

Paper Number: PN042001

Paper Title: Volunteers in Board and Community Leadership: What Types of Relationships Aid or Hamper Effective Organizing, Advising, Monitoring and Accountability?

Author(s):

Paul Salipante, Mandel Center for Nonprofit Organizations, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Heights, OH, USA

Description

Recent scandals in business organizations leading to passage of Sarbanes-Oxley have brought increased scrutiny of nonprofit governance practices. These developments have solidified the belief, based in agency theory, that independence and distance is needed in board member – nonprofit executive relationships, in order to assure proper monitoring. At the same time, many elements of the nonprofit sector have embraced the concept that social capital, involving the developing and leveraging of relationships of trust and reciprocity (Putnam, 2000), contributes to organizational and societal betterment. These two sets of conceptions, of governance independence and social capital, support seemingly different views of effective relationships among volunteer leaders and nonprofit professionals. This panel provides an opportunity to explore the nature of such relationships in several contexts, with the strongest focus being on governance situations. The intent is to begin to specify the nature of relationships that can be effective in the multiple roles played by volunteer leaders: Organizing, advising, monitoring, and assuring organizational accountability. The hope is to contribute to a more refined understanding of how particular types of relationships and social ties contribute to effective or ineffective governance and community outcomes.

Each of the panelists (save the chair) is both a practitioner and a scholar, pursuing research in areas of direct personal experience. Carmen Simmons is director of a community foundation in Ontario. She explores the role of networks of volunteers in community coalitions, using the lens of complexity theory (Zimmerman, Lindberg & Plsek, 1998) to examine large networks of volunteers. The paper frames community social capital as involving dense networks of relationships operating in dynamic and unstable environments requiring a collective intelligence and adaptability. Susan Williams, chief financial officer of a private college, is studying board functioning in educational institutions, with a particular focus on social ties among board members. Contrary to her initial expectations regarding the efficacy of social capital in board settings, the study indicates that close ties are dysfunctional in a number of instances and that other factors are more powerful in explaining board effectiveness. These themes are further explored in research on boards by Joe Mandato, a business sector investment entrepreneur who serves on several nonprofit boards. Mandato presents a relationally-oriented model of board governance, building on recent nonprofit literature (Herman & Renz, 1999; Taylor, Chait & Holland, 1996), that is empirically tested. Results indicate the types of practices that enable a partnering and entrepreneurial form of relationship to build trust which, in turn, results in improved board outcomes. The final paper, by Paul Salipante, Bart Morrison (executive director of a regional nonprofit), and Don Zeilstra (capital campaign consultant) attempts to integrate the concepts and findings of the panelists' papers, as well as that of their own field research, presenting exploratory ideas on the nature of relationships that can simultaneously achieve performance and process accountability in nonprofit settings.

(References to cited works can be found in the panelists' papers.)

Paper Number: PN042001.1

Paper Title: Toward the Specifying of Effective Relationships for Volunteer-Professional Partnerships

Author(s):

Paul Salipante, Mandel Center for Nonprofit Organizations, Case Western Reserve University,
Cleveland Heights, OH, USA

J. Bart Morrison, Island Institute, Rockport, ME, USA

Donald Zeilstra, Ketchum, Inc., East Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Summary of Research

Recent developments in governance have reinforced the belief that board member independence and distance from executives is necessary for proper monitoring of managerial action. Such a belief runs counter to the notion of partnerships between volunteer leaders and nonprofit professionals as a means to greater performance accountability for nonprofit organizations. This paper draws upon the other papers presented in the panel to develop a more refined understanding of the impact of professional relationships and social ties on the effectiveness of advisory and monitoring interactions involving leadership volunteers and managerial professionals.

Description

Presented last in the panel session, this paper seeks to integrate ideas from the other panel papers and from prior research performed by this paper's authors. The intent is to develop a more refined understanding of the impact of professional relationships and social ties on the effectiveness of interactions involving leadership volunteers and managerial professionals. Such interactions are found in a variety of nonprofit settings, including boards, capital campaigns, community coalitions, and vision committees. Past research, and the papers in this panel, reach varying conclusions regarding the role of social ties and social capital in governance and project success. This variation suggests that extant views of social ties and board-executive independence require critical examination and re-theorizing if nonprofit practice is to be improved. We suggest that subtle distinctions are required and attempt some movement in that direction, inviting the comments and critiques of others.

In the area of board governance, an important challenge is that relationships appropriate for some board roles, such as close partnering for advising and strategizing (Morrison, 2002), may seemingly be counterproductive for others, such as monitoring and oversight. An important characteristic of excellent organizations and practices is the ability to take such seeming paradoxes and "have it both ways". We suggest that this is possible in the area of governance and volunteer leadership, with appropriately structured relationships.

Contemporary literature and practice is of two minds with regard to relationships of volunteer leaders and managerial professionals. On the one hand, Sarbanes-Oxley has reinforced the view that effective monitoring of executives' behavior and decisions requires independence and a separation of interests. This view is consistent with the application of agency theory in business governance settings and reflects much scholarly work on problems resulting from lack of independence on business boards. On the other hand, the wide acceptance in nonprofit circles of the concept of social capital, and the belief that its production in voluntary associational activity promotes organizational, community, and societal benefit, suggests the value of social ties for producing collective action. Applied to governance situations, as it has been by James Westphal (1999), this latter view suggests the value of strong ties at the board level between board members and organizational executives. Westphal argues that agency problems in business organizations can be controlled by the creation of appropriate financial incentives. In the nonprofit sector commitment to organizational mission and values can be argued to serve the same function.

This paper leans toward the second of these two views. However, based on the papers in this panel and our own research, we propose that the nature of the ties be neither distant (independent), weak,

nor strong. Partnering relationships built on professional respect and trust are different than the strong social ties that can lead to collusion in scandalous activity. The relationships may lie between Granovetter's (1983) strong ties and weak ties. Groupthink (Janis, 1992) is possible even with weak ties, if the norms are to not challenge others' ideas. Hence, the importance of valuing the differing knowledge bases of volunteer leaders and professionals, and the creation of norms that each bring their differing knowledge to the issues at hand.

Our proposal, then, is that the relational ties should be those of "professional partners", with the parties operating in a context of concern for organizational legitimacy and accountability. The latter must be defined in a particularly broad fashion, encompassing both performance and process dimensions. Volunteer leaders have been argued to be highly professional (Karl, 1998), perhaps more so than the nonprofit managers and professionals with whom they interact. Contemporary volunteer leaders come from successful careers in the professions, business, education and public service, possessing general and specialized knowledge highly germane to successful organizational and project management. The challenge is to create relationships that enable volunteers and nonprofit professionals to leverage their differing knowledge bases on behalf of the organization's mission. The relationships should be characterized by practices of joint strategizing and planning but not collusion, by respect for each other's skills but not by deference, by challenging and critical thinking and not by groupthink, by high expectations of personal commitment to the organization, and by continual reflection, learning and knowledge creation regarding effective performance (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Zeilstra, 2003). We propose that, through such relationships, the seemingly incompatible board roles of consulting with management while simultaneously monitoring them can be attained. Relationships to avoid, but which appear to exist in the sector according to William's research (reported at this session), are those where social relationships and friendships dominate, and where reciprocity of self-interested favors is given and expected. At the other extreme, independent and distant relationships allow hiding of information and ineffective performance, and concealing of scandalous behavior. Professional, partnering relationships with frequent engagement make concealment more difficult. An engaged board member/volunteer is more likely to have information enabling "scratch and sniff" tests of managerial professionals' claims.

The nonprofit managerial literature on volunteer and board management gives emphasis to structures and the clear definition of roles and responsibilities. This paper suggests that more attention be given to the nature of interpersonal relationships. As suggested by both Mandato's and Simmons' research reported at this panel, a combination of professional partnering relationships and commitment to mission enables a wide latitude of roles and initiatives to be effective. These initiatives can be taken in an entrepreneurial climate of volunteer leaders and managerial professionals operating as members of a network containing a wide range of skills. The members tackle whatever issues are most important, utilizing whichever members have knowledge and skill relevant to the issue at hand. Active, mission-focused entrepreneurial engagement with each other can bring to bear the two knowledge bases of volunteer leaders and nonprofit professionals, in a synergistic fashion that is energizing, innovative, and adaptive.

References

Granovetter, M. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited, *Sociological Theory* (1), 201-233.

Janis, I. (1992). Groupthink: The desperate drive for consensus at any cost. In *Classics of Organization Theory*, 195-199.

Karl, B.D. (1998). Volunteers and professionals: Many histories, many meanings. In W.W. Powell & E.S. Clemens (eds.), *Private Action and the Public Good*, Yale University Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Morrison, J. Bart (2002). Another Thrice-Told Tale: Strategy Formation, Accountability, and Competent Governance in a Nonprofit Organization. Dissertation, Executive Doctor of Management Program, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University.

Westphal, J.D. (1999). Collaboration in the boardroom: Behavioral and performance consequences of CEO-board social ties, *Academy of Management Journal*. 42(1), 7-24.

Zeilstra, D. (2003). Reciprocal learning in teams, *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, 39 (Spring), 23-52

Paper Number: PN042001.2

Paper Title: Voluntary Action in Complex Community Alliances

Author(s):

Carmen Simmons, Sudbury Community Foundation, Case Western Reserve University, Sudbury, CAN

Summary of Research

Volunteers who participate in complex community social change activities are reported to develop a heightened sense of social justice, engage in complex systems interaction, acquire skills in collaboration, innovation, and creativity, and develop extensive cross-sectoral community networks. Because this enriched social capital has enormous potential for the community and the sector, it is important to understand these dynamics and the role voluntary action plays in responding to the needs of a diverse society. A complexity lens helps us distinguish the multifaceted dynamics of these community change volunteer activities, and it refines understandings of social capital's role in voluntary action.

Description

Social change at a community level is often the result of concentrated voluntary action – networks of volunteers and managerial professionals acting in concert with one another, frequently through formal multi-sectoral alliances or community coalitions – to achieve important community reform, enriching the base of the community's social capital. The importance of social capital has been well-documented by Putnam (2000) and others who have called for the development of new structures and policies in order to renew civic engagement. However, such networks do not always result in successful community change. Quite often the complexity of the social problems they address, the systems they create, the people and systems they interact with, and countless other countervailing forces will result in social change failure. Nevertheless, such action creates a thicket of social capital that has been both exciting to observe and difficult to understand. Moreover, such activity highlights the need to refine our understanding of the role such relationships play in responding to the needs of a diverse society

While accepted as a community benefit in and of itself, social capital arises from a dimly-understood complex of actions and interrelationships undertaken by countless community volunteers working toward discreet sets of community objectives. In community coalitions and other formalized collaborations, emphasis on the work of volunteers is heightened. The complexity of such collaborations and their multi-sectoral nature places extraordinary and unfamiliar demands upon volunteers, requiring the development and utilization of important skill sets. Enhanced engagement enables volunteers to see issues from a whole community perspective: They acquire skills in collaboration, innovation, and creativity; they develop a heightened awareness of social justice and social change; they engage in complex systems interaction; and, they develop expanded community networks. (Chavis, 2001; Wolff, 2001a & 2001b; Foster-Fishman, et al, 2001)

The high levels of complexity, ambiguity, and unpredictability found in community alliances and coalitions, as well as the lengthy time spans that govern such activities, have been shown to resist traditional analysis (Berkowitz, 2001). Indeed the lenses traditionally used may obscure the very principles we are hoping to uncover. Traditional conceptualizations of volunteer activity in complex community alliances are static constructs that cannot account for the fluid interactions and emergent properties of complex systems over time. Formalized community alliances and coalitions are an effective way for communities to manage the complexity in their environments. (Bradshaw, 2000) Complex adaptive systems are indicators of robust, adaptable, and evolving systems that generate enhanced volunteer development and rich social capital. Although interactions within such a system occur using sets of mutually acceptable rules, participants (agents) adapt over time by changing the rules of engagements and thus altering the trajectory of the system and the expected outcomes. (Zimmerman, et al, 1998, p. 263) This paper will present a conceptual model examining the nature of volunteer action and social capital in environments of high instability and flux utilizing complex adaptive

systems and associated complexity principles to uncover the dynamic nature of voluntarism in complex environments. The paper refines conceptions of social capital by suggesting that community coalition success may hinge on highly dense networks of volunteers with a collective intelligence and skill for adaptation.

References

Berkowitz, B. (2001). Studying the outcomes of community-based coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 2, 213-227.

Bradshaw, T. K. (2000). Complex community development projects: collaboration, comprehensive programs, and community coalitions in complex society. *Community Development Journal*. 35, 2, 133-145.

Chavis, D. (2001). The paradoxes and promise of community coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 2, 309-320.

Foster-Fishman, P., S. Berkowitz, D. Lounsbury, S. Jacobson, N. Allen. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 2, 241-261.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Wolff, T. (2001a). Community Coalition building – contemporary practice and research: introduction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 2, 165-172.

Wolff, T. (2001b). The future of community coalition building. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 2, 263-268.

Zimmerman, B., C. Lindberg, P. Plsek. (1998). *Edgework: insights from complexity science for health care leaders*. Texas: VHA Inc.

Paper Number: PN042001.3

Paper Title: Building Blocks of Effective Nonprofit Boards

Author(s):

Susan Williams, Dowling College, Oakdale, NY, USA

Summary of Research

There is widespread concern over the effectiveness of nonprofit boards of trustees, with many failures. According to Gibelman, Gelman & Pollack, "appropriate board oversight could have prevented the harm that befell them, their constituencies, and the community they serve" (1997, p. 22). The purpose of this research project is to understand the impact that social capital and the motivation, prestige and length of service of board members has on board effectiveness. Preliminary results indicate board reliance on social capital to be problematic.

Description

This research looks at the two primary functions of boards of trustees, providing resources and the monitoring of management (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Westphal, 1999).

Providing Resources

Advice and counsel is the exchange of information based on skills and experience of board members. Gaining external support is the ability of an individual to give something of value to the institution by becoming concerned with its problems, attempting to aid it, and presenting it favorably to external parties (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Studies relying on resource dependence theory indicate that organizational performance is related to board capital (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003). Board capital consists of human capital and relational capital. The portion of board capital I examine is relational capital, more commonly termed social capital. This research will examine how advice and counsel and gaining support from important elements from outside the organization are produced by social capital and board member motivation.

Monitoring of Management

The monitoring of management is a board function that developed in the modern corporation. It is the watching over of management by the board of trustees on behalf of the shareholders in the for-profit sector and stakeholders in the nonprofit sector. The monitoring is to assure that management is carrying out functions to support the charitable purpose and that assets are not diverted. One central problem, as stated by Pfeffer & Salancik (2003, p. 162), is that "management controls the information that the board members receive about the organization and its operations. Through the control of information, management can see to it that board members, who are only associated with the organization on a part-time basis, are essentially prevented from exercising control except under the most extreme circumstances."

The ability to monitor management is becoming the subject of newly proposed legislation for the nonprofit sector due to the 2002 federal legislation known as Sarbanes-Oxley, enacted in response to highly publicized corporate scandals. BoardSource recently ran a teleconference and review entitled "The Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Implications for Nonprofit Organizations." Many of the tenets of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act are being proposed for state adoption through nonprofit corporation law. The review suggests that nonprofit institutions should voluntarily adopt some of the provisions of the act.

Social capital

Social capital refers to connections among individuals and the social networks and norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them (Putnam, 2000). Putnam argues that strong social capital made America a great democracy. Others similarly argue that social capital makes a company strong

and results in real gains in the bottom line, arguing that, "business runs better when people within an organization know and trust one another" (Prusak & Cohen, 2001, p. 86). Broadly speaking, the argument is that people utilize social capital to transmit information, share resources and develop and create value for the society or organization that they are part of.

Applying this argument to boards, and relying on the concept of board capital noted earlier, we would expect social capital to make a board more effective. This argument is supported by work previously done by James Westphal (1999) who has challenged the long-standing concept that independent boards are more effective, especially in the monitoring of management. Using the term social ties very similarly to the above definition of social capital by Putnam, Westphal emphasizes the impact of personal loyalty and trust. His research on 600 companies suggested how and when a lack of social independence can increase board involvement and firm performance. Not only did social ties typically fail to reduce the level of board monitoring activity, but also such ties enhanced the provision of advice and counsel from outside directors on strategic issues. In this research, I plan to understand not just how social ties fail to reduce the level of board monitoring, but if it positively enhances it. Westphal's work also focuses on social ties advice and counsel on strategic issues. I plan to focus on how social capital may enhance providing resources and what role it may play in the monitoring of management.

Research in Process

The current research, which will be completed for presentation at this panel, aims to extend the above ideas and findings by further examining whether and how social ties reduce or enhance the level of board monitoring. It also investigates whether social capital enhances the role of board members in providing resources for the organization. The study is based on interviews of board members from several institutions of higher education. Although the research was begun with the premise that social capital was a key to effective board work, its preliminary results indicate otherwise. Many board members suggested other elements to be the key, and the study has found instances when close relationships impaired the ability to monitor. Elements of greater importance are noted to be the commitment of board members and the strength and skill of the CEO.

REFERENCES

- Carver, John. (1990). *Boards that make a difference: A new design for leadership in nonprofit and public organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Carver, John & Miriam. *Carver's policy governance model in nonprofit organizations*.
<http://www.carvergovernance.com/model.html>
- Chait, P., Holl, T.P. & Taylor, B.E. (1993). *The effective board of trustees*. Phoenix: The Oryx Press.
- Carpenter, M. & Westphal, J. (2001) *The strategic context of external network ties: Examining the impact of director appointments on board involvement in strategic decision making*. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 639-660.
- Dalziel, T. & Hillman, A. (2003). *Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives*. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 383-396.
- Gelman, S.R., Gibelman, M. & Pollack, Daniel. (1997) *The credibility of nonprofit boards: A view from the 1990s and beyond*. *Administration in Social Work*, Vol 21 (2), 21-40.
- Harvard Business School Press. (1999). *Harvard business review on nonprofits*. Boston.
- Pfeffer, J., (1972). *Size and composition of corporate boards-of-directors-the organization and its environment*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* Vol. 17, Issue 2, 218-228.
- Pfeffer, J. *Size, Composition, and Function of Hospital Boards of Directors: A study of organization-environment linkage*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* Sept 1973 Vol 18 Issue 3 p 349-364
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource-dependence perspective*. Stanford, California. Stanford University Press..
- Price, James. L., *The Impact of governing boards on organizational effectiveness and moral*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Dec 63, Vol.8 Issue 3 p 361-378.
- Provan, K., *Board power and organizational effectiveness among human service agencies*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 1980 Vol 23, No. 2. 221-236
- Prusak, Laurence & Cohen Don. (2001). *How to invest in social capital*. Harvard Business Review.

79.6, 86-93.

Putnam, Robert D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Robinson, Maureen K. (2001). *Nonprofit boards that work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Spitzer, Eliot. *Right from the start: A handbook for not-for-profit board members* office of the attorney general. <http://www.oag.state.ny.us/charities/duties.html>

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 464-476.

Westphal, James D. (1999). Collaboration in the boardroom: Behavioral and performance consequences of CEO-board social ties. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 42, No. 1, 7-24.

Paper Number: PN042001.4

Paper Title: Relational Governance: An Evolving Model Responding to Evolving Needs

Author(s):

Joseph Mandato, Case Western Reserve University, Atherton, CA, USA

Summary of Research

While donors to nonprofit organizations are beginning to question the sector's governance practices and accountability, researchers are challenging prevailing models of governance practices. Given the shortfall in effective practice, a deductive study is conducted to determine the impact of a refined management model, called relational governance, on board outcomes.

Description

Rarely have we experienced the crisis in confidence on the part of the American public towards the management and governing boards of nonprofit organizations as is currently the case. The erosion of public confidence has occurred partly as a result of several highly visible and widely publicized scandals (Strom, 2003) that have exposed examples of management negligence and partly due to lack of board awareness in several historically well-respected nonprofits. As a result, donors are questioning the sector's governance practices and accountability and researchers are challenging prevailing models of governance practices. The research reported here involves a deductive study that was undertaken to determine the impact of a relational model of governance on outcomes defined in the literature as examples of effective practice. These outcomes are measured in behavioral and affective terms. The relational governance model emphasizes partnering, advising relationships between board and management and greater board skills utilization. It builds on recent nonprofit governance literature and extends the work of Herman, Renz and Heimovics (1997), Taylor, Chait and Holland (1996), and Westphal (1999), while contrasting on several dimensions with the well-known and practiced policy governance model (Carver, 1990). A research design employing a survey instrument tested the impact of the model, with the unit of analysis being the nonprofit board member.

At a time when the Sarbanes-Oxley Act has promulgated the view that boards should maintain a high degree of independence from management, this research offers an empirical examination of the relationship of social ties, board management partnering and advising relationships to board effectiveness. An early result of the research, while not conclusive, appears to demonstrate the value of particular practices, including social ties and a partnering/advising relationship between board and CEO, which appear to counter those often prescribed by policy governance. Results of this research have implications for practitioners and researchers interested in understanding how to maximize the utilization and potential contribution of senior nonprofit volunteers and boards of directors.

References

Carver, John. (1990). *Boards That Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Herman, Robert D. and David O. Renz. (1999). *Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 28 (2), 107-125.

Strom, Stephanie. (2003). *Foundation to Keep Leader Accused of Fraud at Xerox*. *The New York Times*. 8 July, p. A 16.

Taylor, Barbara E., Chait, Richard P. and Thomas P. Holland. (1996) The New Work of the Nonprofit Board. The Harvard Business Review. Sept.-Oct., 36-46.

Westphal, James D. (1999). Collaboration in the Boardroom: Behavioral and Performance Consequences of CEO-Board Social Ties. Academy of Management Journal. 42 (1), 7-24.

Paper Number: PN042008

Paper Title: Accounting for Volunteer Value

Author(s):

Femida Handy, York University, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Description

This panel is based on a data set from a project funded for the period (2003-2006) by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). This study—Creating a Framework for Valuing Volunteer Labour: An Interdisciplinary Approach—has three objectives: first, to determine what percentage of nonprofits impute a financial value for volunteer contributions within their accounting statements, on what basis these amounts have been calculated, and to what extent these reported contributions reflect the total value of volunteer contributions; second, to determine the extent to which voluntary organizations use volunteers as a substitute for paid labour and to what extent volunteers complement paid labour; and third, to evaluate critically existing policies, both Canadian and international, for including volunteers within financial statements and to present an alternative that can overcome the limitations of these policies. The initial step in addressing these objectives was through national web-based survey of nonprofits throughout Canada drawn from the directory, Associations Canada (2003). At present, we have about 500 returns. We also intend to make the study comparative by drawing samples from the U.S. and the U.K., but we are not certain if that can be completed in time for the ARNOVA conference, so these abstracts focus on the Canadian sample.

The panel consists of four papers, which are jointly authored since we are working on the data set as a team. All of the papers are drawn from the data set except for the final paper on policy. That one is based on policy research, but it is influenced by the data set. This project and the related presentations for ARNOVA extend a line of research from the participants (Handy & Srinivasan, 2002, 2004; Handy et al, 2002; Mook, Richmond, & Quarter, 2003a, 2003b; Quarter, Mook, & Richmond, 2003;

References

- Handy, F. and N. Srinivasan. 2004. "Improving Quality While Reducing Costs? An Economic Evaluation of the Net Benefits of Hospital Volunteers" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* Vol. 33, No.1 pp. 28-54
- Handy, Femida, and Srinivasan, Hans. (2002). *Volunteers in hospitals: Scope, trends, and value*. Toronto: York University.
- Handy, F., R. Cnaan, J. Brudney, Meijs, L.; U. Ascoli, and S. Ranade (2002). "Public perception of "Who is a Volunteer": An examination of the net-cost. Approach from a cross-cultural approach," *Voluntas* Vol. 11, No 1, pp 45- 65.
- Mook, Laurie, Richmond, Betty Jane, and Quarter, Jack. (2003a). *Integrated Social Accounting for Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. *Voluntas*, 14 (3), 283-298.
- Mook, Laurie, Richmond, Betty Jane, and Quarter, Jack. (2003b). *Social Accounting for Nonprofits: Two Working Models*. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13 (4), 308-324.

Paper Number: PN042008.1

Paper Title: Why report volunteer labor? An organizational perspective, part 1.

Author(s):

Laurie Mook, OISE/University of Toronto, Toronto, CANADA

Femida Handy, York University, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Summary of Research

This research seeks to find out the factors that may prevent nonprofit organizations from including this important resource in their accounting so as to provide a true social account of their activities and reports on what may be some typical problems in doing full social accounting for volunteer labor at the organizational level.

From the quantitative and qualitative data gathered for over 500 nonprofit organizations, we establish the possible determinants of this under accounting.

Description

Why report volunteer labor? An organizational perspective, part 1.

Abstract

The economic role of volunteers is highlighted in some recent major surveys, nationally and internationally (Hall, 2000, Independent Sector. 2001 Salamon & Anheier. 1997). A recent study indicates that volunteer labour represents about 11 percent of the total labour contribution in Canada (Livingstone, 2001). Yet in spite of important contribution of volunteers, the benefit that they generate is seldom included in nonprofit organizations' accounting statements, even for those that heavily rely upon them for their providing their services.

