have the greatest access to them.

This research may help nonprofits to coordinate their activities in a way to most effectively provide assistance. It will provide more detailed evidence about the extent to which food pantries are accessible to those who need them. This is an important consideration in policy discussions regarding a shift in responsibility for social service provision from the federal government to community-based nonprofit organizations.

Bielefeld, W., Murdoch, J.C., and Waddell, P. 1997. The Influence of Demographics and Distance on Nonprofit Location, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26(2): 207-225.

Eisinger, P. 1998. *Toward an End to Hunger in America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Ohls, J., F. Saleem-Ismail, R. Cohen, and B. Cox. 2002. *The Emergency Food Assistance System – Findings from the Provider Survey, Volume II: Final Report*. Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report no. 16-2. USDA, Economic Research Service, Washington, D.C.. Retrieved at: www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr16.

Poppendieck, J. 1998. *Sweet Charity? Emergency Food and The End of Entitlement*. New York: Penguin Books.

Paper Number: PA051237

Paper Title: When Government Fails: Hispanic/Latino Nonprofit Organizations Respond

Author(s):

Darlene Xiomara Rodriguez, University of Georgia, University of Georgia, Bogart, GA, USA
Jeffrey L. Brudney, University of Georgia, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

Summary of Research

This research applies network theory from the public administration literature to nonprofit agencies, specifically to networks of Hispanic/Latino advocacy organizations. Stakeholders and organizations which comprise the network are identified using Yin's case study approach. Our objective is to evaluate the cultural factors that affect the creation and expansion of organizational networks and enhance the standard model of interorganizational networks developed by Milward and Provan. The purpose of this research is to examine how nonprofit executive directors identify, select, and work within a networked arrangement in managing and leading their organizations, and the outcomes achieved by the network.

Description

INTRODUCTION

□ The study of organizational networks has increased substantially in the last decade. Much of the work on organizational networks has focused on improving organizational effectiveness and establishing collaborative relationships (Milward and Provan, 2002; Milward and Provan, 2000; Provan and Milward, 1987; Powell, 1990). This research will examine the network of Hispanic/Latino nonprofit organizations that have arisen in the state of Georgia in response to government's failure at the state level to address the needs of a large, emerging population. Even though a substantial literature on interorganizational networks exists, very little or none of it has examined the effects of cultural factors such as Hispanic/Latino shared identity and heritage on the formation, nature, operation, and results of the network.

LITERATURE REVIEW

□ Theoretical foundations for a study on the existence and development of interorganizational networks and their impact on the nonprofit sector focus on the resource dependence literature (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978) and transaction cost theory (Williamson, 1985). Resource dependence theory suggests that one organization's dependence on another for essential resources affects the relationship between the organizations (Kotter, 1979; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). Management theorists have expanded the work of sociologists to illustrate that resource dependence is a key factor in the development of organizational strategy (Greening and Gray, 1994; Oliver, 1991). Baysinger goes on to argue that resource dependence can be viewed and examined as a political activity (Baysinger, 1984). Rehbein and Schuler (1995) have elaborated Baysinger's position showing how a network of nongovernmental stakeholders, including nonprofit organizations, may mobilize for political action.

□ Transaction cost theory is concerned with identifying the organizational arrangement that minimizes transaction costs (Williamson, 1985). A transaction occurs "when a good or service is transferred across a technologically separable interface" (Williamson, 1985: 552). Three dimensions determine the magnitude of transaction costs. Uncertainty relates to the ease or difficulty of determining a relationship. Frequency is the extent to which a type of transaction occurs regularly. Asset specificity focuses on the extent to which physical or human assets are specialized to a particular transaction. High levels of any of these dimensions creates pressure to internalize a function.

□ Based on this research, we can see how nonprofit organizations and other stakeholders may form networks in the periphery to influence government activity, yet lack capacity to play an active role in setting the agenda. This insight seems especially valid for nonprofit organizations and other stakeholders whose mission focuses on traditionally underserved communities and individuals. People of color and immigrants to the United States are two such populations that have been disenfranchised; therefore, nonprofit organizations that serve these groups may find it beneficial to work in collaborative

arrangements to maximize their services and resources.

□ Both resource dependence theory and transaction cost theory explain how coalitions among nonprofit organizations may form. These theories coupled with the literature on cultural and racial identification may help us understand the special needs that may arise in these networks. For instance, a shared cultural heritage on which membership resides and the resources they may bring can inform us if different resources are identified to help them influence the process of agenda setting and stakeholder theory.

□ Organizations engage in political activities to reduce uncertainties related to dependence on government. However, when enacting and influencing public policy, the nonprofit sector plays a vital role in ensuring that their respective constituents' needs are addressed. For example, the influence of states on federal immigration policy has grown in importance especially in the last two decades since the 1986 amnesty granting legal status to certain undocumented immigrants. The demands placed on local and state-wide nonprofit social service agencies has increased as a result, especially in California, Florida, New York, and Texas, each of which are states with high immigration rates (U.S. Census, 2000). However, new receiving areas for immigrants, especially those of Hispanic/Latino origin, have begun to increase in other states that do not have the infrastructure or service delivery networks to serve this new and increasing clientele. These trends mean that networks of Hispanic/Latino nonprofit organizations will become increasingly important, not only in providing services to the community but in influencing public policy.

PROPOSED STUDY

□ This research proposes to apply network theory from the public administration literature to nonprofit agencies, specifically to networks of Hispanic/Latino advocacy organizations. Stakeholders and organizations which comprise the network are identified using Yin's case study approach (Yin, 2000; Yin, 1994; Yin, 1992; Yin, 1984). His approach allows for multiple levels of analysis, which include individual, agency, and network levels, to develop an in-depth picture of a single case. We use the case study approach to examine inter-organizational networks.

□ The purpose of this research is to examine how nonprofit executive directors identify, select, and work within a networked arrangement in managing and leading their organizations, and the outcomes achieved by the network. Recognizing the importance of interorganizational relations in the development and maintenance of this "third sector," we examine the behaviors and attitudes of executive directors in the management, maintenance, and expansion of networks as a way of realizing their respective organizational missions.

□ The study is based on a network of social service organizations that have an explicit mission to serve the Hispanic/Latino community in Georgia. The study utilizes both survey methods and in-depth interviews. The research considers the following questions: how are these networks established; who determines which organizations are part of the network; how do organizations perceive their relationship with other agencies within the network; what factors, skills, or managerial tools help executive directors manage the network and meet client needs; and what services, programs, and/or other resources do network members exchange with one another (i.e., money, power, status, experiences, reputation, membership, publicity). Our objective is to determine if there are cultural factors that affect the creation and expansion of organizational networks, which would enhance Milward and Provan's model of interorganizational networks.

Paper Number: PA051238

Paper Title: Strategic and Synergistic Relationships: Improving Latino Achievement and Success in Education

Author(s):

Bernadette Musetti, University of Georgia, Bogart, USA

Paul Matthews, University of Georgia, Bogart, USA

Elida Perez-Knapp, University of Georgia, Bogart, USA

Darlene Xiomara Rodriguez, University of Georgia, University of Georgia, Bogart, GA, USA

Summary of Research

Georgia is experiencing some of the nation's most dramatic demographic changes, including the fastest growing Latino population and the lowest school completion rates for Latinos. Educational institutions at all levels are struggling to keep pace with meeting the needs of this changing population. This session describes the ways in which a major research university is proactively taking the lead in raising Latino achievement in Georgia, and where that is made possible through the commitment and funding by diverse stakeholders. Presenters will describe the outcomes from case studies and how their confluence has resulted in increased access and achievement for Latinos.

Description

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Nationally, Latino K-12 educational issues have been of growing interest to educational researchers (e.g., González, Huerta-Macías, & Tinajero, 2001; Padrón, Waxman, & Rivera, 2002; Reyes, Scribner, & Scribner, 1999; Romo & Falbo, 1996; Slavin & Calderón, 2001) most of this however, tends to focus primarily on parts of the country with long-established Latino communities. The education of Latinos in the parts of the U.S. that have not traditionally had large Spanish speaking populations is also of growing interest and importance. Georgia is a destination point for what some have referred to as the "new Latino diaspora" (Wortham, Murillo, & Hamann, 2002) and differs in many ways from many other states where there have been significant Latino populations for decades. In Georgia, for instance, over 93,000 students identified as Hispanic were served statewide in 2002-03, compared with fewer than 24,000 in 1994-95. Such drastic increases in the Latino student population mean that schools, administrators and teachers must adapt to a changing work environment to continue meeting their students' educational and social needs. However, school administrators and teachers are often uncertain of how to maintain their efficacy when faced with a changing student population (e.g., Flaxman & Passow, 1995; Stodolsky & Grossman, 2000). Educators across the state of Georgia are struggling to meet the needs of this rapidly changing student population, many of whom are English Language Learners.

Multiple efforts within the office of educator partnerships at one institution of higher education have focused on teacher professional development and district/school level change to meet the educational needs of Latinos, where it is recognized that education is workforce development and the best "investment" of resources in terms of human and economic impacts. This professional development and technical assistance to P-12 has been made possible through grants of three main types, the work of which is detailed below. The three main funding sources that converge to make this work possible are: 1) private foundation monies which provide for undergraduate and graduate scholarships, a faculty chair in teacher education, both focused ultimately on Latino issues and achievement, and a Center for Latino Achievement and Success in Education; 2) state legislative and university regents' funding to offer educators statewide training to receive the ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages) add-on endorsement, and 3) federal funding for teacher education and improvement in various areas including curriculum design and development for content area courses to be made accessible to English Language Learners at middle and high school, reading strategies for mainstream teachers in linguistically and culturally diverse elementary classrooms, multicultural literature circles and enhanced library collections, and Latin American study abroad opportunities for teachers. Importantly, the ways in

which these efforts leverage one another and provide support for large scale efforts is key to understanding the Center's significant achievements to date.

This session describes the ways in which a major research university is proactively taking the lead in raising Latino achievement in the state of Georgia, and where that is made possible through the commitment and funding by diverse stakeholders, among them, private, federal and state entities. Presenters will describe the outcomes from case studies in each of these efforts as well as how their confluence has resulted in increased access and achievement for Latinos. The case studies emanate from 24 school district teams that are involved with the Center. These results are coupled with various public, private, and nonprofit organizations that have been working together in influencing public policy, especially at a time when there are several anti-immigrant resolutions that are being proposed in the Georgia legislature.

WORKS CITED

Flaxman, E., & Passow, A. H. (1995). *Changing populations, changing schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

González, Maria Luisa, Huerta-Macías, Ana, & Tinajero, Josefina Villamil (Eds.). (2001). *Educating Latino students: A guide to successful practice*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Padrón, Yolanda N., Waxman, Hersh C., & Rivera, Hector H. (2002). *Educating Hispanic students: Obstacles and avenues to improved academic achievement*. Washington, DC: CREDE.

Reyes, Pedro, Scribner, Jay D., & Scribner, Alicia Paredes (Eds.). (1999). *Lessons from high-performing Hispanic schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Romo, Harriett D., & Falbo, Toni (1996). *Latino high school graduation: Defying the odds*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Slavin, Robert E., & Calderón, Margarita (Eds.). (2001). *Effective programs for Latino students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stodolsky, Susan S., & Grossman, Pamela L. (2000). *Changing students, changing teaching*. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 125-172.

Wortham, Stanton, Murillo Jr., Enrique G., & Hamann, Edward T. (Eds.). (2002). *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of identity*. Westport, Conn.: Ablex.

Paper Number: PA051239

Paper Title: Nonprofits and the Distribution of Afterschool Programs in New York City

Author(s):

Meryle G. Weinstein, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Summary of Research

This study will explore differences in the types of programs available to children and youth in New York City during their out-of-school hours, with a particular focus on low-income and minority children. Using data from the Partnership for Afterschool Education (PASE) and the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS), the goal of this research is to identify the structure of the distribution of afterschool programs, controlling for neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics and the academic achievement of schools within these neighborhoods.

Description

Over the past 20 years, federal and state governments have increasingly devolved the provision of social services to local communities, which in turn have increasingly relied on the nonprofit sector -- and in more recent years, the for-profit sector -- to provide these services (Milligan & Fyfe, 2004). While the providers of healthcare, social welfare, and job training services have received a great deal of attention in the literature, there has been little work focusing on the nonprofit organizations that provide educational services outside of school settings (Clotfelter, 2001). This oversight is especially important given that research on education indicates that in-school experiences explain only part of racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps. Many argue that these gaps can be at least partially explained by differences in access to a range of enrichment opportunities during students' out-of-school time (Miller, 2001). Therefore, to reduce these gaps, low-income children would need to be given the same access to learning opportunities and enrichment activities as their more advantaged peers (Halpern, 2000).

This study will explore differences in the types of programs available to children and youth in New York City during their out-of-school hours, with a particular focus on low-income and minority children. Much of the research on out-of-school programs has focused on who participates and the barriers to participation for those who do not. There has been little research about the overall level and mixture of available resources, the relationship between the type of programs and school and neighborhood demographics, and the characteristics of the service providers in different neighborhoods.

These questions are especially important given that prior research on the distribution of nonprofit service providers has found uneven access to services -- areas of cities that are 'rich' and 'poor' in voluntary sector resources. (Milligan & Fyfe, 2004). For example, some research has found that low to middle income residents have access to more voluntary sector services (Wolch & Geiger, 1983). The authors believe that residents who are self-reliant and community-minded and have a sufficiently large threshold of special population groups requiring service support have the greatest advantage in securing nonprofit service provision. Similar conclusions were reached in other studies that also found a correlation between number of nonprofit service providers and socioeconomic status, with a higher number of nonprofit service providers found in middle class areas (Skelton, 1997). Nonprofit provision of educational support services also appears to be negatively related to average income, but positively related to average age and median house value of the community (Bielefeld & Murdoch, 2004).

These results are not surprising, given that while the development of the social economy contributes to empowerment of local communities, few organizations can survive without public money (Milligan & Fyfe, 2004). Local differences in political power may also impinge on organizations' ability to obtain government funds to support their service provision. Therefore, those communities that are best able to navigate the political process of the distribution of funds have a greater chance of obtaining support for nonprofit service provision.

Data from the Partnership for Afterschool Education (PASE) will be combined with data from the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS). The PASE database contains information on free afterschool programs available in New York City, including the name of the sponsoring organization, the address, and the type of programs offered. The NCCS database contains information that tax-exempt nonprofit organizations file with the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS Business Master File (BMF) contains descriptive and financial information on all active nonprofit organizations. The Core Files, produced annually, contain financial information for each organization that files yearly tax returns with the IRS.

The goal of this research is to identify the structure of the distribution of afterschool programs, controlling for socioeconomic characteristics and academic achievement of schools. Following on the research of Merrett, Wolch, and Fyfe (Fyfe & Milligan, 2003; Merrett, 2001; Wolch, 1999), I hypothesize that nonprofit providers of afterschool programs are less likely to be found near schools that have the highest poverty rates and lowest test scores and are more likely to be found near schools with lower poverty and higher test scores, thereby leaving those most in need with the least access to needed afterschool programs.

References

Bielefeld, W., & Murdoch, J. C. (2004). The Locations of Nonprofit Organizations and Their For-Profit Counterparts: An exploratory Analysis. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 221-246.

Clotfelter, C. T. (2001, October 11-12). The Nonprofit Sector in K-12 Education. Paper presented at the Conference in Honor of Dick Netzer, New York University.

Fyfe, N. R., & Milligan, C. (2003). Out of the Shadows: Exploring contemporary geographies of voluntarism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(4), 397-413.

Halpern, R. (2000). The Promise of After-School Programs for Low-Income Children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(2), 185-214.

Merrett, C. D. (2001). Declining Social Capital and Nonprofit Organizations: Consequences for small towns after welfare reform. *Urban Geography*, 22(5), 407.

Miller, B. M. (2001). The Promise of After-School Programs. *Educational Leadership*(April), 6-12.

Milligan, C., & Fyfe, N. R. (2004). Putting the Voluntary Sector in its Place: Geographical Perspectives on Voluntary Activity and Social Welfare in Glasgow. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33(1), 73-93.

Skelton, I. (1997). Geographic Variation in Services Under Different Providers: The case of formal child care in Ontario. *Professional Geographer*, 49(2), 224-235.

Wolch, J. R. (1999). Decentering America's Nonprofit Sector: Reflections on Salamon's crisis analysis. *Voluntas*, 10(1), 25-35.

Wolch, J. R., & Geiger, R. K. (1983). The distribution of urban voluntary resources: An exploratory analysis. *Environment and Planning A*, 15, 1067-1082.

Paper Number: PA051243

Paper Title: Managing Stakeholders through the Merger Process: The Case of the Utah Symphony & Opera

Author(s):

Nancy Winemiller Basinger, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Jessica Romine Peterson, Make a Wish Foundation of Utah, Murray, UT, USA

Summary of Research

Aside from potential cost savings, mergers, acquisitions and consolidations can mean better service for clients, new opportunities for staff and board development and motivation, and increased and expanded fund raising capability. As past research reveals, however, stakeholder-related issues are often the cause of major problems during strategic restructuring. This article examines the 2002 merger of two arts organizations, the Utah Symphony and the Utah Opera from the perspectives of its stakeholders, in order to better understand the roles various stakeholders play in determining the challenges and opportunities faced during nonprofit mergers.

Description

Research suggests that as the nonprofit sector faces increasingly complex social and cultural needs, competition, scarce resources, and demand for professionalism, strategic restructuring partnerships are the solution, or at least a serious consideration, for many nonprofits. Strategic partnerships are a growing choice among larger nonprofit organizations (Swarden, 1996; Hiland, 2003; Kohm and La Piana, 2003).

The nonprofit merger process is distinctly different from for-profit mergers. Economic or financial motivations are part of every merger decision – for-profit and nonprofit alike. However, nonprofit mergers are by definition more motivated by community and charitable purposes rather than increased market share. Nonprofits cannot distribute profits to investors. Profits must be used to advance the mission, meaning higher profits lead to better community care (Herrington, 1999). Mission takes precedence over bottom-line concerns. “In the nonprofit world people feel so strongly about their causes that their common concerns are whether their cause will continue to be a priority after a merger,” says Bill Shore (Marchetti, 2000). The interests of their stakeholders and improvement of the services that benefit them remains the bottom line (Golensky & DeRuiter, 1999).

It is this important distinction in the nonprofit merger process that has direct application for stakeholder theory. A stakeholder is described as anyone who ‘can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives’ (Freeman, 1984). Since the success of any nonprofit organization is directly linked to the support and experience of its various stakeholders – clients/patrons, volunteers, board of directors, funding sources, staff, management, etc – the opportunities available through strategic partnerships to strengthen and maintain stakeholder relations cannot be overlooked. Aside from obvious financial benefit, mergers, acquisitions and consolidations can mean better service for clients, new opportunities for staff and board development and motivation, and increased and expanded fund raising capability. As past and current research reveals, stakeholders and stakeholder-related issues are often the cause of major problems and even failure among strategic restructuring partnerships. When organizational leaders can facilitate regular, open communication with various stakeholders, maintain knowledge of common merger stresses and anxieties, and anticipate culture clashes, they can pave the way for successful strategic partnerships.

However, most existing research on strategic restructuring partnerships focuses on social service organizations; the contribution of this research is the examination of stakeholders’ views regarding a recent merger of two arts organizations - the Utah Symphony and the Utah Opera. As strategic restructuring becomes more prevalent in the nonprofit sector, it is important to understand the stakeholders’ perspectives and any distinguishing factors that may result from nonprofit mergers among arts and cultural, rather than social service, nonprofits.

This study centers around several research questions addressing some of the most important issues related to nonprofit strategic restructuring partnerships (Kohm & La Piana, 2003):

(1) □ What are the benefits to various stakeholders of strategic restructuring partnerships of arts

organizations?

(2) □ What are the costs and challenges to various stakeholders of strategic restructuring partnerships of arts organizations?

(3) □ According to various stakeholders, what factors contribute to successful strategic restructuring partnerships of arts organizations?

An instrumental case study method is employed in this research. In this project, we are most interested in learning more about the management of stakeholders to facilitate successful mergers in arts organizations. In other words our interest is in the phenomenon, rather than the subject of the study, the Utah Symphony and Opera. Instrumental case studies are appropriate when “the public administration researcher wants to gain greater insight into a specific issue,” (McNabb, 2002). Like most case studies, this study is characterized by the use of multiple sources for data (interviews, information from the media, documents, etc.) and by the collection of information at multiple points in time (Yin, 1993). Primary data was gathered for the study by analyzing documents and conducting interviews with various stakeholders of the merged organization including staff, management, board members, musicians, volunteers, and former members of the separate organizations. The case study methodology gathers information, in this case through both interviews and the content-analysis of public documents (which appeared over the past five years), to describe a management situation that is constructed to be sensitive to the context in which the behavior occurred (Bonoma, 1985).

□ Our analysis reveals that the most significant issue for all stakeholder groups was the mission shift and related “loss of identity” that occurred for these two organizations in the three years following the merger. The Utah Symphony & Opera sought to blend the organization in all ways and at all levels immediately after the merger. Technical experts in set design with the Opera were charged with painting the music stands of the symphony. Symphony musicians were required to play for the pit orchestra at opera performances. The distinct difference in the art forms, the divergent interests of their core audiences, and dual-mission job responsibilities for all staff members led to pervasive and consistent confusion among nearly all of the stakeholder groups.

Information and involvement was perceived to be a precious commodity among all stakeholder groups, but even among those intimately involved in the merger process, there was a perception of a “need” to keep as much information as possible on a “need to know” basis. Attempts were made by management to reduce the perception of a veil of secrecy following the merger. Unfortunately, many stakeholders indicated that deceptions early in the process made later attempts at communication less effective. Public opinion of the merged organization in Salt Lake City today is quite negative. Media accounts repeatedly present the merger as the basis for current financial difficulties in the organization. Sadly, very few stakeholders were able to identify any benefits that exist in the merged organization which they believe are attributable to the merger. A recent analysis by an independent consultant suggests that the merged organization has realized annual cost savings of nearly \$500,000 per year but stakeholders who were aware of this report were skeptical of this conclusion. Although most were reticent to admit this, respondents often struggled to provide information about any sort of benefits and most did not feel that any artistic synergies had been realized after the merger.

Finally, financial inter-dependence, rather than reducing financial stress for both groups, was actually seen by stakeholders with primary allegiance to the Opera as well as stakeholders loyal to the symphony, as the basis for increasing acrimony. Stakeholders on “both sides” indicated that the “other side” had clearly “stolen” from their preferred art form. Although there was not unanimous agreement regarding the impact of the “theft” on the quality of the art produced, all concluded that ultimately the reputation of the organization would (or already had) suffer(ed). We found very few stakeholders who now express allegiance to the merged organization. All seem to identify themselves, even three years after the merger, as stakeholders of only one “side” of the organization. The case of the Utah Symphony & Opera reveals a great deal about the difficulties in stakeholder management in the arts and provides many lessons for nonprofit managers considering any sort of strategic restructuring partnership.

Paper Number: PA051244

Paper Title: To Be a Reliable Partner: Still an Impossible Task? Nonprofit organizations and public policy in Croatia

Author(s):

Sinisa Zrinscak, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

Summary of Research

Based on a few researches done on the role of nonprofit organizations in Croatia, and particularly on the CIVICUS Civil Society Index 2004/2005, the paper will analyze the possibilities of the nonprofit organizations to influence the public agenda. It will show that their relative inability for shaping public policy can be explained by the Croatian historical heritage and transitional circumstances but will also show how the increasing of their public presence makes the crucial point of their future development. In connection with that it will also analyze strategies of public campaigns used by nonprofit organizations.

Description

As in other post-Communist societies, the development and the social role of the nonprofit sector in Croatia has been after 1989 heavily shaped by the Croatian historical heritage. The Communist state took the basic responsibility for its citizens, which limited the space for any individual and group initiatives. In the attempt to completely control social life, a modicum-minimum freedom of action was allowed only in the sector of sports and culture, and in a part of professional organizations. Therefore, the nonprofit sector in Croatia is similar to that in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania or Slovakia, where it is dominantly cultural-recreational (Salamon et al, 1999.21).

□The situation has been slowly changed in the after 1989 period, although Croatia found itself in specific social circumstances. The Homeland War (1991-1995) which accompanied the Croatian independence created a series of new needs to which the state could not adequately respond, what enabled the operation of new, domestic and international nonprofit organizations. However, due to the limited democratic and economic development, the semi-authoritarian political regime which existed in the 1990s expressed the high hostility toward the nonprofit sector. Even in the second half of the 1990s one can record a series of political, legal and tax obstructions for the development of the nonprofit sector (Crpic, Zrinscak, 2005). The situation changed slightly in 2000, after a new reform-minded central-left Government came to power, but the new change of the Government at the end of 2003 again posed a problem of the long-lasting and effective social role of the nonprofit sector.

