

TIBS Survey Results

May 9, 2006

Survey disposition

	Date	Sent to	Responses
Survey sent to current members	April 10, 2006	95	33
First reminder	April 22, 2006	64	14
Last reminder	May 3, 2006	48	4
Survey sent to previous members who have not renewed	May 8, 2006	46	3

Response rate for current members: $51/95 = 54$

Response rate for previous members: $3/46 = 7\%$

1. What is your discipline?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Public Administration/Public Policy/Government	24.10%	13
Nonprofit Management	16.70%	9
Other (see below)	14.80%	8
Sociology	13.00%	7
Education	13.00%	7
Social Work	11.10%	6
Nonprofit professional	9.30%	5
Philanthropic Studies	7.40%	4
Economics	7.40%	4
Urban Studies	5.60%	3
Nonprofit practitioner	3.70%	2
Political Science	1.90%	1
Law	1.90%	1
International Studies	1.90%	1
History	1.90%	1
Communications	1.90%	1
Business (includes Accounting, Finance)	1.90%	1
Anthropology	1.90%	1
Religion	0.00%	0
Psychology	0.00%	0
Health Care Administration	0.00%	0
Environmental Studies	0.00%	0

Comment [MRH1]: Page: 1

Pretty good response rate; indicates moderate interest but not that TIBS is a top priority for people. May mean that people like the idea of talking about TIBs but that they won't go far out of their way to be involved

Comment [MRH2]: Page: 1

My take here is that TIBs attracts people who theories, issues, and boundaries that related to organizational management will be particularly interesting and pertinent to TIBs members because so many of them are in management related areas of academe and practice. It may also be that the divide between academic study of management and the professional application of management skills may be bridged by a larger group people than has been assumed. There has been an assumption on the practitioner side that academic don't study the most vexing issues of management life, whatever those might be, and on the academic side that practitioners are too busy flailing at daily problems to step back and see the underlying commonalities and potential solutions. Perhaps TIBs members are the gap-fillers who are really interested in how theory informs practice. The advantage of having practitioners who are scholarly in their approach to management is that they can help academics see the interface among theories from varying disciplines.

What if we selected a theory that has strong scholarship in several of the disciplines that TIBs members represent...relationship, systems, contingency, stakeholder?...and had a series of speakers who each gave an overview of the development-over-time of that theory in his/her field capped with a snapshot of current thinking about the theory in that field? That might help all TIBs members expand their theoretical boundaries. We all know that others are doing what we're doing but it is difficult to master the way a theory is approached in another discipline without some guideposts. The TIBs meeting could set up some guideposts that would be useful to both academics and practitioners among our members. It might be a lively discussion period!

Arts
Response Total 0.00% 0
54

Other:

1. Interdisciplinary
2. Philosophy
3. Policy studies
4. Risk reductio
5. Academic
6. Change Management
7. social policy
8. Interdisciplinary

2. Please answer the following questions:

	Yes	No	Unsure	Response Total
Have you ever attended a TIBs preconference session?	54% (29)	46% (25)	0% (0)	54
Did you attend the last ARNOVA conference in Washington, DC?	61% (33)	39% (21)	0% (0)	54
Did you attend the last TIBS preconference session in Washington, DC?	36% (19)	64% (34)	0% (0)	54
Do you plan on attending the next TIBS preconference session in Chicago?	53% (28)	13% (7)	34% (18)	54

Comment [MRH3]: Page: 1
Lots of people who did not attend the preconference session. Hmmm. Now I am really interested in their reasons!

3. If you attended the last ARNOVA conference, but DID NOT attend the last TIBS pre-conference, meeting, why not?

1. not sure, actually
2. I was unable to attend the conference
3. Travel conflicts and bad luck with the airport bus.
4. Time conflict - re getting to ARNOVA early.
5. Only joined Arnova recently.
6. Personal Problems.
7. No funding by my university
8. last minute schedule change - on job market.
9. Didn't arrive at the conference in time - couldn't attend a day early to attend.
10. Conflicted with another interest group meeting--grassroots and community
11. Schedule conflict at home. Couldn't arrive in time.
12. ARNOVA board meeting
13. My selection of interest groups is fairly new, and without specific reminders/prompts/or invitations, I probably simply chose to attend to other things at the conference.
14. Couldn't get there a day early.
15. The scheduling of the event made it impossible to attend given flight schedules and the cost of staying in DC for an extra night.