In part, this oversight has to do with accounting regulations for nonprofit organizations, but as this research will show, the problem is more fundamental and relates to the interpretation of what counts as work, the valuation of volunteer work, the organizational culture, and the challenges nonprofit organizations face in accounting and reporting for the volunteer work undertaken.

Using information from surveying over 500 nonprofit organizations across Canada, we find that less than forty percent keep records of volunteer hours, and less than 4% report the value of their volunteer labor in their financial statements. This suggests that although macro statistics for volunteering are available, at the organizational level, there is a serious under reporting of volunteer hours used.

Although several scholars have started to explore, the need for and ways to, build volunteer labor into the nonprofit accounting systems, there is little literature on why such underreporting exists (Mook et al., 2004; Quarter, Mook, & Richmond, 2003). This research seeks to find out the factors that may prevent nonprofit organizations from including this important resource in their accounting so as to provide a true social account of their activities and reports on what may be some typical problems in doing full social accounting for volunteer labor at the organizational level. Understandably, if there are few incentives to an organization to keep records of volunteer labor and the costs of doing so are considerable, nonprofit organizations are not going to spend their scarce resources in undertaking an accounting exercise of the use of volunteer labor and a financial evaluation of this resource.

From the quantitative and qualitative data gathered for over 500 nonprofit organizations, we establish the possible determinants of this under accounting. The determinants we investigate include: the size of the organization, existence of paid professional staff, the ratio of paid employees to volunteers, the type of organization, the nature of volunteer work in the organization, the existence of labor unions, the attitudes towards substitution of volunteer labor the with paid labor (and vice versa), use of computer-

assisted accounting and data systems, the overall contribution of volunteers towards the mission of the organization, and incentives or disincentives arising from government regulations and the requirements from the funders of these organizations.

References

- Brudney, Jeff. (1990). *Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ferris, James M. (1984). Coprovision: Citizen time and money donation in public service provision. *Public Administration Review* 44 (4): 324–333.
- Livingstone, David. (2001). *Working and learning in the information age*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Hall, Michael, Larry McKeown, and Karen Roberts. (2001). *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry
- Independent Sector. (2001). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Key Findings*. www.independentsector.org/PDFs/GV01keyfind.pdf (8 March 2004).
- Mook, Laurie, Sousa, Jorge, Elgie, Susan, and Jack Quarter. (2004). *Social Accounting for Nonprofits: The Case of Volunteer Contributions*. Under review by the *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*.
- Quarter, J., Mook L. & Richmond, B.J. (2003). *What counts: Social accounting for nonprofits and cooperatives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Salamon, Lester, and Helmut K. Anheier. (1997). *Defining the nonprofit sector: A cross-national analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Paper Number: PN042008.2

Paper Title: Why report volunteer labor? An organizational perspective, part 2

Author(s):

Jack Quarter, Toronto, CANADA

Laurie Mook, OISE/University of Toronto, Toronto, CANADA

Summary of Research

Even though volunteer contributions have not been included in conventional accounting statements, organizations are starting to estimate a value for them. Based on preliminary results from a survey of over 500 nonprofit organizations in Canada, approximately 20 percent estimate a value for volunteer hours. From qualitative and quantitative data, we explore the possible factors that led to these organizations placing a value on their volunteer contributions, and how this information is used

Description

Why report volunteer labor? An organizational perspective, part 2

In part 1 of this presentation we focused on those organization that do not presently account for volunteer value in order to understand possible determinants of this under-accounting. Part 2 focuses on those organizations that do estimate a value for their volunteer contributions and how this information is used.

One of the earlier critics of conventional accounting for nonprofits (Henke 1972, 53) argued that “the financial statements for most not-for-profit organizations show little more than where dollars came from, for what they were expended and the extent to which the acquisitions and expenditures were consistent with the budgetary plan.” The limitations of conventional accounting are particularly problematic for the subset of nonprofits that are donative organizations—that is, rather than earning their revenues from the market, they rely heavily on either grants or donations from such external sources as government and from individuals, corporations, and foundations. For organizations of this sort, conventional accounting documents their costs without assessing their benefits (Anthony and Young 1988; Henke, 1989). These organizations are portrayed as users of resources rather than as creators of value through their services to society. Much of that value comes from volunteer contributions, which because they are not exchanged in the market, are for the most part not reflected in conventional accounting statements (Mook et al., 2004; Quarter, Mook, & Richmond, 2003).

Even though volunteer contributions have not been included in conventional accounting statements, organizations are starting to estimate a value for them. Based on preliminary results from a survey of over 500 nonprofit organizations in Canada, approximately 20 percent estimate a value for volunteer hours. From qualitative and quantitative data, we explore the possible factors that led to these organizations placing a value on their volunteer contributions, and how this information is used. The criteria investigated include the size of the organization, the ratio of paid employee FTEs to volunteer hours, the type of organization, the nature of volunteer work in the organization, the attitudes towards substitution of volunteer labor the with paid labor (and vice versa), the attitudes towards placing a value on volunteer contributions and including them in accounting statements, the use of computer-assisted accounting and data systems, the overall contribution of volunteers towards the mission of the organization, and incentives or disincentives arising from government regulations, and the requirements from the funders of these organizations.

References:

Anthony, R. N., and Young D. W. (1988), Management control in nonprofit organizations, 2nd edition,

Irwin, Burr Ridge, IL.

Henke, E.O. (1972). Performance evaluation for not-for-profit organizations. *The Journal of Accountancy*, 133 (June), 51–55.

——— (1989), *Accounting for nonprofit organizations*, 2nd edition, PWS-Kent Publishing, Boston.

Mook, Laurie, Sousa, Jorge, Elgie, Susan, and Jack Quarter. (2004). *Social Accounting for Nonprofits: The Case of Volunteer Contributions*. Under review by the *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*.

Quarter, J., Mook L. & Richmond, B.J. (2003). *What counts: Social accounting for nonprofits and cooperatives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Paper Number: PN042008.3

Paper Title: Nonprofit Production: Are paid and Volunteer Labor Substitutes?

Author(s):

Femida Handy, York University, Toronto, CANADA
Jack Quarter, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Summary of Research

This research reports on the findings regarding the use of volunteers and paid staff of 500 nonprofit organizations across Canada, who use volunteers. Our research will analyze the data obtained on the use of volunteers by these organizations to understand the substitutability or complementarity between paid and volunteer labor

Description

Nonprofit Production: Are paid and Volunteer Labor Substitutes?

Volunteers are an intrinsic part of the labor force for many nonprofit organizations and are critical in the production of goods and services. They often are seen as co-producers with paid labour, a phenomenon referred to as co-production (Brudney, 1990, Ferris, 1984). Their importance in the economy as providers of labor is underscored in a number national and international studies which report on their contribution in terms of the number of hours annually and the number of people involved in voluntary activity (Hall, 2000, Independent Sector. 2001 Salamon, Lester & Anheier. 1997). For example, a recent study indicates that volunteer labour represents about 11 percent of the total labour contribution in Canada (Livingstone, 2001).

Most of the literature on the demand for volunteers assumes that they are free of cost to the organization. This is not the reality, as organizations must incur real costs in recruiting, training and managing their volunteer labor (Handy and Srinivasan, 2004). What is even less discussed is how organizations make choices between volunteer labor and paid labor in the production of goods and services. Arguably, despite the costs incurred in using volunteer labor, the costs are heavily outweighed by the benefits. Nevertheless, organizations for a variety of reason prefer paid labor to volunteer labor, as few nonprofit organizations (excepting small grassroot organizations, self-help groups etc) are run completely by volunteers. In part, the choice to use paid labor may be a function of labor market rigidities and other constraints, or necessitated by the size of the organization.

This research reports on the findings regarding the use of volunteers and paid staff of 500 nonprofit organizations across Canada, who use volunteers. Our research will answer the following questions in order to understand the substitutability between paid and volunteer labor: How do nonprofit organizations react to changes in the supply of volunteers, in terms of their strategies and outputs? Would they change their mix of volunteers and paid labour? What are the roles of paid and volunteer labor? Would monetary donations compensate for volunteer labour? What changes they had noticed in the mix of paid and volunteer labor in their organizations? Did the existence of labor unions dictate the mix between paid and volunteer labor?

Whether volunteer labor and paid labor are considered substitutes or complements for one another will help us understand the demand for volunteer labor better and be useful in policy making at the macro and micro (organizational) levels.

References

Brudney, Jeff. (1990). Fostering volunteer programs in the public sector. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ferris, James M. 1984. Coprovision: Citizen time and money donation in public service provision. *Public Administration Review* 44 (4): 324–333.

Livingstone, David. (2001). *Working and learning in the information age*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Hall, Michael, Larry McKeown, and Karen Roberts. 2001. *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Handy, F. and N. Srinivasan. 2004. "Improving Quality While Reducing Costs? An Economic Evaluation of the Net Benefits of Hospital Volunteers" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* Vol. 33, No.1 pp. 28-54.

Independent Sector. 2001. *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Key Findings*. www.independentsector.org/PDFs/GV01keyfind.pdf (8 March 2004).

Salamon, Lester, and Helmut K. Anheier. 1997. *Defining the nonprofit sector: A cross-national analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Paper Number: PN042008.4

Paper Title: Rethinking Policy for Volunteer Accounting

Author(s):

Laurie Mook, Toronto, CANADA

Jack Quarter, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Summary of Research

Existing accounting standards emphasize that an imputed value for volunteers can be included in accounting statements when an organization would normally pay for the task. This paper evaluates critically existing policy for including volunteers within financial statements and suggests revisions to accounting policy. Accounting policies from Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. are reviewed and then proposals of revision are made.

Description

Rethinking Policy for Volunteer Accounting

This final paper evaluates critically existing policy for including volunteers within financial statements and suggests revisions to accounting policy. Accounting policies from Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. are reviewed and then proposals of revision are made. Existing accounting standards emphasize that an imputed value for volunteers can be included in accounting statements when an organization would normally pay for the task. For example, in Canada, the accounting standards guiding the recognition of volunteer contributions are found in the Handbook of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA), and date back to April 1997:

4410.16: An organization may choose to recognize contributions of materials and services, but should do so only when a fair value can be reasonable estimated and when the materials and services are used in the normal course of the organization's operations and would otherwise have been purchased. The U.S. Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) provides a similar definition of what can and cannot be recognized as contributed services in its Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 116: Accounting for Contributions Received and Contributions Made (FASB, 1993):

9. Contributions of services shall be recognized if the services received (a) create or enhance nonfinancial assets or (b) require specialized skills, are provided by individuals possessing those skills, and would typically need to be purchased if not provided by donation. Services required specialized skills are provided by accountants, architects, carpenters, doctors, electricians, lawyers, nurses, plumbers, teachers, and other professionals and craftsmen [sic]. Contributed services and promises to give services that do not meet the above criteria shall not be recognized.

This paper presents an analysis of these guidelines and suggests revisions to them that would better account for the value that volunteers contribute to the labour force of nonprofit organizations.

References:

Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) (2001). CICA Handbook, Sections 4400-4460, Canadian Institute for Chartered Accountants, Toronto.

Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) (1993), Statement of financial accounting standards No. 116: Accounting for contributions received and contributions made. Available <http://www.fasb.org/st/summary/stsum116.shtml> (5 June 2002).

Paper Number: PN042043

Paper Title: 'Episodic Volunteering': The Move from Long Term Volunteer Service to Short Term Involvements. Why It Happens and What the Future Holds

Author(s):

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

Description

Proposal for a Panel for the ARNOVA 2004 Conference

Proposed Panel Title: 'Episodic Volunteering': The Move from Long Term Volunteer Service to Short Term Involvements. Why It Happens and What the Future Holds

Panel Coordinators: Nancy Macduff and Margaret Harris

Prime Contact: Nancy Macduff

Paper presenters: Eleanor Brilliant; Jeff Brudney and Lucas Meijs; Ram Cnaan; Nancy Macduff

Panel discussant and chair: Margaret Harris.

Panel Contact addresses:

Nancy Macduff
Macduff/Bunt Associates
Washington State University
925 "E" St.
Walla Walla, WA 99362
Tel. 509-529-0244
Fax. 509-529-8865
Email mba@bmi.net

Margaret Harris
Professor of Voluntary Sector Organisation
Aston Business School, Aston University
Birmingham, B4 7ET, England
Tel. 44 (0) 121 359 3011
Fax. 44 (0) 121 359 1148
Email m.e.harris@aston.ac.uk

Eleanor Brilliant
Rutgers University
School of Social Work
536 George Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
Tel: 914-723-0629
Fax: 914-722-6090
Email: Elbrillian@aol.com

Jeffrey L. Brudney, Ph.D.
University of Georgia
School of Public and International Affairs
Department of Public Administration and Policy
204 Baldwin Hall

Athens, GA 30602-1615
Tel. 706) 542-2977
Fax. 706) 583-0610
Email. jbrudney@uga.edu

Ram Cnaan
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania
3701 Locust Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Tel. 215 898 5523
Fax. 215 573 2099
Email cnaan@ssw.upenn.edu

Lucas C.P.M. Meijs
Business Society Management, Rotterdam School of Management
Erasmus University Rotterdam
P.O.Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands
Tel++-31-10-4081921
Fax.++-31-10-4473513
Email lucas.meijs@planet.nl

Proposed Panel Title: 'Episodic Volunteering': The Move from Long Term Volunteer Service to Short Term Involvements. Why It Happens and What the Future Holds

Panel Rationale: The panel is concerned with the phenomenon of the "shrinking" volunteer. The number of people willing to volunteer for a short term, or episodically, appears to be on the increase. Reports by the US Department of Labor show people serving for shorter periods of time annually. This is confirmed by the long term research of Independent Sector (2002). What has caused this apparent shift away from the long term commitment to volunteering prevalent in the past? Is the shift temporary or permanent?

Papers presented by panelist will start to address these questions by looking at them from different perspectives including: the 'recruitment fallacies' that discourage long term commitment; environmental and organizational factors that promote or impede volunteering; the impact of the shift to episodic volunteering on those managing volunteers; and the implications of episodic volunteering for the generation of social capital.. The arguments presented in the papers are grounded in research findings from studies in the fields of social work, organizational management and sociology. They are also grounded in applied research and practitioner literature.

Panel Focus and Scope: The first paper (Brilliant) looks at the problematics behind the statistics. It explores organizational and environmental factors that promote or impede volunteering. The second paper (Cnaan) provides a discrete analysis of the impact of the "recruitment fallacy" (just ask them and they will come) and builds the case that fewer people are willing to commit to long term service. The third paper (Meijs and Brudney) examines the difference between modes of service in different types of organization (programmatic or membership) and the implications of those differences for type of volunteering (long term or episodic). The final paper (Macduff) moves from the growth of episodic volunteering to the projections of some sociologists who predict the demise of volunteering if organizations are unwilling to drastically change the way they engage individuals in civic service. The chairperson/discussant has a track record as a scholar/practitioner and will ensure that the session is both scholarly and also focused on practitioner-relevant issues.

Key Words: episodic volunteering, volunteer recruitment, volunteer service, reflexivity, collectivism

The Four Proposed Papers

Paper One: Eleanor L. Brilliant - VOLUNTEERS AND AGENCY BOUNDARIES: ISSUES OF DISCOVERY

Although social science study of volunteers is of relatively recent origin (Karl, 1998), there is now a burgeoning scholarly and practitioner literature on the motivation of volunteers, the role of volunteers, recruitment and retention of volunteers, and the management of volunteers. Still many discussions of voluntarism make little distinction between different kinds and qualities of volunteering, and in general argue that more volunteering would be better. National surveys of charitable activity in the United States link volunteering and giving; and their findings suggest that households with people who volunteer may also be likely to give more money (Independent Sector, 2002). Volunteering is considered an important underpinning of a civil society (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 1999), and is a value laden concept. Nevertheless, even in a country like the United States which appears preoccupied with the idea of voluntarism, it is reported that only forty-four percent of adults volunteered with a formal organization in 2000.

This paper considers the problematics behind the numbers. It explores organizational and environmental factors that promote or impede volunteering, even while the rhetoric of our society proclaims the need for volunteers and the virtue of volunteer participation. I start from the premise that voluntary organizations are believed to be core instruments of a democratic system, and therefore they should be open organization systems with permeable boundaries (Scott, 2003). Nonetheless, it may be not easy for volunteers to find their way in to an organization, and transaction costs can make nonprofit organizations less open than is proclaimed. Volunteers who are defined as boundary-spanners (Hasenfeld, 1983) often meet with unanticipated obstacles to their good intentions. In this paper I analyze this issue. I will explore problems of boundaries, paths of access, control by group elites, organizational identity and diversity, conflicts around the meaning of inclusiveness, and shortages of organizational resources for outreach and absorption. My data will be provided by archival sources and reports, personal interviews, newspaper articles and other secondary sources. The paper will conclude with a discussion of future directions.

Paper Two: Ram Cnaan – THE RECRUITMENT FALLACY AND THE RISE OF EPISODIC VOLUNTEERING

There are a few reasons why episodic volunteering is on the rise and committed long-term volunteering is on the decline. One reason, often neglected in the literature, has to do with the “recruitment fallacy.” The “recruitment fallacy” refers to the idea that while people are most often recruited by being asked (and most often by someone they like) this is only the initial stage of recruitment. People who are asked and agree to volunteer then have to cross psychological thresholds that may be quite demanding. The new volunteer has to be interviewed by strangers, to be assigned by them, to come to a place where he or she knows no one or too few, where he or she will be the “novice” vis-à-vis the “regulars,” and to perform a task that he or she is not sure about. Clearly the process is not as alienating as described for all volunteers, but for others it is a psychologically frightening and daunting process. Often those who agree to volunteer are unaware of the process that lies ahead and the “asking friend” is soon out of the picture. The reality of the recruitment process may give the new volunteer “cold feet” so that he or she drops out.

The idea that being asked by a friend is sufficient is a fallacy. It ignores the need for a couched and protected entry process to volunteering. Unlike in a job recruitment process where people are willing to undergo the alienating process to secure employment, new volunteers expect to be pampered and valued.

Episodic volunteering provides a way of dealing with the “recruitment fallacy.” The newly recruited

volunteer risks only a little as the commitment is short-term; others are also new; there is no clique of veteran volunteers; the task does not require training by strangers; making new contacts is in the nature of the event; and the organizers are aware of the need to make people feel good. Attending to the flip side of the "recruitment fallacy," that is, lessening the psychological barriers of being a long-term volunteer, may encourage some people to do less episodic volunteering and more long-term volunteering.

Paper Three: Lucas Meijs and Jeffery Brudney – SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INAPPROPRIATE VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT

Putnam (1993, 2000) shows the importance of social capital. Despite the heated debate in academic circles concerning the direction of the relationship between volunteer work and social capital (does volunteer work produce social capital, or does social capital produce a rise in volunteerism?), it is generally acknowledged that a relationship exists.

Unlike "real" capital, social capital can be neither abused nor consumed, but must be manufactured and maintained. Putnam argues that face-to-face organizations and contacts are particularly important to the development of social capital. He expresses concerns about a new volunteerism in the United States that takes place mostly in the context of one-on-one relationships rather than in groups. While Putnam writes about the content of voluntary work, this paper looks at the consequences if volunteer management is successful in delivering services but not in developing social capital.

Meijs and Hoogstad (2000, 2001) draw a distinction between two approaches to management. 'Membership management' works with a stable group of volunteers who know one another and who together decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. In 'program management', in contrast, volunteers are sought according to the tasks that need to be fulfilled. Volunteers may enter with little difficulty, but may leave just as easily. In many cases, the volunteers hardly know each other at all. Are forms of volunteer management that are efficient and effective now potentially fatal for the formation of community (and therefore the long-term survival of the entire non-profit sector) in the future?

The paper will address this question using research literature on the relation between volunteering and social capital; data on trends in volunteering towards short term and episodic volunteering; and the results of a survey with (Dutch) managers of volunteer centers and national organizations to find out reactions of organizations to these changes and their expectations for the long run.

Paper Four: Nancy Macduff – THE SHRINKING VOLUNTEER: WHERE HAVE ALL THOSE LONG TERM SERVICE VOLUNTEERS GONE?

Beginning in the late 1980s, this author wrote and taught about the changes in the way people were volunteering in the US and Canada. The writing and training was prompted by the increasing number of managers of volunteer programs who reported dramatic increases in people requesting shorter assignments. Hard numbers soon augmented the unscientific report of changes in the way people volunteered. In a 1989 study there was a high interest in volunteer work of shorter duration. Fully 79% of those not volunteering said they would volunteer if it were a short duration task (JCPenney and Volunteer: The National Volunteer Center, 1989). Then in 1999 Independent Sector asked volunteers about the type of volunteering they were doing in relation to time spent. Episodic volunteering was reported by 49% of respondents (Independent Sector, 1999). Current Independent Sector research indicates that volunteers continue to reduce the amount of time spent per year volunteering (Independent Sector, 2003), increasingly asking for short-term assignments. The 1989 study was an early warning for what is reality in the 21st century.

The work of authors including Beck, Giddens, Lash, Eckstein, Ellison, Hustinx, Safrit, and Merrill lays the foundation for explaining apparent systemic changes in the nature of volunteering, especially in

Westernized countries. They suggest a picture of volunteering substantially different from that which has existed in the past. The preference for episodic types of positions require a new type of thinking by managers of volunteer programs. Episodic volunteers and short service positions, provide the opportunity to bring on board a new type of volunteer. Projects are short in duration or on an ad hoc basis. They are limited in time and commitment. The intensity of the involvement is significantly reduced (Hustinix and Lammertyn, 2003; Macduff, 2003). Personal motivations dictate the types of activities in which the individual might want to volunteer.

This paper reports the results of a survey of managers of volunteers and their perceptions about the increase in episodic volunteering and how the change is altering management strategies. It includes results on such things as the integration of long term service volunteers and episodic volunteers in the same program; how that is managed; the percentage of volunteer service in programs by time given; and what they see in the future for the way in which volunteers will serve clients and members in nonprofit organizations. The author uses the results of the survey to propose new means for practitioners to organize the entire volunteer service given to the organization.

References □

- Beck, Ulrich, (1994) "The Reinvention of Politics: Towards a Theory of Reflexive Modernization," in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA
- Beck, Ulrich, Giddens, Anthony, and Lash, Scott, (1994). *Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA
- Eckstein, Susan. (2001). "Community as Gift-Giving: Collectivistic Roots of Volunteerism." *American Sociological Review*, Vol 66. December.
- Ellison, Nick, (1997). "Towards a New Social Politics: Citizenship and Reflexivity in Late Modernity." *Sociology* Vol. 31, No. 4, November.
- Gaskin, Katherine, (1999) "Vanishing Volunteers: Are Young People Losing Interest in Volunteering?" *Voluntary Action*. Vol. 1, No. 1. Winter 1999
- Giddens, Anthony, (1984) "Living in a Post-Traditional Society," in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA 1994.
- Goss, Kristin. 1999. "Volunteering and the Long Civic Generation." *Nonprofit and Volunteer Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 28. No 4. December.
- Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. (1983). *Human Service Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hustinix, Lesley and Lammertyn, Frans, 2003. "Collective and Reflexive Styles of Volunteering: A Sociological Modernization Perspective," *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. Vol. 14, No. 2, June .
- INDEPENDENT SECTOR. (2002). *Giving & Volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: .
- Karl, Barry D. (1998). "Volunteers and Professionals: Many Histories, Many Meanings." In Powell, Walter W. and Clemens, Elizabeth S., Eds. *Private Action and the Public Good*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Lash, Scott, (1994) "Reflexivity and its Doubles: Structure, Aesthetics, Community," in *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA .
- Macduff, Nancy (2003). *Episodic Volunteering: A Management Strategy.*, MBA Publishing, Walla Walla, WA
- Meijs, Lucas C.P.M. en E.D. Hoogstad. (2000). Een ander paradigma? Het verschil tussen ledenmanagement en programma management van vrijwilligers. Gepresenteerd tijdens de derde onderzoeksdag over vrijwilligerswerk in Nederland en Vlaanderen, 30 november 2000. Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, Vakgroep Business Society Management, Faculteit Bedrijfskunde, Rotterdam.
- Meijs, Lucas C.P.M. Meijs and Esther Hoogstad. (2001). 'New ways of managing volunteers: combining membership management and programme management'. *Voluntary Action*. Vol 3, Nr. 3, p. 41-61.

Putnam, Robert D. With Robert Leonardi and Rafaella Y. Nanetti. (1992).

□ Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton University,

□ Princeton, N.J.

Putnam, Robert. (2000). Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Safrit, R. Dale and Merrill, Mary, (2002) "Management Implications of Contemporary Trends in Volunteerism in the United States and Canada," The Journal of Volunteer Administration, Vol. 20, No. 2, Spring

Scott, W. Richard.(2003). Rational, Natural and Open Systems, 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Skocpol, Theda and Morris P. Fiorina, Eds. (1999). Civic Engagement and American Democracy. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press and Russell Sage Foundation.

□

□

□

□

Paper Number: PN042043.1

Paper Title: Volunteers and Agency Boundaries: Issues of Discovery

Author(s):

Eleanor Brilliant, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Summary of Research

Volunteering is considered an important underpinning of a civil society (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 1999), and is a value laden concept. Nevertheless, even in a country like the United States which appears preoccupied with the idea of voluntarism, it is reported that only forty-four percent of adults volunteered with a formal organization in 2000.