□The researches on nonprofit sector are still very rare in Croatia. Those few completed proved to be very important in identifying crucial problems of the development of the nonprofit sector. The research on the role of nonprofit organization at the local levels showed that the attitude of local Governments toward them tend to be ambivalent: they are welcomed to satisfy needs of citizens but not to undertake active position in the process of shaping public policies at the local level. The procedure of donating public money to nonprofit organizations is also non-transparent (Bezovan, Zrinscak, 2001). The CIVICUS Civil Society Index done in 2001 measured the civil society through four dimensions: structure, space, values and impact. The most negative score got the dimension of impact. The nonprofit organizations are inefficient in influencing public agenda and promoting interests of their members, particularly marginalized social groups. Major political groups do not see them as reliable partners which have legitimate place inside the process of public policy making (Bežovan, 2004).

□This paper will rely on just mentioned researches as well as on the new CIVICUS Civil Society Index done in Croatia at the end of 2004 and beginning of 2005. The public influence of nonprofit organizations was measured by a series of questions posed to both ordinary citizens and nonprofit organizations themselves. Beside that, a few public campaigns were analyzed in which nonprofit organizations were involved and which aims were to change the public policy in certain fields, such as the rights of workers, children and families. The paper will present results of the research concerning the impact of the nonprofit organizations and will particularly analyze one public campaign which has attempted to change legislation to guarantee a free Sunday to workers which in many cases have to work continuously without any free days and without any additional pay for such a work. The analyses will focus also the positions of different actors and strategies used by nonprofit organizations which

proved to be less or more successful.

REFERENCES:

Bezovan, G., Zrinscak, S. (2001.) Mogucnosti decentralizacije u socijalnoj politici i nove uloge lokalnih vlasti /Possibilities of Decentralization in Social Policy and of the New Role of Local Authorities/, Revija za socijalnu politiku 3-4:239-258.

Bezovan, G. (2004) Civilno drustvo /Civil Society/. Zagreb: Globus.

Crpic, G., Zrinscak, S. (2005) Emerging Civil Society. Leisure time and voluntary organizations in Croatia, in: Baloban J. (ed.) In a Search of an Identity. Comparative Values Study: Croatia and Europe. Zagreb: Golden Marketing (in print).

Salamon, L.M. et al. (1999) Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector. Baltimor: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Paper Number: PA051245

Paper Title: A Portrait of Membership Associations: The Case of Indiana

Author(s):

Kirsten Gronbjerg, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Patricia Borntrager, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Summary of Research

Membership organizations have long been recognized as mediating institutions – connecting people to one another and to society. Past research has examined who are members of various types of organizations, but there is relatively little information about the organizations themselves or how they compare to other types of nonprofit organizations. In this paper we draw on a survey of 2,206 Indiana nonprofits of all types to provide a portrait of the full range of membership organizations and how various types of membership organizations differ on key organizational dimensions. We also consider differences among subgroups within these types of membership organizations.

Description

Membership organizations have long been recognized as mediating institutions that connect individuals to other people as well as to the mega institutions – government and big corporations – that otherwise dominate modern mass societies. Indeed, research shows that members of associations tend to be more engaged in political activities, spend more time with neighbors, and have greater confidence and trust in societal institutions. At the same time, there is growing concern that membership organizations are on the decline and that the social capital they foster is deteriorating.

While there has been a great deal of research on who are members of various types of organizations, there is relatively little information about the organizations themselves, and in particular how they compare to other types of nonprofit organizations. In this paper we draw on a survey of 2,206 Indiana nonprofits of all types to provide a portrait of the full range of membership organizations – whether charities, congregations, advocacy, or mutual benefit organizations, whether registered with the IRS or not, or whether formally incorporated or not.

For part of our analysis, we compare nonprofits that have members to those that do not. However, our primary focus is on how various types of membership organizations differ on key organizational dimensions. We also consider differences among subgroups within these types of membership organizations where relevant. Our analysis highlights differences that meet statistical criteria of significance (5 percent or less chance that the results occurred randomly).

Organizational Profiles: Overall, we find that three fourths of Indiana nonprofits are membership organizations. We group these into six types: religious congregations (29 percent), civic associations (22 percent), mutual benefits (14 percent), recreation groups (8 percent), occupation/industry groups (7 percent), and other member groups (all remaining organizations with members, 22 percent).

The majority (76 percent) of membership organizations serve both their own members and the general public while one fifth (19 percent) serve their own members only. Membership nonprofits target their services primarily by geographic location (48 percent) and age (47 percent). Religious congregations stand out as more likely to target services by age (71 percent), gender (48 percent) and religious faith (56 percent). They are also more likely to have multiple service targets.

In general, membership organizations are smaller and older than organizations without members although there is great variation among types. Mutual benefits are the oldest, particularly fraternal beneficiary societies. Religious congregations are the largest in size followed by other member and occupation/industry groups. The majority (60 percent) of membership organizations rely on dues to some extent, particularly occupation/industry groups, recreation groups, and civic associations.

Changes Affecting Membership Organizations: The majority (53 percent) of membership organizations saw changes in their membership rolls with 26 percent reporting increases and 27 percent reporting decreases. Mutual benefits stood out with almost half (47 percent) reporting a decrease in the number of members. The majority (52 percent) of membership organizations say that demand for services stayed the same while the majority (63 percent) of organizations without members report that it increased.

The majority (71 percent) of membership organizations report at least one change in community conditions and almost half (49 percent) report impacts from changes. They were most likely to note changes in population size and employment opportunities (48 percent each). Membership organizations are less likely to report government policy changes than organizations without members. Two thirds (66 percent) of membership organizations reported that policies did not change and 78 percent reported that they were not impacted by changes. Occupation/industry groups are more likely to perceive changes and impacts and they are most likely to be involved in advocacy activities.

Interaction Among Membership Organizations: Membership organizations have more formal affiliations than organizations without members. The majority (63 percent) of membership organizations are affiliated with other organizations, particularly religious congregations (79 percent) and occupation/industry groups (77 percent). Membership organizations are also more likely to have formal collaborations or informal networks than nonprofits without members. The majority of membership organizations (57 percent) are involved in collaborations with other member groups (70 percent), occupation/industry groups (68 percent), and religious congregations (67 percent) most likely to do so.

Membership organizations are less likely to compete with other entities than organizations without members. Only two fifths (40 percent) say they compete. Other member groups are the most likely to report competition (57 percent).

Human Resources: Over half (52 percent) of membership organizations have paid staff. However, this varies greatly among types of membership organizations from 87 percent of religious congregations to only 28 percent of mutual benefits and 27 percent of civic associations. Over three fourths (76 percent) of membership organizations use volunteers. Membership organizations are more likely to use volunteers than nonprofits without members and they are more likely to value them highly. The majority of membership organizations have boards of directors, but they have fewer board members than nonprofits without members.

Management Challenges: The majority of membership organizations face challenges in enhancing visibility (76 percent), delivering high quality programs/services (72 percent), performing strategic planning (66 percent) and evaluating programs (62 percent). Enhancing visibility and service delivery are greater challenges for membership organizations than for organizations without members, as is attracting new members/clients with the majority (87 percent) of membership organizations saying it is a challenge including 54 percent for whom it is a major challenge. Obtaining funding is a challenge for two thirds (66 percent) of membership organizations. It is less of a challenge for membership organizations than for organizations without members (81 percent).

In terms of information technology tools, the majority of membership organizations have computer access for key staff/volunteers (63 percent), computerized client/member records (60 percent), computerized financial records (58 percent), and internet access (51 percent). Membership organizations are less likely than organizations without members to have internet access or an organizational e-mail address.

Finally, three fourths (75 percent) of membership organizations have an annual report and 60 percent have a recently completed financial audit. Membership organizations are more likely to have reserves dedicated to maintenance (46 percent) and capital improvement (37 percent) than organizations without members (36 percent and 27 percent respectively).

Conclusion: Two key findings stand out from our analysis: First, we found significant differences among the six types of membership organizations on almost every dimension we considered. Second, we found two overall clustering of responses, in that religious congregations, other member groups, and occupation/industry groups tend to have similar responses while recreation groups, civic associations and mutual benefits tend to answer in similar ways.

Paper Number: PA051246

Paper Title: Hospice of Pine Lakes Basin: A Nonprofit's Response to For-Profit Competition

Author(s):

Karen A. Froelich, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, USA

Summary of Research

Nonprofit organizations are increasingly challenged by for-profit competition. This presentation chronicles the response of one nonprofit hospice provider to for-profit entry into its service area. To provide context, growth in for-profit competition is described, and competitive differences between nonprofits and for-profits are summarized from a review of the literature. Case study methodology is employed to track strategies and tactics of the incumbent nonprofit and the entering for-profit hospice over a three-year period. Lessons learned center on constructive use of competitive threat to rediscover and leverage core strengths. Implications for developing effective strategic response to for-profit competition conclude the presentation.

Description

The Problem of Increasing For-Profit Competition -

In addition to traditional challenges to viability and success, nonprofit organizations increasingly face competition from for-profit firms. Many human service fields once populated by public and nonprofit providers in the 1970s now include a substantial proportion of for-profit players. Growth in government contracting and broader insurance coverage contribute to perceptions of profit potential that attracts for-profit firms to the growing human service industries. Today, for-profit firms are major competitors in both general and specialized hospitals (Ferris & Graddy, 1999), increasingly involved in welfare-to-work services (Frumkin & Andre-Clark, 2000), and are becoming dominant in nursing homes (Hamilton, 1994), daycare, and home health care (Frumkin & Andre-Clark, 2000). Some human service areas, such as hospice care, are just beginning to see an influx of for-profit entrants (Hamilton, 1994); however, market-share growth of for-profits is rapid (Simpson, Rice, & Rigg, 2003). How to effectively respond to this increased competition from for-profit firms is a critical issue for nonprofit organizations.

Literature Review -

A review of the literature reveals keen interest in potential differences between nonprofit and for-profit human service providers, especially regarding service access, quality, and cost. Variations in industries, regions, time periods, competitive context, religious or chain affiliation, and measures lead to mixed empirical results (Wolff & Schlesinger, 1998). However, many studies find that for-profits have lower costs than nonprofits, generally attributed to less intensive service provision and careful selection of clients to avoid high-cost segments (see reviews in Bradley & Walker, 1998; Luksetich, Edwards, & Carroll, 2000; Rosenau, 2003). Consistent with notions of contract failure (Hansmann, 1980), measures that tap into more difficult to observe attributes show greater differences between for-profit and nonprofit human service providers (Bradley & Walker, 1998; Morris & Helburn, 2000). For-profits are often larger than their nonprofit rivals, with national rather than regional or local presence, leading to potential scale and scope economies (Frumkin & Andre-Clark, 2000; Hamilton, 1994). Taken together, the attributes of for-profit firms often place nonprofits at a disadvantage in a competitive marketplace, leading to prescriptions for nonprofits to become more "business-like" (Fram & Brown, 1988; Emerson & Twersky, 1996; Kearns, 2000). Exactly what is entailed by being "business-like" is unclear (Dart, 2004), but advice typically centers on attaining greater efficiencies in order to beat for-profit "business" at its own game. However, as Frumkin & Andre-Clark (2000) so clearly explain, a more effective strategy for nonprofits is to focus on their valued differences compared to for-profit rivals, rather than merely imitating operational efficiencies (Porter, 1996). While efficiency is important, a unique strategy based on distinctive skills, strengths, and values will better equip the nonprofit organization for increased competition from for-profit firms.

Approach and Data Sources -

An intensive organizational study chronicles the response of one nonprofit hospice -- Hospice of Pine Lakes Basin (HPLB) -- to for-profit entry into its service area. Case study methodology is employed to track strategies and tactics of the incumbent nonprofit and the entering for-profit hospice over a three-year period. Data sources include a series of in-depth face-to-face interviews with key individuals (executive director; program, finance, and marketing managers; board members), promotional materials, financial statements, newspaper reports, archival data, and the SEC 10-K filing and other stock-related reports for the for-profit organization. From the initial jarring entry of the for-profit (following their soon-to-be manager's employment interview process at HPLB where she gleaned valuable competitive insights) to the ongoing struggles for market share, the study focuses on HPLB's internal and external responses to the new competition. Lessons learned include the constructive use of competitive threat to address latent problems and improve operations, but more importantly, to rediscover and leverage core strengths. Over time, a strategy resting on HPLB's heritage and values was developed and pursued, leading to favorable organizational and competitive outcomes.

Contributions to the Field -

The study of Hospice of Pine Lakes Basin further illuminates common strategic positions and tactics of nonprofit and for-profit organizations that are generally consistent with descriptions found in studies of various other human service areas. The comparative objectives, actions, and outcomes have public policy and regulatory implications. The main contribution of the study is to show how entry of for-profit competition can be used as a catalyst for positive change. The study demonstrates that urgent reassessment coupled with measured but prompt action can enable vigorous defense and reveal avenues for offensive strategy, especially when deeply rooted in unique organizational strengths. The findings are instructive for nonprofit organizations seeking to develop effective strategic response to increasing for-profit competition.

References -

- Bradley, E.H., & Walker, L.C. (1998). Education and advance care planning in nursing homes: The impact of ownership type. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(3), 339-357.
- Dart, R. (2004). Being "business-like" in a nonprofit organization: A grounded and inductive typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 290-310.
- Emerson, J., & Twersky, F. (1996). *New social entrepreneurs: The success, challenge, and lessons of non-profit enterprise creation*. San Francisco: The Roberts Foundation.
- Ferris, J.M., & Graddy, E.A. (1999). Structural changes in the hospital industry, charity care, and the nonprofit role in health care. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1), 18-31.
- Fram, E.H., & Brown, V. (1988). *Policy vs. paper clips: Selling the corporate model to your nonprofit board*. Milwaukee: Family Service America.
- Frumkin, P. & Andre-Clark, A. (2000). When missions, markets, and politics collide: Values and strategy in the nonprofit human services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1-Supplement), 141-163.
- Hamilton, V. (1994). The impact of ownership form and regulatory measures on firm behavior: A study of hospices. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 4(4), 415-430.
- Hansmann, H.B. (1980). The role of nonprofit enterprise. *Yale Law Journal*, 89, 835-898.

Kearns, K. (2000). *Private sector strategies for social sector success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Luksetich, W., Edwards, M.E., & Carroll, T.M. (2000). Organizational form and nursing home behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(2), 255-279.

Morris, J.R., & Helburn, S.W. (2000). Child care center quality differences: The role of profit status, client preferences, and trust. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(3), 377-399.

Porter, M. (1996, November/December). What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74, 61-78.

Rosenau, P.V. (2003). Performance evaluations of for-profit and non-profit U.S. hospitals since 1980. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13(4), 401-423.

Simpson, D., Rice, A.J., & Rigg, C. (2003, June 3). Flash note: Odyssey Healthcare, Inc. NY: Merrill Lynch.

Wolff, N., & Schlesinger, M. (1998). Access, hospital ownership, and competition between for-profit and nonprofit institutions. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(2), 203-236.

Paper Number: PA051248

Paper Title: Community Foundation: What Determines Grantmaking?

Author(s):

Alison Louie Anker, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA

Summary of Research

This research examines grantmaking of community foundations. In particular, this study empirically examines whether donors or community foundation boards and staff determine the recipients of grants. The study tests whether organization mission impacts the percent of donor driven grants versus unrestricted grants, and also whether the recipients of grants differ based on the percent of funding from donor driven funds versus unrestricted funds.

Description

In the study of philanthropy, scholars seek to understand who gives and to whom they give. We know that in 2001 what individuals gave to nonprofits accounted for approximately 76 percent of total giving to charities. Gifts to foundations and other unrestricted funds accounted for 12.1 percent of individual giving. (O'Herhiy, Havens, and Schevrish forthcoming). Given the interest in where donations go and the fact that foundations received the third most in philanthropic contributions, the question is: where do foundations give and what are their giving priorities? Community foundations have accounted for such a small percent of foundations and have not been the focus of much research (Prewitt forthcoming). However, community foundations are one of the fastest growing segments of philanthropy. There are currently over 650 community foundations in the country while in 1987 there were only 100.

As the number of community foundations is increasing, it is important to understand their giving patterns. How are community foundations making funding decisions? The questions governing my research are: Does the mission statement govern giving priorities? Do community foundations give primacy to donor interests when making grants? Do donor characteristics affect grant-making in community organizations? And, do community needs affect grant-making?

Community foundations use donations they receive from individuals to grow assets which can be invested back into the community. Thus, the philanthropic environment plays a large role in the operations of a community foundation (Pfeffer and Salanick 1978). Thus, leaders in community foundations must devise action plans that would enhance their position to receive donations. The underlying assumption of strategic planning is that management decisions can direct the organization (Child 1972) and that management changes can enhance organizational stability (Gawthrop 1984, Lawrence and Lorsch 1967, Aldrich and Pfeffer 1976). Indeed, strategic planning allows community foundations to assess their environment and improve their relationship with it. Part of the strategic planning process is to refine the mission or the focus of the organization so that it matches the changes the organization wishes to make (Kotler & Andreason 1996). In this case, the mission would focus on wooing donors and increasing charitable giving. This focus draws on the idea the donors receive increased utility when they direct the grant-making.

Contributions to a community foundation can be given to a number of different funds, including designated, donor-advised, unrestricted, field-of-interest, and organization endowed. Two methods of giving, designated and donor-advised, allow the donor to select the organization or organization type that will be the recipient of their donation. Increasingly, community foundations attract potential donors by offering opportunities for strategic giving (Luck and Fuert 2002). In doing so, power is transferred from the board to the donors in order to secure certain inputs that allow the community foundation to grow. Community foundations use donor-advised giving as a method for growing their community support and hope that those who are introduced via donor-advised funds will later give to the foundation's general fund (Luck 1987).

□

This study focuses on American community foundations. I have collected over 150 annual reports from community foundations and compiled a database by doing a document analysis. I have supplemented the data with corresponding data from the 2000 census. I lay out a model and test hypotheses. I empirically examine my model, where the percent of grants that are donor driven (either donor advised or donor designated) vary based on the independent variables which are organization age, professionalization (measured by whether it was a member of the Council on Foundations), size (measured by assets), mission priority (donors, community needs), as well as community factors, including per capita income, average education, and racial mix. I also examine whether the recipients of community foundation grants differ based on the percent of donor driven grants.

Aldrich, Howard E. and Jeffery Pfeffer. "Environments of Organizations." *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 2 (1976) 19-115.

Gawthrop, Louis C. *Public Sector Management, Systems, and Ethics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Kotler, Philip and Alan R. Andreason. "The Strategic Planning Market Process. In P. Kotler and A. Andreason. *Strategic Planning for Nonprofit Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1996.

Luck, James I. "Taken Under Advisement." *Foundation News*. Sept. – Oct. 1987: 52-5.

Luck, James I. and Suzanne L. Fuert. "A Flexible and Growing Service to Donors: Donor-Advised Funds in Community Foundations." Washington D.C.: Council on Foundations, September 2002.

O'Herlihy, Mary, John Havens and Paul Schervish. "Charitable Giving: How Much, By Whom, and To What?" *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 2nd Edition. Forthcoming.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald R. Salancik. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependency Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Prewitt, Kenneth. "Foundations." *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 2nd Edition. Forthcoming.

Paper Number: PA051249

Paper Title: Evaluating the Raising More Money Model: The Case of the Girl Scouts

Author(s):

Nancy Basinger, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Ara Serjoie, Girl Scouts of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Summary of Research

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Raising More Money (RMM) Model for the fundraising efforts of Girl Scout Councils. Although RMM indicates that 1,000-1,500 organizations have participated in their 101 workshop to learn how to implement the model, no objective research has been done to ascertain the benefits of this new approach to fundraising. By comparing those Girl Scout Councils that use RMM with similar Councils across several markets that do not use RMM, this article highlights various outcomes associated with this novel fundraising approach.

Description

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Raising More Money Model for the fundraising efforts of Girl Scout Councils throughout the U.S. and to better understand the utility of the model for nonprofits in general. Through nonprofit state associations and word-of-mouth, the RMM model is increasingly used in many communities across the U.S. Although RMM indicates that 1,000-1,500 organizations have thus far participated in their 101 workshop in order to learn how to implement the model, no independent research has examined this approach. By comparing Councils that use RMM with Councils that do not use RMM, this article highlights the various outcomes associated with this novel fundraising approach.

The Raising More Money model “trains and coaches nonprofit organizations to implement a mission-based system for raising more money from individual donors. This system ends the suffering about fundraising and builds passionate and lifelong donors.”

This model’s focus is based on cultivating relationships that lead to establishing lifelong donations from individuals to the nonprofit. Terry Axelrod, the Founder and President of Raising More Money divides the process into four main steps in the Raising More Money Circle Model:

1. Point of Entry
 - Facts 101
 - Emotional Hook
 - Capture Names
2. Follow Up
 - Listen and Involve
 - Cultivation Process
3. Ask for Money
 - Units of Service
 - Multiple Year Pledges
4. Introduce Others
 - “Free Feel-Good” Cultivation Event

This circular approach indicates that the task is an ongoing process, whereby stewardship of past and current donors continues, while new donors are being cultivated for a donation. It also points to the organization’s responsibility to engage their prospects in conversations throughout the cultivation phase, suggesting that such a tactic will help the solicitation of gifts.

Axelrod claims that the Raising More Money approach has distinctive benefits which set it apart from other fundraising programs. Since over 80 percent of contributions to nonprofits are from individual

donors, this allows the organizations to “tap into” this huge financial resource. She suggests that fundraising requires scientific methods, rather than it being an art, and hence she has specific systems and steps in place that classify the progression of the relationship with donors.

According to Axelrod, this structure is designed to build lasting constituencies, and create “multiyear” pledges from them. Therefore, this model allows the development professional to continue the components of their work that they already feel are effective, while implementing new ideas which provide consistency. She asserts that this brings a sense of calm to fundraising for the organization.

Finally, Raising More Money contends that the mission-based manner in which donors are approached and cultivated, ascertains the donor’s genuine loyalty to the organization and their work. This provides the fundraiser to continually educate the donors on their work, and maintain the donors’ involvement in various ways within the nonprofit.

Traditional fundraising techniques suggest similar strategies in many ways. The cultivation of donors, building personal relationships, and stewardship are all key factors in any fundraising program (Temple, 2004). Traditional fundraising techniques therefore seem to have the same goals but attempt to meet them in very different ways. In nonprofit management generally, nonprofit managers are encouraged to build a donor base that is a broad cross-section of the community (Smith & Lipsky, 1992). Traditionally, this is accomplished through annual campaigns that use techniques such as direct-mail and telephone solicitations. In addition, new donors are often brought into the organization through special events, which may include gala dinners, walk-a-thons, golf tournaments and the like. Once these techniques have distinguished donors from potential donors, the fund development staff works to cultivate relationships with these individuals interested in the organization and its mission (Dove, 2003). Long-term, one-on-one, etc.

Axelrod’s approach differs in that it is formulaic and specifically designed around pre-packaged events. These events are designed to educate donors and build their connection to the organization. However, since the point of entry and ask events occur in a group setting, they do not emphasize building one-on-one relationships in the same way as traditional fundraising approaches.

The objectives of this study are:

- to determine the differences in outcomes (e.g. dollars raised and commitment of resources) between the Raising More Money model and traditional fund raising techniques.
- to determine the environmental and organizational characteristics of nonprofit organizations that may increase the likelihood of successful implementation of the RMM model
- to evaluate whether or not implementation of the Raising More Money model will have both short-term and long-term benefits to the fundraising efforts of nonprofits

The GSUSA provided tracking data on Councils that have used the RMM model. In addition, we administered an email survey to Councils using RMM asking about the effectiveness of the model relative to expectations from traditional development practices and also from the model itself. Finally, Councils that have not implemented the RMM model were surveyed by email in order to learn about their fund development practices and results.

Full implementation of the RMM model is costly and time-consuming. We found that many fund development professionals, as well as organizations, with several years of experience of active fund development were reticent to change their core practices. Some of these experienced professionals and organizations, however, were willing to use some of the RMM practices to supplement their existing fund development strategies. Among organizations with little experience raising funds from individuals, however, the model was more widely adopted and appreciated. Since the model provides very specific step-by-step instructions for full implementation, there was a sense of security among less experienced development officers and broader board support for the strategies.

Outcomes from RMM seem to occur more quickly among organizations without experience in fund

development. In addition, although the external environment of the organization was relevant, overall the internal organizational characteristics were much more significant to adoption of and success with the RMM model. Finally, the long-term outcome evaluations were mixed. While some Councils felt that they would have greater success without RMM strategies, others saw a great deal of benefit in building life-long donors through the model techniques.