16. Not clear why it is important to do so.

Comment [MRH4]: Page: 1
 I see 2 clusters: a marketing-needed cluster, and a cost-factor cluster. I think I remember receiving several reminders from Felice last year inviting members to attend and specifying the program. I can try to do even more of that this year. We could address the cost factor by having our meeting on Thurs evening starting with an informal dinner, or Thursday morning starting with a breakfast, or even Wed evening conflicting with Teaching Section

4. I am a member of TIBS ... (Check all that apply.)

	Response Percent	Response Total
To participate in discussions on TIBS topics	79.60%	43
To meet (or find) others interested in these topics	64.80%	35
To self-identify as interested in these topics	51.90%	28
To build my credentials in these areas	20.40%	11
To have a chance to take some leadership role in an area I care about	20.40%	11
Other (see below)	16.70%	9
Response Total		54

Other:

1. I am not a member of tibs
2. to help further theory development in our field
3. To move from practice into scholarship
4. To identify the latest issues and opportunities in TIBS
5. to learn through discourse
6. Did not know I was a TIBS member?
7. To encourage more focus on these issues within ARNOVA
8. Interest in theory
9. in the hopes that the section might help to keep me current on literature, controversies, etc.

Comment [MRH5]: Page: 1
 Interesting responses. TIBS members want to talk/discuss and they want others to know who they are and what they're interested in. We can help in both areas. 20% say they might be willing to take a leadership role. That is surprising high. I need to think creatively about how to find them and give them that chance.

5. Which of the following are most important to you as benefits of TIBS membership? (Rate 1 – 5, with 1 most important and 5 least important. Use numbers more than once.)

	Response Average	1 Very important	2	3	4	5 Not important	
Increase discourse on nonprofit theory, boundary issues, and intersectoral analysis	1.32	75% (40)	17% (9)	8% (4)	0% (0)	0%	Comment [MRH6]: Page: 1 Discussion is key
Opportunity to hear and discuss talks by leading scholars about shared research interests at annual section meeting	1.54	58% (30)	33% (17)	8% (4)	2% (1)	0%	Comment [MRH7]: Page: 1 They want to hear from leaders...although I think that emerging leaders would be good, not just established leaders
Receive information disseminated by TIBS section outside of annual meetings related to shared research, teaching, and practice interests	1.92	48% (24)	26% (13)	14% (7)	10% (5)	2%	Comment [MRH8]: Page: 1 It surprises me that this is so high. I guess we might want to send them more notices...heads-up on pertinent publications, maybe?
Interactions with other TIBS members at annual section meeting	2.14	33% (17)	35% (18)	18% (9)	12% (6)	2%	Comment [MRH9]: Page: 1 Also strong
Other (see below)	2.33	67% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (1)	
Participation in section activities to advance TIBS interests in ARNOVA as a whole (e.g. representation of sections on ARNOVA board)	2.86	12% (6)	28% (14)	34% (17)	14% (7)	12% (6)	
Opportunity to take a leadership role in TIBS section (e.g. serve on Executive Committee)	3.46	4% (2)	22% (11)	28% (14)	16% (8)	30%	Comment [MRH10]: Page: 1 It is important or very important to 13 members that we find them and ask them to take a leadership role. A challenge!
Chance to be involved in planning program at section's annual meeting	3.56	6% (3)	15% (7)	25% (12)	25% (12)	29% (14)	
Total Respondents	53						
	1						
(skipped this question)							

Other:

1. Theory of Evaluation of Nonprofits
2. Talk about theories. Most of what I have seen distributed and heard discussed are about issues. I would like the theoretical discussions to address ontological and epistemological concerns - what does it mean to BE within the nonprofit sector, how is it we come to know within the sector etc. Boundaries, as a sociological construct could also be examined from these viewpoints. While I respect our scholarly elder statesmen, perhaps there is also room for more exploratory presentations by new or emerging scholars.