This paper considers the problematics behind the numbers. It explores organizational and environmental factors that promote or impede volunteering, even while the rhetoric of our society proclaims the need for volunteers and the virtue of volunteer participation

Description

Although social science study of volunteers is of relatively recent origin (Karl, 1998), there is now a burgeoning scholarly and practitioner literature on the motivation of volunteers, the role of volunteers, recruitment and retention of volunteers, and the management of volunteers. Still many discussions of voluntarism make little distinction between different kinds and qualities of volunteering, and in general argue that more volunteering would be better. National surveys of charitable activity in the United States link volunteering and giving; and their findings suggest that households with people who volunteer may also be likely to give more money (Independent Sector, 2002). Volunteering is considered an important underpinning of a civil society (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 1999), and is a value laden concept. Nevertheless, even in a country like the United States which appears preoccupied with the idea of voluntarism, it is reported that only forty-four percent of adults volunteered with a formal organization in 2000.

This paper considers the problematics behind the numbers. It explores organizational and environmental factors that promote or impede volunteering, even while the rhetoric of our society proclaims the need for volunteers and the virtue of volunteer participation. I start from the premise that voluntary organizations are believed to be core instruments of a democratic system, and therefore they should be open organization systems with permeable boundaries (Scott, 2003). Nonetheless, it may be not easy for volunteers to find their way in to an organization, and transaction costs can make nonprofit organizations less open than is proclaimed. Volunteers who are defined as boundary-spanners (Hasenfeld, 1983) often meet with unanticipated obstacles to their good intentions. In this paper I analyze this issue. I will explore problems of boundaries, paths of access, control by group elites, organizational identity and diversity, conflicts around the meaning of inclusiveness, and shortages of organizational resources for outreach and absorption. My data will be provided by archival sources and reports, personal interviews, newspaper articles and other secondary sources. The paper will conclude with a discussion of future directions.

Paper Number: PN042043.2

Paper Title: The Recruitment Fallacy and the Rise of Episodic Volunteering

Author(s):

Ram Cnaan, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Summary of Research

There are reasons why episodic volunteering is on the rise and committed long-term volunteering is on the decline. One reason, often neglected in the literature, has to do with the "recruitment fallacy." Unlike in a job recruitment process where people are willing to undergo the alienating process to secure employment, new volunteers expect to be pampered and valued. Episodic volunteering provides a way of dealing with the "recruitment fallacy." The newly recruited volunteer risks little, as the commitment is short-term. This paper explores the impact on community social capital of new forms of volunteering.

Description

There are a few reasons why episodic volunteering is on the rise and committed long-term volunteering is on the decline. One reason, often neglected in the literature, has to do with the "recruitment fallacy." The "recruitment fallacy" refers to the idea that while people are most often recruited by being asked (and most often by someone they like) this is only the initial stage of recruitment. People who are asked and agree to volunteer then have to cross psychological thresholds that may be quite demanding. The new volunteer has to be interviewed by strangers, to be assigned by them, to come to a place where he or she knows no one or too few, where he or she will be the "novice" vis-à-vis the "regulars," and to perform a task that he or she is not sure about. Clearly the process is not as alienating as described for all volunteers, but for others it is a psychologically frightening and daunting process. Often those who agree to volunteer are unaware of the process that lies ahead and the "asking friend" is soon out of the picture. The reality of the recruitment process may give the new volunteer "cold feet" so that he or she drops out.

The idea that being asked by a friend is sufficient is a fallacy. It ignores the need for a coached and protected entry process to volunteering. Unlike in a job recruitment process where people are willing to undergo the alienating process to secure employment, new volunteers expect to be pampered and valued.

Episodic volunteering provides a way of dealing with the "recruitment fallacy." The newly recruited volunteer risks only a little as the commitment is short-term; others are also new; there is no clique of veteran volunteers; the task does not require training by strangers; making new contacts is in the nature of the event; and the organizers are aware of the need to make people feel good. Attending to the flip side of the "recruitment fallacy," that is, lessening the psychological barriers of being a long-term volunteer, may encourage some people to do less episodic volunteering and more long-term volunteering.

Paper Number: PN042043.3

Paper Title: Social Capital and Inappropriate Volunteer Management

Author(s):

Lucas Meijs, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, Netherlands

Jeffrey Brudney, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

Summary of Research

Putnam (1993, 2000) shows the importance of social capital. Despite debate in academic circles concerning the direction of the relationship between volunteer work and social capital (does volunteer work produce social capital, or does social capital produce a rise in volunteerism?), it is acknowledged that a relationship exists. Meijs and Hoogstad (2000, 2001) draw a distinction between two approaches to the management of volunteers with the potential for impacting social capital. This paper answers the question: "Are forms of volunteer management that are effective now potentially fatal for the formation of community and social capital in the future?"

Description

Putnam (1993, 2000) shows the importance of social capital. Despite the heated debate in academic circles concerning the direction of the relationship between volunteer work and social capital (does volunteer work produce social capital, or does social capital produce a rise in volunteerism?), it is generally acknowledged that a relationship exists.

Unlike "real" capital, social capital can be neither abused nor consumed, but must be manufactured and maintained. Putnam argues that face-to-face organizations and contacts are particularly important to the development of social capital. He expresses concerns about a new volunteerism in the United States that takes place mostly in the context of one-on-one relationships rather than in groups. While Putnam writes about the content of voluntary work, this paper looks at the consequences if volunteer management is successful in delivering services but not in developing social capital.

Meijs and Hoogstad (2000, 2001) draw a distinction between two approaches to management. 'Membership management' works with a stable group of volunteers who know one another and who together decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. In 'program management', in contrast, volunteers are sought according to the tasks that need to be fulfilled. Volunteers may enter with little difficulty, but may leave just as easily. In many cases, the volunteers hardly know each other at all. Are forms of volunteer management that are efficient and effective now potentially fatal for the formation of community (and therefore the long-term survival of the entire non-profit sector) in the future?

The paper will address this question using research literature on the relation between volunteering and social capital; data on trends in volunteering towards short term and episodic volunteering; and the results of a survey with (Dutch) managers of volunteer centers and national organizations to find out reactions of organizations to these changes and their expectations for the long run.

Paper Number: PN042043.4

Paper Title: The Shrinking Volunteer: Where Have All Those Long Term Service Volunteers Gone?

Author(s):

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

Summary of Research

79% of people not volunteering say they would volunteer if it were a short duration task (1989). In 1999 Independent Sector asked volunteers about the type of volunteering they were doing in relation to time spent. Episodic volunteering was reported by 49% of respondents (1999). The work of authors including Beck, Giddens, Lash, Eckstein, Ellison, Hustinx, Safrit, and Merrill lays the foundation for explaining systemic changes in the nature of volunteering. This paper reports the results of a survey of managers of volunteers and their perceptions about the increase in episodic volunteering and how change is altering management strategies.

Description

Beginning in the late 1980s, this author wrote and taught about the changes in the way people were volunteering in the US and Canada. The writing and training was prompted by the increasing number of managers of volunteer programs who reported dramatic increases in people requesting shorter assignments. Hard numbers soon augmented the unscientific report of changes in the way people volunteered. In a 1989 study there was a high interest in volunteer work of shorter duration. Fully 79% of those not volunteering said they would volunteer if it were a short duration task (JCPenney and Volunteer: The National Volunteer Center, 1989). Then in 1999 Independent Sector asked volunteers about the type of volunteering they were doing in relation to time spent. Episodic volunteering was reported by 49% of respondents (Independent Sector, 1999). Current Independent Sector research indicates that volunteers continue to reduce the amount of time spent per year volunteering (Independent Sector, 2003), increasingly asking for short-term assignments. The 1989 study was an early warning for what is reality in the 21st century.

The work of authors including Beck, Giddens, Lash, Eckstein, Ellison, Hustinx, Safrit, and Merrill lays the foundation for explaining apparent systemic changes in the nature of volunteering, especially in Westernized countries. They suggest a picture of volunteering substantially different from that which has existed in the past. The preference for episodic types of positions require a new type of thinking by managers of volunteer programs. Episodic volunteers and short service positions, provide the opportunity to bring on board a new type of volunteer. Projects are short in duration or on an ad hoc basis. They are limited in time and commitment. The intensity of the involvement is significantly reduced (Hustinx and Lammertyn, 2003; Macduff, 2003). Personal motivations dictate the types of activities in which the individual might want to volunteer.

This paper reports the results of a survey of managers of volunteers and their perceptions about the increase in episodic volunteering and how the change is altering management strategies. It includes results on such things as the integration of long term service volunteers and episodic volunteers in the same program; how that is managed; the percentage of volunteer service in programs by time given; and what they see in the future for the way in which volunteers will serve clients and members in nonprofit organizations. The author uses the results of the survey to propose new means for practitioners to organize the entire volunteer service given to the organization.

Paper Number: PA041110

Paper Title: Nonprofit Program Evaluation: Organizational Challenges and Resource Needs

Author(s):

Joanne Carman, SUNY at Albany, Albany, NY, USA

Judith L Millesen, Ohio University, Athens, OH, USA

Summary of Research

Using data gathered through a mail survey of nonprofit organizations, interviews with executives from nonprofit organizations, and interviews with executives of funding organizations, this empirical paper examines the evaluation challenges and resource needs of today's nonprofit organizations. The paper focuses on organizations providing human services in the fields of community development, developmental disabilities, and social services and examines how a variety of factors impact the evaluation experiences of nonprofit organizations, including the political and institutional environment, the service field, requirements of funders, executive leadership and support for evaluation, and various organizational characteristics.

Description

Using data gathered through a mail survey of nonprofit organizations, interviews with executives from nonprofit organizations, and interviews with funders, this paper examines the evaluation challenges and resource needs of today's nonprofit organizations. The research focuses on organizations providing human services in the fields of community development, developmental disabilities, and social services and examines how a variety of factors impact the evaluation experiences of nonprofit organizations, including the political and institutional environment, the service field, requirements of funders, executive leadership and support for evaluation, and various organizational characteristics. By relying on both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection, the research is both descriptive and explanatory.

This research has three key implications for evaluation theory and practice. First, this research adds to the small, but growing body of systematic and empirical research about nonprofits and program evaluation. While there has been a general consensus within the nonprofit and evaluation literatures about the value of doing program evaluation, there has been relatively little empirical research describing the extent to which nonprofit organizations are actually engaged in program evaluation, and even less empirical research about what these experiences are like.

Second, this research will add to the literature and describe the implementation challenges that nonprofits encounter when they do evaluation, including: data collection and management issues, staff resistance to data collection, lack of expertise, confidentiality issues, and the lack of resources. These data will help evaluators, funders, and nonprofit managers to better understand and hopefully avoid many of these implementation challenges, as well as help evaluators, funders, and nonprofit managers to build upon evaluation successes.

Third, this research will describe the resource needs of today's nonprofit organizations, including: technical assistance and training about evaluation concepts, computer hardware and software, evaluation training for staff, as well as external and internal leadership. These data will help evaluators, funders, and nonprofit managers to better understand the resource needs of nonprofit organizations, and help them to invest scarce resources in those areas that will be most helpful and useful.

Partial Bibliography

Alie, R. E. & Seita, J. R. (1997). Who's Using Evaluation and How? *New Study Gives Insight*. *Nonprofit World* 15 (5) 40-49.

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

Billitteri, T. J. (1998). Tracking the effectiveness of charities. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, June 4th, p. 35-37.

Fine, A. H., Thayer, C. E. & Coghlan, A. (1998). Program evaluation practice in the nonprofit sector. Washington, D.C.: Innovation Network, Inc.

Frederickson, H. G. (2000). Measuring performance in theory and practice. *PA Times*, 23 (8) 8-10.

Hendricks, M. (2000). Outcomes measurement in the nonprofit sector: Recent developments, incentives, and challenges. A paper prepared for the American Society for Public Administration, Center for Accountability and Performance, Symposium on Leadership of Results Oriented Management in Government, February 11-12, 2000, George Washington University.

Hoefer, R. (2000). Accountability in action? Program evaluation in nonprofit human service agencies. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 11(2) 167-177.

OMB Watch (1998). Measuring the measurers: A nonprofit assessment of the Government Performance and Results Act. Washington, D.C.

Paper Number: PA041204

Paper Title: Prepared for Quality? The Adoption and Implementation of Quality Systems in UK nonprofits

Author(s):

Ben Cairns, Centre for Voluntary Action Research, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Margaret Harris, Center for Voluntary Action Research, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Romayne Hutchison, Freelance Researcher, St. Albans, UK

Summary of Research

There are growing public policy pressures on nonprofits to demonstrate excellence in 'performance' but there has been little research on the implications of these pressures. This paper focuses on the adoption & implementation of 'quality approaches'/'quality systems' in nonprofits. Building on the findings from a wide empirical study in the UK, we examine the factors which drive nonprofits to adopt 'quality systems'. We analyse the distinctive challenges of implementing quality in a nonprofit context and suggest critical success factors. We conclude by discussing the organisational and policy implications of applying the concepts of 'quality' & 'performance' to the nonprofit sector.

Description

Proposal for a Paper for the ARNOVA 2004 Conference, Los Angeles

Proposed Title: 'Prepared for Quality? The Adoption and Implementation of Quality Systems in UK nonprofits'

This paper draws on a wide-ranging, large-scale study of the use of quality systems in the nonprofit sector (commonly referred to in the UK as 'the voluntary and community sector' or 'VCS'). It provides new perspectives on the drivers behind adoption of quality systems in the third sector as well as on the challenges of implementation.

Voluntary and community organisations (VCOs) are increasingly seen in the UK as instruments of public policy implementation and as an integral part of the 'mixed economy of welfare' (Harris, Rochester and Halfpenny, 2001). As their role in public services delivery has expanded, VCOs have also been asked to demonstrate that they have some form of 'performance improvement' or 'quality management' system in operation. Initially, adoption of quality approaches was 'encouraged' by threats of privatisation and loss of service contracts. With the election of the New Labour government in 1997, there was a shift to a 'Best Value' approach (Donnelly, 1999), the fundamental principles of which are 'challenging, consulting, comparing and competing' (Barclay and Abdy, 2001). Two recent major policy documents from central government departments explicitly refer to 'quality' as a means by which third sector deliverers of public services can be 'modernised' and their 'performance' improved (HM Treasury, 2002; Strategy Unit, 2002). Thus national government initiatives and the requirements of the sector's funders in general, have produced an explosion of interest in 'quality' and 'quality systems' across the UK voluntary sector over the last few years (Bradshaw et al., 1998; Cole, 1998).

In spite of this growing interest amongst policy makers and VCOs themselves, there has been up to now very little research into the organisational implications for VCOs of adopting and implementing a quality approach. Much of the rhetoric about quality systems suggests that they can encourage organisational harmony as well as cohesion in organisational objectives although there is little empirical evidence to support this argument. Indeed, the lack of precision in measurement schemes and the essentially subjective nature of 'measuring' human services pose real challenges for implementation. There has been some evidence that quality systems can actually create organisational problems (for example, Cole, 1998; Gaster, 1995; Hackman and Wageman, 1995; Paton et al, 2000; Walsh, 1995;).

The study reported in this paper broke new ground by combining an extensive literature review (CVAR, 2003) with both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection (CVAR, 2004). It thus

represents the first substantial and integrated study of quality systems in the UK VCS. The fieldwork for the study comprised an online and postal questionnaire completed by 165 VCOs; 55 semi-structured telephone interviews and 14 focus groups with representatives from 24 VCOs, 10 VCS 'infrastructure bodies' and four 'guardians' of the most commonly used standard quality systems.

The data revealed a wide range of reasons behind the decision by a nonprofit to adopt a quality system. Whilst these drivers can be seen as both multiple and interlocking, we draw a distinction between mandatory drivers and voluntary drivers. Both the decision to adopt a quality system in general and the decision to adopt a specific system are decisions which are driven by guidance (sometimes pressure) from governmental funders. We also found (as did Scott and Cole (2000) in the US) that some VCOs anticipate and pre-empt pressures from funders and other external stakeholders by voluntarily adopting a quality system before they are forced to do so. Interviews with representatives of VCOs themselves indicated that an adopted quality system is much more likely to be viewed positively if it has been accepted voluntarily rather than imposed from outside. The degree of satisfaction with an adopted system is also related to the extent to which the chosen system provides an 'organisational fit'. Some VCOs develop their own systems or adapt the standard ones to reflect the nature of their services and clients.

With regard to implementation, the study found that the challenges are essentially operational, rather than ideological: in general the idea of adopting quality appears to be firmly embedded within the sector. However, there was evidence that VCOs would benefit from, and welcome, support in implementing quality. They want information about choices and ongoing guidance when systems are implemented. They need support especially to ensure that quality systems can be understood, justified and practically useful; that timescales are realistic; that resources are made available; and that targets are achievable.

A number of the VCO interviewees raised the question of quality issues being seen as an 'add on' to other work rather than integral to all systems and processes within their organisations. It appears that quality is more likely to be useful and accepted if it is integrated into strategic planning processes, work plans and organisational reviews. Organisations where quality remained an 'extra', to be discussed and worked on as time allowed, generally struggled with the concept and experienced only limited benefits in terms of improved services and greater sustainability.

The paper concludes with a discussion of the management, organisational, operational and policy implications of the study findings for individual VCOs and for policy-makers currently concerned with the role of the third sector in the delivery of public services.

References

Barclay, J. and M. Abdy (2001) *Funders and Quality in the Voluntary Sector*, QSTG / NCVO, London

Bradshaw, Y., I. Kendall, M. Blackmore, N. Johnson and S. Jenkinson (1998) 'Complaining Our Way to Quality: Complaints, Contracts and the Voluntary Sector', *Social Policy and Administration*, Volume 32, No. 3, pp209-225

Cole, R. (1998) 'Learning from the Quality Movement: What Did and Didn't Happen and Why?' *California Management Review*, 41 (1), pp43-73

CVAR (Centre for Voluntary Action Research) (2003) *Literature Review on The Adoption and Use of Quality Systems in the Voluntary Sector*, QSTG/CES/NCVO, London

CVAR (Centre for Voluntary Action Research) (2004) *Study on The Adoption and Use of Quality Systems in the Voluntary Sector*, QSTG/CES/NCVO, London

Donnelly, M. (1999) 'Making the difference: quality strategy in the public sector', *Managing Service Quality*, Bedford, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp47-52

Gaster, L. (1995) *Quality in Public Services*, Open University Press, Buckingham

Her Majesty's Treasury (2002) *The Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector in Service Delivery - A Cross Cutting Review*, HM Treasury, London

Hackman, J.R. and R. Wageman (1995) 'Total Quality Management: Empirical, Conceptual and Practical Issues', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40 (2), pp 309-342

Harris, M.; C. Rochester and P. Halfpenny (2001) 'Voluntary Organisations and Social Policy: Twenty Years of Change', in M. Harris and C. Rochester (eds) *Voluntary Organisations and Social Policy in Britain*, Palgrave, Basingstoke

Paton, R.; J. Foot and G. Payne (2000) 'What Happens When Nonprofits Use Quality Models for Self-Assessment?' *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Fall 2000, pp21-34

Scott, W.R. and Cole, R. (eds) (2000) *The Quality Movement and Organisational Theory* Sage, Thousand Oaks

Strategy Unit (2002) *Private Action, Public Benefit – A review of Charities and the Wider Not-For-Profit Sector*, Strategy Unit, London

Walsh, K. (1995) 'Quality through markets' in A. Wilkinson and H. Willmott (eds) *Making Quality Critical*, International Thomson Business Press, London and Boston

Paper Number: PA041341

Paper Title: A Stakeholders' Approach to Design and Implementation of a Social Service, Evaluation System

Author(s):

Stephen Wernet, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO, USA

Gerald Blasi, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

Summary of Research

With the increasing demand for accountability, stakeholder designed and implemented assessment systems provide an alternative approach to hierarchically established systems. This paper reports on a case study of a major, metropolitan United Way's, stakeholder approach to design and implementation of its impact assessment system. The case study uses interviews, document analysis and participant observation to report on the initial work phases and steps in the system design and implementation.

Description

1. the problem or issue to be addressed

Over the past decade, accountability within the nonprofit sector has become increasingly important. It has taken numerous forms including financial, governance, and programmatic. Of particular interest to nonprofit, management professionals is programmatic accountability, sometimes referred to impact assessment.

Impact assessment is the concern with client change attributable to program services or intervention (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004).

For the most part, impact assessment has utilized classic, experimental design. However, there are other approaches to impact assessment that employ comparisons based upon quasi-experimental as well as nonexperimental designs. These latter approaches to programmatic evaluation have become increasingly important, and the norm within many federated fundraising systems.

The question that faces nonprofit professionals regarding evaluation systems is how to design and implement a system that is respected and supported by all major players within the system?

2. the topic's relation to the state of knowledge in the field (including relevant literature)

Accountability itself has numerous perspectives and approaches (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004; Mark, Henry and Julnes, 2000). Some approaches refer to accountability as process, formative or implementation assessment. Here accountability is focused upon the implementation of program services testing for fidelity to program design.

Others refer to accountability as outcome, summative or impact assessment. Here accountability is focused upon the client change attributable to program services.

Assessment for accountability has numerous perspectives. Some define it from a positivistic perspective that equates to classical hypothesis testing. Some define assessment from a postpositivistic perspective that perceives it as an interpretive phenomenon.

One approach to assessment is the stakeholder approach (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004). In this approach, every interested party is included within the evaluation from the outset. This approach attempts to meld a postpositivistic perspective with both implementation and impact assessments. It is believed that a stakeholder approach to evaluation will insure an assessment system that is supported by all major stakeholders of a human service system. There is some empirical literature on this subject. Unfortunately, it is sparse and limited. There is a need to expand our understanding of these stakeholder designed and implemented systems.

3. the approach you will take (including data sources)

This paper will report on the development of a system-wide assessment system utilizing a stakeholder approach. The system design and implementation is currently in process. This work is a multi year project begun in 2003 and slated for completion no later than 2007. The system design and implementation consists of numerous phases with several steps. The first of several steps in the first phase have been completed and the first steps of the second phase are currently beginning.

Designed as a case study (Yin, 2003), the authors will report on the development and implementation of the assessment system within a major, metropolitan United Way system. The case study will report on data collected from documents, interviews and observations with funded service organizations, and interviews and observations of professionals and staff involved from the United Way perspective. The authors will report as participant observers in the design and implementation process.

4. the contribution to the field your work will make

This work will help the field in several ways. It will help expand the field's understanding of the stakeholder approach to assessment and evaluation. The work will also expand our knowledge about phased approaches to designing evaluation systems.

5. References

Mark, Henry and Julnes. (2000). *Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding and Improving Policies and Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, (2004). *Evaluation. A Systematic Approach*. Seventh Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Paper Number: PA041014

Paper Title: Understanding The Influence Of Ethnicity And Religion On Volunteering And Giving In Canada

Author(s):

Ida E. Berger, Ryerson University, Toronto, CANADA

Summary of Research

Recognition of the multi-cultural nature of the Canadian population has led many companies to consider ways of reaching beyond their traditional bases of support to target hitherto untapped ethnic or religious communities. Likewise, market conditions within the voluntary sector have pushed many non-profit organizations to consider market segmentation and targeting as a means of survival and growth. Unfortunately, there is no systematic Canadian research on the attitudes, social norms, benefits sought, opportunities, experiences or behaviors of ethnic and/or religious groups in the philanthropic sector. This paper contributes to this gap by examining philanthropy by ethnic and religious identity.

Description

UNDERSTANDING THE INFLUENCE OF ETHNICITY AND RELIGION ON VOLUNTEERING AND GIVING IN CANADA

Ida E. Berger
Ryerson University

Recognition of the multi-cultural nature of the Canadian population has led many companies across a wide array of business domains to consider ways of reaching beyond their traditional bases of support to target hitherto untapped ethnic or religious communities. Likewise, market conditions within the voluntary sector have pushed many non-profit organizations to consider business models, including market segmentation and targeting, as a means of survival and growth (Husbands, McKechnie and Gagnon, 1999). However, this task is neither easy nor straightforward. Strategists and managers must recognize that different ethnic/religious groups function within different sets of beliefs about, and attitudes toward philanthropy and voluntary behavior; and that there are differences in normative pressures among individual ethnic/religious groups. Unfortunately, there is no systematic Canadian research on the attitudes, social norms, benefits sought, expectations, opportunities, experiences or behaviours of ethnic and/or religious groups in the philanthropic sector. This paper contributes to this gap by examining philanthropic behaviour by ethnic and religious identity.

This paper seeks to understand and explain the relationship between ethnic/religious identity and philanthropic behavior (giving of time and money) in Canada. Specifically, using the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) the research: 1) compares and contrasts the voluntary and philanthropic behaviors of the Canadian population across ethnic and religious lines; 2) compares and contrasts the motivations for and perceived impediments against such action; and by so doing 3) articulates and examines a model that traces the influence of ethnicity on voluntary and philanthropic behavior in a multi-cultural society.

Consistent with recent work looking at the role of human, cultural and social resources in explaining race-based (Musick, Wilson and Bynum, 2000), gender-based (Schlozman, Burns and Verba, 1994) and religion-based (Cnaan, Kasternakis and Wineburg, 1993) differences in philanthropy, this study will examine ethnicity and religion-based differences in attitudes, norms and philanthropic behaviors (both the giving of time and money) in the Canadian population. In this study I take the position that ethno-cultural diversity (whether one is, or chooses to see oneself as, a Canadian-Jew, a Chinese-Canadian or an un-hyphenated Canadian, for instance) influences the nature of attitudes toward, and perceived normative pressures regarding philanthropic behavior. It is through this dual mediation process that

ethnicity influences giving behaviors.