Paper Number: PA051251

Paper Title: Using the Tools of Philanthropy to Improve Public Policy Implementation

Author(s):

Jodi Sandfort, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Summary of Research

In this paper, I suggest alternative models to venture philanthropy from the field of public policy analysis and management. Over the past forty years, public policy and management researchers have created analytical frameworks that are directly applicable to daily, philanthropic work. This paper begins by laying out some of these frameworks. Then, focusing upon the particular lessons of one body of research literature emerging from public policy schools – public policy implementation – I consider what can be gleaned from this research and applied to the current practice of strategic philanthropy.

Description

In recent years, much has been made of “venture philanthropy,” which seeks to employ the business principles of venture capitalists to the practice of philanthropic grant-making (Frumkin 2003; Letts, Ryan et al. 1997). While there are increasing questions about the viability of this approach (Carlson 2000), few alternative models are being put forth that provide philanthropists with such clear questions to weigh as they consider the various, competing interests involved in any private investment for the public good.

In this paper, I suggest alternative models can be gleaned from the field of public policy analysis and management. Specifically, over the past forty years, public policy and management researchers have created analytical frameworks that are directly applicable to daily, philanthropic work. This paper begins by laying out some of these frameworks.

Then, focusing upon the particular lessons of one body of research literature emerging from public policy schools – public policy implementation – I consider what can be gleaned from this research and applied to the current practice of strategic philanthropy. Since the first large study of policy implementation was published in 1973, entitled *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington are Dashed in Oakland or Why it's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All* (1973), scholars have consistently documented profound challenges inherent in implementing public policy and reforming public systems (Berman 1978; Brodtkin 1990; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989). This complexity has only increased during the last twenty years, with more policy making authority devolved to state and local governments and with private organizations increasingly relied upon to implement public programs. (Gronbjerg and Salamon 2002; Smith and Lipsky 1993).

The implementation literature has responded to this complexity by increasingly focusing on ‘implementation networks’ (Hjern and Porter 1981) – the range of public and private organizations involved in a particular field, in particular places, that work together to implement public programs (O’Toole 1993). It also has begun to point out the trade-offs among various tools that government is using to carry out public policy (Salamon, 2002) and the multiple consequences for nonprofit organizations who rely too heavily upon public resources (Gronbjerg 1991; Smith and Lipsky 1993).

Given the flexibility of philanthropic dollars and the unique array of change tools available, philanthropy can be an important source of fuel for social change. However strategically investing private resources could be enhanced with a more accurate understanding of the larger field within which a particular organization operates. It could be improved by more awareness of the flow and form of public revenue in that field and how that shapes nonprofit organizational health. The probability of making systemic change could be increased with more understanding of current implementation networks and the exchange of resources within those networks. In this paper, I explore these and other implications

gleaned from research on policy implementation in public and nonprofit organizations point to alternative models of philanthropic practice than those offered by proponents of venture philanthropy.

References

Berman, P. (1978). "The Study of Macro- and Micro- Implementation." *Public Policy* 26(2): 157-184.

Brodkin, E. Z. (1990). *Implementation as Policy Politics. Implementation and the Policy Process.* Palumbo and Calista: 107-118.

Carlson, N. (2000). "But is it Smart Money? Nonprofits Question the Value of Venture Philanthropy." *Responsive Philanthropy*(Spring).

Frumkin, P. (2003). "Inside Venture Philanthropy." *Society*: 7-15.

Gronbjerg, K. and L. Salamon (2002). *Devolution, Marketization, and the Changing Shape of Government-Nonprofit Relations. The State of Nonprofit America.* L. Salamon. Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press: 447-470.

Gronbjerg, K. A. (1991). *Understanding Nonprofit Funding: Managing Revenues in Social Services and Community Development Organizations.* San Francisco, Jossey Bass:.

Hjern, B. and D. O. Porter (1981). "Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis." *Organizational Studies* 2(3): 211-227.

Letts, C., W. Ryan, et al. (1997). "Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists." *Harvard Business Review* 75(2): 36-44.

Mazmanian, D. and P. Sabatier (1989). *Implementation and Public Policy.* Lanham, University Press of America.

O'Toole, L. (1993). "Interorganizational Policy Studies: Lessons Drawn From Implementation Research." 3(2): 232-251.

Salamon, L (2002). *The Tools of Government Action: A Guide to the New Governance.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Smith, S. R. and M. Lipsky (1993). *Non-Profits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Paper Number: PA051254

Paper Title: Youth-led Community Organizing: Models, Methods and Policy Outcomes

Author(s):

Lee Staples, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Melvin Delgado, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Summary of Research

This paper reports on youth-led community organizing through grassroots nonprofits. Case materials have been gathered from selected nonprofits across the United States that represent the diversity of youth-led organizing efforts by geography, ethnicity, gender, goals and objectives. Cross-cutting theoretical and practice themes are examined, as well as opportunities and challenges for youth-led organizing to impact public policy within multiple arenas, including communities, municipal governments, schools, public housing developments, and human services organizations.

Description

Youth-led Community Organizing: Models, Methods and Policy Outcomes

This paper reports on the growing phenomenon of youth-led community organizing through grassroots nonprofits across the United States. Case materials have been gathered from selected nonprofits that represent the diversity of youth-led organizing efforts by geography, ethnicity, gender, goals and objectives. Cross-cutting theoretical and practice themes are examined, as well as opportunities and challenges for youth-led organizing to successfully impact public policy within multiple arenas, including communities, municipal governments, schools, public housing developments, and human services organizations. Policy, practice, and research recommendations are made to increase the effectiveness of nonprofits that sponsor youth-led community organizing efforts.

- A youth development or youth-led paradigm has emerged during the past decade effectively transforming young people from their traditional roles as “consumers,” “victims,” “perpetrators,” and “needy clients” to positive assets who are quite capable of being major contributors within their respective communities (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Kirshner, O’Donoghue & McLaughlin, 2002). The scholarly literature helping to shape social policy has begun to deal with questions about which community actions most effectively promote positive development in young people (Camino, 2000; Lerner, 2003). The belief that youth must play an active and meaningful role in shaping their own destiny has been very influential in grounding policy interventions in a set of values that are participatory in nature (Barich, 1998; Earls & Carlson, 2002). Youth participation or youth-led interventions now occur in a variety of ways, including youth-led research (Checkoway & Richards-Schuster, 2002), social enterprises (Delgado, 2004), health education campaigns (McCall & Shannon, 1999), philanthropy (Bjorhovde, 2002), and school reform (Sorensheim, 1998).
- The field of grassroots community organizing has not escaped this renewed attention on youth as key actors on their own behalf. Themes related to social and economic justice have resonated in countless numbers of initiatives that seek to bring about positive social change within schools and in the broader community. Community organizing by and for youth can be found in numerous fields, such as transportation, school reform, health promotion, safety, media, research, courts, disability rights, gender and racial equality. However, regardless of the particular youth-led organizing focus, there are a number of important similarities that can be expected to be present: 1) youth are in decision-making roles and have been well-prepared to assume leadership; 2) adults are present but their role is dictated by youth, and there is an explicit acknowledgement that adults are there to support and not to lead; 3) organizing goals are multifaceted; 4) carefully thought out organizing strategies, methods, techniques and tactics always are stressed; 5) projects either explicitly or implicitly embrace positive social change outcomes for youth and the broader community; 6) the goal of learning never is lost sight of throughout the duration of an organizing project; and 7) although projects address serious issues and concerns, having fun still is an integral part of the experience.

□ Case materials have been collected through a variety of methods, including participant observation, nonrandom purposive interviews, focus groups, and written evaluations of meetings, events, and training workshops. The analysis has been conducted along eleven dimensions of organizational development: Participation, Leadership, Staffing, Structure, Goals and Objectives, Target Systems, Strategies and Tactics, Resources, Allies, Communication Systems, and Policy Outcomes (Staples, 2004). The study contributes to the growing literature on youth-led grassroots community organizing by providing a conceptual and practice foundation from which youth-led grassroots community organizing can be understood, analyzed and undertaken.

References

- Barich, C. (1998). Oh, the places we'll go! *New Designs for Youth Development*, 14, 6-9.
- Bjorhovde, P.O. (Ed.). (2002). *Creating tomorrow's philanthropists: Curriculum development for youth*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Camino, L. (2000). Putting youth-adult partnerships to work for community change: Lessons from volunteers across the country. *CYD Journal: Community Youth Development*, 1, pp. 27-31.
- Checkoway, B. & Richards-Schuster, K. (2002). *Youth participation in community evaluation research*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Community Change, School of Social Work, University of Michigan.
- Delgado, M. (2004). *Social youth entrepreneurship: The potential for youth and community transformation*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.
- Earls, F. & Carlson, M. (2002). Adolescents as collaborators in search of well-being. In M. Tienda & W.J. Wilson (Eds.). *Youth in cities: A cross-national perspective*. (pp. 58-83). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eccles, J. & Gootman, J.A. (Eds.). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council.
- Kirshner, B., O'Donoghue, J.L. & McLaughlin, M. (Eds.). *Youth participation: Improving institutions and communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lerner, R. (2003). Developmental assets and asset-building communities: A view of the issues. In R.M. Lerner & P.L. Benson (Eds.). *Pathways to positive development among diverse youth*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCall, D.S. & Shannon, M.M. (1999). *Youth led health promotion, youth engagement and youth participation*. Ottawa, Canada: Health Canada.
- Sonenshein, R. (1998). Making the rules: Youth participation and Los Angeles Charter reform. *New Designs for Youth Development*, 14, pp. 39-40.
- Staples, L. (2004). *Roots to power*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.

Paper Number: PA051255

Paper Title: The ethical implications of social activism

Author(s):

Donna Hardina, California State University, Fresno, Fresno, CA, USA

Summary of Research

Social activists and community organizers often weigh the ethical implications of tactical methods used to achieve social change. However, little is known about how activists make ethical decisions. In this paper, the author describes findings obtained through 15 qualitative interviews with social activists and paid, professional community organizers.

Description

Putnam (2000) has argued that political activism and the ability to influence social change is an essential component of civic engagement and the production of social capital. These activities improve the quality of life in communities and society as a whole. Social change requires that political activists employ a variety of strategies and tactics to lobby for legislation, gain public support, elect progressive political candidates, and work for the reallocation of resources to assist marginalized groups. Often effective social activism involves confrontation tactics. Picketing, demonstrations, strikes, and boycotts can be potentially harmful to members of the target group, causing humiliation, social ostracism, or loss of employment (Fisher, 1994).

Little discussion has taken place among activists about the ethics of using such tactics. Often ethical reference points are limited to Saul Alinsky's writings on the ethical reasons why confrontation tactics should be used. Alinsky (1970) argued that in most social change-related organizing, "the ends justify the means" (p. 24). Many professional organizers and social activists maintain that ethical tactics are those that are justified by the seriousness of the issue (will people be harmed if action is not taken), the salience of the issue to the public, and the nature of the relationship (colleague, opponent, adversary) between those with the power to make decisions and the activist (Brager, Specht, & Torczyner, 1987; Netting, Kettner, & McMurty, 1993). Consequently, efforts to resolve ethical dilemmas are often made on a case-by-case basis or situational basis (Hardcastle, Wenocur, & Powers, 1997).

The lack of a clear ethical framework can cause much confusion for people, both volunteers and professionals) who are just beginning to engage themselves in the social change process. In addition, activists may be confronted with an additional dilemma. Reisch and Lowe (2000) note that some situations that appear to contain ethical concerns for the organizer are actually problems that should be addressed by others (for example, constituency group members). Consequently, before confronting the dilemma in question, the organizer must determine whether he or she is actually responsible for handling the problem and who should be consulted.

In this paper, the author explores the process through which political activists examine the ethical implications of their actions. Fifteen community organizers and political activists participated in qualitative interviews. Questions focused on how organizers and activists make ethical decisions and what individuals and groups are consulted in the decision-making process. Participants were also asked to identify situations in which confrontation oriented tactics are required, such as civil disobedience, and direct action. The findings indicate that the activists interviewed relied on personal conceptualizations of right and wrong in making ethical decisions. In contrast, paid, professional community organizers emphasized the need for consultation with constituents about tactical options and the potential risks associated with activities involving direct action and civil disobedience.

References

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.

Brager, G., Specht, H., & Torczyner, J. (1987). *Community organizing* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Fisher, R. (1994). *Let the people decide* (updated ed.). New York: Twayne.

Hardcastle, D., Wenocur, S., & Powers, P. (1997). *Community practice: Theories and skills for social workers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Netting, E., Kettner, P., & McMurty, S. (1993). *Social work macro practice*. New York: Longman.

Putman, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Touchtone.

Reisch, M., & Lowe, J. I., (2000). "Of means and ends" revisited: Teaching ethical community organizing in an unethical society. *Journal of Community Practice*, 7(1), 38.

Paper Number: PA051256

Paper Title: Identity and Culture in the Leadership Process: A comparative narrative analysis of immigrant-worker, ecology and indigenous grassroots groups

Author(s):

Amparo Hofmann- Pinilla, Research Center for Leadership,, New York University, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Serviv, New York, NY, USA

Olavarria Margot Olavarria, Leadership for a Changing World, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Sonia Ospina, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Summary of Research

This paper draws on qualitative research collected for the Leadership for a Changing World project, which focuses on the question: How do communities trying to make social change engage in leadership? It is a comparative narrative analysis of immigrant-worker, ecology and indigenous organizations using the framework of three tasks social movement organizations perform in the leadership process: setting direction, creating commitment, and facing adaptive challenge. We illustrate how the groups' collective identities and culture organizes, mobilizes, builds commitment, and at the same time may be transformed in the process.

Description

In many ways, the stories we tell define who we are. As Stuart Hall notes, identity is a narrative of the self (1996: 346). This holds true for social movement organizations: collective narratives reveal much about a group's motivations, ideas, feelings, beliefs, values, moral orientation, and agency that may serve as a basis for successful social action. This paper analyzes and compares collective narratives from immigrant-worker, ecology and indigenous groups. We use Bill Drath's (2001) framework of three tasks that all groups working for social change perform in the leadership process: setting direction, creating and maintaining commitment, and facing adaptive challenge. This highlights the ways that the collective identities and culture of these groups is used to organize, mobilize, build commitment to the work, and at the same time may be transformed in the process. We aim to identify the cultural underpinnings and common discursive elements of effective leadership among these groups. This paper will draw from shared stories of immigrant-worker, ecology and indigenous groups' successful experiences revealed through appreciative narrative interviews that are focused on positive events and practices. We chose these particular groups because their identities and goals are clearly defined.

This paper informs literature on leadership, social movements, and narrative-identity. Bill Drath's conceptualization of leadership as a relational process of meaning making in a community of practice is embedded in culture. According to Drath, culture building is the "primary leadership process" (Drath and Palus 1994: 10). Drath's concept of leadership comes from a social constructivist perspective wherein leadership is a "social meaning-making process" that occurs in groups of people engaged in common activity (Ibid: 9). "Meaning" places a person in relation to a world version by connecting their experience to their cognitive grid, or an ordered structure of ideas and feelings. Therefore, effective leadership is participative leadership wherein influence becomes an outcome, not the core, of leadership and influence is diffused horizontally, and not in a top-down, authoritative manner.

Using Drath's three leadership tasks to illustrate identity in the leadership process adds an important dimension to social movement theories that use culture and identity to explain mobilization and understand how perceptions of opportunities that arise in the process of challenging injustice affect strategies and outcomes. The culture of a group influences what social actors define as legitimate in the framing of the issues and grievances (Snow, Rockford, Worden and Benford 1986). In Drath's terms, this is part of the process of setting direction. Social movement theorists also point out that collective participation is greatly influenced by worldviews, feelings of solidarity and perception about identities (Hirsch1986), most important in the tasks of setting direction and creating commitment. In addition, many of the stakes that collective groups defend come from the social actors' need to affirm values, beliefs and to form a knowledge base that may conflict with those of established culture (Touraine

1981, 1985; Melucci 1985), aspects included in all three of Drath's leadership tasks. This view complements and completes structural approaches to social movement scholarship dominant in the U.S. throughout the 1980s (McAdam, Tilly and Tarrow, Tarrow 1995); and provides a broader and more fungible view of leadership than previously held by the resource mobilization scholars (McAdam 1983) Our study also informs the emerging literature on narrative-identity. Stuart Hall's idea of identity as a narrative of the self that provides templates for "being in the world" (or in Drath's terms, "meaning-making") links narrative to identity and identity to culture defined as "ways of being in the world." Drawing on this concept, Ronald Jacobs points out that narratives provide moral orientation, understandings of agency and selfhood, as well as define social bonds and relationships, factors that are indispensable to movement-building (2002, 205-206). Arriving at an articulation of a "we" that resonates among and unifies movement members and potential members is a challenge that depends on effective use of personal and collective narratives because "people experience life in a storied way" (Ibid.).

Jacobs also notes that stories of effective social change provide counter-narratives to circulating public narratives from the government, or other institutions. These counter-narratives bring into relief the collective identities of immigrant-worker, ecology and indigenous groups. Margaret Somers (1994: 625-629) emphasizes, along with Joan Scott (1991), the importance of situating these collective narratives in time, space, and relationality. She employs the concept of "narrative identity" in locating ourselves or others in social narratives to define who "we/they" are and understand social action and agency. By highlighting parts of these narratives from ecology, indigenous and immigrant groups participating in the LCW program, we will show how they represent cultural practices involved in the leadership process according to Drath: Identifying a mission and vision and framing the problem to be addressed in setting direction; creating and maintaining commitment; and innovation of strategies as part of facing adaptive challenges. We will illustrate that despite having different collective identities that propel their work, all three group clusters exhibit and use very similar characteristics in carrying out these leadership tasks. However, a close examination reveals that the narratives that serve as examples of ways that the organizations "perform" leadership show different nuances.

The immigrant-worker groups illustrate how immigrant identity is both a challenge and an asset in building leadership. A common multicultural "immigrant" or "worker" identity must be constructed over individual national identities. The ecology groups in the LCW project illustrate a strong identification with a place or region where the environment and health of the community has been devastated by polluting industries. Where there is an intersection of this environmentalist's identity with indigenous subjectivity, indigenous traditions, oral history, spirituality and the past play an important role in leadership. Because indigenous cultures are constantly threatened by development and the appeal of mainstream American popular culture, these groups make preservation of their culture part of their mission and part of their performing the three leadership tasks identified by Drath.

As a comparative study of the third sector, our paper shows shared characteristics that nonprofit organizations engaged in social change employ to effectively identify their mission, mobilize their communities, confront critical challenges, and educate and influence policymakers. As such, practitioners in nonprofits, policymakers, and scholars alike will find this study enlightening.

Selected Bibliography

- Draft W (2001). *The Deep Blue Sea: Rethinking the Source of Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc
- Drath, W. and Palus, C. (1994). *Making Common Sense: Leadership as Meaning Making in a Community of Practice*. Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership.

Hall, S. (1996). *Ethnicity: Identity and Difference*. In G. Eley and G. Suny (eds.), *Becoming National* (pp.341-356). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, E. 1986; "The Creation of Political Solidarity in Social Movements Organizations." *The Sociological Quarterly* 27 (3): 373-387.

Jacobs, R. 2002 "Narrative Integration of Personal and Collective Identity in Social Movements"

Gamson, W. A. 1992. *Talking Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Snow, D. A. 2004. Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields. In D. A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*: 380-412. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. 1988. Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1: 197-217.

Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A., & Kriesi, H. 2004. Mapping the Terrain. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*: pp.3-16. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Scott, Joan. 1991. The Evidence of Experience. *Critical Inquiry* 17(4): 773-797.

Somers, M. (1994). *The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational Approach*. *Theory and Society*, Vol. 23 (pp. 605-645).

McAdam, Doug. 1983. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago University Press.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. 1996. Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes -- toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, Vol. 1-22. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Melucci, Alberto, 1985. "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements," *Social Research* 52 (4)

Tarrow, Sidney, 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements Collective Action, and Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, S. 1992. Mentalities, Political Cultures, and Collective Action Frames: Constructing Meanings through Action. In A. D. Morris, & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*: 174-202. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Touraine 1981, *The Voice and the Eye*. Cambridge university Press

Paper Number: PA051259

Paper Title: Difference of formulation between two types of nonprofit organizations: From the data analysis of voluntary organizations in Japan

Author(s):

Wataru Matsumoto, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan

Summary of Research

This paper study which better are demand-oriented organizations or supply-oriented organizations formulated in Japan. Using a questionnaire survey data, nonprofit and voluntary organizations in Japan are categorized to two groups, demand-oriented organizations or supply-oriented organizations. On the other hand, this paper set up the Formulation Index on the basis of various theories and observations in the field, and analyzed which better are, in Japan, demand-oriented organizations or supply-oriented organizations formulated. As a result, it was found that demand-oriented organizations tend to formulate rather than the supply-oriented organizations in Japanese nonprofit and voluntary sector.

Description

In Japan, many people worked voluntarily for the relief of quake victims in the 1995 Great Hanshin Earthquake. Since then, lots of nonprofit and voluntary organizations have appeared, developed and gained attention. Some external donors hoped that nonprofit organizations are independent toward autonomic growth (Matsumoto, 2003).

By the way, existence of nonprofit organizations is usually explained from both sides of demand and supply in the society (Salamon, 1992; Ben-Ner & Van Hoomissen, 1996).

The explanation focusing the demand side is almost classified to market failure and government failure. As one example of government failure demanding nonprofit organizations, there is influence of median voters (Weisbrod, 1974, 1986, 1988). In market failure demanding nonprofit organizations, there are agency problems (Fama & Jensen, 1983a, 1983b) and contract failure (Hansmann, 1980, 1987) such as lemon markets (Akerlof, 1970) and so on. The explanation focusing the supply side is almost two as follows (Salamon, 1992). One thing is nonprofit organizations contribute to implementation of pluralism and freedom. The other thing is nonprofit organizations contribute to implementation of solidarity. So this paper study which better are, in Japan, demand-oriented organizations or supply-oriented organizations formulated. The data for analysis comes from the questionnaire survey depending on the cooperation of the Nippon Foundation.

In the survey, there is a key question: Which do you think the most mainly reason your organization active in volunteer work is?

1. Enterprise and government activities only are not enough in the society.
2. Volunteer activities have social significance in themselves.

Answer 1 corresponds to the demand-oriented organizations. Answer 2 corresponds to the supply-oriented organizations.

On the other hand, this paper set up the Formulation Index as follows on the basis of various theories and observations in the field.

Formulation Index

- (1) Having some full-time management staffs
- (2) Having some supporting members
- (3) Having a rule to dissolve the organization
- (4) Having assisted or advised by a support center
- (5) Sum of the annual income
- (6) Number of executive board members
- (7) Pattern of the closing account
- (8) Decision rule of the action policy

In conclusion, demand-oriented organizations tend to formulate rather than the supply-oriented organizations in Japanese nonprofit and voluntary sector.

References

Akerlof, George A. (1970) "The market for lemons," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(3), 488-500.

Ben-Ner, Avner & Van Hoomissen, Theresa (1993) "Nonprofit organizations in the mixed economy: A demand and supply analysis," Ben-Ner, Avner and Gui, Benedetto (eds.), *The Nonprofit Sector in the Mixed Economy*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 27-58.

Fama, Eugene & Jensen, Michael (1983a) "Separation of ownership and control," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26, 301-326.

Fama, Eugene & Jensen, Michael (1983b) "Agency problems and residual claims," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26, 327-350.

Hansmann, Henry. (1980; 1986) "The Role of Non-Profit Enterprise," *Yale Law Journal*, 89(5), 835-898. Reprinted in Rose-Ackerman, ed. *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions: Studies in Structure and Policy*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Hansmann, Henry. (1987) "Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization," in Powell, Walter ed. *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.

Matsumoto, Wataru (2003) "The clarification of the tacit knowledge to assess non-profit organizations in Japan," *Annals of Business Administrative Science*, 2(3), 29-38. from <http://www.gbrc.jp/>

Salamon, Lester M. (1992) *American's Nonprofit Sector*. The Foundation Center, New York.

Weisbrod, Burton A. (1974) "Toward a theory of the voluntary nonprofit sector in a three-sector economy," in Edmund S. Phelps ed. *Altruism, Morality, and Economic Theory*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 171-195.

Weisbrod, Burton & Nestor Dominguez (1986) "Demand for Collective Goods in Private Nonprofit Markets: Can Fundraising Expenditures Help Overcome Free Rider Behavior?" *Journal of Public Economics*, 30, 83-95.

Weisbrod, Burton A. (1988) *The Nonprofit Economy*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Paper Number: PA051261

Paper Title: Is there a social democratic civil society regime in the welfare field?