7. What are your fields of interest within nonprofit theory and boundary issues?

1. for-profit, nonprofit, government relations
2. Social Economy
3. grassroots associations, nonprofit group theory, social capital, civic participation
4. Organizational change, accountability, capacity Comparative measures
5. Articulation of theories
6. combining theories from a number of different disciplines WRT impact of social policy changes on nonprofit and voluntary sector organizations
7. Ethics; political theory, especially the relation of nonprofits and democracy; grassroots organizations
8. Role of the sector in society; Governance and other board roles and models; Models of nonprofit lifecycles, change, etc.
9. Theory and practice of philanthropy in a free society
10. An interdisciplinary approach to attempting to resolve sector issues.
11. social movements, public private relations, organizational influence on public policy, women and nonprofit organizations
12. hybridity
13. Intersection with public policy.
14. Social movement theory; governance and governmentality theory; social capital and collective efficacy; anything else that gives me insight into relationships between government and non-profits; community participation and empowerment
15. My own particular interest is in non-profit governance and management. However, I believe work on non-profit theory and boundary issues provides important contextual information for this work. hence TIBs is an important way for me to keep up with developments in the field.
16. The evolving relationships between government and NPO's in the delivery of services. Risk reduction in organizations through ensuring that the purpose is clear, that those with responsibility have the requisite authority, and that the working documents are consistent and without gaps both within them individually and between them where they are interrelated.
17. MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS. ISSUES PERTAINING TO VOLUNTEERS AND VOLUNTEERISM - INCLUDING THE MANAGEMENT OF VOLUNTEERS. ISSUES SURROUNDING 'USER-GROUPS'. THEORIES OF SECTOR IN AN INTERNATIONAL - CROSS-CULTURAL SETTING.
18. Welfare State Intersection with Nonprofit Sector Comparative Nonprofit Sectors and Differences in How countries envisage nonprofits in their social system Comparison of Evaluation of Public agencies/policies and Nonprofit agencies/organizations/policies
19. How organizations (particularly philanthropic organizations) are guided in their work by a vision of social values. How organizations can increase collaboration around shared social values.
20. Government funding to Nonprofit Community organization and Social capital
21. The impact of complexity on theory direction and andragogy.
22. change management, organizational capacity
23. 1. Relationship between government and nonprofits 2. Competition between nonprofits and for-profits 3. Determinants of nonprofit efficiency and effectiveness 4. Measurement of nonprofit firm performance
24. 3rd party governance, shared management, "business-ification" of the sector, impact of new regs.

25. The relation between the privatization of human services and organizational isomorphism among service providers.
26. Non-economic theories of nonprofit sector and philanthropy. Cultural analysis of nonprofits and philanthropy (qualitative approaches focused on meanings, language, practices, etc.). Rationale for philanthropy and nonprofit sector (justifications for why use philanthropy and nonprofits to do public work).
27. voluntary sector-government relations theory
28. Relationship between grassroots/community and nonprofit organizations; positive conceptualizations of nonprofit sector (instead of failure of market as explanation for nonprofits)
29. That fuzzy area between nonprofit and for-profit
30. nonprofits and government organizational theory in general
31. the border between nonprofit and commercial activity and impact on distinctive features of nonprofit organization
32. Nonprofit theory and issues in general; I have no interest whatsoever in 'boundary' issues; in fact, I find the whole concept malformed.
33. advocacy activities by nonprofit organizations
34. Actually, I have been in and out of studying NPOs over the last few years-- my interest in them has represented about half of my research program, though I expect that to grow. I have done theory development work, mostly grounded theory. I suppose most of my current interest would be in the theoretical and practical boundaries between NPOs and for-profit orgs. I would see an interest group as a place to learn and discuss more about this area.
35. application of generic management theory to nonprofit sector development of new theory to explain nonprofit management problems
36. 1. The shifting roles among the three societal sectors -- nonprofit, government, and business -- in solving problems and delivering services of public importance. 2. Collaboration, alliances, and partnerships across sectoral boundaries. 3. The validity of the statement, often heard these days: There are already too many nonprofit organizations.
37. Ontology symbolic and social boundaries critical theory
38. grassroots, internet/technology
39. theory and boundaries
40. social economy
41. the government-nonprofit nexus, the importance of civil society for a democratic political system
42. Translation of research to practice
43. civil society, inter-organizational collaboration and community partnerships
44. advocacy public policy intersectoral relations
45. Theory construction.
46. communication issues for nonprofits fund raising nonprofits in other countries than US

Comment [MRH11]: Page: 1
 Good heavens. I am not sure what we learned here. But I did take the time to group the responses and that indicated that the topics most often mentioned were "theory" and "management"

8. For longterm planning purposes we would like to know if there is interest in the following activities. Please indicate which would be of greatest interest to you and which of least interest. (Rate 1-5, with 1 being of most interest, and 5 of least interest.)