Attitudinal Influences. There exists a large literature examining “cultural asymmetry” in preference and persuasion, implying that different behaviors are consistent with different cultural meanings. (See Aaker, 2000 for a review.) The asymmetric findings have been explained as stemming from two cognitive processes. First, because of diversity in culturally based traditions, religions, and histories, different cultures hold culturally distinct sets of values and beliefs. Secondly, culturally distinct media, personal experiences or social environments render culturally distinct beliefs more accessible. The cultural asymmetric findings imply that the specific beliefs associated with giving, the way they are evaluated and consequently the attitudes toward giving behavior in general, and towards giving to specific organizations in particular, will vary by ethnicity.

Normative Influences. In addition to personal, within individual factors, philanthropic behavior may also be influenced by the norms and obligations of an individual’s social network. Higher levels of culturally distinct identification with an ethnic or religious group should lead to a stronger network of culturally distinct relationships that in turn lead to higher levels of culturally distinct voluntary behavior. This implies that those with strong culturally distinct identities will be embedded in social networks dominated by culturally distinct referent others. Subjective norms in such a network would direct members to contribute resources (both time and money) to the culturally distinct activities that are valued by the network. (See Berger and Gainer, 2000 for support for this conceptualization in the U.S. Jewish community.) In other words, the decision to give, and where, will depend on the extent to which the behavior supports, and is supported by, an individual’s chosen social network and therefore will vary by ethnicity.

Facilitating/impeding factors. Ethnic diversity is now a mainstay in profiles of the Canadian population. Liberal immigration policies have resulted in a large proportion of citizens with ancestries other than our two founding peoples (English and French). While this diversity adds immeasurably to the richness of our culture it also challenges us to continually examine the accessibility, inclusiveness and equity of our institutions and processes. We point regularly to our society's unique ability to integrate many diverse cultures while still supporting diversity, yet, there is evidence of discrimination along ethnic or religious lines.

If members of ethnic or religious groups are systematically excluded from participating in the voluntary sector, either because of their own motivations or because of social barriers, then they are excluded from the very processes through which their social and economic status might improve, and the processes through which they might contribute fully to Canadian society. It is the purpose of this paper to examine whether or not there are systematic differences in philanthropic participation by ethnic or religious identity. In addition, I explore whether such differences stem from personal motivations (attitudinal or normative) and/or social barriers.

As a multi-cultural country, where ethnic diversity is celebrated, and immigration a constant reality, Canada is composed of a growing number of citizens who define themselves as both Canadians and members of ethnic/religious sub-cultures. Within the Canadian voluntary sector researchers have demonstrated the importance of religion and religiosity in discriminating between those who are and those who are not civically active (Reed and Selbee, 2001). However, the implications of ethno-cultural diversity in attitudes and norms regarding philanthropy have not been explicitly addressed. This paper will focus on this gap. The paper will consider diversity in the motivations and normative pressures toward philanthropy expressed by different ethnic groups in Canada. With this knowledge, broad-based, ethnically neutral organizations will be able to develop effective strategies to attract ethnically identified citizens. Similarly, ethnically specific organizations will be able to develop effective strategies for attracting and holding members and volunteers whose identities may be assimilating into the general Canadian culture.

References.

Aaker, Jennifer L (2000) "Accessibility or Diagnosticity? Disentangling the Influence of Culture on Persuasion Processes and Attitudes", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26 (March), 340-357.

Berger, Ida E. and Brenda Gainer (2000) *Identity, Communal Embeddedness and Philanthropy*, Presented at the Fourth International Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Dublin, Ireland.

Cnaan, R., A. Kasternakis & R.J. Wineburg, (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: Is there a link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22 (1): 33-51.

Husbands, Winston, A-J McKechnie and Mario Gagnon (1999). *An Assessment of the Need to Improve the Body of Knowledge on Volunteers and Volunteering in Canada*. Toronto: CCP

Musick, Marc A, John Wilson and William B. Bynum (2000). "Race and Formal Volunteering: The Differential Effects of Class and Religion," *Social Forces*, 78:4, 1539-1571.

Reed, Paul B. and L. Kevin Selbee (2001) "The Civic Core: Disproportionality in Charitable Giving, Volunteering, and Civic Participation". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 4, December 2001 761-780.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns and Sidney Verba (1994). "Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources," *The Journal of Politics*, 56, No. 4, 963-90.

Paper Number: PA041141

Paper Title: Wealth, Wealth Transfer, and Philanthropy Among African-American Households

Author(s):

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

Summary of Research

In 2001 there were 13.2 million U.S. households with an African-American householder. These households earned 7.1 percent of aggregate household income, owned 2.5 percent of aggregate household wealth, and contributed 5.4 percent of aggregate household charitable giving. This paper presents (1) statistical patterns and trends in income, wealth, and philanthropic giving among households with African-American householders, and (2) estimates of wealth transfer and projections of inter vivos philanthropic giving from 2001 through 2055 for these same households. The patterns for African-American householders are contrasted with patterns for non African-American householders, controlling for income and initial levels of household wealth.

Description

In 1998 we developed a wealth transfer microsimulation model (WTMM) to project the amount of wealth to be transferred from the adult population in 1998 to charitable organizations, government (via taxes), and heirs in the 55-year period from 1998 through 2052. Using the model, we estimated that \$41 trillion (1998 dollars) would be transferred under the assumption of 2 percent real growth in wealth, \$73 trillion under the assumption of 3 percent real growth in wealth, and \$136 trillion under the assumption of 4 percent real growth in wealth. Assuming the \$41 trillion were all transferred at death via final estates (estates without a surviving spouse) and assuming that allocation of that amount followed historical averages, there was a potential \$6 trillion to be allocated to charitable causes during the 55 year period. The corresponding estimates for potential allocations to charity were \$12 trillion in the 3 percent growth scenario and \$25 trillion in the 4 percent growth scenario.

The WTMM is based on data from the Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF), a survey of approximately 4,500 households conducted every three years sponsored by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve. The sample consists of a random sample of approximately 3,000 households and a high wealth oversample of approximately 1,500 households. The total sample is weighted to be representative of the population. The survey contains detailed information on assets owned and liabilities owed by members of the household. It also contains detailed information on sources of income, employment, and demographic characteristics, including Race of householder. It is therefore a good source of information concerning household wealth (i.e. net worth) and its distribution by race.

In addition to data from the SCF, the WTMM incorporates mortality rates derived from mortality data assembled by the Center for Disease Control, life cycle savings rates estimated from the SCF, and historical allocations of the value of final estates (estates without a surviving spouse) among heirs, government (via estate and gift taxes), and charitable derived from Internal Revenue Service data. The main functions of the WTMM grows household wealth along secular trend modified by life cycle savings rates, calculates the number of final estates, and allocates the value of these estates by asset class to heirs, taxes, and charitable causes. Since the original model was calibrated using national data without regard to race, it was incapable of producing estimates of wealth transfer for African-American households.

In 2003 we began a project to expand and update the WTMM. The update process recalibrates the model based on data from the 2001 SCF, new mortality rates from the CDC, and updated allocation rates based on IRS data from 1992 through 2001. The expansion of the model includes modifications to accommodate changes in the federal estate tax law, inclusion of projections of inter vivos charitable giving along trend, and estimation of parameters to allow wealth transfer estimates by selected demographic characteristics, including analysis of wealth transfer by African American householders.

Since 1998 we have frequently been asked for estimates of wealth transfer for African-American households. This paper will present this often-requested analysis and will first place the wealth transfer results in the context of patterns and trends in income, wealth, and philanthropy among African-American householders. The paper is thus divided into two sections.

The first section presents patterns and trends regarding income, wealth, and charitable contributions among African-American householders as contrasted with non African-American householders. This analysis is based primarily on SCF data for 1992, 1995, 1998, and 2001 and will include an examination of the composition of portfolios of assets. One issue addressed in this section is the rate of growth of wealth among African-American as compared with other households. Variations in income, wealth, and philanthropy among African-American households by education, marital status, and other demographic characteristics will be presented. The information in the first section of the paper will serve as a context for understanding the levels and amounts of wealth transfer by African-American households.

The second section of the paper will present the estimates of wealth transfer from the application of the expanded wealth transfer model. These findings will estimate the amount of wealth transfer and its allocation among charitable causes, taxes, and heirs among African-American households from 2001 through 2055. The estimates will be tabulated by household net worth in 2001 and by household net worth at time of death. The estimates for African-American households will be contrasted with corresponding estimates for non African-American households. Discrepancies in wealth transfer will be related to differences in education, marital status, initial household income, initial size of household, and life expectancy between African American and non African American households.

Paper Number: PA041279

Paper Title: Do the rich donate more? Differences in the practice of philanthropy between higher and lower income groups in the Netherlands.

Author(s):

Pamala Wiepking, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Summary of Research

This paper considers direct and indirect relationships between income and donating behaviour. We expect people from different income groups to experience different rewards and restrictions when making charitable donations, leading to differences in the amount they donate. Results show that in absolute terms people in higher income groups donate more money, but in relative terms both the richest and the poorest donate most. We find that the 'price of giving' is an important explanation for the Dutch higher income groups to donate more money, and that psychological rewards explain part of the proportional large donations of the lower income groups.

Description

In the Netherlands, philanthropy is big business. The total household contributions made to charity is estimated at 1,753,000 euro in 2001. No less than 83 % of the Dutch households contributed to this total, with an average donation of € 303,-. However, the median donation was lower (€114,-), indicating that there are large differences between households in the amount of money donated (Schuyt, 2003). Intuitively, variation in income is a logical explanation for differences between households in donating behaviour. The research question of this paper is: What are the direct and indirect influences of income on donating behaviour?

In order to answer this question, we first summarize and test recent assumptions and results found in philanthropic literature about the relationship between income and donating behaviour with Dutch data. Bivariate results show that a) the direct relation of income on donating behaviour is positive linear (Meuleman and Beckers, 2003); (Rooney, Steinberg and Schervish, 2001); (Damen et al., 2000); (Regnerus, Smith and Sikkink, 1998); (Smith, Kehoe and Cremer, 1995) and b) in relative terms this relation is U-shaped. Both the rich and the poor give the largest percentage of their income to philanthropy (Andreoni, 2001); (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996); (Jencks, 1987).

An explanation for the first part of this U-shaped pattern of giving is that those with a low income will predominantly be young people, who expect their income to be rising in the near future and therefore they might feel that they can afford to donate relatively large amounts (Andreoni, 2001). Another assumption we test is the so-called 'price of giving'. Due to tax regulations the material costs of a charitable donation differ for people of different income groups (Jencks, 1987; Wolff, 1999; Bakija, 2000). People in higher income groups gain more by deducting their donations than people in low income groups and therefore the first will donate more.

Next to these explanations found in previous philanthropic literature, we construct new hypotheses about the direct and indirect relation between income and donating behaviour. These hypotheses are based upon the theoretical assumption that people of different income groups experience different restrictions and rewards when making a charitable donation.

In order to test our assumptions, we use the second wave of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey (henceforth abbreviated as GINPS03). The GINPS03 is a national survey among +/- 1,500 randomly sampled individuals from a pool of 40,000 households. Data will be collected in May 2004 with a web-based survey, for which participants receive an invitation by e-mail. The GINPS03 contains extensive 'Area' modules on giving and volunteering, and special attention is paid towards issues related to income.

Because the GINPS03 data is not available at the time of writing, we discuss some preliminary descriptive results for the GINPS01 data (the first wave of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey) about the direct relationship between income and donating behaviour. The questions asked in

GINPS01 are highly comparable to those in GINPS03, with the exclusion of some income related questions. In the final paper 'Do the rich donate more?' Heckman Two Stage Regression will be used to test multivariate assumptions about the direct and indirect relationship between income and donating behaviour.

Table 1 Descriptive results for the direct and relative relation between income and amount of money donated (donors only).

Income	Mean donation(€)	Mean ratio(*1000)	N
Less than € 15,000	166.51	16.16	70
€ 15,000 – € 20,500	210.16	11.59	74
€ 20,500 – € 23,000	182.01	8.37	64
€ 23,000 - € 28,000	182.23	7.08	187
€ 28,000 – € 34,000	215.50	6.90	182
€ 34,000 - € 45,000	243.62	6.17	289
€ 45,000 - € 56,000	259.40	5.14	299
€ 56,000 - € 68,000	390.66	6.30	72
€ 68,000 - € 91,000	574.87	7.23	86
More than € 91,000	248.84	2.04	74
Total	255.02	6.91	1397

The bivariate results in table 1 show that income is indeed linear related to amount of money donated, and that there is an almost U-shaped pattern for the relative relationship between income and amount donated. Only people who earn more than €91,000 do not fit into this U-shape pattern, as they donate only 2 ‰ of their income to charity. Other preliminary results of the GINPS01 data show that the 'price of giving' is an important explanation for the Dutch higher income groups to donate more money, and that psychological rewards can explain part of the proportional large donations of the lower income groups.

Literature

- Andreoni, J. 2001. "The Economics of Philanthropy." in International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science, edited by N.J. Smelser, and P.B. Baltes. London: Elsevier.
- Bakija. 2000. Distinguishing Transitory and Permanent Price Elasticities of Charitable Giving with Pre-Announced Changes in Tax Law. Unpublished paper.
- Damen, S., D. Mortelmans, L. Raeymaeckers, R. Röben, and D. Versweyveld. 2000. "De wilde weldoener? Vlaamse geefpatronen aan liefdadigheid." PSW-paper 2000.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia A., and Murray S. Weitzman. 1996. Giving and Volunteering in the United States. Washington: Independent Sector.
- Jencks, C. 1987. "Who Gives to What?" Pp. 321-339 in The Non-Profit Sector. A Research Handbook, edited by W.W. Powell. London: Yale University Press.
- Meuleman, Heiner, and Tilo Beckers. 2003. "Hat die Flut vom August 2002 die Spendenaktivität gesteigert? Ein vergleich der Häufigkeit und der Hintergründe habitueller und Spontaner Spenden." ZA-Information 52:37-57.
- Regnerus, Mark D., Christian Smith, and David Sikkink. 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 37:481-493.
- Rooney, P.M., K.S. Steinberg, and P.G. Schervish. 2001. "A Methodological Comparison of Giving Surveys: Indiana as a Test Case." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 30:551-568.
- Schuyt, Th.N.M. (Ed.). 2003. Geven in Nederland 2003. Houten: Bohn, Stafleu en Van Loghum.
- Smith, Vincent H., Michael R. Kehoe, and Mary E. Cremer. 1995. "The Private Provision of Public Goods: Altruism and Voluntary Giving." Journal of Public Economics 58:107-126.
- Wolff, E. 1999. "The Economy and Philanthropy." Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America. Pp: 73-98 in C. T. Clotfelter and T. Ehrlich (Eds.). Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Paper Number: PA041389

Paper Title: Asian-American Philanthropy: Increasing Knowledge, Expanding Possibilities

Author(s):

Andrew T Ho, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

Summary of Research

How can the nonprofit community best encourage philanthropy in the growing affluent Asian-American population? Through using a survey, personal interviews, and comparing the data with existing research, this paper will explore and identify the questions that need to be asked of those that have the wealth to be philanthropists. By gathering a set of questions that can provide increased knowledge about the giving patterns of Asian-Americans, the nonprofit community will be able to expand its possibilities in understanding how to encourage philanthropy by meeting the needs of the sophisticated and modern Asian-American philanthropist.

Description

ARNOVA 33rd Annual Conference

Proposed Paper: Asian-American Philanthropy: Increasing Knowledge, Expanding Possibilities

Author: □ Andrew Ho, Georgetown University

Summary

How can the nonprofit community best encourage philanthropy in the growing affluent Asian-American population? This paper will explore and identify the questions that need to be asked of those that have the wealth to be philanthropists, but are not yet, including: Why do some choose to put their wealth into a foundation, but others are content with charity? What about the use of other tools of giving such as establishing a donor advised fund, endowing a scholarship at a university, contributing to a community foundation, or giving annually to service organizations? What level of net worth allows an Asian-American to feel comfortable about giving to a cause that goes beyond one's extended family? To what causes are Asian-Americans most likely to give to? Is one's giving limited to one's own Asian community (Chinese, Korean, Filipino, etc.), to the larger pan-Asian community, or does giving extend to more general, non-Asian causes? Is there a difference between first and second generation Asian-Americans in their perspectives on giving? What about the Asian-Americans who have been in the United States for five or six generations? They are likely to no longer have any ties to relatives remaining in Asia; have they been fully inculcated in American philanthropic models of giving, or are there still hints of Asian culture influencing their giving? By gathering a set of questions that can provide increased knowledge about the giving patterns of Asian-Americans, the nonprofit community will be able to expand its possibilities in understanding how to encourage philanthropy by meeting the needs of the sophisticated and modern Asian-American philanthropist.

Issues to be addressed

What are the questions that can be asked of Asian-Americans to encourage philanthropy? What is being done now to encourage greater philanthropy in the Asian community? What are nonprofits involved with Asian-Americans doing now? What are the differences between philanthropy in Asia and philanthropy by Asian-Americans? From previous studies we see definitive patterns of giving by Asians. Do these patterns change with each succeeding generation growing up in America? What are the differences between various Asian ethnic groups (Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Filipino, Vietnamese) in their giving patterns?

Relationship to the state of knowledge

According to the 2000 U.S. census, Asian-Americans make up 4.3% of the total U.S. population -- about 12 million people who identify themselves as at least part Asian. However, this number represents an increase of 63% from the 1990 census, making Asian-Americans the fastest growing of all the major racial/ethnic groups in the U.S., in terms of percentage growth. Though they constitute

only 3% of the national population, they make up 5% of the affluent households (incomes over \$100,000). As Asian-Americans increase in wealth and influence in the United States, this demographic and its impact on American philanthropy must be understood. With little prior research being done in this area, and with no quantitative data sets compiled for affluent Asian-Americans, the nonprofit sector has overlooked an increasingly important demographic to philanthropy in America.

Sources of data

One source of data will be from the development of a survey about attitudes toward philanthropy. The survey will attempt to gauge the influence of a variety of factors on attitudes toward philanthropy, charity, and giving. Some of these factors include, but are not limited to: perceptions of wealth, levels of household wealth, education levels, generational differences in attitudes towards philanthropy, influences of Asian culture and American culture on giving, and identifying causes that Asian-Americans feel are worth giving to. A second source of data will come from face to face interviews. Potential interview subjects include wealthy Asian-Americans, Asian-American young professionals, and small business owners who have potential for future philanthropy. A third source of information will be from past studies of Asian-Americans and philanthropy. By comparing what has been studied with the new data collected from surveys and interviews, a list of questions can be developed to provide a basis for more in-depth research on this demographic and enable the philanthropic community to hypothesize about the future impact of Asian-Americans on overall philanthropy in America.

Contribution to the field

Diversity in philanthropy is a growing trend in 21st century America. In order for the philanthropic sector to keep up with the growing demands of an increasingly diverse population, research needs to continue in areas that will contribute knowledge and understanding to the sector. Developing this set of questions is the first step towards having a more comprehensive understanding of the impact Asian-Americans could have on philanthropy in the United States in the 21st century. The results are expected to generate discussion in foundations, nonprofits, and thinktanks interested in the impact of diversity on the philanthropic and wider nonprofit sector.

Preliminary Bibliography

Chambers, Simone and Will Kymlicka, editor. *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Chao, Jessica. *Topics in Asian American Philanthropy and Voluntarism*. Center for Study of Philanthropy, New York. 2001.

Chao, Jessica. *Asian-American Philanthropy: Expanding Circles of Participation*. Council on Foundations, 1999.

Ilchman, Warren F., editor. *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998.

Lee, Robert. *Guide to Chinese-American Philanthropy and Charitable Giving Patterns*. San Rafael, CA: Pathway Press, 1990.

Ostrower, Francie. *Why The Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Reeves, Terrence and Claudette Bennett. *The Asian and Pacific Islander Population in the United States, March 2002*. U.S. Census Bureau Report.

Smith, Bradford, et al. *Philanthropy in Communities of Color*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999.

Paper Number: PA041039

Paper Title: Strengthening The Capacity of Executive Directors

Author(s):

Keith Seel, Institute for Nonprofit Studies, Mount Royal College, Calgary, CANADA

Anita Angelini, Institute for Nonprofit Studies, Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta, CAN

Summary of Research

This exploratory grounded theory research project addresses executive directors' understandings of job satisfaction/quality relative to their role. A sample of nine executive directors of small nonprofits used an action learning model to guide group discussions of eight dimensions of job quality/satisfaction. Specific questions are: 1) How can a peer-to-peer action learning model be constituted with executive directors for the purpose of finding strategic and tactical solutions to job quality and job satisfaction issues? and, 2) What are the conceptual elements of a grounded theory of job satisfaction and job quality for executive directors of small social service organizations?

Description

Strengthening The Capacity of Executive Directors

Authors

Keith Seel, PhD. Candidate, Mount Royal College, Alberta, Canada

Anita Angelini MBA, Mount Royal College, Alberta, Canada

Introduction

The paper presents the findings of a 9 month project focusing on the job quality and job satisfaction issues faced by Executive Directors (EDs) of small social service organizations. The research project, "Strengthening the Capacity of Executive Directors," began in October 2003 and concluded in June 2004.

One of the areas least investigated in Canada is job quality and job satisfaction for Executive Directors. There is some research that addresses employee recruitment and retention, and to the level of success an organization obtains because of its ED, but these do not highlight the current job experience of Executive Directors. This research also does not explore the various dimensions of job quality that may be present and/or how those dimensions could be improved.

Research Questions

The research is guided by the following questions:

* How can a peer-to-peer action learning model be constituted with executive directors for the purpose of finding strategic and tactical solutions to job quality and job satisfaction issues?

* What are the conceptual elements of a grounded theory of job satisfaction and job quality for executive directors of small social service organizations?

Project Description

Executive directors are a significant asset in nonprofit organizations. They fulfill a critical leadership and/or management role and are responsible for organizing and directing employee and volunteer activities towards the completion of the organization's mission. In effect, executive directors are the fulcrum on which balances the success or failure of an organization. Because of issues such as poor compensation and benefits, excessive demands and responsibilities, and few learning opportunities, Executive directors are an asset that is vulnerable and at risk for leaving an organization. Reducing the vulnerability of executive directors likely means finding a way to improve the various dimensions of job satisfaction, some of which are mentioned above. Ensuring that executive directors are satisfied in their role could significantly and positively impact on the capacity of an organization to address its mission

with a strong, committed, and loyal employee and volunteer base. Such an effort to reduce job quality and reduce the vulnerability of these leaders, results in building the capacity of the nonprofit sector to be effective.

The recent Canadian Policy Research Network's paper (McMullen & Schellenberg, 2003), Job Quality in Non-Profit Organizations, identifies eight dimensions of job quality of which two--extrinsic rewards (earnings, benefits, job security) and, hours and scheduling (work hours, flexibility, work-life balance)--were focused on.

The remaining dimensions remain relatively unexplored. Those are:

- * Employment relationships
- * Organizational structure Job design □
- * Intrinsic rewards
- * Skill use and development
- * Health and safety

The paper addresses designing a process to enhance the elements of job satisfaction from the perspective of a select group of Executive Directors.

Methodology and Outcomes

Starting in October 2003 and concluding in June 2004, the project tracks a small sample (9) of Executive Directors representing smaller nonprofits. An action learning process has been adopted for the group work--something we call peer learning within the participant group. A grounded theory approach is taken to identify substantive theory around how executive directors understand and act on job quality and job satisfaction.

Action learning may be viewed as the engine that converts changes in the external environment to the necessary internal organizational and individual changes (Mumford, 1991). Spence (1998) defines action learning as a process of learning and reflection supported by colleagues, with the intention of getting things done and (b) a process which brings people together to find solutions to problems and, in doing so, develops both the individuals and the organization. Key elements of action learning identified by Spence and adopted for the project are that it find a solution to a real problem, that it is voluntary and learner driven, that individual development is as important as finding the solution to the problem, that it is a highly visible and social process leading to organizational change, and that it requires time (4-9 months). Together the group works to solve long-standing problems that cannot be solved through training and that in doing so, strategic and tactical issues are addressed.

Reed (no date) of the Aspen Institute reports that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were important to job quality and satisfaction with the highest rated rewards combining both monetary and non-monetary factors (including "doing work you believe in" and "job security"). Historical studies that provide insight into executive director turnover include the 1997 David and Lucille Packard Foundation which discovered that 45% of their grantees experienced a leadership change within the previous three years. CompassPoint also studied the path of first-time Executive directors and found that only 14% had chosen another leadership position within the nonprofit sector.

Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) is the research method of choice for the project. Grounded theory is a methodology of process analysis that transcends the time and place of a unit.

(Conceptualization for grounded theory is abstract of time, place and people. This means that grounded theory is also abstract of any one field of study, routine, perception, and abstract from any type of data whether qualitative or quantitative.) It therefore, raises the analysis to a theory from an empirical description of a unit, located in time and place (Glaser, 1995). Constant comparison allows for the emergence of categories and subsequently, theories, to emerge and to develop and independence from the gathered data (Gibson, 1997). Conceptualization generalizes grounded theory to that it cuts across research methods and uses all forms of data resulting from those methods. As such it allows for an unbounded inquiry into the world of executive directors.