Author(s):

Karl Henrik Sivesind, Institute for Social Research, Oslo, Norway

Per Selle, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

Summary of Research

It is frequently assumed that voluntary and nonprofit organizations play a limited role in welfare service provision in the Nordic, social democratic countries. The public sector has the main responsibility for meeting the population's welfare needs. This paper confronts this assumption with results from a comparative analysis of highly industrialized countries with extensive welfare arrangements. We focus on civil society sector employment in relation to total employment in the welfare field, including education and research, health, and social services. Explanatory factors are public welfare spending, share of income from donations, and religious homogeneity.

Description

A 'social democratic' civil society model or regime is often used to categorize the Scandinavian countries, or the Nordic group of countries. In the social democratic regime, it is assumed, voluntary or nonprofit organizations have a small share of the welfare services, because these fields are mainly the responsibility of the public sector. Voluntary organizations are, however, relatively active when it comes to the promotion of political, social and recreational interests (Janoski 1998; Salamon & Anheier 1998; Salamon et al. 2003; Salamon & Sokolowski 2001). The main purpose of this paper is to confront assumptions of this type in comparative research on nonprofit sector or civil society with results from a comparative analysis. The empirical analysis focuses on employment in voluntary sector welfare services. Is there a social democratic civil society regime in the welfare field in Norway, Sweden and Finland? Do the voluntary sectors of these Nordic countries display conformity and distinctiveness in accordance with the theoretical assumptions? If so, can the commonalities of social democratic countries be explained by similar and distinct social mechanisms (Hedström & Swedberg 1998)? We compare data from the Nordic countries that so far have participated in the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (CNP) - Sweden, Norway and Finland - (Helander & Sivesind 2001; Helander & Sundback 1998; Lundström & Wijkström 1997; Sivesind et al. 2002; Sivesind et al. 2004) with other highly industrialized countries with extensive welfare arrangements belonging to the corporatist and liberal regimes, i.e., EU countries, Australia and the USA (Salamon et al. 1999).

We focus on civil society sector employment in relation to total employment in the welfare field, including education and research, health, and social services. Explanatory factors are public welfare spending, share of income from donations, and religious homogeneity. Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) (Ragin 1987; Ragin 2000) is applied to sort countries in types. The results show that the consequences of public sector welfare spending on civil society welfare employment vary depending on other social conditions. In liberal countries, low public sector welfare spending results in a small civil society share of employment. The preconditions are religious heterogeneity and large shares of civil society income from donations. In other Western European countries, the size of public sector welfare spending is inversely proportional with the size of the civil society share of employment, depending on religious heterogeneity. The Nordic countries have the smallest share of civil society welfare services, highest religious homogeneity, and largest public welfare costs. They do not represent a separate constellation of factors, but are closely followed by presumably corporatist countries like France and Austria. When data from Denmark are available and taken into account together with recent developments, the distinctiveness of the Nordic countries will probably be further reduced.

References

Habermas, J. (1992). Further Reflections on the Public Sphere. In C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 421-461. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hedström, P. & Swedberg, R. (1998). *Social mechanisms : an analytical approach to social theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Helander, V. & Sivesind, K. H. (2001). Frivilligsektorns betydelse i Norden (The Impact of the Voluntary Sector in the Nordic Countries). In L. Skov Henriksen & B. Ibsen (eds.), *Frivillighedens udfordringer (The Challenges of Volunteering)*, pp. 49-66. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.

Helander, V. & Sundback, S. (1998). *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Finland*. Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project no. 34. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Janoski, T. (1998). *Citizenship and civil society : a framework of rights and obligations in liberal, traditional, and social democratic regimes*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.

Lundström, T. & Wijkström, F. (1997). *The Nonprofit Sector in Sweden*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ragin, C. C. (1987). *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ragin, C. C. (2000). *Fuzzy-set social science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Salamon, L. M. & Anheier, H. K. (1998). Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. *Voluntas*, 9, 213-248.

Salamon, L. M., Anheier, H. K., List, R., Toepler, S., Sokolowski, S. W. & Associates. (1999). *Global civil society : dimensions of the nonprofit sector*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W. & List, R. (2003). *Global Civil Society: An Overview*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Salamon, L. M. & Sokolowski, W. (2001). *Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Evidence from 24 countries*. Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project no. 40. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Sivesind, K. H., Lorentzen, H., Selle, P. & Wollebæk, D. (2002). *The Voluntary Sector in Norway - Composition, Changes, and Causes*. Report no. 2. Oslo: Institute for Social Research.

Sivesind, K. H., Lorentzen, H., Selle, P., Wollebæk, D., Sokolowski, S. W. & Salamon, L. M. (2004). Norway. In L. M. Salamon, S. W. Sokolowski & Associates (eds.), *Global civil society: Dimensions of the nonprofit sector, Volume II*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Paper Number: PA051262

Paper Title: The Role of Leadership and Organizational Capacity for Program Evaluation

Author(s):

David Van Slyke, The Maxwell School at Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA
Salvatore Alaimo, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Summary of Research

Scholars and practitioners suggest that leadership is important in shaping an organization's culture and determining whether programs are evaluated. The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of an organization's programs is an essential to overall accountability. Existing literature focuses on insufficient resources for why evaluation is not conducted. We suggest that while resources are necessary, they alone will not ensure that programs are evaluated and that findings will be used by the leadership in decision making. We hypothesize that program evaluation cannot be enacted as an organizational strategy for measuring the performance and effectiveness of programs without the proper leadership.

Description

Issues of accountability in the nonprofit sector have received considerable exposure recently and continue to be a major focus for leaders, funders, board members, donors, the media and academics. Scholars and practitioners have suggested that leadership plays an important role in shaping an organization's culture and in determining whether programs are to be evaluated. The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of an organization's programs and its leadership are essential components of a nonprofit's overall accountability. However, such evaluations remain largely under investigated in the academic community. Too often, funders especially have suggested that if nonprofits were to more actively engage in program evaluation, accountability to myriad stakeholders could be enhanced and organizational transparency increased. The call for evaluation from funding organizations, accountability groups, and those interested in the performance of nonprofit programs and services represents an "external pull" rather than an "internal push" from the nonprofit organization's leadership. The existing literature covers the typical reasons why evaluation is not conducted in nonprofit organizations such as insufficient expertise, time, and funding.

In this study, we suggest that that while such resources are necessary, they alone are not enough to ensure that programs are evaluated in an organization and that the findings will be used by the organization's leadership in decision making. We hypothesize that program evaluation cannot be enacted as an organizational strategy for measuring the performance and effectiveness of programs without the proper leadership. We also examine the extent to which leadership is actively exercised in developing an organization's culture and links the organizations mission, results, and evaluation with decision making. Our initial exploratory findings suggest that for a leader to effectively make this link and embed it deep within the organization's fabric and culture requires the leader to give top down voice, resources, and support for this strategic focus while working in concert with internal stakeholders on building bottom up support for such a focus."

Our methodological approach includes interviewing a stratified purposive sample of nonprofit human services CEOs and Board members across multiple sites using a semi-structured protocol. Our questions are guided by the broader leadership, organizational culture, and program evaluation literatures as well as more recent scholarship on each of these subjects within the context of nonprofit organizations. We will also examine organization level cases in which program evaluation has been conducted and used successfully and those where it has not been conducted because of a failure of leadership. The underlying reasons why the evaluations are or are not conducted is a principal focus of this research.

The contribution of this scholarship to the field of nonprofit management is to convey the critical importance of the organization's leadership in determining whether programs are evaluated and how those results are used in decision making. Our findings suggest that leaders who give voice, support, and allocate resources for program evaluation not only inculcate an ethos of evaluation and performance measurement, but that they use this information in their own strategic planning and direction setting for the organization. The study findings have a number of implications for nonprofit management and organizational effectiveness. Perhaps most importantly, the findings highlight the importance of leadership and provide guidance about enacting organizational mechanisms directed at increasing accountability.

Bausch, Thomas A. "Servant-Leaders Making Human New Models of Work and Organization," *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit and Servant Leadership*. ed. Larry C. Spears. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

Block, Stephen R. *Why Nonprofits Fail: Overcoming Founder's Syndrome, Fundphobia, and Other Obstacles to Success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Brest, Paul. "What the Nonprofit Sector can Learn from Home Improvements." *The Nonprofit Quarterly*. Third Sector New England: Winter, 2003.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Publishing Co., 1985.

Denison, Daniel R. *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1990.

Drucker, Peter. *Managing the Nonprofit Organization*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.

Fetterman, David M. and Abraham Wandersman, eds. *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice*. New York: Guilford Press, 2005.

Forbes, Daniel P. "Measuring the Unmeasurable." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (June 1998): 183-202.

Frumkin, Peter. "Good Performance is not Measured by Financial Data Alone." *The Chronicle for Philanthropy*, 30, May 2002, 38.

Frumkin, Peter. "Going Beyond Efficiency." *The Nonprofit Quarterly*. Third Sector New England: July, 2001.

Grace, Kay Sprinkel. *The Nonprofit Board's Role in Setting and Advancing the Mission*. Washington, DC: BoardSource, 2003.

Harwood, Richard. "Accountability and the Sustainable Nonprofit." *Philanthropy News Digest*. The Foundation Center, September, 2004.

Hatry, Harry and Linda Lampkin, eds. *Outcome Management in Nonprofit Organizations*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2001.

Heskett, James L. and Leonard Schlesinger. "Leaders Who Shape and Keep Performance-Oriented Culture." *The Leader of the Future*. Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith and Richard Beckhard, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Hoefer, Richard. "Accountability in Action?" *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 11, no.2

(winter 2000): 167-177.

Jaskyte, K. (2004). "Transformational leadership, organizational culture and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(2), 153-168.

Johnson, Craig E. *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

Lynch, Richard. *Lead!: How Public and Nonprofit Managers can bring out the best in Themselves and their Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Mark, Melvin M., Gary T. Henry and George Julnes. *Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding, and Improving Public and Nonprofit Policies and Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Milstein, Bobby, Thomas J. Chapel, Scott F. Wetterhall and David A. Cotton. "Building Capacity for Program Evaluation at the Centers for Disease Control." *New Directions for Evaluation* 93 (Spring), 2002, 27-46.

Nanus, Bert and Stephen M. Dobbs. *Leaders Who Make a Difference: Essential Strategies for Meeting the Nonprofit Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Newcomer, Kathryn E. "Using Performance Measurement to Improve Programs." *New Directions for Evaluation* 75 (fall, 1997) : 5-14.

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

Packard, Thomas. "Enhancing staff commitment through organizational values: The case of a homeless shelter." *Administration in Social Work*, 25 (3), 2001, 35-52.

Plantz, Margaret C., Martha Taylor Greenway, and Michael Hendricks. "Outcome Measurement: Showing results in the Nonprofit Sector." *New Directions for Evaluation* 75 (fall, 1997): 15-30.

Powell, James Lawrence. *Pathways to Leadership: How to Achieve and Sustain Success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Preskill, Hallie and Darlene Russ-Eft. *Building Evaluation Capacity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

Sanders, James R. "Mainstreaming Evaluation." *New Directions for Evaluation* 99 (Fall), 2003, 3-6.

Schallock, Robert L. *Outcome-Based Evaluation*. (New York: Plenum Press, 1995).

Schein, Edgar H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Senge, Peter. "Leading Learning Organizations: The Bold, the Powerful and the Invisible." *The Leader of the Future*. Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith and Richard Beckhard, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Stern, Gary J. *The Drucker Foundation Self-Assessment Tool: Process Guide*. New York: The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management, 1999.

Stockdill, Stacey Hueftle, Michael Baizerman and Don W. Compton. "Toward a Definition of the ECB Process: A Conversation with the ECB Literature." *New Directions for Evaluation* 93 (Spring), 2002, 7-25.

Sutherland, Stephanie. "Creating a Culture of Data Use for Continuous Improvement: A Case Study of an Edison Project School." *The American Journal of Evaluation* 25 (3), 2004, 277-293.

Trice, Harrison M. and Janice M. Beyer. *The Cultures of Work Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993.

Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Wholey, Joseph H., Harry P. Hatry and Kathryn E. Newcomer, eds. *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Wholey, Joseph H. "Managing for Results: Roles for Evaluators in a New Management Era." *The American Journal of Evaluation* 22 (3), 2001, 343-347.

Wilensky, Ava S. and Carol D. Hansen. "Understanding the Work Beliefs of Nonprofit

Paper Number: PA051263

Paper Title: An Evaluation Index for Nonprofit Web Sites

Author(s):

M. Curtis Hoffman, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Dan Rinsema-Sybenga, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Shannon M McMaster, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Summary of Research

This paper discusses the development and use of a holistic index for scoring the quality of Web sites of nonprofit organizations. It reviews the various published recommendations and research on nonprofit Web site development, with the goal to produce a scoring system comparable to the Website Attribute Evaluation System (WAES) and the Urban E-Government Index used to evaluate local government web sites. By evaluating web sites through provision of mission-related information, client services, philanthropic opportunities, organizational transparency, accessibility, and design best-practices, the index serves as a tool for nonprofit organizations as they build their on-line capacity.

Description

Nonprofit organizations reach many people through their Web sites. While a large body of literature provides suggestions to nonprofit organizations about Web site development, this literature has notable limitations.

Information is often directed to technologists, in a language inaccessible to those unfamiliar with Web development jargon. Alternatively, it is sometimes written for nontechnical nonprofit organizers, but provides only vague help to the Web developer.

Articles tend to deal either with issues related to general Web-site development (e.g., using appropriate colors and font sizes), or to issues related to good nonprofit Web practices (e.g., attracting on-line donations). Few articles deal holistically with nonprofit Web-sites.

Given the limited resources of many nonprofit

organizations, the frequent focus on advanced and expensive on-line features may discourage development of simple but good Web sites.

Moreover, the nonprofit sector is without a well-developed Web site evaluation tool; whereas the public sector has at least two comprehensive scoring systems:

a. □ Website Attribute Evaluation System (WAES), developed by the Cyberspace Policy Research Group at the University of Arizona, Tucson (www.cyprg.arizona.edu).

b. □ Urban E-Government Index Developed at Taubman Center for Public Policy at Brown University (www.brown.edu/Departments/Taubman_Center/)

This paper develops and uses a holistic index for scoring the Web sites of nonprofit organizations to build capacity within the sector. Rather than simply providing scores for hundreds of sites, this project would:

- reveal, in the aggregate, how well nonprofit organizations are fulfilling the potential of the Web in provision of different dimensions, such as mission-related information, client services, philanthropic opportunities, and organizational transparency.

- highlight exemplar sites that scored well at least in one dimension.

- provide criteria for developing good sites that use only the cheapest, simplest technology (i.e., static HTML pages) as well as for more expensive and elaborate designs (e.g., those involving online

database queries, on-line forms, customized member-only areas, Flash).

There are secondary uses for the index once it is available. For example, it might:

- Supply a United Way or community foundation the means to evaluate the general strengths and weaknesses of grantee or member Web sites allowing for appropriate advice and support;
- Allow individual nonprofits to better evaluate a Web site developed by a consultant and conversely, provide technology consultants a tool for communicating options to their clients;
- Provide a nonprofit research center an instrument for conducting time series monitoring of trends in nonprofit Web site capacity

The index was developed on a scoring system with a potential high score of 100. The index was then tested through a review of 200 nonprofit web sites in Michigan. The results are used to discuss the value of the index as well as establish some benchmarks for rating nonprofit web sites using the index.

Paper Number: PA051264

Paper Title: Third Sector Research and Public Policy: Expanding Participation for Greater Social Impact

Author(s):

Christopher Corbett, N/A, Albany, NY, USA

Summary of Research

Consensus grows for Third Sector research to become more inclusionary and socially relevant. Calls for change come at the organizational level (Blue Ribbon Task Force, 2000), including from ARNOVA's Presidents (Young 2001; Galaskiewicz, 2003) and Sector level, the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund (2002). Typically cited is the need to strengthen linkages among researchers, practitioners and policy makers, or advance a "partnership model", increasing relevance of Third Sector research. This research identifies three ways Third Sector research organizations can alter their behavior settings and achieve these ends, and help in re-shaping a public sector, as envisioned by Goldsmith & Eggers (2004).

Description

In recent years there has been a growing consensus of the need for Third Sector research to further evolve and become more inclusionary. For example, ARNOVA's Blue Ribbon Task Force (2000), made up of numerous forward looking leaders and researchers in the field, identified various recommendations including the need for ARNOVA to become more multi-disciplinary and multi-constituent, as well as becoming more relevant to practitioners (p. 14).

□ Young (2001) in his Presidential Address presents a global vision and challenge; he asks: what is it that social scientists, professionals, practicing managers and leaders, researchers and scholars can do to be more socially valuable (p. 652)?

□ The Nonprofit Sector Research Fund (Quality of Nonprofit and Philanthropy Research, 2002), in assessing the state of the field, issued its report based upon the critical thinking of 28 leading scholars and practitioners in the field, identifying various shortcomings of the field and specific strategies to advance nonprofit and philanthropic research. While acknowledging that some researchers favor keeping practitioners "largely out" of the research process, it identifies three specific strategies which convey a more inclusionary approach including: first, strengthen linkages among researchers, practitioners and policy makers; second, support practitioners' participation in research projects and third, enhance understanding of local, state and federal policy makers and their staffs concerning the nonprofit sector, including facilitation of expert testimony in hearings, briefs, papers or other mechanisms used by policy makers (p. 3).

□ ARNOVA's former President Galaskiewicz (2003a), in his President's Message (p. 3), favors an inclusionary view as well, calling for nonprofit researchers to engage in the affairs of the day, moving beyond creating academic research for publication. He challenges researchers to become involved in the process of interpretation and dissemination, calling for a partnership where there is "true dialog" between research, practice and policy makers. Further, he articulates his vision where there is a joining together in a "partnership model" that is problem-centered, where researchers mobilize their tools and expertise to explore solutions in partnership with practitioners and policy makers.

□ Subsequently, at the November 2003 ARNOVA Conference in Denver, Colorado, this same theme was again pursued in the President's Address (Galaskiewicz, 2003b). That is, this needed future direction of Third Sector research was graphically conveyed where research, practice and policy were initially illustrated (via overhead slide) as three separate entities. Subsequently the overhead illustration was modified to show an evolution of all three entities to become overlapping-- in the form of a classic Venn diagram-- graphically challenging ARNOVA's membership to further evolve to a "partnership model".

□ Yet how will ARNOVA evolve into a "partnership model" and become more inclusionary, bringing together researchers, practitioners and policy makers? How can Third Sector research engage with and influence public policy makers, as a major theme of this year's ARNOVA conference intends? This

is far easier said than done. The purpose of this research is to identify specific ways that Third Sector research organizations, like ARNOVA, can introduce changes to the research organization's behavior setting in order to achieve these ends. Specifically, this research proposes that these ends can be accomplished by becoming a more inclusionary and diverse society. Further, the time now is ripe for such an evolution of ARNOVA for a number of reasons. First, there is a growing consensus on the need for such change at the organizational level (Blue Ribbon Task Force; Presidents Young, & Galaskiewicz) as well as at the Sector level, by the Nonprofit Sector Research Fund (NSRF). Secondly, ARNOVA is undergoing a significant organizational change currently, in transitioning from a single editor to two new co-editors who took over that role in mid-2004 (New Editors Announced, 2004). This presents further opportunity for change. As has been noted, Third Sector journal editors play a highly significant role as they largely decide both the research priorities and which research is fit for publication and dissemination (Corbett, 2003, p. 16).

□ These circumstances create new opportunities for ARNOVA to expand its membership and become more inclusionary and to structure its future research to be more valuable to the broader society at large-- consistent with the numerous calls for such change from the Blue Ribbon Task Force, Presidents Young and Galaskiewicz, as well as the NSRF.

□ The purpose of this research is to identify various specific ways to institutionalize change in a research organization in order to become more inclusionary and, thereby, create research more relevant to society at large. Three areas are proposed and are designed to expand the organization's membership and institutionalize greater member participation in a research organization processes, including the creation and evaluation of the organization's research products. Specifically, the research identifies and describes how the "partnership model" may be implemented through three changes: first, through modification of bylaws; second, through expansion of the journal's research to address public policy and practitioner implications, where possible, and third, through the introduction of processes that enable member participation in identifying research priorities and the process of evaluation itself (Corbett, 1996). These changes will enable greater influence of Third Sector research in social problem solving, such as by re-shaping the public sector, a potential recently articulated by Goldsmith & Eggers (2004).

□ The contribution of this research to the field is to address two major failures of Third Sector research: first, to successfully translate research into practice by engaging researchers, practitioners and policy makers within the behavior setting and secondly, to develop criteria of evaluation, as called for by Wagner (1994), that can be applied to research findings and project choices. This will be accomplished by identifying changes to institutionalize greater inclusion and participation in the organization's behavior setting, enabling the formation of a "partnership model"-- where researchers, practitioners and policy makers join together in a problem-centered, solution seeking way, increasing the positive social impact of Third Sector research.

□

Selected References

Blue Ribbon Task Force (2000, November). The ARNOVA task force on new directions.

An electronic dialog. Presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Corbett, C.J. (1996, July). Evaluating research in international settings. Paper presented at the second international conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Mexico City, Mexico.

Corbett (2003, November). Promoting debate and building consensus on nonprofit theory development. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, Denver, Colorado, U.S.A.

Galaskiewicz, J. (2003a). The president's message. *Arnova News*, 32(2), 3.

Galaskiewicz, J. (2003b, November). The president's address: annual membership meeting.

Notes from overhead presentation of November 22, 2003, Denver, Colorado, U.S.A.

Goldsmith, S. & Eggers, W. (2004). *Governing by network: The new shape of the public sector*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution

New Editors Announced (2004). New NVSQ, ARNOVA abstracts editors announced. *Arnova News*, 33(1), 10.

Quality of Nonprofit and Philanthropy Research (2002). *Snapshots: Research highlights from the nonprofit sector research fund*. No. 23, May/June. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute, 2002, p.1-2.

Wagner, A. (1994, July). *Towards third-sector research: Developing a scientific paradigm*. Plenary seminar on Theory presented at the Inaugural Conference of I.S.T.R, Pecs, Hungary.

Young, D. (2001). President's state of the field address. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(4), 645-653.

Paper Number: PA051265

Paper Title: Program Evaluation in Nonprofit Human Service Organizations: A Conceptual Theory of Ethical Responsibility

Author(s):

Salvatore Alaimo, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Summary of Research

The focus of accountability in the nonprofit sector has primarily been in the context of financial responsibility. This paper seeks to balance this focus on resource efficiency with program effectiveness. A conceptual theory of ethical responsibility for program evaluation is developed through reviewing literature on ethics, leadership concepts, ethical guidelines of stakeholder groups and the evaluative framework set up by an organization's mission. Interviews with stakeholder group representatives and three case studies of human services organizations were also included in the development of this theory.

Description

While the focus on accountability in the nonprofit sector has been primarily based on financial efficiency (Eisenberg, 2004; Lee, 2004; Sinclair, 2004) overall accountability should also include program effectiveness. Recent literature (Block, 2004; Frumkin, 2002; Reider, 2001) has begun the process to seek such a balance (see Figure 1). Reasons for evaluating programs have included improving the program, meeting funding organizations' requirements, and the effort to remain competitive (Frumkin, 2001; Hatry and Lampkin, 2001; Mark, Henry and Julnes, 2000; Weiss, 1998). Beyond these reasons, this paper seeks to answer several questions: 1) What is the relationship between program evaluation and the mission of an organization? 2) Is there an ethical responsibility for leadership to ensure programs are evaluated?

To answer these questions the concepts of mission, program evaluation and leadership were reviewed. Classic and modern literature on ethics was also reviewed along with the ethical guidelines established by stakeholder groups in the environment of program evaluation. This overall review formed the basis for the development of the conceptual theory. The theory was supplemented by three case studies of human services organizations. Interviews were also conducted with the director of a resource center for research and evaluation of a national, youth-serving organization; an executive director of a small human services organization; a vice president for evaluation at one of the top 50 largest private foundations; an independent evaluation consultant; the chair of the ethics committee for the American Evaluation Association.

Mission

For the purposes of this paper we will look at the ethical and operational contexts of an organization's mission. Missions have been characterized as "the very first and most basic principle for ethical behavior in any organization..." (Bausch, 1996). They have also been framed as the organization's reason for being or its purpose (Nanus and Dobbs, 1993; Stern, 1999). Missions can comprise an end in terms of a social good and the most important measure of success for the organization (Nanus and Dobbs, 1993). Examples of missions were examined and most revealed an evaluative framework in which the effort to evaluate the organization's programs link directly to that mission. Such a framework asks how the organization will accomplish its mission as well as how the organization knows it has done it i.e. expanded access to higher education, worked towards ending homelessness, etc.