	Response Average	1 Very interested	2	3	4	5 Not interested
Other (please specify below)	1	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
A special issue of NVSQ edited by TIBS section members and devoted to TIBS topics of interest	1.79	44% (23)	42% (22)	6% (3)	6% (3)	2% (1)
A "best journal article" award sponsored by TIBS	2.37	29% (15)	29% (15)	23% (12)	15% (8)	4% (2)
Sponsorship of a graduate student doing work in an area of interest to TIBS to attend and give a paper at the ARNOVA annual meeting	2.4	23% (12)	37% (19)	23% (12)	12% (6)	6% (3)
A "best book" award sponsored by TIBS	2.53	24% (12)	31% (16)	25% (13)	8% (4)	12% (6)
A section newsletter	2.67	16% (8)	31% (15)	35% (17)	6% (3)	12% (6)
A mid-year e-conference on some topic of interest to TIBS members	2.78	24% (12)	20% (10)	22% (11)	25% (13)	10% (5)
A "best practice" award sponsored by TIBS	3.06	8% (4)	27% (13)	31% (15)	17% (8)	17% (8)
A "hospitality room" hosted by TIBS members on-going during the ARNOVA annual meeting	3.24	6% (3)	22% (11)	34% (17)	18% (9)	20% (10)
Total Respondents	52					
	2					

(skipped this question)

Other:

1. Both the article and book award are great ideas but may be too soon in the TIBS lifecycle. we are still figuring out what TIBS is all about and we'd be hard pressed to come up with criteria. What worked this last year was choosing an article to discuss that advanced theory. I think this is a baby step towards eventually having a paper award. I think we need to have a critical mass of active scholars who agree on the boundaries of TIBS before we can come up with appropriate criteria.

2. Discussion groups focused around a question that people bring prepared responses to... these could be discussed and also produced as a conference monograph by TIBS. For example, symbolic boundaries are defined as the vehicle through which individuals acquire status and control resources. Given current resource issues, how do symbolic boundaries contribute to or detract from nonprofit capacity?

10. Do you have any further suggestions/comments for building and expanding TIBs?

1. I think our plenary sessions for both years were very effective. The article-based discussion this year was very effective and we should do that again. The roundtable success is dependent on both the issue and the facilitator.

2. Thank you for your work!

3. A more open leadership **process**. Re: Clarity of focus, why would we want to offer a practice oriented award? That does not seem to me to fall within the domain of TIBs!

4. POSSIBILITY OF UK BASED **BRANCH**??

5. I think TIBS is operating at about the right level, based on my one engagement in DC. There are many demands on our time as it is, and keeping TIBS somewhat informal and open-ended as a kind of ongoing conversation without the higher level of effort required to be more formal is not a bad thing. The best things about TIBS to me were simply meeting and interacting with other kindred spirits in a rather loose but moderated **discourse**.

6. one of the challenges of the pre-conference meetings is the additional cost-- which makes it also prohibitive to attend a mid year conference. However, increased means of communication that don't involve meetings would be highly **valuable**.

7. I'd say in general for ARNOVA to further and more prominently promote its sections for the benefit for newer and occasional members.

8. No, but a good idea. Thanks for this reminder, or I might never have responded.

9. Keep up the good work and enthusiastic leadership of this important activity!

10. Thanks to all the folks who organized this survey and asked for our input.

Comment [MRH12]: This one needs response, but how? I'd love to get this person on our executive committee.

Comment [MRH13]: I like the international interest

Comment [MRH14]: Bravo for this approach!

Comment [MRH15]: Juxtaposed to the one ahead of it