References

- Dow, Warren (2001) "Backgrounder on Trends in the Changing Workforce and Workplace"; Voluntary Sector Initiative Report. August
- Gibson, B. (1997). Dangerous dentaling: A grounded theory of HIV and dentistry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queens University of Belfast, Belfast.
- Glaser, B. (2002). Conceptualization: On theory and theorizing using grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1 (2). Article 3. Retrieved March 9, 2004 from <http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/>
- Glaser, B. (1995). *Grounded Theory: 1984-1994*. Volume 1. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press
- Glaser, B & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine Press.
- McMullen, K. & Schellenberg G. (January, 2003). Job Quality in Non-Profit Organizations, CPRN Research Series on Human Resources in the Non-profit Sector No.2. Canadian Policy Research Networks
- Mumford, A. (1991). Individual and Organizational Learning: Balance in the Pursuit of Change. *Studies in Continuing Education*. 13, no. 2: pp.115-125. (EJ 443 992)
- Spence, J. (1998). Action Learning for Individual and Organizational Development. Practice Application. No. 11. (www.cete.org/acve/docgen.asp?pab&ID=89 accessed March 8, 2004)
- Reed, C. S. (no date). Rewards in Nonprofit Organizations: Individual Work Values, Reward Preferences and Organizational Reward Structures. Nonprofit Sector Research Fund, The Aspen Institute Retrieved March 8, 2004 from http://www.nonprofitresearch.org/newsletter1531/newsletter_show.htm?doc_id=25246

Paper Number: PA041069

Paper Title: The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Something's Gotta Give

Author(s):

Gary M. Grobman, White Hat Communications, Harrisburg, PA, USA

Summary of Research

This research surveys recently published material from the popular press, trade and scholarly books, magazines, and peer-reviewed journals that address trends affecting the future of the nonprofit sector. This paper integrates trends relating to terrorism, demographics, technology, accountability, sector convergence, attitude changes, changes in the nature of the relationship between government and the voluntary sector, and economic stability in order to assist the author in suggesting what the future of the nonprofit sector will look like.

Description

Many believe that the nonprofit sector is undergoing a revolutionary transformation, the result of massive change in society with respect to demographics, economic instability, technology advancement, cultural and attitudinal shifts, and increased competition for shrinking resources (Hodgkinson, Lyman & Associates, 1989; Salamon, 1999, Putnam,2000; Salamon, 2001; Gronbjerg, 2001; Grobman, 2002).

It is difficult to find a time in the long and honored history of the nonprofit sector that was free of the generic challenges that it faces today. The most obvious--an inability to meet legitimate and increasing needs for services as a result of limited resources--is a plague that will not likely disappear in our lifetime. As a sector that provides collective goods dependent on voluntary donations of time and money, there will be cycles of public trust and public participation. Government partnership with the nonprofit sector will also likely go through its ups and downs, influenced by the political ideology of elected officials, budget realities, and the level of confidence these officials have in the ability of the sector to deliver goods and services consonant with that ideology. Other generic challenges include maintaining the public trust in the face of ethics scandals, attracting committed volunteers, and improving communication between those who manage and govern nonprofits.

The purpose of this paper is to focus not on these generic challenges particularly, but to look at what transformational trends, both for good and for bad, point to potential major restructuring of the sector from the standpoint of how it is perceived by contractors, government regulators, donors, and the public.

I will discuss eight emerging trends that have the potential to transform the sector during the next two decades.

- Trend 1: Increased terrorism, including cyber-terrorism, and the fear of terrorism
- Trend 2: Changing demographics
- Trend 3: Increasing pace of technology
- Trend 4: Increasing demands for accountability from government, funders, and the public
- Trend 5: Convergence of the for-profit, nonprofit and government sectors
- Trend 6: Attitude changes of donors
- Trend 7: Changes in the relationship between government and the nonprofit sector
- Trend 8: Increasing economic instability

References

Grobman, G. (2001). The nonprofit organization's guide to e-commerce. Harrisburg, PA: White Hat Communications.

Grobman, G. (2002). *The nonprofit handbook*. Harrisburg, PA: White Hat Communications.

Gronbjerg, K. (2001). The U.S. nonprofit human services sector: A creeping revolution. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(2), 276-297.

Hodgkinson, V. A.; Lyman, R. W. & Associates (1989). *The future of the nonprofit sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Salamon, L. (2001). The current crisis. In J.S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 420-432). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Salamon, L. (1999). *America's nonprofit sector: A primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.

Weisbrod, B. A. (2001). The future of the nonprofit sector: Its entwining with private enterprise and government. In J.S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 399-409). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Paper Number: PA041102

Paper Title: What Do Nonprofit Managers Really Want?

Author(s):

Arthur C. Brooks, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA

Summary of Research

The objectives of nonprofit managers are not immediately apparent. Indeed, nonprofits may seek to maximize their level of service, their budgets, their level of service quality, or something else entirely; alternatively, they may have ambiguous or unstable objectives. This paper presents a theoretical model of managerial objectives, and tests it using data on New York State nonprofits. The estimates indicate that some organizations tend toward service maximization, although they generally fundraise insufficiently to meet this goal. Other nonprofits exhibit mixed or ambiguous objectives, while one type appears to maximize budget. These results have implications for public policy and nonprofit management.

Description

What is the objective of nonprofit organizations? Legally, the answer is fairly straightforward in the United States. However, this type of information gives us relatively little insight into what the organizations—or their leaders—actually seek. For example, in producing a charitable or educational service without profit, does the manager of a charity maximize the level of output (say, the number of hungry people fed, or symphony orchestra concerts performed)? Does he or she seek to maximize the quality of the services rendered? Or does the manager want to maximize the organization's share of a particular market? These are all objectives which are compatible with the tax code's regulations.

This article attempts to uncover nonprofit managerial objectives empirically, using a large sample of organizations in New York State from 2001. Based on a structural model of behavior developed by Steinberg (1986), I identify a range of possible objectives, and find several that are evident in the data. These findings have implications about the way nonprofits are governed, and how they might be supported and regulated.

The most striking result from the data analysis in the paper is the absence of evidence that any of the subsectors pursues pure service maximization. The closest possibilities to this that we find are three groups (arts, health, and international) that fundraise "too little" so that the marginal effect of fundraising is above one. We might say that these nonprofits tend to approach the objective of service maximization. This has implications for policy and management. In the simplest case—if nonprofit managers were entirely free to choose their fundraising budgets—these results would lead to the simple recommendation that managers should spend more money on fundraising than at present. However, this might not be possible because of organizational or donor-imposed restrictions. (In some cases, it might even be the government that conditions contracts on certain spending limits.) This suggests that a policy change among organizations and donors in this area would enhance organizational effectiveness.

Other results I find are that a) education nonprofits appear to maximize their budgets (an outcome that is clearly inefficient), and b) social welfare and environmental organizations appear to have ambiguous objectives.

Paper Number: PA041160

Paper Title: People Centered leadership: building power from within

Author(s):

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

Amparo Hoffman, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Erica Foldy, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Jennifer Dodge, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Summary of Research

We discuss preliminary findings from a research project on community leadership in non-profits in the US. In addition to strategies to leverage external power, leaders engage in work that leverages power from within. These organizations use what we call an appreciative model of leadership, based on a profound appreciation for the inherent worth of human beings as the source of collective strength and power. We identify the values and associated practices of this humanistic approach, and argue that when used in congruence, the values and practices create a distinctive frame of reference that gives meaning and direction to the work.

Description

This paper presents some preliminary findings from a study of the meaning making processes that contribute to generate effective leadership in non-profit organizations engaged in social change. We draw from an on-going, national, multi-year, multimodal research agenda about community leadership in the United States. The broad research is guided by the question: "In what ways do communities making social change engage in the work of leadership?". This question was framed from a constructionist approach that defines leadership as meaning-making in communities of practice (Drath, 2001; Fletcher, 2002), and that therefore constitutes a particular type of "work" accomplished collectively, what Heifetz (1994) calls the work of leadership.

□

In nonprofit organizations engaged in social change efforts, the work of leadership includes envisioning and developing strategies to build power (McAdam, et al, 1996; Wood, 2002; Osterman, 2002). Findings from our project suggest that, in addition to the traditionally outwardly focused work needed to manage relationships with both allies and enemies, these organizations spend time and energy doing inwardly focused work that helps them leverage power from within. These types of leadership work reinforce and support each other in continuous feedback loops. The inward work seems to be critical to ensure the effectiveness of the outward work. Likewise, outward work becomes the arena within which the organization further develops internal capacity.

In this paper we discuss the inwardly oriented strategy as enacted in organizations whose leadership explicitly acknowledged the importance of building power from within. Using a data set for 20 organizations we identified a shared set of values, assumptions and practices which, when used in congruence, create a distinctive frame of reference that gives meaning and direction to the work. We have called this the appreciative model of leadership, because it is based on a profound appreciation for the inherent worth of human beings as key assets and as a source of collective strength and power. This humanistic approach can be described as people-centered leadership.

A critical characteristic of this approach is the alignment or congruence between value driven assumptions about society and human beings and the types of practices and strategies chosen to develop and authorize people to move the work forward. In the paper we identify and describe a set of values and the practices associated with them, including relentless humanity (re-framing or interrupting behaviors that deny the humanity of an individual or group), developing communicative practices (listening, thinking together, dialogue, story-telling), offering opportunities for personal transformation, and for leadership development.

The appreciative model is linked to organizational performance because the practices developed from this humanistic approach contribute to strengthen organizational capacity and the strong degree of congruence between values and practices helps clarify direction and generates commitment of organizational members. External power building has been documented and studied considerably in organizational studies in general (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978) and in the nonprofit world in particular (Crislip, 1994; Huxham and Vangen, 2000;) as well as in the organizing and social movements literature (McAdam, et al, 1996; Gamson, 1992; Woods, 2002). Yet that actors in these organizations explicitly design strategies to build power from within, and view this as critical leadership work for effective organizational performance represents a new idea worth exploring. While our findings emerge from leadership specifically oriented toward social change, they have important implications for thinking about leadership in the context of any value-based organization, and thus can be useful for most nonprofit organizations.

Bibliography:

- Chrislip, David D. and Carl E. Larson (1994). *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Drath, W. (2001). *The Deep Blue Sea: Rethinking the Source of Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Fletcher, Joyce K. (2002). *The Paradox of Post Heroic Leadership: Gender, Power and the "New" Organization*. Submitted to Organization and Management Theory Division of the Academy of Management.
- Gamson, W. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Collective Action*. In A. Morris, & C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers In Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. (2000). *Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-Up World*. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1159-1175.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfeffer, J and Salancik. 1978. *G. The External Control of Organizations*. New York: Harper Ro

Paper Number: PA041374

Paper Title: The Disconnect between Need and Supply: the Growing Divide Between Organizational Practice and Volunteer Involvement

Author(s):

Penelope M Rowe, Community Services Council Newfoundland and Labrador, St. John's, CANADA

Kenneth Curlew, Community Services Council Newfoundland and Labrador, St. John's, Newfoundland

Summary of Research

This presentation will address the issue of management and operation of voluntary, community-based organizations (VCBOs) particularly in the context of their ability to attract and retain volunteers. The paper presents the findings of a survey with 860 organizations and 1550 individuals in which organizational approaches to management and coordination of volunteers and people's willingness to volunteer were explored. The research addresses questions about organizational practices that support or inhibit their ability to recruit and retain volunteers and the reasons individuals cite for not becoming involved.

Description

Much of the current literature focuses on why individuals do not get involved (NSGVP 2001, CSC 2002). This study offers an interesting glimpse into the practices of a variety of voluntary, community-based organizations (staffed and un-staffed, rural and urban) and draws tentative conclusions about the disjuncture between organizational and sector-wide need for more volunteers and the contributing factors for declining volunteerism. The problem is generally attributed to a number of personal factors that affect people's desire to become involved. Our paper contends that much of the problem may be related to organizations clinging to traditional approaches and out of date perceptions of how to effectively engage volunteers. There is a concomitant impact on the assumption of leadership roles (CSC 2002). The paper identifies a number of contributing factors such as mobility, lifestyle changes, and monetary concerns, and offers tentative conclusions about the importance of organizations and their current leaders adopting new practices. The information from the survey has been expanded through in depth self-assessments conducted with four organizations to more intimately explore the issues in a first-hand manner.

The research is set in the context of the development of a Strategic Social Plan (SSP) in Newfoundland and Labrador, which created a new environment for the voluntary, community-based sector (VCBS). The SSP acknowledged the significant role of the VCBS. In 1998, the provincial government released *People, Partners and Prosperity: A Strategic Social Plan for Newfoundland and Labrador (SSP)*, a framework for social development that focuses on an integrated approach to social policy development and the new alliances needed to incorporate community needs and priorities in social and economic programs. The SSP emphasizes the linkages between social and economic development, investing in people, and building on community and regional strengths. It acknowledges the role of the VCBS as a channel for people to become involved and build communities.

The Community Services Council's survey found that 59% of organizations within the province are in need of more volunteers and a significant number (38%) of organizations have trouble recruiting people to serve on their board of directors. Results from the survey of individuals inquired about possible reasons why people do not volunteer. Some of the reasons cited include: 53% indicating VCBOs did not promote themselves and volunteer opportunities enough; 46% indicating the possibility of being held legally responsible; 42% indicating that they thought volunteers are not appreciated; and 42% cited lack of training for volunteers board of directors was near the bottom of the list at under 10%. The research also shows a significant lack of focus on coordination, management and task definition.

This paper should offer insight into the range of issues which influences individual involvement and contribute to the development of new organizational practices. The results of these studies will provide assistance for voluntary organizations especially in rural areas in addressing inadequacies as well as

provide government officials and policymakers with evidence for future public policy initiatives.

Bibliographical References:

Brock, Kathy L (2000). *Sustaining a Relationship: Insights From Canada on Linking the Government and Third Sector*. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research.

Brown, R. James; and Penelope Rowe (1999). *Values Added: The Voluntary Community-based Sector in Newfoundland and Labrador*. St. John's, NF: Community Services Council.

Bruce David; Paul Jordan; and Greg Halseth (1999). *The Role of Voluntary Organizations in Rural Canada: Impacts of Changing Availability of Operational and Program Funding*. Canadian Rural Restructuring Project.

Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating (2001). Joint Report by the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy and Canadian Heritage.

Community Services Council (1999). *N-Vision: Newfoundland and Labrador Voluntary Sector Information Network: Proposal*.

Community Services Council (2003). *The Leadership Gap: Perception or Reality?* (Pending).

Community Services Council (2003). *The Perceived Impact of Participation in Community Service Summer Placements on Students Continuing Involvement in the Voluntary Sector*. (Pending).

Community Services Council (2003). *Volunteering in Newfoundland and Labrador: Provincial research project in the Voluntary, Community-Based sector*.

Deaux, K.; and Stark, B. E. (1996). *Identity and motive: An integrated theory of volunteerism*. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Delacourt, Susan; Donald G. Lenihan, eds. (1999). *Collaborative Government: Is There a Canadian Way?* IPAC.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (1998). *People, Partners, and Prosperity: A Strategic Social Plan for Newfoundland and Labrador*. St. John's, NF: Office of the Queen's Printer.

Hall, Michael; A-J Mckechnie; Katie Davidman; and Fleur Leslie (2001). *An Environmental Scan on Volunteering and Improving Volunteering*. Canadian Center for Philanthropy.

Marshall, Joan (1999). *Voluntary Activity and the State: Commentary and Review of the Literature Relating to the Role and Impact of Government Involvement in Rural Communities in Canada*.

Omoto, A. M.; and M. Snyder (2002). *Considerations of community: The context and process of Volunteerism*. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 45 (5), 846-867.

Rowe, Penelope M (1998). *Fostering a climate for growth and development: final report of the Roundtable on the Role of the Voluntary Community-based or Third Sector and the Social Economy in Regional Development in Atlantic Canada*. St. John's: Community Services Council.

Saint-Martin, Denis (2004). *Coordinating Interdependence: Governance and Social Policy Redesign in Britain, the European Union and Canada*. Canadian Policy Research Networks (Unpublished).

Salmon, Lester M.; Leslie C. Hems and; Kathryn Chinnock (2000). The Nonprofit Sector: For What and for Whom? Working Papers of The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.

The Capacity to Serve: A Qualitative Study of the Challenges Facing Canada's Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations (2004). Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.

White, Julie (1997). Building Caring Communities: Five Capacities That Build Communities, and Ten Things Funders Can Do To Support Them. Presentation to Pragma Council Spring 1997 Conference.

Quarter, Jack; Laurie Mook and; Betty Jane Richmond (2002). What Counts: Social Accounting for Nonprofits and Cooperatives. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Paper Number: PA041385

Paper Title: Utilization of Consultants of Color by Nonprofit Organizations in the Greater Milwaukee Area: Exploring the Perceptions of Bias and Discrimination

Author(s):

Karl M. Nichols, Helen Bader Institute for Nonprofit Management, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Pamela Fendt, Center for Economic Opportunity, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Summary of Research

The Consultants of Color Project was created in response to insights shared over the course of a one-year intensive community planning process of a nonprofit academic center in the Greater Milwaukee area. Prominent consultants relayed personal experiences of discrimination and exclusion by nonprofit organizations in the Milwaukee consulting marketplace, and called on this nonprofit academic center to commission a study on these issues. The purpose of this paper is to explore and examine how the findings of this study align with the body of literature that has been published in the areas of nonprofit consulting, race, capacity building, and philanthropy.

Description

Paper Title: Utilization of Consultants of Color by Nonprofit Organizations in the Greater Milwaukee Area: Exploring the Perceptions of Bias and Discrimination

Author(s):

Karl M. Nichols, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Pamela Fendt, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Summary of Research:

The Consultants of Color Project was created in response to insights shared over the course of a one-year intensive community planning process of a nonprofit academic center in the Greater Milwaukee area. Several prominent consultants relayed personal experiences of discrimination and exclusion by nonprofit organizations in the Milwaukee consulting marketplace, and called on this nonprofit academic center to establish programming to address their concerns. There was a strong sense that consultants of color who provide management support services to nonprofit organizations were underutilized and in need of increased exposure for sustained growth and development. During the summer of 2003, a total of 27 people participated in focus groups sessions. Eighty-nine percent of the focus group participants were people of color. Among these respondents (including consultants, staff of nonprofit organizations and staff from local foundations), there was nearly unanimous agreement that racial discrimination has been a practice that has negatively affected consultants of color as they sought to provide their services in the nonprofit sector in Milwaukee.

The purpose of this paper is to explore and examine how the findings of this study align with the body of literature that has been published in the areas of nonprofit consulting, race, capacity building, and philanthropy. This paper will also discuss how local foundations, nonprofit organizations, management support organizations, and consultants alike can identify approaches that create greater inclusion and increase the utilization of consultants of color in building the capacity and effectiveness of nonprofit organizations.

Description:

Problem Statement

America's nonprofits, under increasing pressure to serve vulnerable populations, have an ever-greater need for providers who know how to help them succeed. The need for the nonprofit organizational capacity building infrastructure to improve the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations has grown dramatically over the last decade. The increasingly competitive environment in which nonprofits conduct their business has led to many new programs and services that enhance management and governance. Yet, despite the new emphasis on capacity building for organizations, certain segments of the consultant community working with nonprofits feel they do not have the same access to opportunities or networks as their counterparts in their respective fields. The issues of race, class, power, and money are still relevant social factors that impact a diverse set of technical assistance providers, namely consultants of color. Today, nonprofit organizations serving communities of color are experiencing a need for quality technical assistance and other capacity building services. There is a direct relationship between the quality of life in a community and the capacity of its nonprofit institutions to address basic human needs, build community, promote social transformation, and achieve institutional change. That is why it is imperative to increase the utilization of consultants of color who can provide quality services to the broad array of nonprofit management needs in the sector.

State of Knowledge in the field

In the past decade, there has been a heightened interest in how the nonprofit sector is maintained, developed, and supported as evidenced by significant growth in capacity building initiatives, management support organizations, and philanthropic support for these services. Although much of the discussion has centered on how to strengthen the system of capacity building services for nonprofits, the question of how to include and increase diverse segments of the consultant provider community in this effort has received less attention.

Approach

The initial study was designed to elicit in-depth information from a variety of stakeholders in the Greater Milwaukee area. The primary topic of investigation was the contention that consultants of color who seek to work with Milwaukee nonprofit organizations face significant discriminatory obstacles. Among these respondents, there was widespread agreement that their careers had been negatively affected by racial discrimination as they sought to offer their services in the nonprofit sector in Milwaukee. The authors will now begin to research how the current body of literature either supports or refutes the assertions of this study.

Contribution to the field

There is a growing body of evidence that capacity building and civic engagement are two of the keys to social transformation in communities. Underserved communities and communities of color have historically lacked access to high quality, culturally appropriate technical assistance support for their capacity building and civic engagement endeavors. The authors contend that research on issues impacting consultants of color for nonprofit organizations will help further build the body of knowledge on this topic, promote the establishment of social policy that is culturally relevant, and serve as a catalyst for funding priorities in diverse communities.

References:

Frey, William H., "The New Urban Demographics," *Brookings Review* (Summer 2000), 20.

Rogers, Pier C. (2001) *Philanthropy in Communities of Color: Traditions and Challenges*. Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action Occasional Paper Series, Vol. 1, No. 1.

Szabat, Kahthryn A. & Otten, Laura. (2002) *Management Support Organizations*. 2002 ARNOVA

Conference Proceedings

Shiao, Jiannbin Lee (1998). Is there a Third Way for Philanthropic Racial Policy?. 1998 ARNOVA Conference Proceedings.

Wlodkowski, Raymond J. and Ginsberg, Margery B., Diversity and Motivation (California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995), xi.

Paper Number: PA041214

Paper Title: Building capacity in the third sector: The effects of a university-based initiative on the use of organizational best practice

Author(s):

Kathleen A. Kost, Institute for Nonprofit Agencies, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

Nancy Maroun, Institute for Nonprofit Agencies, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

Summary of Research

This paper examines the results of a three stage prevention/intervention model delivered to executives in nonprofit human service organizations through the Institute for Nonprofit Agencies, a university based initiative. Using three years of pre and post assessment data, the influence of Institute service use, executive director tenure and length of agency existence on change are identified. Results indicate that there was an increase in the awareness and use of administrative and financial best practices.

Description

Problem/issue to be addressed: While not unique in the pressure it experiences (Light, 2000), the funding constraints in Western New York present a special challenge to human service providers. In the past three years, the City of Buffalo, as a consequence of its Fiscal Control Board, Erie County and New York State, the United Way as well as local foundations have all cut their allocations to health and human service organizations.

The Institute for Nonprofit Agencies, a university-based initiative, was established in 2001 in response to concerns expressed by private foundations and the public sector regarding the capability of human service and health agencies to successfully respond to the needs of individuals and families at-risk. These needs are ever-increasing, due in part to the region's low rate of job growth and high poverty rate (<http://factfinder.census.gov/bf/>) and the subsequent affects these have on service delivery systems (Kettner & Martin, 1996). This paper examines the affect of this initiative to strengthen organizational infrastructure on the use of organizational best practices by executives in nonprofit health and human service agencies and describes the impact of use on funders.

Theoretical foundation: The theoretical framework of community readiness change developed by Edwards, Jumper Thurman, Plested, Oetting and Swanson (2000) guided the development of a three-stage prevention/intervention model utilized by the Institute. The community readiness for change model includes the factors of community climate such as leadership, policy and legal statutes, program stability and the availability of funding to support activities. In addition the work of Drucker (1990; 1995) and Mali (1986) on management by objectives was used to inform the identification of business practices that strengthen organizational infrastructure.

Data/Methods: A three stage model of prevention/intervention is used to assist client agencies over the course of one year; these stages are: 1) An organizational pre and post assessment; 2) ten days of executive training; and 3) twenty hours of targeted consulting. Of the 120 agencies that completed an initial application for service, 93 completed an organizational pre-assessment. To date, 43 of these organizations have completed a post assessment. Post-assessments are currently being collected for agencies that participated during the past year. The pre and post assessment, designed by Institute staff with members of its Advisory Board, has 89 items across seven domains and an alpha reliability of .92. Bivariate and multivariate methods are used to examine the presence of change and the influence of Institute service use, executive director tenure and length of agency existence on change.

Implications for practice: Results of this study suggest that a university partnership with nonprofit organizations can improve the use of administrative and financial best practices. In addition, this partnership has led to an increase in the willingness of funders to provide support for capacity building activities for administrative areas and an understanding that this support is essential to the continued delivery of effective services.

References:

Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the nonprofit organization*. New York; Harper Collins Publishers.

_____ (1995). *Managing in a time of great change*. New York: Truman Talley Books/Dutton.

Edwards, R. W., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. A., Oetting, E. R., & Swanson, L. (2000). *Community*

readiness: Research to practice. *Journal of Community Psychology* 28(3), 291-3-7.

Kettner, P. M. & Martin, L. L. (1996). The impact of declining resources and purchase of service contracting on private, nonprofit agencies. *Administration in Social Work*, 20(3), 21-38.

Light, P. C. (2000). *Making nonprofits work*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press and The Aspen Institute.