Program evaluation

Evaluating programs is a method for answering the key questions set up by the evaluative framework of the mission. The operational parts of evaluation mostly comprise the assessment of a program in terms of that program's outcomes (Schalock, 1995; Weiss, 1998). The purpose of evaluation tends to be the improvement of programs or policies, or social betterment (Mark, Henry and Julnes, 2000; Patton, 1986; Plantz, Greenway and Hendricks, 1997; Weiss, 1998). Outcomes are typically defined as

changes in behavior, role status and/or gaining of knowledge or understanding that occurs when a person experiences the program. Two important criteria for measuring outcomes of such programs are that the outcome is valued by the person experiencing the program and that it is logically connected to the program (Schalock, 1995). Developing a logic model as a visual display for a program helps ensure that its intended outcomes follow this logic and are linked to the mission of the organization (See Figure 2).

Leadership □

For the purpose of this paper the positions of leadership comprise the Board of Directors and the CEO of the organization. Leadership can include the traits of courage and humility (Harwood, 2004). It also contains ability in terms of exercising judgment, intuition, and innovation in moving an organization in the direction that makes the greatest contribution to society (Nanus and Dobbs, 1993). Leadership carries great responsibility in an organization such as keeping its people in synch with and personally supporting the mission (Lynch, 1993; Powell, 1995), stewardship with respect to accountability and obligation to the various stakeholders of the organization (Johnson, 2004). Program evaluation can effectively provide valuable information that can aid in making those decisions and carrying out those responsibilities.

Conclusions and Conceptual Theory

Much attention has focused on accountability for nonprofits in financial terms. A review of the literature suggests equally, if not more important, is the accountability to the mission of the organization. The mission defines what an organization does and its overall purpose and relevance. Missions contain social goods that impact the lives of people and therefore are the single most important measure of success of nonprofit organizations. The mission sets up a framework in which programs can be evaluated. This connection is made through developing a program logic model (see Figure 2). Therefore, program evaluation is the method for determining the effectiveness of an organization's programs and its work towards satisfying its mission.

The leadership of a nonprofit organization constitute the people (Executive Director/CEO and Board of Directors) who arrange and guide the human, capital, and intellectual resources in order to maximize the impact on its consumers that the organization was created to serve. Therefore the mission constitutes a covenant that the leadership is bound to. Program evaluation is the method for which the leadership can determine the level of impact the organization has made on its consumers in an attempt to fulfill that covenant of the mission.

Conceptual Theory

If - The mission is the single most important measure of success of nonprofit organizations,
And - Program evaluation is the tool for determining the effectiveness of programs which in turn determines the measure of success of the mission,
And - □ The leadership of the organization (Executive Director/CEO and Board of Directors) is bound to the covenant of the mission,
Then - The leadership of the organization (Executive Director/CEO and Board of Directors) is ethically responsible for having its programs evaluated in order to determine the level of impact on its consumers and the measure of success of the mission.

This theory has important implications for the academic study of philanthropy and for the practice of incorporating program evaluation into nonprofit management. Understanding the connections made in this theory will hopefully bridge the gap between efforts to satisfy an organization's mission and the lack of efforts to evaluate its programs. This can be attained when leadership realizes that evaluating programs helps fulfill the ethical covenant of the mission to the organization's stakeholders, especially the consumers of its programs. In addition, such an understanding will contribute to capacity building for program evaluation internally with staff and volunteers and externally with funding organizations. Lastly, it is the author's hope that this theory will prompt further research in the area of leadership's role in the capacity for program evaluation and a greater overall understanding of the importance of

evaluating human services programs.

Agnes, Michael ed. Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus. New York: MacMillan, 1996.

American Evaluation Association. About Us – News. Available on-line:
<http://www.eval.org/News/news.htm>

American Evaluation Association. The Guiding Principles for Evaluators. July, 2004.
Available on-line: <http://www.eval.org/Guiding%20Principles.htm>

American Evaluation Association. The Program Evaluation Standards. Available on-line:
<http://www.eval.org/EvaluationDocuments/progeval.html>

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. General Information. Available on-line:
<http://www.mellon.org/MellonGeneral.htm>

Aristotle. The Ethics of Aristotle – The Nicomachean Ethics. Translated by J.A.K. Thomson.
New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

Aristotle. "The Moral Virtues." Vice and Virtue in Everyday Life: Introductory Readings in
Ethics. ed. Christina Sommers and Fred Sommers. Orlando: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1993.

Association of Fundraising Professionals. The Accountable Nonprofit Organization. Available
on-line: http://www.afpnet.org/tier3_cd.cfm?folder_id=897&content_item_id=1072

Bausch, Thomas A. "Servant-Leaders Making Human New Models of Work and Organization,"
Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit and Servant Leadership. ed. Larry C. Spears. New
York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Alliance. BBB Wise Giving Alliance Standards for Charity
Accountability. Available on-line: <http://www.give.org/standards/newcbbbstds.asp>

Block, Stephen R. Why Nonprofits Fail: Overcoming Founder's Syndrome, Fundphobia, and
Other Obstacles to Success. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Bonnet, Deborah, Vice president for Evaluation at the Lumina Foundation. Interview by author,
25 October 2004, Indianapolis. Tape recording.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation – Vision. Available
on-line: <http://www.mott.org/about/vision.asp>

Community Foundation for the National Capital Region. Foundation Facts – Our Mission.
Available on-line: <http://www.cfncr.org/page13823.cfm>

Council on Foundations. National Standards for U.S. Community Foundations. Available on-
line: <http://bestpractices.cof.org/community/ListStandards.cfm>

Council on Foundations. Stewardship for Corporate Grantmakers. Available on-line:
http://www.cof.org/files/Documents/Corporate_Grantmaking/Corporate%20Principles/Corporate.pdf

David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Program Areas and Grantmaking.
<http://www.packard.org/index.cgi?page=program>

Decatur Cooperative Ministry. Decatur Cooperative Ministry News. Spring 2004, 1-8.

Denver Foundation. Our Mission. Available on-line:
<http://www.denverfoundation.org/page16375.cfm>

Drucker, Peter. Managing the Nonprofit Organization. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.

Eisenberg, Pablo. "Don't Cry for Thee, Foundations," Challenges for Nonprofits and Philanthropy: The Courage to Change. Lebanon, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 2004.

Forbes, Daniel P. "Measuring the Unmeasurable." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 27, no. 2 (June 1998): 183-202.

Foundation Center. Researching Philanthropy – Top 100 U.S. Foundations by Asset Size. Available on-line: http://fdncenter.org/research/trends_analysis/top100assets.html

Frumkin, Peter. "Good Performance is not Measured by Financial Data Alone." The Chronicle for Philanthropy, 30, May 2002, 38.

Gallagher, Brian. Restoring Faith in America's Charities: A Call for Accountability. (presented at a National Press Club Newsmaker Luncheon, Washington, DC, 22 November 2004), Washington, DC: Federal News Service. Available on-line:
<http://national.unitedway.org/content/file.cfm?articleid=100>

Girls, Inc. Learn About Us. Available on-line: <http://www.girlsinc.org/ic/page.php?id=1>

Goulet, Denis. Development Ethics. New York: The Apex Press, 1995.

Grace, Kay Sprinkel. The Nonprofit Board's Role in Setting and Advancing the Mission. Washington, DC: BoardSource, 2003.

Greater DesMoines Community Foundation. The Community Foundation – Our Mission. Available on-line: http://www.desmoinesfoundation.org/fn_main.asp

Harwood, Richard C.. "The Sustainable Nonprofit." Philanthropy News Digest. The Foundation Center, Available online: <http://fdcenter.org/pnd>

Hoefer, Richard. "Accountability in Action?" Nonprofit Management and Leadership 11, no.2 (winter 2000): 167-177.

Independent consulting firm (anonymous). Interview by author, 22 November 2004, Indianapolis. Tape recording.

Independent Sector. About Us: Who We Are. Available on-line:
<http://www.independentsector.org/about/about-is.htm>

Independent Sector. Statement of Values and Code of ethics for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Organizations. Available on-line:
http://www.independentsector.org/members/code_ethics.doc

Johnson, Craig E. Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

Johnstone, Ginette and Judith V. Waymire. What If...A Guide to Ethical Decision Making. Ontario, Canada: Johnstone Training and Consultation, 1992.

J. Paul Getty Trust. About the Grant Program – Mission. Available on-line:
<http://www.getty.edu/grants/program.html>

Kresge Foundation. 2003 Annual Report. Available on-line:
http://www.kresge.org/annual_report/2003ann_rep.pdf

Lumina Foundation for Education. About us – Mission. Available on-line:
http://www.luminafoundation.org/about_us/mission.html

Lumina Foundation for Education. About us – Mission. Available on-line:
http://www.luminafoundation.org/about_us/index.html

Lutheran Services in America. Affiliation with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Available on-line: <http://www.lutheranservices.org/Documents/SocialMinistryPartnership.pdf>

Lynch, Richard. Lead!: How Public and Nonprofit Managers can bring out the best in Themselves and their Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Mark, Melvin M., Gary T. Henry and George Julnes. Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding, and Improving Public and Nonprofit Policies and Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations. Standards for Excellence: An Ethics and Accountability Code for the Nonprofit Sector. Available on-line:
http://www.marylandnonprofits.org/html/standards/04_02.asp

Nanus, Bert and Stephen M. Dobbs. Leaders Who Make a Difference: Essential Strategies for Meeting the Nonprofit Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Newcomer, Kathryn E. "Using Performance Measurement to Improve Programs." New Directions for Evaluation 75 (fall, 1997) : 5-14.

Nicholson, Heather Johnston, Director of National Resource Center for Girls, Inc. Interview by author, 3 November 2004, Indianapolis. Tape recording.

Orange County Community Foundation. About OCCF – A Brief Snapshot. Available on-line: <http://www.oc-cf.org/Default.asp?Page=67>

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

Plantz, Margaret C., Martha Taylor Greenway, and Michael Hendricks. "Outcome Measurement: Showing results in the Nonprofit Sector." New Directions for Evaluation 75 (fall, 1997): 15-30.

Powell, James Lawrence. Pathways to Leadership: How to Achieve and Sustain Success. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Richard King Mellon Foundation. Funding Policy. Available on-line:
<http://fdncenter.org/grantmaker/rkmellon/policy.html>

Schallock, Robert L. *Outcome-Based Evaluation*. (New York: Plenum Press, 1995).

Sinclair, Matthew. "Former D.C. United Way Boss Pleads Guilty: Suer must repay the organization." *Nonprofit Times*, 1, April 2004, 6.

Smurl, James F. *A Primer in Ethics*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press, 1985.

Somerville, Bill. "A Judgment Call," a reader response to "Bring out the Outcomes." *Foundation News & Commentary*. March/April, 2003.

Stern, Gary J. *The Drucker Foundation Self-Assessment Tool: Process Guide*. New York: The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management, 1999.

United Way of America. *United Way Mission and Vision*. Available on-line:
<http://national.unitedway.org/aboutuw/mission.cfm>

United Way of America. *Outcome Measurement Resource Network*. Available on-line:
<http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/>

United Way of America. *Outcome Measurement Resource Network: Frequently Asked Questions*. Available on-line: <http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/faq.cfm#Q3>

Vann, Beth, Executive Director of Decatur Cooperative Ministry. Interview by author, 16 November 2004, Decatur, GA. Tape recording via telephone.

Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Wilensky, Ava S. and Carol D. Hansen. "Understanding the Work Beliefs of Nonprofit Executives Through Organizational Stories." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (fall 2001): 223-237.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. *Evaluation Toolkit – Toolkit Overview*. Available on-line:
<http://www.wkkf.org/Programming/Extra.aspx?CID=281&ID=2>

Wood, Roger, Manager of Product Development for United Way of America. Interview by author, Arlington, VA., 10 December 2004. Telephone with notes.

Paper Number: PA051266

Paper Title: Contracting Out Local Government Services to Nonprofit Organizations :Fiscal and Service Quality Implications

Author(s):

Hee Soun Jang, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Summary of Research

Description

Paper Number: PA051268

Paper Title: The Role of Religion in Fostering Civic Responsibility

Author(s):

Corwin E. Smidt, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Summary of Research

This paper seeks to examine the role of religion in fostering civic engagement in a more systematic and comprehensive fashion by: developing greater precision in specifying the relationship between religion and civic engagement, and confirming the existence of discernable patterns across a variety of studies rather than only within one such data source. The paper will investigate what facet(s) of religion is/are most important in fostering civic engagement and examine this matter through the analysis of relationships across a variety of national survey data files collected since 1990.

Description

Over the past decade, various scholarly studies on the civic engagement of Americans (e.g., Verba et al. 1995; Skocpol and Fiorina 1999; Putnam 2000) have revealed the important role that religion plays in such engagement. Roughly speaking, almost “half of all associational memberships in America are church related, half of all personal philanthropy is religious in character, and half of all volunteering occurs in a religious context” (Putnam 2000, 66). People are more likely to give money and time, even to secular efforts, if they are church members (Wuthnow 1996, 87; Campbell and Yonish 2003), and they are also significantly more likely to vote if they are church members (Wald, Kellstedt, & Leege 1993, 49). In fact, religion generally rivals education as a “powerful correlate of most forms of civic engagement” (Putnam 2000, 67), with religious involvement being one of the strongest factors contributing to both philanthropy and volunteering (Putnam 2000, 67).

Such studies—while important in establishing the relationship between religion and civic engagement—nevertheless suffer from several important problems. First, those studies analyzing the role of religion in fostering civic engagement have generally assessed religion’s role in a rather unsystematic fashion. Some have focused on church membership, others on church attendance, some on the salience of religion in one’s life, and still others on the religious tradition of one’s religious affiliation. What is needed, therefore, is a more systematic assessment of the various manifestations of religion and whether, and to what extent, such different facets of religion may relate to the shaping of civic engagement. In other words, what is it specifically about religion that contributes to civic engagement? Is it religious beliefs, religious commitment, religious networks, or some combination of such factors?

Second, these different facets of religion need to be examined in light of the various means by which civic engagement can occur (e.g., associational membership; volunteering, service, and philanthropy; and political participation). The same facet of religion (e.g., church attendance) may not necessarily relate identically to different manifestations of civic engagement, as different facets of religion may be linked in different ways to different manifestations of civic engagement. Consequently, not only is greater precision needed in terms of specification of the religion variable, but such an analysis needs to be conducted in light of the breadth by which civic engagement can be expressed.

And, finally, those studies that serve to document the role of religion in shaping civic engagement have been rather confined in their assessments. Each study, while important, has usually been based largely, if not exclusively, on one major survey conducted for some particular research project. As a result, no effort has been made to ascertain whether the particular patterns related to religion’s role in fostering civic engagement hold across various studies or whether they are simply unique to one particular study. Confirmation of patterns across a variety of studies is necessary to establish more firmly that religion plays an important role in fostering civic engagement.

Thus, the proposed paper seeks to conduct a more systematic assessment of the different facet(s) of religion and how each facet may (or may not) shape the different ways in which civic engagement may be manifested—and to ascertain whether any resultant patterns hold across a variety of studies. Not only will the proposed paper analyze religion and civic engagement in a more consistent fashion, but it do so based on a comparative assessment of the impact of religion on civic engagement across a variety of major data sources rather than one such major source.

Obviously, the analysis for this proposed paper reflects a major research effort—a much larger effort than is typically tied to a conference paper. Reviewers of this proposal might rightfully question whether what is proposed will likely be done, or stated somewhat differently, whether I can deliver on what I proposed to do in this paper. However, as the analysis proposed in this paper is tied to a research project that was recently funded by the Bradley Foundation, the analysis will be conducted regardless of whether or not this proposed paper is accepted. The proposed paper is simply a vehicle by which I am seeking to report on the findings related to this research effort.

Here is a listing of the national data files that will be examined for this paper in order to validate across different studies the specific nature of the relationship between different facets of religion and particular expressions of civic engagement:

1. The Religion and Public Life Survey, conducted in 2002 (N=2002)
2. The Third National Survey on Religion and Politics, conducted in 2000 (N=4000)
3. The Benchmark Survey of the Saguro Seminar, national random sample conducted in 2000 (N= 3000)
4. The General Social Survey of 1998 (N=2832)
5. Wuthnow's Civic Involvement Study, conducted in 1997 (N=1528)
6. God and Society in N. America, 1996 (N=3000 Amer, N=3000 Can.)
7. Verba, Schlozman, Brady, Civic Participation Study, 1990 (N=2515)

References

Campbell, David, and Steven Yonish. 2003. "Religion and Volunteering in America." Pp. 87-106 in Corwin Smidt, ed., *Religion as Social Capital: Producing the Common Good*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of America Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Skocpal, Theda, and Morris Fiorina. 1999. "Making Sense of the Civic Engagement Debate." Pp. 1-23 in Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina, eds., *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutional Press.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Schlozman, and Henry Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality. Civic Volunteerism in*

American Politics. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wald, Kenneth, David Leege, and Lyman Kellstedt. 1993. "Church Involvement and Political Behavior." Pp. 121-138 in David Leege and Lyman Kellstedt, eds., *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1996. *Learning to Care*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Paper Number: PA051271

Paper Title: The Growth of Donor Directed Giving: Revisiting the Social Relations of Philanthropy

Author(s):

Susan Ostrander, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Donor-centered philanthropy is organized around the needs and interests of donors (wealthy individuals or private foundations), and has arguably been the dominant philanthropic form in the U.S. for some time. This paper argues that a new dominant form has emerged over the past decade which the author calls donor-directed philanthropy. Foundations define activities and programs they want to support and make a grant to an organization with which they have an already-established "partnership." Philanthropic advisors counsel individual donors toward what they see as responsible and effective philanthropy.

Description

Some fifteen years ago, Paul Schervish and I conceptualized what we called a relational model of philanthropy (Ostrander and Schervish 1990). We argued that philanthropy at its best is organized around a reciprocal relationship between donor and recipient where both parties give and get, and where donors and grantees engage together in a negotiated mutuality. We contrasted this ideal relational form with donor-centered philanthropy, and with what we called needs-based philanthropy which could as well have been called grantee-centered philanthropy.

Donor-centered philanthropy is organized around the needs and interests of the donor, and has long been the dominant -- though by no means uncontested -- philanthropic form in the U.S. Charitable giving by wealthy individuals and most private foundations has centered on what those donors define, largely in isolation from any meaningful discussion or interaction with grantees, as important and useful to fund. Research on how and why the wealthy give has established that most charitable giving is to organizations and "causes" from which donors benefit directly or indirectly (Ostrander 1985, Odendahl 1990, Ostrower 1995).

This paper argues that a relatively new dominant philanthropic form has emerged over the past decade that goes beyond donor centered to what the author is calling donor directed. Here the donor not only independently defines what will and will not be funded based on donor interests and concerns, but the donor also assumes an on-going active and directive stance in relation to grantee programs and activities. This directive stance goes well beyond what Schervish and I defined earlier as "donor engagement" where donors have some on-going mutual and negotiated connection to grantees. Indeed, donor directed philanthropy is not unlike what Lester Salamon called "third party government" where states contract with nonprofits to carry out publically-defined state mandates, except here donors are "partnering" with grantees groups to carry out privately defined donor mandates.

Donor directed philanthropy is exemplified in several ways. Whereas it used to be common practice for foundations to widely circulate somewhat open requests for proposals within a given area, increasingly foundations simply define the programs and activities they wish to fund and award a grant to an organization with whom they already have a pre-established and on-going "partnership." The grantee "partner" typically has little to say about how the program is designed or what its goals are or how they are to be evaluated -- though they may be in genuine agreement with the foundation's priorities which is why they are selected for a grant!

Social entrepreneurship of a certain sort is another expression of donor-directed philanthropy. Here the donor adopts the almost-heroic entrepreneurial spirit of for-profit business emphasizing innovation, optimism, and a "can-do" attitude, and "investing" in some shiny new approach to previously intractable social problems. Certainly not all individuals or organizations who characterize themselves as social entrepreneurs run roughshod over grantee interests and concerns, and some even engage in the kind of genuine power-sharing over designing social projects that fit the ideal "relational" model of philanthropy that Schervish and I originally envisioned, I would argue that these are not the most typical.

This paper explores the origins, expressions, facilitators, and implications of donor directed

philanthropy. It contrasts these with kinds of philanthropic giving by both individuals and foundations that pose alternatives to donor directed philanthropy. Indeed, the paper argues that philanthropy has become contested terrain between those advocating that donors should be more directive as a condition of being responsible and effective, and those advocating for a more relational philanthropy where donor and grantees share power and where grantee knowledge is valued along with donor resources. "Evidence" for the arguments presented are based on a scan of existing literature on philanthropic trends and selected foundation websites; on-going conversations with current and past staff members of foundations, philanthropic advisors, and wealthy donors; plus the author's past and present active participation and ethnographic research observation in several alternative philanthropy organizations (Ostrander 1995, 1999, 2004).

Paper Number: PA051273

Paper Title: Exploring the Formation of Collaborative Relationships between Nonprofit and Public Organizations

Author(s):

Jessica Word, Florida State University, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

Summary of Research

This paper explores the formation of collaborative relationships between nonprofit organizations and public organizations using the lenses of strategic management and interorganizational relations literature. The research develops and tests empirical models of the factors that contribute to collaboration both between nonprofit organizations and between nonprofit organizations and governments.

Description

In recent years, the emphasis in governments has shifted from production of goods and services to greater levels of contracting with both private and nonprofit enterprises (Milward and Provan, 2000). This has led to an increasing number of nonprofits primarily dependent upon governments for financial support (Smith and Lipsky, 1993). However, the recent economic downturn has diminished government's resources for funding these activities while simultaneously constraining the other principal nonprofit revenue sources, philanthropic giving and user fees provided by nonprofit customers and clients.

Meanwhile, the authority extended to some nonprofits in these new relationships with governments break new ground, including increasing influence – for some nonprofits -- over the shape of public policy and the shape of government-nonprofit contracts. As these roles change and as resources become tighter, the competitive and political environment for service-providing nonprofits becomes more complex, inviting an array of new types of alliances between nonprofits and other organizations that they perceive as able to assist them in their strategic endeavors.

The increased involvement of the nonprofit sector in delivery of public services led many funding organizations to expect that nonprofits would work together and in conjunction with public agencies to deliver services. While some progress has been made into understanding the antecedents of collaboration between nonprofits and governments (Gazeley & Brudney, 2004), little is known about the factors that influence collaboration between nonprofit organizations or how these factors differ from those that influence collaboration with public organizations. The purpose of this research is to produce an empirical analysis that will help to illuminate the differences between these two phenomena.

This paper articulates and empirically tests two models of collaboration: 1) among nonprofit organizations and 2) between nonprofit organizations and public organizations. The study draws upon literature in the areas of sociology, management, and interorganizational relations. Both models explore key factors that have been related to the building of interorganizational relationships in both the public and private sectors to explore the reasons that nonprofit organizations collaborate. The factors explored include environmental conditions, organizational factors, and strategic interdependencies between organizations.

The paper employs an original data set collected in 2005 from 1,200 nonprofit organizations in 12 major metropolitan areas combined with data from the ICMA's Municipal Yearbook 2004, the NCCS data and the 2002 Census of governments. The survey asks about both the behavior of nonprofits in their collaborations with each other and their collaborative behavior with governments.

The paper uses the results of the two models to explore possible differences between these two phenomena and demonstrate the ways in which collaborations among nonprofits are different than those that cross sectors. The paper promotes a greater understanding of the importance of these

relationships for nonprofit organizations and the reason for their formation. In particular, it proposes a model of the formation of relationships that is unique to nonprofit organizations.

Paper Number: PA051274

Paper Title: Applying Microeconomic Theory to the Board-Executive Relationship in Human Service Organizations

Author(s):

Martha Golensky, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Summary of Research

Much has been written about the board-executive relationship in nonprofits, and yet, there is still a lack of consensus as to the real nature of the relationship. This paper applies stakeholder theory and the concept of incomplete contracts to increase our understanding of organizational leadership. A comparison is made between the findings of two research studies conducted a decade apart, to explore which ideas on the roles and responsibilities of boards and CEOs have endured over time and which have changed in response to the social and economic pressures of today's complex, ever-changing environment.

Description

1. Issue to be Addressed

Much has been written about the board-executive relationship, mostly from a normative perspective, and yet, there is still a lack of consensus as to the real nature of this relationship. Ideally, some believe, it should be a partnership (although not necessarily of equals). On the other hand, Carver (1997) suggests that the board must dictate the key policies of the organization, working with and through the CEO to achieve desired ends. A third perspective acknowledges the significant role of the executive in helping the board reach its full potential (Block, 1998; Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

Today, human service organizations (HSOs) operate in an ever-changing and highly complex environment characterized by "heightened demands for...services, higher expectations for accountability, and increased competition for funding (Edwards, Austin & Altpeter, 1998, p. 5). Perhaps more so than in the past, the contemporary pressures on HSOs to demonstrate both programmatic and fiscal accountability place an even greater level of responsibility on the leadership core—the board of directors and the chief executive officer—to position the organization for maximum effectiveness (Block, 2004).