Mali, P. (1986) *MOBO updated: A handbook of practices and techniques for managing by objectives*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Paper Number: PA041235

Paper Title: Getting Results: The Challenges in Evaluating Partnership-Making to Build Capacity in Children's Services

Author(s):

Gayla Rogers, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, CANADA

Jane Matheson, Wood's Homes, Calgary, CANADA

David Este, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, CAN

Ann Lawson, Wood's Homes, Calgary, AB, CAN

Donovan J Tymchyshyn, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, CAN

Summary of Research

This paper is concerned with the various ways in which building capacity in children's services through partnership can be understood, evaluated and acted upon. A critical examination of the impact partnerships have in capacity building is necessary and this paper is particularly concerned with the ideas of expectations and outcomes, which underpin the diverse needs of programmes (Brinkerhoff, 2002). In this way, this paper attempts to offer a conceptual foundation of how one can effectively measure the outcomes of partnerships in a diverse and complex environment.

Description

During the past decade, many child serving agencies have partnered to build capacity within the sector. This activity is largely based on good will with limited attention to the responsibilities, accountabilities and liabilities of each relationship. The importance of inter-organizational connections is regularly documented in strategic and business plans and organizational value statements. Funding is increasingly contingent on coming to the table with your partners. As a result, countless complicated relationships are created and many scarce resources are devoted to partnership-making. Along with this trend toward partnering is the underlying assumption that partnering will contribute to providing seamless service delivery, demonstrate fiscal responsibility and lead to a reduction of program duplication. However, do partnerships really build capacity in the delivery system, lead to more efficient operations and contribute to better outcomes for children? How can one measure the impact partnerships have in building capacity in children's services?

Nonprofit organizations are increasingly under pressure by stakeholders to measure the responsiveness and impact partnerships have in building capacity. The concern for accountability and implications for policy is being fuelled by many factors internally and externally imposed (Philips & Graham, 2000). The requirement to perform effectively and efficiently is nothing new, but the pressures to measure and get results has increased. As a result, nonprofit organizations are increasingly forced to ask questions such as:

1. Is this service really needed in the community?
2. Can this service be provided at a cost that makes sense?
3. Does this approach of partnering offer some competitive advantage over other ways of doing it?
4. Is there a strategy in place to achieve success, and
5. How can we measure the benefits of this service (Broadbent, 2001)?

Most of the literature on partnerships is descriptive in nature. There are reports describing what it takes to create a partnership, the importance of leadership, the lessons learned about success and failure. A smaller collection is prescriptive and offers guidelines and frameworks for partnership creation. However, there are very few studies to guide best practices, offer a conceptual foundation upon which to negotiate and build partnerships, or how to measure outcomes, which tend to be less clear, or less tangible (Broadbent, 2001; Torjman, 1999).

Using a case study approach, this two-year federally funded research project investigated how

partnerships are created, maintained, evaluated and perceived by stakeholders to better understand the experience of partnering and to conceptualize the partnership process and assess its impact. Lincoln and Guba's (1985) case study format outlining the problem, context, issues and lessons learned was applied and the qualitative software tool AtlasTI was used to aid data analysis.

The findings show that partnership-making is difficult, sometimes unsuccessful, always complex, and difficult to evaluate. By outlining the procedures best followed, the challenges to be negotiated, the reasons for success and sustainability, and the need to establish evaluative measures, the study contributes to the capacity building impact of partnerships in children's services.

References

Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2002a). Assessing and improving partnership relationship and outcomes: A proposed framework. *Evaluation and program planning*, 215-231.

Broadbent, Alan. (2001). *The Philanthropic Contract: Mutual Benefit for the Public Good*. Ottawa, Canada: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.

Himmelman, A.T. (1992). *Communities working collaboratively for change*. Minneapolis: Himmelman Consulting Group.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Phillips, S.D. & Graham, K.A. (2000). Hand in Hand: When accountability meets collaboration in the voluntary sector. In K. Banting (Ed.), *The nonprofit sector in Canada: Roles and relationships* (pp. 149-190). Kingston and Montreal, Canada: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.

Torjman, Sherri. (1999). *Are Outcomes the Best Outcome?* Ottawa, Canada: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.

Paper Number: PA041378

Paper Title: Communities of Practice: Innovation on the Front Lines

Author(s):

Laurie Goldman, M.I.T., Cambridge, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Discussion forums that bring together practitioners operating the same programs in different organizations and environments offer opportunities for information exchange, problem solving, and mutual support. This study examines how such "communities of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger et al 2002) operate in the context of self-sufficiency programs implemented by practitioners of nonprofit and public housing agencies throughout Massachusetts. Findings suggest that the forums improve practices and programs and sometimes precipitate organization-wide reforms, state-wide collaborations, and policy changes. Financial and administrative support, technical assistance, and communication channels with organizational and policy decision-makers would yield more effective and sustainable innovation.

Description

Communities of Practice: Innovation on the Front Lines

This paper examines discussion forums where practitioners operating social service programs in different nonprofit and public organizations and service jurisdictions gather regularly for collective problem solving and mutual support. Such forums comprise "communities of practice" or groups of people who share concerns about a topic and who seek to deepen their knowledge and expertise by interacting on an ongoing basis (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Brown and Duguid 1991, 2001; Wenger et al 2002). They thus complement efforts to build capacity at the level of the single organization and neighborhood or regional community.

While the communities of practice approach to organizational and inter-organizational learning and innovation has become a prominent strategy in private industry, it is just beginning to be introduced to the public and nonprofit arena (Snyder and Briggs 2003). The research reported here contributes a front-line perspective to this inquiry.

The community of practice as a strategy of fostering and sustaining innovation is particularly relevant to service providing organizations in the nonprofit and public sectors. One reason is the growing emphasis on programs that award front-line workers considerable discretion in problem solving and program development, often in lieu of program resources, training, and tested service technology (Sandfort 2000; Meyers et al 2003; Lurie and Riccucci 2003). Moreover, where such contracted programs occupy the margins of the organizations' core mission and competencies, limited resources for learning and innovation are likely to be directed elsewhere (Light 1998; Alexander et. al 1999; Austin 2003). The potential for learning from practice and from "best practices" developed in different environments thus promises to build organizational capacity where it is most needed.

Informing my inquiry is a multi-year, comparative study of three discussion forums attended by practitioners of self-sufficiency programs operated by nonprofit and public housing agencies throughout Massachusetts. Transcripts of meetings and follow-up interviews with individual practitioners were analyzed with the assistance of a textual analysis computer program.

Findings indicate that these communities of practice foster peer learning and innovation in several ways. Practitioners exchange information, train newcomers, share "best practices," engage in collective analysis of problems, brainstorm about possible solutions, evaluate whether departures from accepted routines and regulations enhance program goals, and help sustain motivation to keep trying in the face of frustrations as well as triumphs. The collective efforts within the community of practice also

yield creative responses to problems that are farther reaching than the innovations street-level practitioners achieve as individuals, including state-wide collaborations with community partners and changes in organizational structures and official program regulations.

The study also points to the challenges the front-line practitioners face in applying the lessons learned from the forums in their own organizations. Innovations devised for their peers' organizations are not always directly transferable to different environments. While practitioners have successfully adapted good ideas to fit their own work contexts, there is a need for new technologies for learning from comparisons and adapting "best practices" as well as training in how to use them.

In addition, managers could do more to support and extend the learning that occurs in the front-line communities of practice. Resources for forum administration, staff time and travel expenses, and training would allow practitioners to do more with what they have. Opportunities for community members to convey their innovative ideas to decision makers within their own organizations and to policy makers would facilitate elaboration and institutionalization of the communities' efforts. Such communication would also offer recognition of front-line workers' efforts and achievements and help to sustain commitment and motivation and curtail burn-out.

The findings have implications for devising management approaches to create and support "communities of practice" among practitioners of other programs that emphasize front-line discretion. The research also suggests directions for further testing and elaboration of theories of front-line problem solving, nonprofit capacity building, and organizational learning more generally.

References:

Alexander, J., Nank, R., & Stivers, C. 1999. Implications of Welfare Reform: Do Nonprofit Survival Strategies Threaten Civil Society? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(4): 452-475.

Austin, M. J. 2003. The changing relationship between nonprofit organizations and public social service agencies in the era of welfare reform. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(1).

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. 1991. Organizational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1): 40-57.

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. 2001. Knowledge and Organization: A Social-Practice Perspective. *Organization Science*, 12(2): 198-213.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Light, P. C. 1998. *Sustaining Innovation: Creating Nonprofit and Government Organizations That Innovate Naturally*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lurie, I., & Riccucci, N.M. 2003. Changing the "Culture" of Welfare Offices: From Vision to the Front Lines. *Administration & Society*, 34(6): 653-677.

Meyers, M. K., Riccucci, N. M., & Lurie, I. 2001. Achieving Goal Congruence in Complex Environments: The Case of Welfare Reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2: 165-201.

Sandfort, J. 2000. Moving Beyond Discretion and Outcomes: Examining Public Management from the Front Lines of the Welfare System. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4): 729-756.

Snyder, W. M., & Briggs, X. D. 2003. *Communities of Practice: A New Tool for Government Managers*. Arlington, VA: IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. 2002. *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Paper Number: PA041421

Paper Title: Nonprofit Capacity Building for Community-Based Care: A Social Network Analysis of Project Site Communities in Texas

Author(s):

Dennis L. Poole, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will examine nonprofit capacity to build local organizational networks of collaboration for community-based care. The paper will be based on a recent study of the Community Awareness and Relocation Services (CARS) Project implemented in five regions of the state by the Texas Department of Human Services. Social network analysis revealed considerable variation in density, degree, and flow of information between organizational actors in the five sites. Nonprofit capacity to build local networks of collaboration influenced performance outcomes in this project.

Description

Virtually every state, in an effort to comply with the 1999 Olmstead decision of the U. S. Supreme Court, now has a federal systems change grant to transition thousands of persons with disabilities from nursing facilities to community based care. While a few states have already made great strides in this area, others are still grappling with ways to plan, develop, and implement services for this population in the most integrated setting. The scope of the task is mind boggling, not merely because of the potential numbers of people involved, but the potential range of services engaged in the process—outreach, assessment, discharge planning, housing, durable medical equipment, home health, assisted living, family or peer support, transportation, and myriad other services as well. The task is further complicated by state and local service delivery systems historically oriented toward long-term care and dependence rather than community care and independence. Most federal change grant recipients are counting on the nonprofit sector to help them to address these challenges at the local level.

Successful outcomes in state transition project will likely hinge on the presence or absence of local organizational networks of collaboration for community based care. State efforts to implement or diffuse innovations often depend on the willingness of community organizations to adopt the innovation, as well as their ability to reconfigure local service delivery systems to ensure its success. Creating synergy between state and community actions for community-based care is extremely difficult when the local ecology or network of relationships fosters learned helplessness among vulnerable population groups likely to benefit from the innovation. These relationships can hinder progress toward social justice—in this case, compliance with the Olmstead ruling—through overly stringent rules, regulations, and resource control. Or, they can empower vulnerable groups, by communicating new information, sharing scarce resources, reducing gaps and overlaps in services, and collaborating in new ways to overcome constraints in the local environment.

Successful outcomes in state transition projects will also hinge on the capacity of the nonprofit sector to build these networks of collaboration at the local level. Most federal change grant recipients are contracting with nonprofit organizations to spearhead their innovations, presumably because they have the contacts and experience to transition individuals successfully from nursing facilities to community based care. Yet, preliminary observations from some state projects raise questions about the capacity of some nonprofit organizations to perform this leadership function. A major barrier to success in the Maine Home to the Community Project, for example, was the lead nonprofit organization working in isolation from nursing facilities and other key community organizations. Adversarial relationships between the lead nonprofit organization and local service providers have been cited as a barrier in other state innovation projects as well.

This paper will present findings from the first systematic study of nonprofit capacity to build local

networks for community based care. The study examined local organizational networks of collaboration before and after implementation of the Community Awareness and Relocation Services (CARS) Project in Texas. Implemented by the Texas Department of Human Services in 2002, this one-year pilot project relocated qualified nursing facility residents to community-based settings in five regions of the states. Using operations audit procedures, the evaluation team found considerable variation in the goals, budget, structure, administration, staff, and networking experience among the lead nonprofit contractors. Social network analysis revealed considerable variation as well in local organizational networks of collaboration before and after implementation of the CARS project. The capacity of the lead nonprofit contractor to build local networks of collaboration influenced performance outcomes in community-based care in each of the five project sites. Researchers and practitioners engaged in nonprofit capacity building at the local should find this study relevant in a variety of health and human service settings.

Paper Number: PA041129

Paper Title: Is it capacity building or grant-readiness? A Foundation and its Nonprofit Constituents

Author(s):

Stuart C. Mendel, Center for Nonprofit Policy and Practice, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will explore the concepts of "grant-readiness" in the sense that both philanthropy and nonprofits are concerned with building the capacity of organizations to do their work effectively. The data for this paper will be generated through a collaborative project with the Saint Luke's Foundation of Cleveland, Ohio, which is funding this research.

Description

Over the past decade, a vibrant discussion has taken place among those interested in the health and well-being of community and faith based nonprofit organizations around the topic of capacity building (Kretzner and McKnight, 1993; Gittell and Vidal, 1998). On the nonprofit organization side of this discussion are calls by nonprofit leaders and practitioners for private funders and government to provide them with unrestricted income in support of the operating overhead, which they do not receive from program oriented grants with restricted budget expenditure lines. In opposition, are grant-makers who follow long standing practices that utilize funding incentives to get nonprofits to support specific foundation priorities that provide for the "welfare of mankind," (Condliffe-Lagemann, 1999).

The need for operating dollars to sustain a nonprofit within a larger context of improving the social welfare of people and nurturing civil society, requires both grant-makers and their recipient organizations to assess one another's capacities to collaborate through a grant relationship. To be "grant ready," the grant-maker must trust that the nonprofit has operational stability, can indeed deliver the promises that it makes in its proposals (a legal contract) and that it meets a standard of performance and effectiveness that reduce the degree of risk the foundation takes in making a grant-making decision to support that organization. The nonprofit organization must be convinced that the grant-maker will honor its commitment but also allow for the risk the nonprofit takes in responding to their initiatives. Thus, when grant makers and nonprofit practitioners enter into a grant agreement, they have really taken a calculated shared risk based upon their readiness to meet their grant obligations.

"Grant-readiness" is a concept that foundations and nonprofits can apply to their decision-making process as a measure of an organizations capacity to accomplish, and its accountability in producing, the outputs for which both enter into a contractual arrangement for funding. Another way of considering "grant-readiness" is as a barometer of the risk the foundation is assuming as it invests in a particular project and organization, and as a function of an organization's stage of development and capacities. In this framework, a definition of "grant-readiness" can be developed through an assessment tool against which both the foundation can measure indicators of an organizations ability and likelihood to deliver promised services before it enters into a grant arrangement. Conversely, a nonprofit can utilize this tool to diagnose its "grant-readiness" as a means to assess its capacity to taker on new work.

Preliminary Sources:

Eadie, Douglas. Changing by design : a practical approach to leading innovation in nonprofit organizations. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, c1997

Gittell, Ross and Avis Vidal. Community organizing : building social capital as a development strategy Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publications, c1998

Hula, Richard C., Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore. Nonprofits in urban America / edited by

Westport, CT : Quorum Books , 2000

Kibbe, Barbara D. editor. Funding effectiveness : lessons in building nonprofit capacity / by Grantmakers for Effective Organizations. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, c2004

Kretzmann, John P. and John L. McKnight Building communities from the inside out : a path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets Evanston, Ill. : Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1993

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe editor. Philanthropic foundations : new scholarship, new possibilities Bloomington, Ind. : Indiana University Press, c1999

Magat, Richard editor. An agile servant : community leadership by community foundations. New York : Foundation Center, c1989

Paper Number: PA041192

Paper Title: Philanthropic Foundations And Support For University Civic Engagement: Building a National Movement for a Just and Democratic Society?

Author(s):

Susan Ostrander, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

Summary of Research

Why and how do U.S. foundations support university civic engagement? What does this suggest about the potential for foundations and universities to contribute to building a just and democratic society? The paper uses an analytic framework of three approaches to civic engagement to study foundation support for different types of engagement. Findings suggest:

(1) most funding is for educating students in civic skills, values, and for social responsibility; (2) the trend is toward funding more institutional reform projects aimed at universities becoming social change agents; (3) some foundations support a role for higher education in building a more strongly democratic society.

Description

Charitable foundations in the U.S. have played important roles in developing and supporting higher education (Hammock 1999:5; Rothschild 1999). This paper explores why and how foundations today support university civic engagement. The paper informs general knowledge about the place of philanthropic foundations in society.

Methodology is based on a review of literature and a scan of Internet sites of both foundations and universities who are civically engaged. This will be supplemented by interviews with campus and foundation leaders. Background comes from a 2001 comparative study of civic engagement on five campuses conducted by the author based on site visits, over 50 interviews, and documents. This paper is organized around three questions with emphasis on the third question, which is the main focus of new study.

□ Question 1: Why are foundations today supporting university civic engagement? A beginning answer is provided by a look at recent foundation history. The funding priorities of large private foundations have evolved to a current emphasis on civil society, community capacity building, and collaborative partnerships such as those between campus and community (Smith 1999). This is a shift from the 1960's and '70's when foundations prioritized support for social engineering design, building, and testing of model programs for social reform with the aim of their later being taken up and funded by the then-expanding federal welfare state. Current priorities reflect the decline of governmental support and the perceived need to find new ways to address social concerns on a more local level through non-governmental partnerships.

□ Question 2: Why is university civic engagement increasing, and why are universities seeking foundation support? The author of this paper and other writers have suggested a number of social, economic, and political forces to account for the surge in university civic engagement in the 1990's (Edwards and Marullo 1999; Ehrlich 2000; Maurrasse 2001). They include a perceived decline in civic and political engagement by college-age youth that many believe can and should be addressed by changes in curriculum and teaching in higher education; and growing pressures on the academy—especially in light of rising tuition costs and encroaches on host communities for expansion of physical plants -- to be more connected to local communities, use campus resources to address the important problems of the day, and provide educational opportunities for students to have “real world” experiences and opportunities.

While campus community service learning programs appear to have preceded foundation emphasis, increased resources from foundations likely contributed as well to the growth of university civic engagement (Bowley and Meeropool 2003). Given the decline in governmental funding for higher education overall, campuses have little choice but to turn to private sources for new initiatives.

□ In a recently published article, the author of this paper began to develop three theoretical frameworks representing different approaches to university civic engagement and based on findings from the 2001

comparative study of five schools. The three approaches represent an emphasis on: (a) students learning skills, values, and attitudes for active citizenship rooted in theories of social and moral development and theories of education and learning for social responsibility (e.g. Colby and Ehrlich 2000); (b) transforming the academy to become an agent of social and institutional change in the larger society through campus-community partnerships leading to a more just and democratic society (Harkavy 1998); and (c) building strong democracy in society and local communities, perhaps by creating public spaces where people might come together to address common concerns and develop collective projects to address them (Boyte and Kari 1996). While these approaches are, of course, not mutually exclusive, findings from the five-school study suggest that schools typically emphasized one more than others, though this might change as they evolved over time. This paper explores whether this framework can be usefully applied to a study of foundation funding of university civic engagement; and, if so, what might be learned from that application about both that framework and about foundation funding more generally.

□ Question 3: What kinds of university civic engagement approaches are philanthropic foundations currently supporting, and what are the implications of this support for how foundations contribute to developing a just and democratic society? Preliminary findings so far suggest the following:

□ First, most foundation support has been directed toward educating students in the skills, values, and attitudes of responsible citizenship through such methods as service learning and revised curriculum development. The work of the Carnegie Foundation's Political Engagement Project illustrates this approach, whose goal is described as "to prepare thoughtful, committed, social responsible and civic-minded graduates" (www.carnegiefoundation.org). The Pew Charitable Trusts' Youth Engagement Project has similar goals.

□ Second, while foundations continue to support this first approach, there appears to be an emerging national trend toward more institutional reform and transformation projects aimed at universities becoming social change agents. Surdna Foundation's Director Edward Skloot recently wrote, "We now believe that infusing democratic principles in individuals is only a start" (www.surdna.org). He gives Surdna's funding of Trinity College's Center for Neighborhoods as an example of a need to "involve institutions to be truly consequential." The Trinity College Project supports a variety of community-based institutions such as a job training center and a day care center for residents of the surrounding neighborhood. Other instances of support for a community-focus with university as change agent are Bonner Foundation funding of the University of Richmond's Center for Civic Engagement, whose goals are expressed by one campus leader as "examining and engaging the critical social justice issues of the day" (<http://oncampus.richmond.edu>).

Third, some foundations are now supporting the role of higher education institutions in explicitly building a more strongly democratic society. One key example of this is the John S. and James K. Knight Foundation's support of University of Maryland's Democracy Collaborative whose stated mission is "to strengthen democracy and civil society locally, nationally, and globally" (www.democracycollaborative.org). The Kellogg Foundation supported National Forum for Higher Education appears to be also moving more in this direction with their newly announced "Access to Democracy" initiative (www.thenationalforum.org).

Questions remain about the potential for two essentially "elite" institutions, philanthropic foundations and the private universities most likely to receive their support, to empower and revitalize low-income communities in a way that seems essential to building a just and democratic society.

Bibliography

- Bowley, R. with J. Meeropool. 2003. *Service-Learning in Higher Education*. Medford, MA: Massachusetts Campus Compact (2 pages).
- Boyte, H. C. and N. N. Kari. 1996. *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Colby, A. and T. Ehrlich. 2000. "Higher Education and the Development of Civic Responsibility." In T. Ehrlich, ed. *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Edwards, B, and S. Marullo. 1999. "Universities in Troubled Times – Institutional Responses." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42, 5: 754-65.
- Hammock, D. 1999. "Foundations in American Polity, 1900-1950." In E.C. Lagemann,

ed. *Philanthropic Foundations*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Harkavy, I, 1998. "Organizational Innovation and the Creation of the New American University." In R. Lerner and L.A.K. Simon, eds. *University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Garland Press.

Maurrasse, D. 2001. *Beyond the Campus*. New York:Routledge.

Rothschild, M. 1999. "Philanthropy and American Higher Education." In C.T. Clotfelter and T. Ehrlich, eds. *Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector*. Indianapolis: Indiana University.

Smith, J.E. 1999. "The Evolving American Foundation." In. C. T. Clotfelter and T. Ehrlich, eds. *Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector*. Indianapolis: Indiana University.

Paper Number: PA041298

Paper Title: Foundation Grantor-Grantee Relationships: A Research Agenda

Author(s):

Kent D. Fairfield, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Kennard T. Wing, Kennard T. Wing & Company, Havertown, PA, USA

Summary of Research

Foundations wield an influence within the nonprofit sector greater than their overall share of philanthropy would suggest. One aspect of foundations that has received little research attention is the relationship between foundation and grantees. Both practitioner literature and a preliminary field study of foundation program officers and nonprofit executives suggest that the quality of these relationships varies widely and that it is often difficult to form productive ones. Clearly, further research is needed to investigate this important but under-researched topic. This paper identifies several areas of theory, formulates pertinent research questions, and outlines studies that could investigate these relationships.

Description

- Foundations play a large part in financing the nonprofit sector. While private donations and government grants account for more total funds flowing to the sector, foundations stand out in offering influence on policies and projects of nonprofits, far out of proportion to the amount of their contribution.
- A body of research does exist around certain aspects of foundation activities, such as where foundation support goes (e.g., Aksartova, 2003; Carman, 2001), who foundations work with (Magat, 1998) and foundation strategy (Netting, Williams and Hyer, 1998). Also, some scholarship exists about interorganizational relationships (e.g., Ring and Van De Ven, 1994; Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Yet few researchers have directed their attention to the relationship between foundations and grantees.
- The practitioner literature points to how foundation-grantee relationships have an important effect on the success of philanthropic activities. Many foundation officers are seen as arrogant in deigning to makes grants to nonprofits. Grantees have been described sometimes as “distrustful of, and in extreme cases, subversive toward the funder . . . saying what they think the funder wants to hear in order to avoid conflict and bolster their chances for grant approval” (Brown & Garg, 1997, 14). If grantor and grantee fail to share a collaborative relationship, foundations run the risk of putting more money into projects that actually are faltering or moving in unauthorized directions (Ryan, 2002). Some nonprofit CEO’s say that a barrier between the two can also preclude the nonprofit from being able to talk through challenges in carrying out a grant and to benefit from the foundation’s counsel on mid-course corrections (Fairfield & Wing, 2004). Ultimately, society suffers with misallocation or suboptimal performance on the most worthy charitable activities.

A small empirical study with focus groups of nonprofit executives and interviews with other executives and foundation program officers suggests that building constructive relationships has a significant effect on outcomes. The quality of such relationships varies widely, however, and it is reported to be particularly difficult to establish productive ones. Clearly more research is needed to investigate this important but under-researched topic. This paper outlines a research agenda, grounded in certain bodies of theory. One has to do with negotiation practices (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Lewicki, Barry, Sanders, & Minton, 2003; Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003; Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Another concerns the tension program officers and nonprofit executives experience between their institutional role and their personal relationship (Eisenhardt, 1989; Ring & Van De Ven, 1994). A third domain regards the quality of discourse of the parties, always challenging despite their avowed interest in collaborating (Argyris, 1976, 1990; Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985; Argyris & Shoen, 1974). These and other conceptual models will suggest certain propositions that need to be investigated empirically.

- The extensive research agenda should embrace a variety of related issues:
 1. □ What are the origins and consequences of effective relationships?
 2. □ How do the parties deal with the dilemma of achieving the best results for the common good, while looking out for the interests of their own organization and its constituents?
 3. □ How do individuals on both sides deal with the tension between the demands of their institutional

role and personal needs for such things as their pride, rewards, and integrity?

4. □ How do parties deal with uncomfortable dialogue around seemingly “undiscussable” subjects such as underperformance, lack of confidence in the other, and power differentials between them?

5. □ How are effective relationships worked out in newer forms of venture philanthropy and engaged philanthropy?

Several studies are outlined, including work that is qualitative, quantitative, and survey-based.

Selected References

- Aksartova, S. (2003). In search of legitimacy: Peace grantmaking of U.S. philanthropic foundations, 1988-1996. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(1), 25-46.
- Argyris, C. (1976). *Increasing leadership effectiveness*. New York: Wiley.
- Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. (1985). *Action science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., & Schoen, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, P., & Garg, S. (1997). *Foundations and comprehensive community initiatives: The challenges of partnership*. Chicago: The Chapin Hall Center for Children.
- Carman, J. (2001). Community Foundations: A Growing Resource for Community Development *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12(1), 7-24.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 57-74.
- Fairfield, K. D., & Wing, K. T. (2004). Building and sustaining collaborative relationships in grant-making. To be presented at the Academy of Management annual conference, August, New Orleans.
- Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The manager as negotiator*. New York: Free Press.
- Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., Saunders, D. M., & Minton, J. W. (2003). *Negotiation*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Magat, R. *Unlikely partners: Philanthropic foundations and the labor movement*, Cornell University Press, 1998
- Netting, F.E., Williams, F.G., and Hyer, K. (1998) Resource centers: A foundation's strategy to support nonprofit grantees. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 8 (3), 261-274.
- Ring, P. S., & Van De Ven, Andrew H. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (1), 90-118.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, Paul A. M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375.
- Ryan, W. (2002). *When projects flounder: Coming to the rescue when good grants go astray*. Grantcraft guides, no. 2. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2003). Nurturing collaborative relationships: Building trust in interorganizational collaborations. *The Journal of Applied B*

Paper Number: PA041414

Paper Title: Spatial and Temporal Variation in Philanthropy across Chicago Neighborhoods, 1980-2000

Author(s):

Heather MacIndoe, University of Chicago, Somerville, MA, USA

Summary of Research

This paper examines philanthropy by private foundations in Chicago neighborhoods (1980-2000) and addresses these questions concerning spatial and temporal variations in foundation philanthropy: (1) How does philanthropy vary across neighborhoods of different social and economic composition? (2) How does temporal variation in philanthropic patterns compare with national trends in philanthropic giving?

The paper reports an empirical analysis of Foundation Center data which improves on previous examinations of this data by geo-coding the location of grant recipients using GIS software which produces maps which can be used to analyze the spatial and temporal patterns of foundation philanthropy across neighborhoods in Chicago.

Description

Spatial and Temporal Variation in Philanthropy across Chicago Neighborhoods, 1980-2000

This paper examines patterns of philanthropy by large U.S. foundations to nonprofit organizations in the City of Chicago from 1980 to 2000. This research explores both spatial and temporal variations in philanthropy and addresses the following questions: (1) How does philanthropy differ across neighborhoods of different social and economic composition? Do neighborhood attributes impact the funds that various nonprofits receive? (2) How does temporal variation in philanthropic patterns in the city of Chicago over the last two decades of the 20th century compare with national trends in philanthropic giving?

This paper presents results from an empirical analysis of two decades of data from the Foundation Center in New York describing foundation funding of nonprofit organizations in Chicago. The data consists of all private foundation grants awarded to recipients in the Chicago metropolitan area from 1980 to 2000. The sampling base included grants of \$10,000 or more awarded by the largest U.S. foundations. This database consists of more than 30,000 grants totaling more than two billion dollars made by about 700 philanthropic foundations to approximately 2,700 organizations in the Chicago metropolitan area during the period 1980-2000.

This analysis builds on previous work on the two sides of the philanthropic relationship: donors and recipients. In their examination of "philanthropy as a social relation," Ostrander and Schervish (1990) assert that the donor has been the primary focus of most research on philanthropy:

A donor focus ignores the ways in which recipients actively take part in defining what goes on in the world of philanthropy, ways in which recipients are agents creating philanthropic institutions and relations. Strategies that recipients and advocates use to obtain support are generally left unexplored and unspecified (1990:67-68).

While attempts to identify the "drivers" of philanthropic investment rightly consider attributes of both parties to the grant exchange, the donor and the recipient; the context of the exchange also deserves attention. One such context is neighborhood location of the recipient organization. What predicts variation in foundation funding across communities? In this paper, I identify and test four hypotheses about philanthropic investment that characterize the communities where the recipient organizations reside: evidence of need, the degree of organizational infrastructure, prior investment in the community, and grassroots/social movement activity in the community.

The analysis reported in this paper is recipient-focused and improves on previous studies of Foundation Center Data by geo-coding the location of grant recipients using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software which produces maps that can be used to analyze spatial and temporal patterns of foundation philanthropy across neighborhoods in Chicago. Chicago has 77 community areas or neighborhoods that are well known (e.g, the Loop; Lincoln Park; Hyde Park), widely recognized politically, and often serve as boundaries for service delivery and allocation of resources. These geographic units vary according to the socio-demographic mix of their residents, the existing infrastructure in the area (including the density of organizations and social ties, and the location of important public sites such as City Hall), and both public and private support to local organizations.

Preliminary References

Alexander, Victoria. 1998. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Strategies: Complexity, Conflict, and Coping in the Nonprofit Sector." Pp. 272-290 in Walter Powell and Elisabeth Clemens, eds. *Private Action and the Public Good*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1998

DiMaggio, Paul J. and Helmut K. Anheier. 1990. "The Sociology of Nonprofit Organizations and Sectors." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:137-159.

Fink, Justin. 1990. "Philanthropy and the Community." Pp. 133-164 in Eds. Jon Van Til and Associates, *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Frumkin, Peter. 1999. "Private Foundations as Public Institutions: Regulation, Professionalization, and the Redefinition of Organized Philanthropy." Pp. 69-100 in Ed. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington.

Galaskiewicz, Joseph. 1985. *Social Organization of an Urban Grants Economy: A Study of Business Philanthropy and Nonprofit Organizations*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Jenkins, Craig T. and Abigail Halcli. 1999. "Grassrooting the System?: The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy, 1953-1990." Pp. 229-256 in Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, ed. *Philanthropic Foundations, New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Laumann, Edward O., Joseph Galaskiewicz and Peter Marsden. 1978. "Community Structures as Interorganizational Linkages." *Annual Review of Sociology* 4:455-84.

Milofsky, Carl and Frank Romo. 1988. "The Structure of Funding Arenas for Neighborhood Based Organizations." Pp. 177-242 in Carl Milofsky, ed. *Community Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ostrander, Susan A., and Paul G. Schervish. 1990. "Giving and Getting; Philanthropy as a Social Relation." Pp. 67-98 in Eds. Jon Van Til and Associates, *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tilly, Charles. 1973. "Do Communities Act?" *Sociological Inquiry* 43:209-240.

Ylvisaker, Paul. 1987. "Foundations and Nonprofit Organizations." Pp.360-379 in Walter Powell, ed., *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Paper Number: PA041011

Paper Title: The Charities Bill 2004: a socio-legal analysis

Author(s):

Jonathan E. J. Garton, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom

Summary of Research

In 2004, the Labour government plans to introduce legislation to modernize the law relating to charitable status in England and Wales. This will include a new statutory definition of charity and a restructuring of the regulatory framework in which the charitable sector operates. This paper critically evaluates these reform proposals and considers the impact on the sector and wider civil society in the light of (i) contemporary sociological theories of civil society and (ii) the current reforms in other Commonwealth jurisdictions.

Description

Issues to be addressed

The paper evaluates the proposed reforms to the law relating to charitable status in England and Wales, which are due to be introduced in 2004 by the Labour government. On the basis of the government paper 'Charities and Not-for-Profits: a Modern Legal Framework' (Home Office, 2003) the reforms are expected to centre on the following: (i) a new statutory definition of charity, which adds seven new categories of charitable purposes to the existing four, (ii) a new form of charitable company, the Charitable Incorporated Organization, and (iii) a restructuring of the regulatory framework in which the charitable sector operates, including the creation of a new tribunal which will hear appeals from decisions of the Charity Commission.

Specifically, the paper considers these reforms in the light of contemporary theories of civil society. This is particularly pertinent as the motivation behind the reforms is the fact that the current legal framework is viewed as outmoded, being based on the Statute of Charitable Uses 1601, and consequently limited in its ability to foster an environment in which the sector can carry out the social functions required of it in the twenty-first century. In the words of the Prime Minister in the consultation document 'Private Action, Public Benefit', the existing law "has not evolved in a way which best meets the needs of contemporary communities" (Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2002, p 5).

In particular, the following themes emerge and are given due consideration: (i) the relationship between the charitable sector and wider civil society (and whether it is appropriate for the state to continue to focus its regulatory strategy on the former); (ii) the relationship between civil society and the private and public sectors; (iii) the relationship between civil society theory and traditional theories of regulation; (iv) the relationship between civil society's position as a provider of 'public goods' and the requirement that charities demonstrate public benefit in their objectives; and (v) the relationship between civil society's role in the facilitation of self-actualization through civic participation and the restrictions on the political activities of charities.

Approach

The paper is divided into two halves, each with a separate analytic approach. The first half of the paper takes a socio-legal approach and considers the reforms in light of the traditional justifications for regulation and then contemporary sociological theories of civil society. The second half of the paper adopts a comparative analysis of the proposals. At the time of writing, a number of other common law countries – specifically Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Scotland – are in the process of introducing or reviewing existing systems of charity regulation. It is useful to consider whether the developments in these jurisdictions are proving to be more or less able to reflect contemporary

academic thinking than their English counterpart. Particular regard will be had to Australia, as the jurisdiction closest to implementing its reforms in the impending Charities Act 2004.

Relation to the state of knowledge in the field

The socio-legal analysis will draw on contemporary theories of both regulation and civil society. In relation to regulation theory, particular regard will be had to the traditional economic and social justifications for regulating industries and their relevance outside the private sector context. In relation to civil society theory, particular regard will be had to the theory of government failure (Levitt, 1973), the theory of contract failure (Hansmann, 1987) and the theory of voluntary failure (Salamon, 1987).

The comparative analysis will build on two previous pieces of research by the author. The first is a report commissioned in 2001 by the University of London's Institute for Philanthropy, which compares the fiscal benefits and regulatory impact of charitable status in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Scotland. The second is a paper evaluating the Australian reform proposals, 'Regulating the Life-World: the relationship between civil society and the law', which was delivered at the 21st Annual Australian Law and Society Conference in December 2003.

Contribution to the field

There are large bodies of research concerned with both regulation and civil society. However, there is very little interaction between the two - the former discipline is dominated by lawyers, the latter by sociologists and political scientists. This paper is an attempt to bridge this gap and facilitate the development of a regulation theory specific to civil society, which can inform future reform proposals.

Select Bibliography

1. Baldwin, R. and Cave, M., *Understanding Regulation Theory, Strategy, and Practice* (Oxford, OUP, 1999)
2. Breyer, S., 'Typical Justifications for Regulation' in Baldwin, R., Scott, C. and Hood, C. (eds.), *A Reader on Regulation* (Oxford, OUP, 1998)
3. Charities Definition Inquiry, *Report of the Inquiry into the Definition of Charities and Related Organisations* (Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia, 2001)
4. Hansmann, H., 'Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization' in Powell, W. (ed.), *The Nonprofit Sector A Research Handbook* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1987)
5. Home Office, *Charities and Not-for-Profits: A Modern Legal Framework* (London, Home Office, 2003)
6. Levitt, T., *The Third Sector New Tactics for a Responsive Society* (New York, AMACOM, 1973)
7. Ogus, A., *Regulation: Legal form and economic theory* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994)
8. Ortman, A. and Schlesinger, M., 'Trust, repute and the role of non-profit enterprise' (1997) 8 *Voluntas* 97
9. Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, *Private Action, Public Benefit: A Review of Charities and the Wider Not-For-Profit Sector* (London, HMSO, 2002)
10. Salamon, L., 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State' in Ostrander, S. and Langton, S., *Shifting the Debate: public/private sector relations in the modern welfare state* (New Brunswick, Transaction, 1987)
11. Salamon, L. and Anheier, H., 'Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally' (1998) 9 *Voluntas* 213

Paper Number: PA041056

Paper Title: The uneasy equilibrium of charitable solicitation, charitable regulation, fraud, and the First Amendment after *Madigan v. Telemarketing Associates, Inc.*

Author(s):

Christopher Sullivan, William Mitchell College of Law, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Summary of Research

This research paper explores the legal history of fraud prosecutions, charitable solicitation regulation, and the First Amendment in light of the 2003 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Madigan v. Telemarketing Associates, Inc.* Attempts to protect citizens from fraudulent or expensive fundraising through percentages or restrictions on speech aspects of solicitation have been struck down by the Supreme Court. By allowing a fraud action to proceed against a for-profit fundraiser, the *Madigan* Court reached an equilibrium point that retreated from their stricter holdings in previous cases while upholding an historical line of cases that rejected First Amendment protection for fraud.

Description

Attempts to regulate charitable solicitation in order to prevent fraud are nothing new. As the charitable sector grew and became more sophisticated, it adopted new methods of fundraising such as direct mail, door-to-door, and telephone solicitation campaigns. This expansion was met with a wave of state regulation and litigation to prevent fraud on the giving public. During the 1980's a series of U.S. Supreme Court cases (*Schaumburg*, *Riley*, *Madigan*) restricted the ability of charity regulators to use aspects of fundraising solicitation as a way to target charities with high fundraising costs. In 2003, the Court heard *Madigan v. Telemarketing Associates*, and allowed a fraud prosecution to proceed. This case both reaffirmed the First Amendment rights of charities around fundraising and advocacy, but opened the door to broader fraud prosecutions at the state level. This paper examines the historical intersection of the First Amendment, charitable solicitation, charitable regulation, and fraud, as well as the possible balancing of all of these competing interests that has resulted from the decision in *Madigan*.

□ Because the Court had previously held that charitable solicitation had a component, the regulation of which was subject to strict scrutiny, it was unclear whether a fraud cause of action could proceed against a fundraiser. By its unanimous decision in *Illinois, ex rel. Madigan v. Telemarketing Associates, Inc.*, the Court explicitly held that the First Amendment did not protect fraudulent charitable solicitations. This holding reflects the culmination of previous cases adjudicating the First Amendment rights of fundraisers. Furthermore, the decision guides state and local regulators to a means of achieving their public policy goals of protecting the public from fraudulent charitable solicitations.

□ There is a certain amount of irony in the fact that the best means of preventing fraud may be a fraud cause of action itself. By focusing on fraud, the Court has highlighted an area of speech that does not deserve the same level of protection as charitable solicitation. Fraud, then, can be wielded as a tool to combat unscrupulous fundraisers. Whether this tool turns out to be a precision scalpel or a blunt cudgel remains to be seen. Fraud litigation against charities and paid professional fundraisers in the wake of the *Madigan* decision indicate that the most egregious offenders can be stopped through coordinated anti-fraud campaigns.

□ This paper first examines the history of the relevant law in the area of commercial speech and prior restraints. Specifically, it examines the three leading cases of regulation of charitable fundraising speech: *Schaumburg*, *Munson*, and *Riley*. Next, the paper discusses the history and holding of *Illinois, ex rel. Madigan v. Telemarketing Associates, Inc.* Next, this paper will explore the holding in *Madigan* in light of *Schaumburg* and its progeny. This analysis includes a survey of recent and pending fraud litigation against charities and their fundraisers, and a review of the Federal Trade Commission's "Operation Phoney Philanthropy." Finally, the paper concludes with some considerations for charities, fundraisers, and regulators as they proceed in the post-*Madigan* era.

Paper Number: PA041099

Paper Title: Voluntary Action, the Reform of Local Governance and the 'Peace Process' in Ireland, North and South

Author(s):

Nicholas V Acheson, Centre for Voluntary Action Studies, University, Coleraine, N. Ireland, United Kingdom

Arthur P. Williamson, University of Ulster, Coleraine, UK

Summary of Research

This paper will consider the development of voluntary action in both jurisdictions in Ireland in the light of recent innovations in local governance. The findings from a research project will show how developments in the field of local government are shaping changes in the relationship between the state and civil society. A primary focus of the research is on the extent to which new governmental structures represent the needs of, and provide a voice for, marginalised people.

Description

This paper will consider the recent development of voluntary action in Ireland, north and south in the light of innovations in local government in both jurisdictions in Ireland. It will present findings generated by a current research project funded by the Royal Irish Academy. These findings, emerging from interviews and documentary analysis, will show how developments in the field of local government in Ireland, are shaping changes in the relationship between the state and civil society. A primary focus of the research is on the extent to which new governmental structures represent the needs of, and provide a voice for, marginalised people. The findings from each jurisdiction will be considered comparatively and in the wider context of the contemporary international debate about local governance and the role of civil society vis à vis the state.

The paper will show how policy in Northern Ireland reflects a desire on the part of the United Kingdom government to contain and manage ethnic conflict, and more recently, to construct a new consensus around a project of modernising the state and its structures within a discourse of peace building. Voluntary and community organisations have been recruited to this modernising project in ways that involve voluntary action as a core part of modern governance.

In the Republic of Ireland, there is a record of successful management of economic and social development nationally and a notable record of addressing issues of social exclusion through partnership companies at local level. Public administration there has been recently been restructured by legislation that requires participation of voluntary and community sector networks in local co-ordinating structures that are linked to local authorities. In both jurisdictions there is a paradox because, on the one hand, government is encouraging participative forms of local democracy and on the other, central government is becoming increasingly dirigiste in its relations with the periphery.

In both jurisdictions, social policy initiatives generated by the European Union following the Maastricht Treaty (1992) have had a formative influence on the development of policy, and in particular towards the participation of civil society organizations in partnership with governmental entities. The evidence presented in the proposed paper will be structured around a key European Union funding initiative that is unique to Ireland, namely the Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation. This has operated in both Irish jurisdictions and in Northern Ireland it has been one of the main drivers of change in governance structures at local level as well as being, because of its funding policies, the main force promoting the growth of the voluntary and community sector. In the Republic of Ireland, in the six Border counties that are contiguous to Northern Ireland, it has also been significant in providing funding and in influencing the application of policy. The use of this single cross-juridical policy frame provides us with a coherent, and appealing, analytical framework for comparing and contrasting the evidence from the two parts of Ireland.

The Irish case resonates with the international debate that is taking place in Europe where May 1, 2004 will see the accession to the European Union of ten new member states. Relationships between institutions and policies, and between national and local governments and civil society networks and interests, provide a new context for social, political and economic development in the accession states from Eastern Europe. The paper will give a comparative account of the recent Irish experience. It will analyse these structures, and will consider and evaluate the manner and extent to which they offer representation of marginalised groups through the voluntary and community bodies that are represented on those partnership bodies.

Paper Number: PA041112

Paper Title: What Must We Render Unto Caesar? A Study of the Tensions Between Nonprofit Privileges & Obligations

Author(s):

Thomas Jeavons, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Summary of Research

This paper will explore questions of what obligations nonprofit organizations owe to the public, and to the government as its agent, because of the privileges granted to them under law and in the framework of an implicit 'social contract.' It will particularly analyze and reflect on the contexts which may create conflicts between those privileges and obligations (for some organizations) centering around issue of mission and values. It will probe both the moral and managerial dimensions of these conflicts, and seek to develop a framework for managing these conflicts (or tensions) so that they can be creative rather than destructive.

Description

Public benefit nonprofit organizations, secular and religious, including congregations, enjoy considerable privileges under law in the United States. These include exemptions from many forms of taxation, both national and local, as well as deductibility on the part of donors for gifts of support to these organizations. These privileges have been extended within the framework of a social contract – in some ways implicit, in other ways explicit – that assumes these organizations have certain obligations to the public, and to the government as the public's agent, which they must honor in exchange for those benefits.

That this is the philosophical justification for the legal and socio-economic foundation of the nonprofit sector is confirmed in legal scholars' explanations of the rationale for tax-exemption. (Columbo, 1995; Douglas, 1987; Hansmann, 1987; Hopkins, 1998). This view is supported as well by prominent historians' examinations of the development of the sector (Bremner, 1989; Friedman, 2003; Hall, 1994; Hammack, 1998; Payton, 1988).

This position has also been plainly stated in case law. Warren Burger, writing in *Bob Jones University v. United States*, said, "Charitable exemptions are justified on the basis that the exempt entity confers a public benefit ... [An exempt institution] must demonstrably serve and be in harmony with the public interest. The institution's purpose must not be so at odds with the common community conscience as to undermine any public benefit that might otherwise be conferred" (Noonan, 1998). Such a statement coming from a Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court as part of a majority opinion surely establishes both a clear limit on the privileges of exempt, nonprofit organizations and a clear framework of positive obligation for them.

However, the question of what it means "to demonstrably serve and be in harmony with the public interest" is not a simple one. Clear answers to this question in specific situations are not routinely self-evident. Nonprofit organizations in the United States have a long tradition of playing roles as agents of advocacy as well as service. In this role such organizations have sometimes stood in opposition to government policies and sought to change "the common community conscience."

This begs the questions, "When an organization seeks to change government policies or programs because the organization sees those policies or programs as harmful to those persons it tries to serve, or contrary to a deeper vision of the common good, is it then acting 'in harmony with the public interest?' When an organization refuses to follow government regulations or challenges a government rulings that require it to behave in a way the organization understands to be harmful to the public, to the people it serves, or to the moral principles it stands for, is it violating 'the community conscience?' Or is it, perhaps, seeking to reform that conscience? If the later is true, is it then failing or fulfilling its

obligations to act in harmony with the public interest?”

These are not merely hypothetical situations. They arise with some frequency in the life of the nonprofit sector and our society and democracy.

In this context, the focus of my proposed paper has two facets. First, I will examine the social and political context by which the grounds for such conflicts of privilege and obligation have been formed historically, and (I will argue) been made more fertile recently. Second, I will try to make these matters concrete, and illuminate them usefully, by describing and reflecting on a particular, current case of such a conflict. Finally, working from both the overview and the specifics of that case, I will reflect on the moral and managerial dimensions of these conflicts, and consider possible avenues for either resolving those conflicts or holding them in a creative rather than destructive balance.

The case to be presented involves a religious organization which has recently been sued by the IRS for refusing to comply with an order it finds morally unconscionable. (As it happens, it is the organization I serve as chief staff officer. [See, U.S. v. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting; U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.]) This organization found itself conflicted over how to act in circumstances that seem to require it to do one thing to meet legal regulations and moral obligations that are incumbent upon exempt organizations; but to do something else to honor the essential moral and spiritual values on which it was founded. These are also values which the members believe are vital to our democracy and civil society.

An analysis of why this organization came to be in such circumstances, and to contest the IRS's actions, brings these larger questions of obligation and privilege into sharp focus. While this case may be in some ways unique, I believe a careful examination of and reflection on the challenges and questions this organization has faced may bring insights to nonprofit leaders, managers and scholars who might need to wrestle with these issues as well.

References

- Bremner, R.H. (1989) *American Philanthropy*, (2nd Ed.).
Columbo, J.D. & Hall, M.H. (1995) *The Charitable Tax Exemption*.
Douglas, J. (1987) *Political Theories of Nonprofit Organization*.
Friedman, L.J. (2003) *Philanthropy in America: Historicism and Its Discontents*.
Hall, P.D. (1994). *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector*.
Hammack, D.C. (Ed.). (1998) *Making the Nonprofit Sector in the United States*.
Hansmann, H. (1987) *Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization*.
Hopkins, B.R. (1998). *The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations*, (7th Ed.).
Noonan, J. (1998) *The Lustre of Our Country*.

Paper Number: PA041220

Paper Title: Is Civil Society Obsolete?

Author(s):

Jeffrey Trexler, SMU School of Law, New York, NY, USA

Summary of Research

Is civil society a viable concept in an age of global terror? The charitable dimension of al Qaeda, Hamas and other terror networks raises serious questions for how we understand voluntary associations outside state and market. While modern notions of civil society have rhetorical value in promoting a particular vision of liberal democracy, they have serious limits as a heuristic. In their place, this paper offers a new theory of transformative social networks, a model that offers a new understanding of nonprofit identity and the idea of civil society itself.

Description

A mere decade before 9/11, Usama bin Laden was winning praise for his humanitarian efforts to build “the road to peace” in the Islamic world. As head of the Islamic Salvation Foundation in Peshawar, he spearheaded altruistic endeavors around the globe through a number of charitable organizations, including a branch office in Brooklyn. Even today, the charitable work sponsored by these groups is so extensive that an expert at Harvard has likened bin Laden’s network to the United Way. Yet despite their commitment to moral purity, the nonprofit NGOs now known collectively as al Qaeda nonetheless sponsor illicit acts—from mass murder to prostitution and the drug trade—that flout the very religious laws its adherents claim to safeguard.