Ensuring the wise use of resources in this time of government cutbacks and increased competition for the private dollar, of privatization and managed care, is a central concern of both internal and external stakeholders (Golensky, 2005, 2004). Even though it is clear in the corporate world that failing to realize anticipated profits can rupture the relationship between the board and executive, as the recent publicity surrounding the forced resignation of Hewlett-Packard's very visible CEO demonstrates, the nature of human service organizations sometimes obscures the fact that financial uncertainty can have the same impact in the nonprofit sector (Golensky, 1994). Therefore, gaining a better understanding of the nature of the board-executive relationship—the expectations on both sides of the equation and their implications for fulfilling the organizational mission—is a worthy objective.

2. Literature Review

This paper will draw on the literature relevant to the topic, including that addressing nonprofit board governance, leadership and decision making, fund development and fiscal management, and organizational effectiveness. However, two paradigms from the field of microeconomics will be featured, specifically stakeholder theory (Absuz & Webb, 1999) and the concept of incomplete contracts, which refers to forms of exchange in which certain aspects are unenforceable *ex post facto*. With such contracts, the laws, informal rules and conventions "that have evolved to cope with the resulting incentive problems will favor interactions that are personal, strategic, durable and in which both norms and the exercise of power play important roles" (Bowles, 2004, pp. 257-258). This

point seems to have clear applicability to nonprofits. (See list of references at the end of the proposal.)

3. □ Approach

□ The paper will take a comparative approach to the expectations of boards for their executives and vice versa by examining two data sets gathered a decade apart, to explore which ideas on respective roles and responsibilities have endured over time and which have changed, potentially in response to the social and economic pressures noted above.

The first data set comes from a grounded theory-based research study I conducted in 1991-1992 of four human service organizations located in small urban centers in the Northeast, in which the board-executive relationship was relatively stable, that is, no serious crisis was facing the leadership core; however, in each case, there were important issues on the table. The focus of this research was on the decision-making process; a survey of and interviews with key informants were two of the primary data collection methods. This project was replicated in 1995 by three two-person student teams under my direction. Three human service agencies in a mid-size Midwestern city were selected, using the same criteria as for the first phase of the study. From both study phases, there were 111 surveys returned, and 35 interviews were conducted (see details in Golensky, 1994, 1997).

The second data set was collected in 2002-2003. Here, the purpose was to identify the nature and scope of the management strategies adopted by leaders of HSOs in response to the changing environment and to examine the impact of these strategic decisions on organizational growth and decline as manifested through key stakeholder relationships. Working with the state association of nonprofits in California, Michigan and North Carolina, to achieve a quasi-national perspective, I chose a random sample of their membership lists of human service organizations. A survey was sent to the CEO of one hundred twenty-five (125) organizations in each state, representing about 17 percent of the association's direct service providers, for a total of 375. One hundred twelve (112) completed, usable surveys were received, for an overall response rate of 30 percent. Subsequently, from a pool of volunteers, CEOs and board leaders were interviewed in each state, for a total of 58 (see details in Golensky, 2004, 2005).

4. □ Contribution to the Field

As noted earlier, learning more about the nature of the board-executive relationship in human service organizations will add to the knowledge base regarding governance and management in this particular subsector of the nonprofit world and in the sector as a whole. The special twist of examining this relationship through the lens of microeconomics should offer some useful insights on contemporary leadership issues, especially in regard to the acquisition and use of resources.

References (Partial List)

- Abzug, R., & Webb, N. J. (1999). Relationships between nonprofits and for-profit organizations: A stakeholder's perspective. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(4), 416-431.
- Block, S. R. (1998). *Perfect nonprofit boards: Myths, paradoxes and paradigms*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster.
- Block, S. R. (2004). *Why nonprofits fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowles, S. (2004). *Microeconomics: Behavior, institutions, and evolution*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carver, J. (1997). *Boards that make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Edwards, R. L., Austin, D. M., & Altpeter, M. A. (1998). Managing effectively in an environment of competing values. In R. L. Edwards, J. A. Yankey, & M. A. Altpeter (Eds.), *Skills for effective*

management of nonprofit organizations (pp. 5-21). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Hart, O. (2003). Incomplete contracts and public ownership: Remarks and an application to public-private partnerships. *The Economic Journal*, 113, 69-76.

Herman, R. D. (2005). Board members of nonprofit organizations as volunteers. In J. L. Brudney (Ed.), *Emerging areas of volunteering (ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 77-91)*. ARNOVA: Indianapolis, IN.

Herman, R. D., & Heimovics, R. D. (1991). *Executive leadership in nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, T. P. (2002). Board accountability: Lessons from the field. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12(4), 409-428.

Golensky, M. (1994). *Governance and decision-making in nonprofit organizations: An exploration of the board-executive relationship*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.

Golensky, M. (2004). *Coping in a constrained economy: Survival strategies of nonprofit human service organizations*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Golensky, M. (2005, March). *The ties that bind: Exploring stakeholder relationships in human service organizations*. Paper presented at the 51st Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, New York.

Murray, V. (2004, November). *Prescriptive and research-based approaches to nonprofit boards: Linking parallel universes*. Paper presented at the ARNOVA Annual Conference, Los Angeles.

Tsui, M., Fernando, C. H., & Gellis, Z. D. (2004). In search of an optimal model for board-executive relationships in voluntary human service organizations. *International Social Work*, 47(2), 169-186.

Paper Number: PA051275

Paper Title: Congregations as Incubators of Service Organizations: Community Development Spin-offs in Three U.S. Cities

Author(s):

Nancy Kinney, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

Summary of Research

The paper reports findings from a study of community development “spin-off” organizations formed by religious congregations in three U.S. cities. A goal of the research is to identify contributing factors in the emancipation of service organizations from their parent, particularly those factors that may help the spin-off achieve subsequent stability and success. Structured by concepts drawn largely from the literature on commercial spin-offs, the study explores data along such dimensions as resource provision and acquisition, skills transfer, market familiarity, innovation, leadership development, and risk perception.

Description

Recent changes in U.S. public policy have emphasized the participation of religious and grass-roots groups in the revitalization and prosperity of local communities (Cohen & Jaeger, 1998). Many community development organizations, in particular those that provide services to the homeless, start out as initiatives of churches, synagogues, mosques and other houses of worship (Clay & Wright, 2000; Cnaan, 1997; Kretzmann, 2000). These organizations become autonomous, separate entities through a gradual “spin-off” process of emancipation. Despite the visibility of these groups in efforts to make communities stronger and more livable, there is little published research about this spin-off process, the reasons it occurs among religious groups and the relationship of assumed nurturance provided to fledgling organizations by the host or parent congregation. □

This paper will report findings from a project based on an exploratory non-experimental design that has studied community development “spin-off” organizations and their parent congregations in three U.S. cities. The research was funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and it focuses on organizations established to provide services to the homeless and others at risk of housing insecurity. A goal of the research has been to identify contributing factors in the emancipation of service organizations from their parent, particularly those factors that may help the spin-off achieve subsequent stability and success. Structured by concepts drawn largely from the literature on commercial spin-offs, the study explores data along such dimensions as resource provision and acquisition, skills transfer, market familiarity, innovation, leadership development, and risk perception. The paper cuts across a number of conference topics: in a general way, the paper relates to problem identification from the practitioner perspective and, more specifically, to the capacity of religiously tied nonprofits to constructively engage government during times of increased expectations. As a result, the paper will have special relevance for practitioners, from both the nonprofit and government sectors.

Clay, E., & Wright, E. (2000). Community-based economic development. In E. L. Queen II (Ed.), *Serving those in need: A handbook for managing faith-based human services organizations* (pp. 201-243). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Cohen, D., & Jaeger, A. R. (1998). *Sacred places at risk: New evidence on how endangered older churches and synagogues serve communities*. Philadelphia, PA: Partners for Sacred Places.

Kretzmann, J. P. (2000). Congregations and communities working together. In E. L. Queen II (Ed.), *Serving those in need: A handbook for managing faith-based human services organizations* (pp. 45-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paper Number: PA051277

Paper Title: The Collaboration between Advocates and Researchers in Phronetic Social Science: A Case Study

Author(s):

Roland Stahl, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA, USA

Corey Shdaimah, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA, USA

Summary of Research

In this paper we use the collaboration formed between a local advocacy group and academic researchers as a case study to highlight what Bent Flyvbjerg (2001) calls “phronetic social science”. In-depth interviews conducted with stakeholders involved with our research reveal that in a phronetic setting researchers are able to increase the understanding of a problem both by providing a rigorous description as well as an analysis of the values that frame the perception of the problem. Advocates, on the other hand are able to press the researchers to consider specific political and socio-economic realities on the ground.

Description

This paper will focus on issues related to a successful collaboration between policy advocates and social scientists. The authors of this paper participated in a research project contracted by the Women’s Community Revitalization Project (“WCRP”), a local advocacy group in Philadelphia, in order to study home repair and maintenance issues affecting low income homeowners. In this paper, we use the collaboration formed between WCRP and the academic research team as a case study designed to highlight “phronetic social science” as described in Bent Flyvbjerg’s *Making Social Science Matter* (2001). Flyvbjerg uses the term phronesis – introduced originally by Aristotle – to argue that social scientists should prioritize the study of value rationality over instrumental rationality. Phronetic knowledge is practical knowledge and as such distinct from epistemic (theoretical) and technical knowledge. Our analysis shares Flyvbjerg’s assumption that “[...] the principle objective for social science with a phronetic approach is to carry out analyses and interpretations of the status of values and interests in society aimed at social commentary and social action, i.e. praxis” (p. 60).

Applying a phronetic framework to our analysis enables us to examine a number of tensions that social science researchers who collaborate with advocacy groups frequently face but rarely articulate. We focus in particular on Flyvbjerg’s claim that in order for the work of social science researchers to be relevant to the communities in and with which they work, social scientists should not pretend that value questions can be ignored when doing empirical research. We argue that they should in fact go further and to consciously and explicitly develop the value premises of the social phenomena studied. An important consequence of such an approach to doing social science is that scientists can no longer credibly claim that they are above the fray of political interests as suggested by the methodological canon in the social sciences. Rather, we maintain that social scientists need to acknowledge the interests of and actively enter into dialogue with other stakeholders concerned with particular social phenomena or problems. Applying phronetic principles thus raises questions about the relationship between social scientists and the public sphere.

In this paper we will present preliminary findings from an analysis of in-depth interviews conducted with all the relevant stakeholders involved with our study. In these interviews we asked our interviewees to specifically reflect and assess the collaboration between advocates and researchers in our study. All stakeholders were interviewed after completion of the original study. Based on our interviews we will argue that scientists increase understanding of a problem by providing a rigorous description of the problem and by analyzing the values that frame the perception of the problem and its solution. Advocates, for their part, force the scientists to consider political and socio-economic realities on the ground. This helps scientists to remain connected with the specific social problem they study. We argue that it is this type of collaboration that produces social science that matters even as it engenders a number of problems regarding the specific roles of advocates and researchers.

Bibliography

Adams-Miller, Michelle (2002) *Owning Up: Poverty Assets, and the American Dream*. The Brookings Institution

Bush, George W., Radio Address by the President to the Nation, Saturday, June 9, 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010608-7.html>

Campbell, Donald T. (1975), "Degrees of Freedom in the Case Study," *Comparative Political Studies* 8:1, 179.

Denton, Nancy A. (2001) *Housing as a Means of Asset Accumulation: A Good Strategy for the Poor?*, in Shaprio, Thomas M. and Wolff, Edward N., eds. *Assets for the Poor: The Benefits of Spreading Asset Ownership*, New York, NY: Russel Sage Foundation, pp. 232-268

Feldman, Leonard (2004) *Citizens Without Shelter: Homelessness, Democracy, and Political Exclusion*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Flyvbjerg, Bent (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it Can Succeed Again*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geertz (1973). *Thick Description. Toward and Interpretive Theory of Culture*. In "The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. Pp. 28-29.

Gilens, Martin (1999) *Why Americans Hate Welfare. Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hillier, Amy, and Culhane Dennis (2003), *Closing the GAP: Housing (Un)Affordability in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Cartographic Modeling Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania,).

Reid, Carolina Katz (2004) *Achieving the American Dream? A Longitudinal Analysis of the Homeownership Experiences of Low-Income Households* (Seattle: Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology, University of Washington, Working Paper 04-04, April, 2004).

Retsinas, Nicolas P. and Eric S. Belsky, eds.(2002). *Low-Income Homeownership: Examining the Unexamined Goal*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Rohe, William M., Shannon Van Zandt and George McCarthy. 2002 *Homeownership and Access to Opportunity*. *Housing Studies*. 17(1) 51-61

Shapiro, Ian (2002) "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, Or: What's Wrong with Political Science and What to do About It," *Political Theory* 30, 4 (August 2002): 596-619.

Shdaimah, Corey, Roland Stahl and Sanford Schram (2004) *Low-Income Home Repair Policies in Philadelphia: Addressing Severe Home Repair Problems*. Preliminary report prepared for the Women's Community Revitalization funded by the William Penn Foundation, <http://www.brynmawr.edu/Acads/GSSW/schram/wcrpreport/wcrpreport091304.doc>

Schram, Sanford (2002) *Praxis for the Poor: Piven and Cloward and the Future of Social Science in Social Welfare*. New York: New York University Press.

Schram, Sanford (forthcoming) *Recommodified Discourse: The Limits of the Asset-Building Approach to Fighting Poverty in Did Somebody Say Dependency?: The Globalization of Welfare Policy Discourse*

Schram, Sanford F. (2004) "Beyond Paradigm: Resisting the Assimilation of Phronetic Social Science," *Politics & Society* 32, 3 (September 2004): 417-433.

Shlay, Ann (2004) *Low-Income Homeownership: American Dream or Delusion*, a paper presented at the 2004 Annual Meetings of the Urban Affairs Association in Washington, D.C.

Shlay, Anne B. and Gordon Whitman (2004). *Research For Democracy: Linking Community Organizing And Research To Leverage Blight Policy* <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/papers.htm>

Smith, Rogers M. (2002) "Should We Make Political Science More of a Science or More about Politics?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35, 2 (June 2002): 199-201.

Toulmin, Stephen (2001) *Return to Reason* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

□Weber, Max (1918/1946) *Science as a Vocation*, a speech given at Munich University in 1918, published in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Translated and edited), *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, pp. 129-156, New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Paper Number: PA051282

Paper Title: Does Identity Matter? Examining the Role of Faith and Ethnicity for Voluntary Agencies in International Development

Author(s):

Shawn Flanigan, SUNY Albany, Albany, NY, USA

Summary of Research

Using data for approximately 800 nonprofit organizations registered with USAID, this paper will examine the degree to which religious and ethnic identity influence where organizations provide services, the types of services provided, and the type of population served. The paper then will consider the role of public funding as a moderator variable in these relationships.

Description

Recent policy initiatives have heralded the benefits of government contracting with faith-based voluntary organizations, generating debates surrounding the role that religion plays in service provision (Chaves, 2002). Such initiatives also have targeted government-sponsored international development, with United States Agency for International Development (USAID) mandated to increase collaboration with faith-based organizations (White House, 2002). Meanwhile, scholars also note that nonprofit organizations may have certain advantages when working with minority groups; policy makers suggest that organizations with faith or ethnic identities possess advantages as service providers due to greater solidarity with their clientele (Monsma, 1996). While both policy makers and scholars posit a relationship between identity and service provision by nonprofit organizations, only a small number of empirical studies have been conducted, and the results of these studies provide conflicting support for this claim (Cnaan 2001; Pipes & Ebaugh 2002; Reese & Shields, 2000). Additionally, there is conflicting evidence regarding the influence of public funding on service provision by faith-based and other voluntary agencies (Monsma, 1996; Reese & Shields, 2000). Meanwhile, the vast majority of research on these topics focuses on organizations operating within the United States, in spite of evidence that the nonprofit sector operates differently in the developing world (Anheier & Salamon, 1998; Clark, 1991; Fisher, 1998)

This paper will present results of a statistical analysis aimed at exploring the relationship between religious/ethnic identity and service provision by international voluntary agencies, and the degree to which public funding moderates this relationship. The analysis will use data from USAID's VolAg Reports for the years 1998-2005, which contain financial data and organizational descriptions for approximately 800 voluntary organizations seeking financial partnerships with USAID. These organizations engage in development work in more than 160 countries. In order to determine the relationship between identity and service provision, these variables will be measured through a content analysis of organizational descriptions. Organizations will be coded as either faith-based, ethnically identified, or as neither as a means of contrasting these three groups of nonprofits. Faith-based organizations also will be coded by denomination and ethnically identified organizations will be coded by ethnicity in order to determine differences that may exist within this category. Service provision will be coded using the schema set forth by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (Salamon et al, 2004). In order to determine the effect of public funding, I will consider total dollars of public funding, dollars of funding from specific sources, and the ratio of the organization's budget that comes from public sources. Data will be analyzed with structural equation models, using both full information estimation and limited information estimation techniques.

Anheier, H. & Salamon, L. (1998). *The Nonprofit Sector in the Developing World*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Chaves, M. (2002). Religious Organizations: Data Resources and Research Opportunities *American Behavioral Scientist*; Jun2002, Vol. 45 Issue 10, p1523, 27p

Clark, J. (1991). *Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Cnaan, R. & Boddie, S. Philadelphia Census of Congregations and Their Involvement in Social Service Delivery. *Social Service Review* 75(4): 559-580.

Fisher, J. (1998). *Non Governments: NGOs and the Political Development of the Third World*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Monsma, S. (1996). *When Sacred & Secular Mix: Religious Nonprofit Organizations and Public Money*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Pipes, P. & Ebaugh, H. (2002). Faith-Based Coalitions, Social Services, and Government Funding. *Sociology of Religion* 63(1): 49-68.

Reese, L. & Shields, G. (2000). Faith-based Economic Development. *Policy Studies Review* 17(2/3): 84-103.

Salamon, L.M. & Sokolowski, S.W. (2004) *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, Volume Two Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2004

White House (2002). Executive Order: Responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development with Respect to faith-based and community initiatives. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/20021212-5.html>

Paper Number: PA051286

Paper Title: Evaluation, Outcomes and Image at United Way

Author(s):

Jill A. Shannon, University of Minnesota, Stillwater, MN, USA

Summary of Research

The promise of a better society through reason and scientific knowledge is a core belief underlying our thinking about evaluation in public policy and organizational practice – a value that resounds through philanthropic funders' current calls for effective practice. This paper takes an alternate view. By exploring why one United Way redefined its evaluation policies over forty-years (1960-2000), it concludes that this United Way's attention to evaluation was more tied to its efforts to capture donors' attention and contributions than making socially-relevant allocation decisions or promoting effective nonprofit practice. This conclusion broadens and re-conceptualizes our understanding of evaluation's social role.

Description

Several commonly accepted assumptions underscore our thinking about evaluation in public policy or organizational practice: evaluation provides scientifically derived knowledge to inform decision making; factual data stands at the basis of rational judgment; and efforts to determine merit are tied to a vision of stronger and more effective programs (Shadish, Cook and Leviton 1991). The promise of a better society through reason and scientific knowledge thus stands as a core belief in our everyday discourse about program evaluation (Schwandt 1992) – a value that is heartily advocated in public policy, advanced in government requirements or regularly echoed in "how-to" evaluation manuals and "best practice" guides. Moreover, in the current climate of nonprofit accountability, it is the value that resounds through philanthropic funders' repeated calls for outcome evaluation and effective practice.

This paper takes an alternate view. Specifically, it draws on my dissertation research which explored the motives and rationale behind why one United Way moved to outcomes accountability in the mid 1990s. Rather than seeing evaluation as a methodological act tied to notions of purposive rationality or social betterment, I framed evaluation as a social institution embedded in regulatory practice (Schwandt 1997) and sought to understand how pressures in United Way's institutional environment and influences from its donors and agencies (DiMaggio and Powell 1993; Ostrander and Shervish 1990), shaped United Way's criteria and practices for evaluating agency performance. Drawing evidence from thousands of documents and interviews, I looked at changes in one United Way's funding requirements over a forty-year period (1960-2000). I conclude that changes in United Way's evaluation requirements were more directly motivated by United Way's efforts to secure donors confidence and justify its relevance at a moment where donor support was threatened, than in actually making rational allocation decisions or in promoting the benefits of program improvement as it claimed to its funded agencies.

This study is significant as it both reconceptualizes and broadens our understanding of evaluation in nonprofit funding requirements. By drawing our attention away from evaluation's rational benefits, it shows how evaluation is a social and historical phenomenon shaped by changing notions of worth, by the parties that define what is appropriate knowledge, and by the social influences that either counter or reason for evaluation in organizational practice.

Such analysis has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to emerging discussion in organizational theory that focuses on how notions of effectiveness are socially constructed (Forbes 1998; Herman and Renz 1999). This study shows how such notions change over time subject to the influence of external dynamics.

Practically, it provides a new means to critically explore funders' growing attention to evaluation and

effectiveness. Currently, in a society that values scientific knowledge and a belief in social betterment such knowledge promises, any effort to question this prevailing practice are often overlooked or silenced. By considering the pressures and constraints to which funders might be responding, this research offers a new analytical lens to examine a widespread phenomenon and by extension, might shed light on the little-understood world of philanthropic funding policy and funder-grantee relations.

WORKS CITED

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Journal* 48:147-160.

Forbes, Daniel P. 1998. Measuring the unmeasurable: Empirical studies of nonprofit organizational effectiveness from 1977 to 1997. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27:183-202.

Herman, Robert D., and David O. Renz. 1999. Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28: 107-126.

Ostrander, Susan A., and Paul G. Schervish. 1990. Giving and getting: Philanthropy as a social relation. In *Critical issues in American philanthropy: Strengthening theory and practice*, ed. J. V. Till, et al., 67-98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwandt, Thomas A. 1992. Better living through evaluation? Images of progress shaping evaluation practice. *Evaluation Practice* 13 (2): 135-144.

Schwandt, Thomas A. 1997. Whose interests are being served? Program evaluation as a conceptual practice of power. In *Evaluation and the postmodern challenge*, ed. L. Mabry, 89-104. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

Shadish William R., Thomas D. Cook and Laura C. Leviton. 1991. *Foundations in Program Evaluation: Theories of Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paper Number: PA051293

Paper Title: Continuity and Change across Regimes: The Case of the Czech Union for the Protection of Nature

Author(s):

JoAnn Carmin, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA

Deborah Balsler, University of Missouri - St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

Petr Jehlicka, Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom

Summary of Research

How did socialist controlled civic associations manage to survive the political and economic transitions associated with the fall of communism? To address this question, we conducted depth interviews with representatives from the Czech Union for the Protection of Nature (CSOP), a conservation organization in the Czech Republic that has endured since 1979. While CSOP's structure has changed, its core aims and environmental values not only remained consistent over time, but shaped practices as the organization navigated the transition. The findings suggest that tight coupling between values and action may enhance survival in turbulent times.

Description

In 1989, the overthrow of the communist regime in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) set in motion a transition to a free-market economy and a democratic system of governance. In the months and years that followed, constitutional and administrative provisions restored numerous freedoms, including the opportunity to form and participate in civic associations. Environmental activism played an important role in civil unrest and mobilization in the late 1980s. As a result, the transition from communism to democracy was accompanied by sweeping environmental reforms, including the development of new environmental institutions and policies (Sloccock, 1996; Tickle & Vavrousek, 1998; Waller & Millard, 1992). With the emergence of an independent civil society, communist controlled organizations associated with environmental and conservation issues either disbanded or found ways to continue their activities in the emerging socio-political context (Jancar-Webster, 1998; Jehlicka, 2001; Vanek, 1996). This raises an important question: How do civic associations and other types of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) survive significant social, political, and economic change?

In democratic nations, such as those in CEE, civil society organizations are empowered to engage in activities and assume a range of responsibilities based on the assumption that they provide a voice for their constituents and address issues of public concern (Cohen and Arato, 1992). As they pursue these aims, they also must satisfy requirements imposed by the state and by funders, conform to national and international standards, adhere to professional norms, and meet societal expectations. According to neo-institutional theory, these types of external pressures lead organizations to adapt their structures so that they are aligned with the broader rules and norms, even though these structures may neither facilitate nor be indicative of their core practices (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan 1977; Scott 1995). Although the impact of institutional change and the resultant pressures has been considered in numerous contexts (e.g., Fligstein & Mara-Drita, 1996; Ruef & Scott, 1998; Sutton & Dobbin, 1996), little attention has been directed to NGOs and how they have managed to survive in transition countries. Moreover, since neo-institutional approaches tend to focus on the impact of structural forces, they give only scant attention to the ways that the values and aims that are central to NGOs affect their practices.

To understand how NGOs cope with significant transitions, we studied the Czech Union for the Protection of Nature (CSOP), a conservation organization in the Czech Republic that has endured since 1979. We conducted ten depth interviews with members of the organization's governing council, with each being in office for one or more time periods from shortly before the fall of the communist regime through to the present. The interviews examined practices, structure, and agenda in each time period as well as explored interpretations of the institutional environment, resource availability, core values, and leadership. All of the interviews were taped and the tapes were transcribed. The interviews conducted in Czech were translated into English. We also collected and evaluated organizational

documents.

We find that although CSOP went through a period of decline immediately following regime change, it is now a stable and growing organization. As suggested by neo-institutional theory, it appears that this was accomplished by altering the structure to be more closely aligned with the economic and political context. In the past, CSOP was supported by the state. Since there is limited history of dues paying membership, local chapters have become entrepreneurial, developing fee-based outdoor programs for adults and youth, forging ties to international donors so that they have resources to implement sustainable development initiatives, and receiving government grants in return for conservation and environmental management activities. Just as financial support has been achieved by engaging market forces, internal administrative practices also have been aligned with the broader institutional context by becoming more democratic. Though CSOP's structure has changed, its core aims and environmental values not only have remained consistent over time, but shaped practices as the organization coped with the transition and navigated a dynamic institutional environment. These patterns suggest that although structure and action are decoupled in many organizations, a tight alignment between values and action may be a factor that enhances survival in turbulent times.

References

- Cohen, Jean and Andrew Arato. 1992. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- DiMaggio, Paul and Walter Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.
- Fligstein, Neil and Iona Mara-Drita. 1996. "How to Make a Market: Reflections on the Attempt to Create a Single Market in the European Union." *American Journal of Sociology*, 102: 1-33.
- Jancar-Webster, Barbara. 1998. "Environmental Movements and Social Change in the Transition Countries. In S. Baker and P. Jehlicka (eds.), *Dilemmas of Transition: The Environment, Democracy, and Economic Reform in East Central Europe* (pp. 69-90). London: Frank Cass.
- Jehlicka, Petr. 2001. "The New Subversives - Czech Environmentalism After 1989." In H. Flam (ed), *Pink, Purple, Green: Women's, Religious, Environmental and Gay/Lesbian Movements in Central Europe Today* (pp. 81-94). Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowen. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2): 340-363.
- Ruef, Martin and W. Richard Scott. 1998. "A Multidimensional Model of Organizational Legitimacy: Hospital Survival in Changing Institutional Environment." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 877-904.
- Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Slocock, Brian. 1996. "The Paradoxes of Environmental Policy in Eastern Europe: The Dynamics of Policy-Making in the Czech Republic." *Environmental Politics*, 5(3): 501-521.
- Sutton, John R. and Frank Dobbin. 1996. "The Two Faces of Governance: Responses to Legal Uncertainty in U.S. Firms, 1955 to 1985." *American Sociological Review*, 61(5): 794-811.
- Tickle, Andrew and Josef Vavrousek. 1998. "Environmental Politics in the Former Czechoslovakia." In Tickle, Andrew and Ian Welsh (eds.), *Environment and Society in Eastern Europe*. Essex: Longman.
- Vanek, Miroslav. 1996. *Nedala se tady dychat*. Praha: Ustav pro soudobe dejiny AV CR.
- Waller, Michael and Frances Millard. 1992. "Environmental Politics in Eastern Europe." *Environmental Politics*, 1(2): 159-185.

Paper Number: PA051294

Paper Title: Organizational Identity Wars: Coping With Ambiguous Threats From Within

Author(s):

Deborah Balsler, University of Missouri - St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

JoAnn Carmin, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Organization members interpret and respond to both clear and ambiguous identity threats. Data from two environmental organizations demonstrate a clear threat in Greenpeace and an ambiguous threat in Friends of the Earth (FOE). In Greenpeace, members agreed that a proposal to alter its tactics violated organizational core values; the proposal was rejected. In FOE, members had varying interpretations of tactic change proposals, which led to protracted conflict. Results suggest that members of nonprofits need to clearly understand the organization's identity and core values in order to promote a common basis for evaluating change proposals and to deter destructive conflict.

Description

Organization identity is the set of features that members understand to be central, distinctive, and enduring in an organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985). This identity, however, can be threatened when members perceive that the value or importance of an organization's central and distinctive features is being challenged (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). Previous research has examined how organizations interpret and respond to identity threats when they come from the external environment (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Elsbach & Sutton, 1992). Identity threats may also emerge from within the organization itself. For example, threats occur when members violate core values and behaviors associated with particular organization roles (Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997). In each of the cases examined in extant research, the identity threat was clear; members recognized and agreed that a particular action or behavior violated what organization members valued. In contrast to clear violations of organization identity, however, threats may also be relatively ambiguous - members have varying interpretations of a particular action or behavior. Though studies suggest that members take action to protect their identity and reduce conflict when clear threats emerge (Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997; Elsbach & Sutton, 1992), it is unclear how they cope when faced with ambiguous threats. In this paper, we compare how organization members respond when they encounter clear versus ambiguous identity threats.

Advocacy and social change organizations rely on a repertoire of tactics to achieve their goals. Tactics are meaningful, not only because of their role in goal achievement, but also because they are an expression of and a means of reinforcing the core values and beliefs of members (Carmin & Balsler, 2002). In other words, tactics are an integral component of a nonprofit's organization identity. Therefore, when a change in a tactical repertoire is proposed, members need to interpret whether the proposed tactic is consistent with, or violates, the organization's identity and underlying core values.

To examine how organization members interpret and respond to identity threats stemming from proposed tactical changes, we studied two environmental organizations: Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace. Both organizations had to contend with proposed changes to their tactics at approximately the same point in time, but they had different reactions and outcomes. Data for the two case studies come from semi-structured, in-depth interviews conducted with 14 representatives from Friends of the Earth and 15 representatives from Greenpeace. These individuals included original founders, organization leadership, members of the board of directors, and staff. Interviews ranged from one to three hours in length, averaging 90 minutes.

Our data show that in the case of Greenpeace, the interpretation of a proposal for tactical change was clear; a member suggested the use of violence, which directly violated a core value of the organization. The proposal for change was rejected. In Friends of the Earth, however, there was less agreement about whether the proposal for change conformed to or violated the organization's identity and core values. Friends of the Earth pursued its goals using a variety of tactics, including the use of lobbying, electoral politics, and grassroots activism. When the members in the Washington DC office suggested moving the organization's headquarters to DC in order to emphasize beltway activism, the

result was widespread and protracted conflict. These initial results suggest that nonprofit organizations need to ensure that members clearly understand the organization's identity and core values in order to promote a common basis for evaluating change proposals and to keep conflict from having destructive consequences for the organization.

References

Albert, S. & D. Whetten. 1985. "Organizational identity." In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Shaw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. 263-295.

Carmin, J. & D. B. Balse. 2002. "Selecting repertoires of action in environmental movement organizations: An interpretive approach." *Organization & Environment*, 15(4): 365-388.

Elsbach, K.D. & R.M. Kramer. 1996. "Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering business week rankings." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3): 442-476.

Elsbach, K.D. & R.I. Sutton. "Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories." *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(4): 699-738.

Golden-Biddle, K. & H. Rao. 1997. "Breaches in the boardroom: Organizational identity and conflicts of commitment in a nonprofit organization." *Organization Science*, 8(6): 593-611.

Paper Number: PA051295

Paper Title: Making Space for Non-Profits: Practitioners Advocate, Promote, & Build Quality Workplace Environments

Author(s):

Diane Vinokur-Kaplan, Nonprofit & Public Management Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

China Brotsky, Tides, Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA

Shelley Hamilton, MarinSpace, San Rafael, CA, CA, USA

Summary of Research

Nonprofit personnel need stable, mission-enhancing workplaces in which to perform their activities, but such buildings and infrastructure are not always available. Two practitioners and an academic present: (1) Contemporary demands that nonprofits face, (including aging infrastructure, new technology, and rising rents); (2) The new, national membership network organization developed to educate and counsel nonprofits regarding space and infrastructure needs; and (3) Specific examples of newly developed buildings that improve nonprofits' productivity, morale, and public image. Particular attention is paid to co-locating nonprofits together to obtain benefits of sustainable, collegial environments, shared services, and economies of scale.

Description

Making Space for Non-Profits:
Practitioners Advocate, Promote, & Build Quality Workplace Environments

This paper addresses the following conference priority: The role of nonprofit practitioners in identifying, addressing, and advocating for policies and programs that address problems they deal with on the front line

THE PROBLEM OR ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED

□ Little attention has been paid to the need for nonprofit personnel to have a stable, mission-enhancing workplace in which to do their work, regardless if they are staff, clients, boards, or other volunteers. For example, most nonprofit management texts and guides do not contain much content on the development, finance, and management of facilities and workspaces, even though many nonprofit managers and boards face these very issues. This oversight is unfortunate for several reasons:

(1) □ Facilities represent a large proportion of nonprofits' budgets: After the cost of personnel, the most expensive item in most nonprofits' budgets is occupancy/rent. In a time of constricted resources, any ways to better control these costs should be welcomed.

(2) □ Crumbling, Outmoded Infrastructures Impede Mission Accomplishment: Many nonprofits' worksites are in need of maintenance or renovation and technological updating. Some reside in historic structures that provide special challenges for public accessibility and thus impede mission accomplishment.

(3) □ Rising energy costs and Environmental Awareness Required Attention: Nonprofits, like other business or homes, must contend with rising energy costs. Many also wish to have "greener", sustainable facilities (cf. Kresge Foundation).

(4) □ Future Personnel will need quality workspace to meet nonprofits' challenges: at a time when the nonprofit sector is being asked to do more than ever, this

possible aid to productivity should not be overlooked. Also, the reported upcoming retirement of many executive directors foreshadows new challenges to recruit and develop a new cadre of management leadership who expect modern accommodations.

THE TOPIC'S RELATION TO THE STATE OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD (INCLUDING RELEVANT LITERATURE)

Academics in organizational sciences, environmental psychology, and engineering have widely demonstrated the beneficial effects of appropriate workplaces on decision-making and reduced stress levels, (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1983, Kaplan, Kaplan & Ryan, 1998), as well as preventing worker job dissatisfaction (e.g., Herzberg's 1959 Two Factor Theory of Hygiene and Motivation).

Yet it has not drawn much attention in the academic nonprofit literature. One exception is Gronbjerg's surveys of Chicago nonprofits (1992), which roughly estimated that "Illinois nonprofit human service organizations own or use more than 110million square feet of space (p. 35), the majority of which is owned by the organizations themselves (p. 36). More than half the organizations reported building maintenance or improvement needs (p. 46), with such needs "most prevalent among residential/institutional care and social service organizations" (p. 47).

Indeed, attention to the need for nonprofits to have quality work environments has come strongly from practitioners (e.g. Brotsky, 2004, Brotsky & Hamilton, 2005; Girvan, 2004; Hutchinson, 1999) and reports for public officials (e.g., Hurley, 2000). This need has also been noted in the recent growth of community development financial institutions (CDFIs), such as the Nonprofit Finance Fund, that seek to address the many capital needs nonprofits face by making loans for facility projects, and for other growth-related needs, such as working capital.

THE APPROACH

□ This presentation will highlight practitioners' important roles in identifying the issue of quality work environments for the nonprofit sector. Two of the presenters are practitioners who are nationally known for their expert advocacy, promotion, and implementation of policies and programs that address these problems. They have been the key players in the creation of a national network organization of concerned nonprofit professionals, which provides education and training to nonprofit leadership from across the country. This Nonprofit Centers Network has focused especially on the benefits and challenges that nonprofits face in acquiring and managing shared, co-located space and services. They are currently collaborating with the third presenter, an academic, to further disseminate their findings.

The session will include:

- (1) an overview of the research on nonprofits' facility needs and the broad forces contributing to them, and recent survey data on the key topics of concern to nonprofit leaders regarding facilities (the academic);
- (2) Examples of sophisticated, successful responses to provide quality workspace, collegial environments for non-profits (Practitioner #1); and
- (3) Recent lessons learned from innovative quality nonprofit work environments that a local organization is now developing (Practitioner #2, the Executive Director of this organization).

THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD OF THIS WORK

□ This work will alert the field to include buildings and physical infrastructure in the current overall discussion of nonprofit capacity-building, in which these aspects have been missing. This presentation will specifically illuminate: (1) the needs and possibilities for quality work environments for various types of nonprofits; (2) the types of new professional resources and advisors to which space-challenged nonprofits can turn; (3) the ongoing accomplishments that various nonprofit practitioners in the field have instigated to implement the kind of quality workspaces that nonprofits deserve to do their public benefit work.

References

Brotsky, China (2004). Shared Spaces: Multi-tenant Centers are Making Rents More Affordable for Nonprofits. The Grantsmanship Center Magazine, Fall, 2004 (<http://www.tgci.com/magazine/04fall/spaces1.asp>. accessed April 4, 2005).

Brotsky, C. and Hamilton, S. (2005) Interviewed in Innovative Solutions: Housing Nonprofits Together. Earned Income Strategies for Multi-Tenant Nonprofit Centers (MTNCs). Social Enterprise Reporter, March.

Girvan, L. (2004). Innovations in Workspace for the Nonprofit Sector: A Study of Multi-tenant Nonprofit Centers. San Francisco, CA: Nonprofit Centers Network. <http://www.nonprofitcenters.org/resources/iwns.php>

Gronbjerg, Kirsten A. et al. (1992). Nonprofit Human Service Facilities in Illinois: Structure, Adequacy, and Management. Report prepared for the Illinois Facilities Fund. Chicago, IL: Department of Sociology-Anthropology, Loyola University of Chicago.

Herzberg, F. An Interview with Frederick Herzberg: Managers or Animal Trainers? Management Review, 1971, pp. 2-5.

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

Hutchinson, K (1999). Getting It Together: Collaboration Models for Community Groups. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: Community Agency Partnership Project, BC Council for Families (email: bccf@istrar.ca).

Kaplan, Stephen & Kaplan, Rachel. (1983). Cognition and Environment: Functioning in an Uncertain World. Ann Arbor, MI: Ulrich's Bookstore.

Kaplan, Rachel, Kaplan, Stephen, and Ryan, Robert L. 1998. With People in Mind: Design and Management of Everyday Nature. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Kresge Foundation. The Green Building Initiative. <http://www.kresge.org/initiatives/index.htm> (accessed April 4, 2005).

Nonprofit Finance Fund. <http://www.nonprofitfinancefund.org/details.asp?autold=5>.

(accessed April 4, 2005).

Paper Number: PA051296

Paper Title: Dealing With Stakeholders: Nonprofit Sector Leadership Development in Two Postsocialist Countries

Author(s):

Joanne M. Coury, University at Buffalo - SUNY, Buffalo, NY, USA

Sinisa Zrinscak, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

Bojana Mesec, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Ann Dill, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

Summary of Research

Previous research has shown NPS organizational leadership to be a crucial aspect in the social construction of organizational legitimacy in the post-socialist context. Yet, we know little about how nonprofit sector leadership is developing in these countries. We examine the scope and forms of stakeholder management activity by executive directors in NP welfare organizations in Croatia and Slovenia. We assess relevant leadership skills that have an impact on congruence of interests and therefore, on perspectives of both stakeholders and nonprofit executives on organizational boundaries. We report the implications for the NPS as civic voice and civil society capacity builder.

Description

For 15 years now, the nonprofit/nongovernmental or third sectors (NPS) in post-socialist countries have been under the microscope, as scholars examine the role these organizations are playing in civil society development (Kuti 1997, 1999; Osborne and Kaposvari 1997; Anheier and Seibel 1998, Salamon and Anheier 1998; Coury and Dill 2000; Kendall et al. 2000). A major concern is whether or not these organizations will provide a "civic voice" (Coury and Dill 2000b) in the ongoing process of welfare retrenchment, a feature of transition to a market economy (Taylor-Gooby 1993, Evers 1995, Snavely 1996, Coury and Despot Lucanin 1996, Coury and Dill 2000a). One critical factor that affects the NPS's capacity building potential in such areas as promotion of civic values and civic participation is whether citizens view these organizations as trustworthy, particularly in the area of interest articulation (Davidkov et al. 2000, Stolle 2001). We have observed in previous research that NPS organizational leadership (or more correctly, leaders as individuals synonymous with an agency's reputation for honesty and ethical conduct) is a particularly crucial aspect in the social construction of organizational legitimacy in the post-socialist context. While historical elements of sector development such as legacies of communism, top-down development, international influences and early professional control might be explanations of this phenomenon, the reality is that leaders of third sector organizations make decisions everyday about mission, advocacy role (or not), and civic engagement. Yet, we know very little about how nonprofit sector leadership is developing in these countries. How do leaders and key stakeholders view their common interests and what does this, in the balance, tell us about interest articulation (Fink-Hafner 1998)?

This is a qualitative study of NPS leadership in Croatia and Slovenia, focused particularly on strategic management of stakeholder relations (Freeman 1984) and the extension of these concepts including stakeholder identification and management to the nonprofit sector (Brudney and Rodriguez 2003). We posited that two of the primary influences on management of stakeholder relations would be 1) congruence of interests (Tschirhart 1994, 1996) and 2) environmental factors such as resource mobilization (Adams and Perlmutter 1995) and sources of legitimation (Mole 2004). We wanted to know what kind of leadership experience these individuals had (Peters et al. 2001) and something about their decision-making style (Uzzi 2005). We felt, too, that NPS executive directors, as leaders, would have to be externally-oriented to identify stakeholders and recognize opportunities and threats to their organization and their position (Bryson 1986, Bryson 1995), command resources (Dowling and Pfeffer 1975) and clarify the mission of their organization (Mitroff 1983, Heimovics and Herman 1990, Herman and Heimovics 1991). In addition, we took into account the cultural context of management (Derr, Roussillon and Bournois 2002, Pierce and Newstrom 2002) in these post-socialist countries. We examine the scope, extent, and forms of stakeholder management activity by executive directors in 30

nonprofit social welfare organizations in Croatia and 30 in Slovenia. We also assesses relevant leadership skills such as environmental scanning and cognitive decision making that have an impact on congruence of interests and therefore, legitimacy with key stakeholders. We conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews individually and confidentially with key informants (executive director, a Board member and at least one other key stakeholder in each NPO) and analyzed relevant documents such as mission statements, articles of incorporation, publications and policy statements regarding external relations if any. The topics for interviews and document analysis were standardized across sites. What this paper adds to the study of the nonprofit sector through an analysis of the perspectives of both stakeholders and nonprofit executives is what impact stakeholder management has on organizational mission and the implications for the articulation of interests and civil society capacity building potential. Contextualization of the meaning of leadership, of opportunities and constraints, as well as norms and values, demonstrates how a linkage between material and cognitive factors works and, at the same time, accounts for the ways in which this linkage is a cultural construction. In this way, Western middle-range theories of organizational leadership gain greater explanatory power. We show how discourse about NPS leadership is linked to issues of legitimacy, resource distribution and civic participation and has an influence on policy making, essentially in the areas of problem definition. Finally, as we are all teachers as well as researchers, we see this (and most) research as a means of educating potential stakeholders and other diverse groups in society (ours and others).

Adams, Carolyn Teich and Felice Davidson Perlmutter 1995. Leadership in Hard Times: Are Nonprofits Well-Served? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 24(3):253-262

Anheier, H.K. and W. Seibel 1998. The nonprofit sector and the transformation of societies: a comparative analysis of Eastern Germany, Poland and Hungary. In W.W. Powell and E.S. Clemens (eds.) *Private Action and the Public Good*. New Haven and New York: Yale University Press

Brudney, Jeffrey L. and Darlene Xiomara Rodriguez 2003. Stakeholder Identification and Management: An Extension to the Nonprofit Sector. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Denver, Colorado, November.

Bryson, John 1995. *Strategic Planning For Public and Nonprofit Organizations: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement*, Revised Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Bryson, John M., RE. Freeman and W. Roering 1986. 'Strategic Planning in the Public Sector: Approaches and Directions.' In B. Checkoway, ed., *Strategic Perspectives in Planning Practices*. Lexington, VT: Lexington Books.

Coury, J. M. and Despot Lucanin, J. 1996. Mending the Social Safety Net After State Socialism: 'Dobrobit' – One Nongovernmental Organization in Zagreb, Croatia. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 25: 283-30

Coury, J. and A.E.P. Dill 2000a. "Between State, Market, and Community: Welfare Retrenchment and Third Sector Development in Croatia and Slovenia." Presented at the 4th International Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Dublin

Coury, J. and Dill, A.E.P. 2000b "A New Civic Voice: How Croatian and Slovenian Nonprofit Hospice Organizations are Reshaping the Public Space." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, New Orleans.

Davidkov, T., G. Hegyesie, J. Ledic, T. Randma, G. Behr, D. Kessler, M. Sulek and R. Payton 2000. Research Note: The Future of Third-Sector Teaching and Research in Central and Eastern Europe. *VOLUNTAS* 11(2):181-190.

Evers, A. 1995. Part of the welfare mix: the third sector as an intermediate area. *VOLUNTAS*, vol. 6:

159-182.

Fink-Hafner, D. 1998. Organized interests in the policy-making process in Slovenia. *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 5: 285-302.

Freeman R.E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Heimovics, Richard D. and Robert D. Herman 1990. Responsibility for Critical Events in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 19: 59-72

Herman, Robert D. and Richard D. Heimovics 1991. *Executive Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations: New Strategies for Shaping Executive-Board Dynamics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kendall, J, H. Anheier, and M. Potersek, (special editors) 2000. 1999 VOLUNTAS Symposium: Ten Years After: The Third Sector and Civil Society in Central and Eastern Europe. *VOLUNTAS* 11(2), June.

Kuti, E. 1997. "Chapter 17: Hungary." In L.M. Salamon. and H.K. Anheier, (eds.). *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-national Analysis*. Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Series 4. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press

Kuti, E 1999. Different Eastern European Countries at Different Crossroads. *VOLUNTAS* 10(1):51-60

Mitroff, Ian I. 1983. *Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind: Toward a New View of Organizational Policy Making*. San Francisco, Washington, London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mole, Graham 2004. "Can Leadership Be Taught." In John Storey, ed., *Leadership in Organizations: Current issues and key trends*. London and New York: Routledge

Nanus, Burt and Dobbs, Stephen M. 1999. *Leaders Who Make a Difference: Essential Strategies for Meeting the Nonprofit Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Osborne, S.P. and A. Kaposvari 1997. "Towards a Civil Society?: Exploring Its Meanings in the Context of Post-Communist Hungary." *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 7: 209-222.

Peters, Jeanne and Timothy Wolfred and Associates 2001. *Daring to Lead: Nonprofit Executive Directors and Their Work Experience*. San Francisco and San Jose: CompassPoint Nonprofit Services

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

Pierce, J.L. and J.W. Newstrom 2002. *Leaders and Leadership: Process, Readings, Self-Assessments and Applications*, 3rd Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill, Irwin

Salamon, L.M. and H.K. Anheier 1998. Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the nonprofit sector cross-nationally. *VOLUNTAS* 9(3):213-248

Snavely, K. 1996. The welfare state and the emerging non-profit sector in Bulgaria. *Europe-Asia Studies*, vol. 48: 647-662

Stolle, D. 2001. 'Getting to trust': An analysis of the importance of institutions, families, personal experiences and group membership. In P. Dekker & E. M. Uslaner (eds.), *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London and New York: Routledge.

Taylor-Gooby, P. 1993. Citizenship, Dependency, and the Welfare Mix – Problems of Inclusion and Exclusion. *International Journal of Health Services*, vol. 23: 455-474.

Tschirhart, Mary 1994. "Artful Leadership". In R. D. Herman and Associate (Eds.), The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Tschirhart, Mary 1996. Artful Leadership: Managing Stakeholder Problems in Nonprofit Arts Organizations. Bloomington and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.

Uzzi, Brian 2005. The Cognitive Style Instrument. Retrieved on January 12, 2005 from <http://www.Kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/uzzi/ftp/page47.html>

Paper Number: PA051297

Paper Title: Agenda Setting and Charitable Contributions: Testing the Correlation between Media Coverage and Donations to the Tsunami Relief Efforts

Author(s):

Richard Waters, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Spiro Kiouisis, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Margarete Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Kathleen Kelly, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Summary of Research

Testing popular fund-raising lore, this study examines whether giving to charitable relief efforts correlates to media coverage. Weekly giving totals to the December 2004 tsunami relief efforts collected by the Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University will be analyzed against media coverage of the crisis in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Los Angeles Times*. Broadcast coverage of ABC, CBS, and NBC will also be included. Initial analysis indicates that there is no correlation to donations and news coverage in the same week; however, when calculating with a one-week lag, statistical significance did emerge ($p < .01$).

Description

Many fund-raising practitioners share a common widespread belief that a nonprofit's fund-raising success is linked to the media coverage the organization and its cause receives. Indeed, this idea has been reported by the *Detroit Free Press* (Meyer, 2005) and the *Christian Science Monitor* (Wood, 2005). The United Methodist Church reflected that donations to their African missions were down because Africa had not been featured prominently in the American media (Crosson, 2005). Despite these claims and fund-raising practitioners' beliefs, scholarly work has not focused on the degree to which the mass media may wield power in guiding individuals' philanthropic decisions. Grounded in the agenda-setting theory of the mass media, this study seeks to determine whether the media do play an important role in directing individuals' donations.

Agenda setting was first studied by McCombs and Shaw (1972) to understand the salience of political issues during the 1968 presidential election. The researchers found a strong correlation between the public's political concerns and what was addressed in the media. More than thirty years have passed since the first agenda setting study, and scholars have found that the mass media have a strong influence over public opinion and the economy (Benton & Frazier, 1976), environmental concerns (Cohen, 1975), expectations for the future (Atwood, Sohn & Sohn, 1978), anti-globalization (Feron, 2004), and opinion of foreign nations (Wanta, Golan & Lee, 2004).

At the 2001 ARNOVA conference, Brooks and Van Slyke posed the question of why individuals donate to some causes above others. Evans and Sokic (2000) recommend organizations seek news coverage to increase their donation totals from the public. Initial analysis based on Center of Philanthropy totals and a quick Lexis-Nexis search for American media coverage of the tsunami shows that the prominent news coverage of the December 2004 tsunami had strong correlations to individual giving. As the news coverage decreased so did individual donations to the relief efforts. Though the two variables, media coverage and individual giving, were strongly correlated; it does not mean causation. Causation can only be proven through experimental methods; however, causation is a necessary condition to make casual inferences with reasonable confidence.

These initial results solely looked at the number of occurrences in which the tsunami was mentioned in the headline. A complete content-analysis of print news coverage crisis in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Los Angeles Times* will occur this summer. Broadcast coverage of ABC, CBS, and NBC will also be analyzed.

A preliminary correlation of coverage in The New York Times and the weekly giving totals as reported by the Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University indicates that there is a strong correlation of media coverage and donations when a one-week lag factor is included in the analysis. This lag provides donors with time to decide which relief effort they will give their contributions to (more than 130 organizations collected donations for relief efforts in the United States), actually making the contribution, and the organization to process and fully recognize receipt of the donation.

References

Atwood, L. E., Sohn, A., & Sohn, H. (1978). Daily newspaper contributions to community discussion. *Journalism Quarterly*, 55, 570-576.

Benton, M. & Frazier, P. J. (1976). The agenda-setting of the mass media at three levels of 'information-holding.' *Communication Research*, 3(3), 261-274.

Brooks, A. & Van Slyke, D. (2001). Why do people give? New evidence and management strategies. Paper presented to the 2001 ARNOVA conference.

Cohen, D. (1975). A report on a non-election agenda-setting study. Ottawa, Canada: Association for Education in Journalism.

Crosson, L. (2005, February 21). Light media coverage means lack of funds for crisis-plagued Africa. Retrieved online at: <http://www.umc.org/interior.asp?ptid=1&mid=6781>.

Evans, H. & Sokic, S. (2000). Strategies for charitable giving. *Journal of Canadian Chiropractic Association*, 44(1), 55-59.

Feron, Elise. (2004). Anti-globalization movements and the European agenda. *The European Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(2), 119-128.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176-187.

Meyer, Z. (2005, March 7). Tsunami relief dwindles as more days pass. Detroit Free Press. Retrieved online at: http://www.freep.com/news/metro/tsunami7e_20050307.htm.

Regnerus, M., Smith, C., & Sikkink, D. (1998). Who gives to the poor? The influence of religious tradition and political location on the personal generosity of Americans toward the poor. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37(3), 481-494.

Wanta, W., Golan, G., & Lee, C. (2004). Agenda setting and international news: Media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 364-378.

Wood, G. (2005, January 24). Tsunami media convergence: not a fair guiding principle for aid. Retrieved online at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0124/p09s02-coop.htm>.

Paper Number: PA051299

Paper Title: Board Prestige and Revenue Change in Nonprofit Organizations: Evidence from a Panel Study

Author(s):

Robert Herman, University of Missouri at Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, USA

David Renz, Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership, University of Missouri - Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will use panel data, collected from local nonprofit organizations first in 1993-94 and then in 2000-01, to investigate the following hypotheses. (1) Board prestige will be greater in donative (those that rely more on donations) than in commercial (those that rely more on earned income) nonprofit organizations. (2) In donative NPOs revenue at time 2 is related to board prestige, controlling for time 1 revenue. Additional analyses will explore what characterizes nonprofit organizations that experience increases in board prestige.

Description

That social class (prestige) is particularly important to some nonprofit organizations and that social class composition of nonprofit organization boards is intimately bound up with the reproduction and legitimation of class structure in the U.S. has long been recognized (e.g., see Ostrander, 1984; Covelli, 1985; Collins and Hickman, 1991; and for a recent review of studies relating to class and boards see Ostrower and Stone, forthcoming). Early studies (Pfeffer, 1973; Provan, 1980) indicated that the extent to which a nonprofit organization's board was prestigious (that is, included individuals widely recognized as among a community's economic and/or social elite) was related to its funding success. Such a relation is widely acknowledged and acted on by nonprofit board members and senior managers, as they seek to attract these "heavy hitters." In spite (or perhaps because) of the obviousness of this relation, little research has been conducted which attempts to assess whether board prestige does change and, if so, with what consequences.

□ Board prestige is probably more important to nonprofit organizations that depend more on donations for revenues than it is for those that rely on a greater proportion of earned income, as more prestigious board members are likely to have access to larger amounts of potential donations than those board members who are less prestigious. Thus, we hypothesize that board prestige will be higher in donative than in commercial nonprofit organizations (our distinction between donative and commercial nonprofit organizations is based on Hansmann, 1980, and Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld, 1998). Using data from a panel study, we also hypothesize that in donative nonprofits that time 2 total revenue is related to extent of board prestige, controlling for time 1 total revenue. In addition to evaluating these two hypotheses, additional analyses will explore what variables distinguish nonprofit organizations with substantial increases in board prestige from those with little or no change in board prestige.

□ In this paper we use panel data first collected on 64 nonprofit organizations in 1993-94 and then on the same organizations (when possible) again in 2000-01. Due to mergers and dissolution, the number of organizations included in data analysis at time 2 is 44. We have collected data on the same variables in same ways at both times; as well we collected some additional data. In this paper we report both on panel analyses and on analyses that use data collected only at time 2. We use the static score approach rather than the change score approach in the panel analyses, as Finkel (1995) argues the former is usually superior. The analyses will provide information to help us understand whether board prestige differs in donative and commercial nonprofit organizations, if changes in board prestige statistically affect changes in total revenues, and what distinguishes nonprofit organizations that increase board prestige from those that do not.

References:

Collins, R., and Hickman, N. (1991). "Altruism and culture as social products." *Voluntas*, 2 (no. 2), 1-15.

Covelli, L. (1985). "Dominant class culture and legitimation: Female volunteer directors," *Journal of*

Voluntary Action Research, 14 (no. 4), 24-35.

Finkel, S. (1995). *Causal analysis with panel data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Galaskiewicz, J., and Bielefeld, W. (1998). *Nonprofit organizations in an age of uncertainty*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hansmann, H. B. (1980). "The role of nonprofit enterprise." *Yale Law Journal*, 89, 835-901.

Ostrander, S. (1984). *Women of the upper class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ostrower, F., and Stone, M. (forthcoming). "Boards of nonprofit organizations: Research trends, findings, and prospects for the future." In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1973). "Size, composition and function of hospital boards of directors: A study of organization-environment linkage." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18, 349-364.

Provan, K. (1980). "Board power and organizational effectiveness among human service agencies." *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 221-236.

Paper Number: PA051301

Paper Title: Couples' Contributions: Who Decides?

Author(s):

Ahlam Fakhra, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA, USA

Debra Mesch, Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Eleanor Brown, Pomona College, Claremont, CA, USA

Patrick Rooney, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Summary of Research

Andreoni, Brown & Rischall's (2003) path breaking research on "Who Decides?" found that women tend to distribute their giving more equally across a range of nonprofit sectors, but men tend to focus their philanthropy in fewer areas. The purpose of this study is to replicate and enhance the earlier work of Andreoni et al., (2003) using a more recent data set. Gender roles in society are evolving quickly. It will be important to test these results repeatedly over the next several decades to see if they are stable over time, or if they evolve with further social adaptations.

Description

Decision making within a household has long been a source of research interest by sociologists and economists. Some have hypothesized a sole head of household is responsible for decision making (Becker, 1981), while further research has suggested bargaining between spouses takes place as each one's varying tastes are taken into account (Lundberg and Pollak, 1996). The latter model of intra-household decision making forms the basis of the Center's proposed philanthropic research study on couples' contributions and decision making within households.

A recent study by Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall (2003), whose path-breaking research "Who Decides?" on philanthropic giving in American households found that women tend to distribute their giving more equally across a wide range of nonprofit subsectors, but that men tend to focus their philanthropy in fewer areas. They also identified significant differences by gender in the types of subsectors men and women support. They also learned that male giving habits were more affected by changes in their marginal tax rates than their female counterparts when it came to deciding how much to give.

Additionally, Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall discovered that among married couples, the family's giving tended to more closely reflect the male preferences rather than the female's, leading Andreoni et al to conclude that there was significant "intra-family bargaining" going on with regard to philanthropic giving.

These findings suggest there are important differences in giving by gender its effect within households that merit further research attention. This need is reinforced by recent research by Rooney et al (2004) that found single women and married couples both more likely to give and give more money than single men after holding income, education, and race constant. Understanding how and if single men and women and their married counterparts determine their giving priorities is of great importance to nonprofit fundraisers and academics who seek to understand the giving process.

Study Design

The design of this study will replicate and expand the earlier work of Andreoni et al, (2003) using a more recent and robust dataset called the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study (COPPS). Andreoni et al. analyzed data collected on behalf of INDEPENDENT SECTOR in 1992 and 1994 and the quality of this dataset was questioned by scholars for errors in the collection and entry of data.

COPPS data is the highest quality source of giving information in the US. COPPS is conducted with experienced interviewers and respondents, which makes it a very reliable data source. The COPPS is conducted in conjunction with the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research's Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). PSID survey is fielded every two years and questions are asked to the same representative families every year. The PSID began surveying 5,000 nationally representative households in 1968 and as children born into the families of panel members mature, they are added to the panel, which now exceeds 7,800 families.

Using the COPPS dataset the Center will further the work of Andreoni et al. by allowing researchers to examine the effects of income, sources of income, sources of wealth, and amounts of wealth in relation to the decision making process within households. For instance, do the decision making dynamics change if there is only a single income earner, or if there is little wealth, but high net income?

In addition, using COPPS, researchers can look at a series of health related questions and their influence on intra-household contributions. Questions could include the effect of having one spouse with a disability or in poor health in relation to couples' contribution patterns.

There are a number of other variables omitted from the original study which may also provide interesting results. These include the number and age of children and potential differences between religious and non-religious giving. Religious and non-religious giving, as suggested in previous studies, should be treated differently (Hrung, 2004). As well, COPPS asks a series of questions such as religious denomination and frequency of attendance at worship services which may also yield interesting conclusions.

References

Andreoni, J., Brown, E., and Rischall, I., 2003, "Charitable Giving by Married Couples: Who Decides and Why Does it Matter?" *Journal of Human Resources*, 8:1 (Winter), 111-133.

Becker, G., 1981, *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lundberg, S., and Pollak, R., 1996, "Bargaining and Distribution in Marriage," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10:4 (Fall), 139-158.

Hrung, W., 2004, "After-Life Consumption and Charitable Giving," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 63:3 (July), 731-745.

Rooney, P., Mesch, D., Chin, W., and Steinberg, K., 2004, "The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the US," *Economic letters*, 86 (2005) 173-180.

Paper Number: PA051303

Paper Title: From philanthropic strategy to strategic philanthropy: Selected Canadian case studies

Author(s):

Mary K Foster, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Agnes Meinhard, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Ida Berger, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Summary of Research

This study uses case studies from 17 Canadian corporations to highlight the features of the internal and external environment that affect the choice of philanthropic strategy. The study compares the role top management support, governance structure, and financial health of the industry in determining the nature and scope of involvement with the nonprofit sector, the processes and structures that manage the philanthropic activity, the relationship with overall vision, the mission and corporate culture, the types of causes supported and accountability requirements enforced.

Description

The rapidly growing literature investigating corporate social responsibility and corporate philanthropy attests to the world-wide interest in this trend, both from an academic perspective and as a legitimate component of commercial success (Burson-Marsteller, 2000; Waddock & Graves, 1997). To date, most of the research has been conducted in the US, and indeed research interest in this topic dates back to the 1930s and 1940s (Carroll, 1999). The body of knowledge in Canada is more modest and has mostly focused on investigating the impact of social disclosure from an accounting perspective (Levin, 1982; Zeghal & Ahmed, 1990). One reason for this narrow focus has been historical. Until very recently, the Canadian government has been the primary architect, builder and funder of the social safety net, thereby pre-empting the need for widespread corporate participation in the provision of social services. Even though social expenditures remain the largest single expenditure category in the Canadian federal budget (Prince, 1999), there has been a noticeable shift in policy at all levels of government. Both the range of services and the amount of funding directed to nonprofit service providers have been severely reduced (Hall & Banting, 2000). As a result, voluntary organizations have seen the need to diversify their funding sources, and have intensified their search for corporate support (Foster & Meinhard, 2004). At the same time, 'corporate' Canada has recognized the value of relationships with the voluntary sector both from a marketing perspective and in response to shareholder concerns for community involvement and social responsibility (Pinney, 2001; Schmid & Meinhard, 2000). Nevertheless, because Canadian corporations have operated in a social, political and economic environment different from their US counterparts, the scope of participation and the level of philanthropic giving has been lower (Azer, 2003). While the Canadian public believes that corporations provide 10 percent of revenues to charitable causes, corporate philanthropy in reality is at a much lower level – in fact closer to 1% (Muttart Foundation, 2002). Since 1988, the Imagine campaign has worked to encourage Canadian companies to donate 1% of pre-tax profits to Canadian charities hoping to bring Canadian corporations closer to their American counterparts (Azer, 2003). Since the inception of the Imagine program corporate giving has almost doubled, increasing from .064% of pre-tax profits in 1988 to 1.04% in 2000 (Imagine Canada, 2002).

Of course, corporate philanthropy can encompass much more than writing a cheque, as Post and Waddock (1995) note in their distinction between philanthropic strategy and strategic philanthropy. According to their definition, firms with a philanthropic strategy have formal and organized processes and procedures for donating. These may include structures to oversee corporate philanthropic activities that can range from cheque writing to support for employees who volunteer their time (McAlister & Ferrell, 2002). On the other hand, the motivations that underlie strategic philanthropy go much further than the usual benevolence demonstrated in philanthropic strategy. With strategic philanthropy the choices made in corporate giving are designed to be synergistic with the firm's mission, goals and objectives. Such strategic philanthropy activities are typically managed professionally and regularly evaluated against stated objectives just like other business activities in the

organization (Saha, Carroll, & Buchholtz, 2003; Smith, 1994). The purpose of this paper is to use case studies of Canadian corporations to compare those that seem to have more features of a philanthropic strategy with those that seem to practice more strategic philanthropy. Specifically, this study will examine the role of top management support, governance structure, and financial health of the industry in determining the nature and scope of involvement with the nonprofit sector, the processes and structures that manage the philanthropic activity, the relationship with overall vision, mission and corporate culture, the types of causes supported and accountability requirements enforced. Seventeen in-depth interviews were conducted with the manager or executive in charge of corporate philanthropy at Ontario-based corporations representing financial services, food and beverage, media and technology, and natural resources. The overall purpose of these interviews was to understand the company's perspective on its perceived role and the role of the government and the nonprofit sector in contributing to civil society. The interviews will be analysed within the context of the continuum of philanthropic strategy to strategic philanthropy highlighting the features of the internal and external environment that affect the placement of a particular company along this continuum. Because more than one company in each of the sectors (outlined above) was interviewed, the potential for comparative analysis exists. The results will provide insights into how corporate philanthropy both shapes and responds to the public agenda.

- Azer, A. (January, 2003). The changing corporate landscape and its effect on charitable giving. Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, University of Alberta, School of Business, Edmonton, AB.
- Burson-Marsteller. (2000). International opinion leader survey on corporate social responsibility. Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum, U.K.
- Canadian Democracy and Corporate Accountability Commission. (2002). The new balance sheet: Corporate profits and responsibilities in the 21st century. Final Report.
- Carroll, A.B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional concept. *Business & Society*, 38 (3), 268-295. □
- Foster, M.K. & Meinhard, A.G. (2004). The factors predisposing voluntary organizations in Canada to diversify revenue sources. *Revise and Resubmit to Nonprofit Management and Leadership*.
- Graves, F.L. (1999). Rethinking government as if people mattered: From Reaganomics to humanomics. In L.A. Pal (ed.) *How Canada spends 1999-2000: Shape shifting: Canadian governance toward the 21st century*, (pp.37-73). Oxford University Press Canada.
- Hall, M. & Banting, K.G. (2000). The nonprofit sector in Canada: An introduction. In K.G. Banting (Ed.), *The nonprofit sector in Canada: Roles and relationships* (pp. 1-28). Montreal and Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.
- Imagine Canada. (2002). Statistics on corporate giving in Canada. Available at www.imagine.ca/content/resource_centre/statistics.asp?section=resources.
- Jeffrey, B. (1999). *Hard Right Turn: The New Face of Neo-Conservatism in Canada*. Toronto: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Johnson, A.F., McBride, S. & Smith, P.J. (1994). Introduction. In Johnson, A.F., McBride, S. and Smith, P.J. (Eds.) *Continuities and Discontinuities: The Political Economy of Social Welfare and Labour Market Policy in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Levin, A.E. (1982). Updating social responsibility. *Canadian Banker and ICB Review*, 89 (5), 56-61.
- McAlister, D.T. & Ferrell, L. (2002). The role of strategic philanthropy in marketing strategy. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36 (5/6), 689-743.
- McBride, S. & Shields, J. (1997). *Dismantling a Nation: The Transition to Corporate Rule in Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Muttart Foundation. (2002). Charities score high on meeting needs. Available at www.muttart.org.
- Pal, L.A. (1997). Civic re-alignment : NGOs and the contemporary welfare state. In R.B. Blake, P.E. Bryden, and J. F. Strain (Eds.), *The Welfare State in Canada: Past, Present and Future*. Concord: Irwin Publishing
- Pinney, C. (June, 2001). *More than Charity: Building a New Framework for Canadian Private Voluntary Sector Relations*. Discussion Paper for Imagine's Voluntary Sector Forum, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Toronto.
- Post, J.E. & Waddock, S.A. (1995). Strategic philanthropy and partnerships for economic progress, philanthropy and economic development. In R.F. America (Ed.), *Philanthropy and economic*

development (pp.167-191). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Prince, M.J. (1999). From health and welfare to stealth and farewell: Federal social policy 1980-2000. In L.A. Pal (ed.) *How Canada spends 1999-2000: Shape shifting: Canadian governance toward the 21st century*, (pp. 151-196). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press Canada.

Saha, D.H, Carroll, A.B., & Buchholtz, A.K. (2003). Philanthropy as strategy. *Business & Society*, 42 (2), 169-201.

Salamon, L.M. (1987). Partners in service. In W.W. Powell (Ed.). *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (pp. 107-117), New Haven: Yale University Press.

Salamon, L.M. (1995). *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schmid, H. & Meinhard, A. (2000). A Comparative Analysis of Emerging Partnerships between Corporations and Nonprofit Social Service Organizations in Canada and Israel. Presented at the annual ARNOVA Conference, New Orleans, LA. November 2000.

Smardon, B. 1991. The federal welfare state and the politics of retrenchment in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 26(2), 122-141.

Smith, C. (1994). The new corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 73 (3), 105-116.

Waddock, S.A. & Graves, S.B. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (4), 303-319.

Zeghal, D. & Ahmed, S.A. (1990). Comparison of social responsibility information disclosure used by Canadian firms. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 3 (1), 38-53.

Paper Number: PA051307

Paper Title: The Role of Values in Evaluative Measurements in Foundations: A Social Values Analysis

Author(s):

John R. Whitman, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Wellesley, MA, USA

Summary of Research

This paper represents preliminary findings in a formative evaluation of the author's PhD thesis research. Two idealized management models for grant-making foundations are presented, one oriented toward improving foundation performance and accountability; the other oriented toward promoting social justice. Their respective evaluation measurement challenges are discussed, as is the evaluative role of nonprofit organizations and other social change agencies that execute foundation programs. An integrated model is proposed for deliberation, not as a universal model for foundations, but one to be considered for appropriate programs in which citizen involvement would be valued.

Description

I am developing an approach for my PhD thesis that examines and synthesizes two models for the management of grant-making foundations: an efficiency model and a social model. These represent stylized models that may be compared as epistemic models for study and discussion. The business management efficiency model is exemplified by the work of the Center for Effective Philanthropy, the outgrowth of an initiative to improve foundation performance and accountability (Center for Effective Philanthropy, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2004d; Porter & Kramer, 1999). The social model is a social justice evaluation model, exemplified by the community foundation movement (Carson, 2002, 2003; Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and Development, 2003; National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2003). Both imply different management goals, but these need not be mutually exclusive.

As part of a formative evaluation of my attempt to synthesize these models, I present preliminary thoughts on my findings. This paper describes the characteristics of these idealized models and considers the measurement challenges facing the evaluation of each. The efficiency model assumes that it is either not possible or too costly to measure the foundation's actual effects on the population it serves. The referent for judgment is the degree of achieving strategic goals in an effective manner. The operational goal is to improve overall foundation performance, and the expectation is that a social benefit can be inferred from performance measures.

The social model would apply specifically to foundations committed to social change. Central to this approach is the evaluative involvement of the people whose lives would be affected by the foundation. This approach might be considered a democratic evaluative capability in the Capability Approach framework (Sen, 1999). Central to the evaluation would be considerations of social justice, both in terms of the distributive effects of a proposed project, and the fair, procedural involvement by the people affected in evaluative and decision-making roles (Tyler, 2000). In this approach, attention is given to applying appropriate qualitative evaluative measures that directly involve the affected populations (Kanbur, 2003).

Specific examples will be presented that generally illustrate these approaches, and the implications of each will be discussed in terms of their corresponding evaluation measurement schemes, as well as the evaluative implications for nonprofit organizations and other social change agents that are funded by foundations to execute programs.

Finally, it will be noted that neither approach need be considered exclusive of the other; and that a proposed integrated approach could ensure primacy for social justice within a wholly responsible and professional management model. While this may or may not be suitable as a single, integrated model for some grant-making foundations, it may be worthy of consideration for certain types of programs in

which citizen involvement is desired.

References

- Carson, E. D. (2002). Community foundations at the crossroads: Social change agents or charitable bankers? Community Foundations of Canada Annual Meeting.
- Carson, E. D. (2003). Making waves to build community and raise awareness: A 21st century strategy for community foundations, Community Foundation Network Annual Meeting.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2002a). Indicators of effectiveness: Understanding and improving foundation performance. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2002b). Toward a common language: Listening to foundation CEOs and other experts talk about performance measurement in philanthropy. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2003). Assessing foundation performance: Current practices, future possibilities. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2004a). Assessing performance at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation: A case study. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2004b). Foundation effectiveness. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2004c). Foundation governance: The CEO viewpoint. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Center for Effective Philanthropy. (2004d). Listening to grantees: What nonprofits value in their foundation funders. Cambridge, MA: Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and Development. (2003?). Social justice grantmaking: Finding common language. Ottawa: Community Foundations of Canada.
- Kanbur, R. (Ed.). (2003). Q-squared: Qualitative and quantitative methods of poverty appraisal. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (2003). Understanding social justice philanthropy. Washington, DC: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (1999). Philanthropy's new agenda: Creating value. Harvard Business Review, 121-130.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. New York: Knopf.
- Tyler, T. R. (2000). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. International Journal of Psychology, 35(2), 117-125.