The positive contributions of civil society to civic life are a familiar theme in nonprofit scholarship, but our account of behavior outside the bounds of civic virtue remains largely inchoate. What makes this lacuna in nonprofit scholarship even more conspicuous is that al Qaeda is far from an isolated example. Nonetheless, to the extent that undesirable behavior is acknowledged, contemporary theories of civil society, charity and nonprofit identity persist in describing the illicit acts of voluntary associations as mere aberrant deviations from a benevolent norm. Corruption, egoism, a lack of oversight, illiberal bias: the assumption is that if a nonprofit NGO acts in an undesirable or unjust way, its actions represent a falling away from the virtues that define the so-called “third sector.”

My paper takes a different approach. While modern notions of civil society have rhetorical value in promoting a particular vision of liberal democracy, they have serious limits as a framework for understanding the dynamics of nonprofit networks. Part I of this paper will explore the definitional tensions within classical and contemporary notions of civil society, with a particular focus on the dynamics of partnership, sovereignty and voluntary association. Part II examines whether modern concepts of civil society remain viable in light of the emergence of nihilistic nonprofit networks, such as al Qaeda, Hamas and other webs of terror. Part III moves beyond models of nonprofit identity rooted in advocacy by proposing the new theory of transformative social networks.

Select Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (1998).

Aristotle, *Politics*.

Carothers, Thomas. *Aiding Democracy Abroad* (1999).

Chambers, Simone and Will Kymlicka, eds. *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society* (2001).

Cohen, Jean-Louis and Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory* (1994).

Glucksmann. *Dostoïevski à Manhattan* (2002).

Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* (1820).

Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1660).

Neiman, Susan. *Evil in Modern Thought* (2002).

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Irony of American History* (1952).

Stern, Jessica. *Terror in the Name of God* (2003)

Van Til, Jon. *Growing Civil Society* (2000).

Watts, Duncan. *Small Worlds* (2003).

Wolfram, Steven. *A New Kind of Science* (2002).

Zizek, Slavoj. *On Belief* (2001).

Paper Number: PA041337

Paper Title: Models of Representation in Community Organizations

Author(s):

Chao Guo, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Juliet A Musso, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Summary of Research

This study develops and applies models of constituent representation to civil society organizations. We draw upon Pitkin's (1967) definition of representation as a multi-dimensional concept to delineate four dimensions of representation - formal, descriptive, symbolic, and substantive –and extend them to the context of community and membership organizations. We discuss the extent to which these dimensions relate to the specific governance context of nonprofit and community associations, contrasting several types of organizations, including community and issue advocacy organizations. The study concludes with a discussion of the theoretical and policy implications as well as future research directions.

Description

As nonprofit organizations increase their prominence in the delivery of public services in the past few decades (Saidel, 1991; Saidel & Harlan, 1998; Salamon, 1987; Zimmermann, 1994), there is a need to reexamine the extent to which they can be held accountable to their diverse constituencies. For example, Frumkin (2002) has discussed the extent to which nonprofit organizations play important roles in promoting civic engagement, and expressing values and faith, in addition to traditional service delivery roles. Other scholars highlight the expressive dimension of nonprofit organizations, arguing that their core function is to “produce important expressive outputs that provide satisfaction to the individuals donating funds, managing programs, and volunteering their time” (Frumkin & Andre-Clark, 2000, p. 159; Mason, 1996). The diverse roles of nonprofits in the public sector raise an important question: what “publics” do nonprofit organizations and community associations represent?

The democratic function of nonprofit organizations can be roughly grouped into two levels of analysis. The institutional-level analyses, as represented by interest-group pluralists (Dahl, 1956; Truman, 1951) and mediating structure theorists (Berger and Neuhaus, 1977), hold that nonprofit organizations contribute to democratic governance through their representational function; that is, nonprofit organizations represent the interests of citizens and mediate between citizens and “mega-structures” (i.e., government and large corporations). This pluralist claim, however, has been discounted by some scholars as one the “the great unfulfilled promises of pluralism” (Frumkin, 2001: 46). The critics have been centered on a crucial question left unanswered by the pluralist theorists: How well do nonprofit organizations actually represent the interests of their constituencies?

By contrast, most of the existing organization-level analyses have emphasized the developmental effects of participation in nonprofit organizations on citizens. Scholars in this line of research have argued that participation in nonprofit organizations is central to democracy because it shapes political behavior and attitudes (Almond & Verba, 1963), develops civic skills and democratic values (Brady et al., 1995), and generates social capital (Putnam, 1993, 1995). Despite their contributions to our understanding of the democratic function of nonprofit organizations, these organization-level analyses seem to have evaded the issue of representation, and thus fail to provide a response to the challenge insufficiently addressed by the institutional-level analyses.

This issue is particularly important and timely given that there is increasing attention to issues of accountability in the nonprofit sector (Arenson, 1995; Gaul & Borowski, 1993). As commented by Weisbrod (1997), nonprofit organizations are “increasingly being seen not as public-spirited philanthropies but as self-serving entities that pursue the interests of their top officials and board members” (p. 545).

This study reflects one of the first efforts to probe into the issue of representation in nonprofit organizations. Placing it into a larger perspective of the democratic role of nonprofit organizations, this study establishes a missing link in the current scholarly research with an organizational-level analysis of representation in nonprofit organizations. Drawing upon Pitkin's (1967) definition of representation as a multi-dimensional concept and extending it to the nonprofit sector context, we delineate four dimensions of representation – formal, descriptive, symbolic, and substantive – in nonprofit organizations, and then discuss the connections between these dimensions. In so doing, it not only builds a solid foundation for the pluralist argument that nonprofit organizations are a primary means through which interests of citizens are represented to the state, but also complemented and strengthened the argument made by the existing organizational-level analyses (i.e., the developmental effects of participating in nonprofit organizations on citizens).

We first review the existing literature on the contribution of nonprofit organizations to democratic governance, revealing the issue of representation as the missing link in the current discussion. Focusing on the organizational level, we then explore the different dimensions of representation in nonprofit organizations, and discuss the connections between these dimensions. We then discuss an application of our model of representation to several types of associations, illustrating the issues that arise with reference to neighborhood associations, a membership advocacy organization (the Sierra Club) and a community service organization. Our study concludes with a discussion of the theoretical and policy implications as well as future research directions.

Paper Number: PA041072

Paper Title: Ecumenical and Interfaith Coalitions: Relational Programs, Government Funding and Congregational Involvement

Author(s):

Paula F. Pipes, University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA

Helen Rose Ebaugh, Sr., University of Houston, Houston, UT, USA

Summary of Research

Chaves and Tsitsos (2001) demonstrate that, contrary to claims regarding faith-based social services, 1) congregations are more likely to address emergency needs than provide relational, holistic programs; and 2) congregations that collaborate with the government are significantly more, rather than less, likely to engage in relational programs. Utilizing data from a national sample of over 650 coalition ministries, we explore these same questions. We examine characteristics of coalitions that provide relational-based social services and assess congregations' involvement in these programs through coalitions' use of volunteers.

Description

Chaves and Tsitsos (2001) test the assertion that government contracts diminish the relational character of faith-based social services. Using congregations as the unit of analysis, they find, contrary to arguments outlined in public debates surrounding the Faith-Based and Community Initiative, that 1) congregations are more likely to address emergency needs than provide relational, holistic programs; and 2) congregations that collaborate with the government are significantly more, rather than less, likely to engage in relational programs. As Chaves and Tsitsos note, however, congregations are not the key actors in the faith-based social service arena.

□

This research utilizes data from a national sample of over 650 ecumenical and interfaith coalitions to examine whether or not these same findings apply to faith-based coalitions. Recent studies have identified a variety of organizational types involved in faith-based service delivery. In general, taxonomies categorize these providers based on a combination of size and geographic focus. Broadly, the organizational types range from the largest, national agencies such as Catholic Charities with a documented history of receiving government funds, to single congregations, which studies demonstrate tend to shy away from both holistic programs and government contracts. Less is known about ecumenical and interfaith coalitions, an intermediate category in these typologies and a widespread form of collaboration among congregations. With locally focused, social service missions and pooled resources, coalitions are more likely than single congregations to partner with the government. Furthermore, these organizations play an intermediary role connecting congregational resources and volunteers to community-based service programs. Examining coalitions' operations is important to understanding congregations' social service activities.

We define an ecumenical or interfaith coalition as an organization that: 1) defines itself as faith-based; 2) delivers at least one social service; 3) is affiliated with congregations in some manner (but is not itself a congregation); and 4) has its own board of directors. Our analysis utilizes data gathered as part of the Coalition Ministries and Congregations Study (CMACS), a national research project funded by the Lilly Endowment. The CMACS project combines quantitative data obtained from a mailed survey of coalitions and field research of coalitions and congregations at selected sites.

In this paper, we first identify the proportion of coalitions with relational programs that involve long-term interaction with clients. We then examine characteristics of these coalitions' related to several key dimensions including revenues and funding sources, congregational involvement and staffing. Finally, we explore congregational volunteers' involvement in direct service roles at coalitions. Chaves and

Tsitsos (2001) find congregational programs that involve long-term, face-to-face services are more likely to include secular collaborators than nonsecular or no collaborator. However, coalitions often utilize congregational volunteers in such programs and in positions that involve intensive interactions with clients, information that may not be available to a given congregational respondent. We identify the proportion of coalitions in which volunteers engage in direct service roles that involve intensive interaction with clients and determine the characteristics associated with these organizations as compared to those that utilize paid staff in these positions.

Paper Number: PA041103

Paper Title: Who Will Take Advantage of Charitable Choice? Examining the Effects of Clergy Attitudes towards Public Funding

Author(s):

Michael Leo Owens, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Summary of Research

Extending the extant research (Chaves 1999), my paper uses multivariate analyses to test whether clergy attitudes about public funding predict the likelihood of congregations to pursue government funding. Data come from a random sample of congregations from the greater Atlanta metropolitan area (N=325). I conclude that some attitudes matter more than others, but attributes remain the most significant predictors of whether congregations might pursue public funding.

Description

A 2001 political sketch by syndicated cartoonist Tony Auth shows a money tree. A label on the tree reads "Office of Faith-Based Initiatives." Just above the label, a serpent, apple in mouth and an Uncle Sam hat on its head, encircles the tree. Five clergymen, representing different faith traditions and denominations, face the tree. The cartoon poses a weighty question for social science and social welfare policy: Which clergyman will stretch out their hand and accept the inducement of government? Charitable Choice, the growing collection of federal and state laws and regulations that pertain to public funding of social welfare services by faith-based organizations, especially religious congregations, makes the question an important one.

Charitable Choice invites government agencies to collaborate with congregations, individually and collectively, to provide social services to poor individuals and families (Davis & Hankins, 1999; Donaldson and Carlson-Thies, 2003). In particular, Charitable Choice permits, it does not require, government agencies to award public contracts, as well as grants, to congregations to develop and administer social services that improve the personal situations and environmental conditions of the poor. Congregations receiving public contracts may use their funds to foster work (job preparation, employment training, and vocational education), nutrition (emergency food distribution and subsidized meals), healthy living (drug and alcohol treatment), and human care (adoptions, foster care, orphanages) among the needy, especially working-age, non-disabled, heads of poor households and their children, on behalf of government. In Milwaukee, for example, Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ received approximately \$600,000 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 2003 to foster welfare-to-work training in the metropolitan area.

Charitable Choice is one of the newest iterations of public dependence on public-private partnerships to govern. Policymakers first embedded Charitable Choice in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Since then, scholars have earnestly produced much needed research on the historic importance and problems of congregations as social welfare providers in the United States (Cnaan 1999, 2002; Dionne & Chen 2001), the proper relationships between religious organizations and government (Bane, Coffin, & Thiemann 2000; Davis & Hankins 1999), the capacity of congregations to collaborate with government to provide services (Farnsley 2001, 2003; Wineburg 2001; McRoberts 2003; Laudarji & Livezey 2000; Smith 2001, 2004), and the politics of funding faith-based organizations (Chaves 2003; Chaves, Stephens, and Galaskiewicz 2004; Formicola, Segers & Weber 2003).

Yet a fundamental issue—whether and which congregations will seek public funding to provide social services—remains understudied. To date, there has been no debate about which congregations are most likely to pursue public funding from government. A single study exists that predicts which congregations are most likely to pursue public funding to deliver social services (Chaves 1999). It determines mainly how the attributes (i.e., social characteristics) of clergy and their followers, along with political and theological ideologies, may predict the choice by congregations to apply for public funding.

Its approach is sound. Generally, attributes are important to understanding political behavior. Nevertheless, as political scientists know, attitudes can be equally, if not more, salient predictors of political behavior than attributes (see, e.g., Verba, Schlozman, & Brady 1995). This is especially true regarding religion and political participation (Harris 1999; Olson 2000).

Extending the extant research on congregations and public funding, I rely on multivariate analyses to test whether the attitudes of clergy, controlling for the attributes and political activism of their congregations, predict the likelihood of congregations to pursue public funding to provide social welfare services. My data come from a random sample of congregations from the greater Atlanta metropolitan area. The data are particularly useful for analyses of congregation interest in Charitable Choice because it contains variables that measure the attitudes of clergy, the social attributes of their congregations, and the political behaviors of clergy and congregations. I show that, with the exception of race, attitudes, along with political activism, may be less powerful than attributes as predictors of whether congregations would pursue public funding.

Paper Number: PA041370

Paper Title: The Rest of the Story: The Perspectives of Faith-Based Program Participants

Author(s):

Jon Singletary, Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

Summary of Research

The people who are served by faith-based organizations are often missing from the design, implementation, and evaluation processes of the human service programs in which they participate. This paper incorporates data from a sample of 15 program participants (using qualitative research interviews asking about personal satisfaction, knowledge of decision-making, various roles, role of faith, and innovative practices) who were able to identify what factors they felt were most important. This introduction to perspectives missing from the discussions of faith-based human services has the potential to enrich the research as well as the services of faith-based human services.

Description

Keywords: religious organizations, human services, faith based initiatives, program participants □

Problem or Issue to be Addressed:

The people who are served by human service programs are too often a missing voice from the design, implementation, and evaluation of these efforts. The emerging lessons of welfare reform suggest that the people served by organizations should be included in planning every phase of a human service program (Cooney & Weaver, 2001; Prince & Austin, 2001). People commonly identified as “clients” or “service recipients” are also able to be full participants in these programs. While they have stories to tell of their experience in the program, the wisdom they bring of what led them to the program and the knowledge they have after participating in the program means that these people are important players in the overall processes of program planning. The participants’ perspectives are too often missing in reports and evaluations of direct service programs including counseling, training, mentoring, education and others. Their voices are vital to the services we offer as they “are the driving creative force behind significant and long-lasting change” (Castelloe, Watson, & White, 2002, p. 26; see also Telfair & Mulvihill, 2000).

In the services offered by faith-based organizations (FBO), the participants’ perspective seems even more vital. Here, administrators, directors, service providers, and other leaders discuss the role of faith and the value of faith for program participants, but the participants themselves seldom share their understanding of faith or their experience in these FBO’s (Gotterer, 2001). Central to the discussion of faith-based initiatives are concerns related to persons served by FBO’s. “Does faith play a role in making faith-based services more effective in the lives of the persons served?” is asked on the one hand, while on the other, we ask “Does faith lead to the manipulation of persons who are vulnerable as they come to receive services in an FBO?”

This research addresses this range of issues by asking 15 participants about their experience in a faith-based direct service program. The qualitative research interviews asked participants about personal satisfaction, knowledge of decision-making, various roles, role of faith, innovative practices, and other issues in the program.

Relation to Knowledge in the Field

Although service recipients go by many different names (clients, consumers, residents, guests, and more), we use the term participant for people who receive services from the programs we have

studied. Current knowledge in the field related to the experiences of program participant and drawn from the stories of their lives is limited. Gotterer (2001) writes that spirituality and religion are rich areas for discussion with program participants, and are often a hidden source of both problems and inspiration. Altman (2003) discusses the importance of seeking and respecting participants' perspectives in service delivery. Ethical and competent responses to the spirituality of program participants have been encouraged in the writings of Sherwood (2002) and Hodge (2004), but a consideration of participants' voices are seldom considered.

There are a variety of questions to be asked of participants in considering their experiences and the knowledge it contributes to the field of faith-based initiatives. The broad-based questions that we use allow participants to identify what factors they feel are most important in relation to the programs in which they are involved. The responses from some of the interviews provided rich insights into the role of a program participant in an FBO; in others, participants provided few comments that help us understand the meaning of being a participant. Yet, even in these interview transcripts, the lack of data is meaningful. This tells us that participants are not accustomed to being included in research on the practices of faith-based organizations and encourages us to explore further the perspectives of people served by these organizations.

Approach to the Study

The data representing participants' perspectives on faith-based programs is from the qualitative (grounded theory) phase of a multi-phase 30-month research project. The sample, based on maximum variation of faith-based direct service programs includes 15 programs in faith-based organizations from four regions in the United States. Administrators, program directors, volunteers, collaborators, and people served by the programs (participants) were interviewed in each program (N=64); this report focuses primarily on the program participants (n=15). The grounded theory developed from the qualitative data has been used in the design of a questionnaire that has been sent to a nationwide sample of leaders in 15,000 faith-based organizations and congregations. The questionnaire includes a variety of questions that reflect the participants' perspectives; the survey data will be used to test our understanding of participant's experiences in faith-based programs.

Contribution to the Field

The lessons we have learned from program participants' allow for the expression of a voice commonly missing from research of faith-based programs and organizations. This introduction to perspectives missing from the discussions of program evaluation, knowledge of organizational decision-making, the variety of client roles, the role of faith, the innovative practices of these programs, and other issues in the program has the potential to enrich the research as well as the services of faith-based organizations.

References

- Altman, J.C (2003). A qualitative examination of client participation in agency-initiated services. *Families in Society*, 84(4), 471-479
- Castelloe, P. Watson, T. & White, C. (2002). Participatory change: An integrative approach to community practice. *Journal of Community Practice*, 10(4), 7-31.
- Cooney, K. & Weaver, D. (2001). The implementation of a 'Work First' welfare-to-work program in a changing environment. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(3), 33-54.
- Gotterer, R. (2001). The spiritual dimension in clinical social work practice: a client perspective. *Families in Society*, 82(2), 187-194.

Hodge-D. R. (2004). Working with Hindu clients in a spiritually sensitive manner. *Social-Work*, 49(1), 27-38.

Prince, J. & Austin, M.J. (2001). Innovative programs and practices emerging from the implementation of welfare reform: A cross-case analysis. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(3), 1-14.

Sherwood, D.A (2002). Ethical integration of faith and social work practice: evangelism. *Social Work and Christianity*, 29(1): 1-12.

Telfair, J. & Mulvihill, B.A. (2000). Bridging science and practice: The integrated model of community-based evaluation (IMCBE). *Journal of Community Practice*, 7(3), 37-65.

(This report is part of a qualitative grounded theory phase of the Faith and Service Technical Education Network (FASTEN) research project, a two phase mixed method inquiry into promising and exemplary practices in faith-based programs, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts and conducted under the leadership of the Center for Family and Community Ministries in the School of Social Work at Baylor University.)

Paper Number: PA041427

Paper Title: Keeping the Faith: The Impact of Religion in Social Service Provision

Author(s):

Amie Hess, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Summary of Research

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) radically changed social service programming and the federal government's role in program design, implementation and provision. I argue that there has been a shift in both the scale and the means of government. Processes of devolution and the federalist agenda have occasioned new actors as primary players in the creation and implementation of social service programming. Nonprofit organizations, particularly faith-based, have prominent roles in social programming at the local level. I present initial findings outlining the role that religion plays in the implementation of the federal abstinence-only program.

Description

Introduction

□ The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) radically changed social service programming and the federal government's role in program design, implementation and provision. Welfare reform has expanded the potential role for nongovernmental organizations by distributing welfare monies as block grants to states, decentralizing administrative control; in short, through processes of devolution. Increasingly the government is drawing on the nonprofit social service sector in implementing social welfare programming. The federal government has actively sought to include "non-traditional" actors in social service provision, creating a new set of state actors with new sources of power at the local level.

□ In addition to 'mainstream' nonprofit agencies, the federal government actively encourages states to partner with faith-based organizations (FBOs) to provide social services through the charitable choice and other faith-based initiatives. This paper uses ethnographic analysis of the implementation of the federal abstinence-only sex education program to ask: How does religion impact program implementation?

□ In 1996 federal government introduced a \$50 million abstinence-only sex education block grant program as part of the massive welfare overhaul. Funded programs must follow a strict set of guidelines outlining a definition of sexuality based on marriage, monogamy, and heterosexuality. Under this program, states apply for a block grant of funds in a process mirroring other welfare reform programs. States then make grants to agencies to run programs at the local level. I conduct an ethnographic analysis of programs in two nonprofits in the outer-boroughs of New York City, including a teen pregnancy prevention organization with a long history in the field of teen pregnancy prevention and a large faith-based charity group which only became involved in the field through the abstinence-only program. In this paper, I draw on eight months of ethnographic data of, Future Hope, the faith-based organization, asking what impact religion has on the implementation of the federal abstinence-only program.

Theoretical orientation

□ Researchers are increasingly noting the importance of devolution as evidenced by the 1996 welfare reform legislation, with its nearly unanimous bipartisan support. In addition to the importance of the states in this new federalist agenda, non-state community actors are increasingly posited as critical actors in public-private ventures. PRWORA offers states the flexibility to contract out services traditionally provided by state actors and provide an array of services not previously provided under welfare (Corcoran et al 2000, Gronbjerg 2001, Martinson and Holcomb 2002, Salamon 1987). And with some variation, states have seized upon the opportunity to devolve implementation to private nonprofit and in some cases for-profit agencies (Holcomb and Martinson 2002). As welfare reauthorization discussion heats up, the Bush administration has made it they would like to see the role of private, faith-based groups increase substantially.

The Question of Faith

- New work looking at the impact of faith-based service provision is beginning to emerge; however, the field is sharply divided between those advocating an increased role for religious organizations and those wary of the growing ties between religion and government (Mink 2001, Twombly 2002). “At the heart of the debate is the fundamental question of what constitutes a faith-based group and how such groups differ from secular providers in their delivery of social services” (Ebaugh et al. 2003, p. 412).
- Several schemas have been proposed which attempt to ascertain whether religious organizations involved in social service delivery are in some way uniquely religious; asking in essence are the organizational characteristics of FBOs distinct from the characteristics other nonprofit service providers (Ebaugh et al. 2003). Unruh and Sider (2001) present a typology of religious elements of faith-based social service programs across two major dimensions of religiosity: environmental elements (affiliation with church/denomination, display of religious objects/images, religious literature in the program space, staff/board members based on religious beliefs, and mission statement with explicit religious references) and active religious elements (direct communication of religious message to clients or client involvement in specifically religious activities). Smith and Sosin (2001) propose three general characteristics: the extent to which an organization is dependent on religious entities for resources; extent of affiliation with and control by a denomination or other religious group; and the extent to which religious culture creates a niche or space for agencies to pursue their religious values. Ebaugh et al., (2003) argue that, in fact, organizations do differ significantly across four dimensions—decision-making, resource preference, organizational culture, and organizational practices. This schema is not so much a way to distinguish faith-based from secular organizations, but rather to assess degree of religiosity.
- These typologies are of limited utility. They might help differentiate whether or not an organization should be classified as faith-based, but do not uncover how, or even if, these characteristics actually play out in the delivery of social services; in the implementation of programming. In sum, the jury is still out on the actual impact of religion on social service provision—at the level of practice—by faith-based organizations.

Hypothesis:

Faith-based organizations embedded within a large bureaucratic structure will be less religiously oriented at the organizational level. Further, I argue that these types of organizations will be most likely to receive government social service grants because of the capacity necessary to both run an organization and meet grant requirements. It is the very work involved in running a service organization that mitigates against the likelihood of religion playing a central role in the day to day organization of work.

Findings in Brief:

Keeping the Faith?

- As anticipated in my hypotheses, religion does not play out at the formal organizational level in the Future Hope organization. As discussed earlier, Future Hope is part of a large, highly organized, highly bureaucratized faith-based charity organization. However, as elaborated below, staff members routinely draw on a religious vocabulary of motive to make meaning of their work. Religious tropes provide motivation and explanation for what at times, is difficult and not materially rewarding work.

References

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. 2000. "2000 Annual Summary: Abstinence Education Grant Program, Section 510 of Title V of the Social Security Act." Washington, DC: DHHS.

Bonastia, Chris. 2000. "Why did affirmative action in housing fail during the Nixon Era? Exploring the "institutional homes" of social policies." *Social Problems* 47:523-542.

Boris, Elizabeth T. 1999. "Introduction--Nonprofit organizations in a democracy: Varied roles and responsibilities." Pp. 3-30 in *Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and conflict*, edited by Elizabeth T. & Steuerle Boris, C. Eugene. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Clark, L. and Estes, Carroll, L. 1992. "Sociological and economic theories of markets and nonprofits:

Evidence from home health organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 97(4): 945-969.

Clemens, Elisabeth, S. 1993. "Organizational repertoires and institutional change: Women's groups and the transformation of U.S. politics, 1890-1920." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(4): 755-798.

Corcoran, M., S. K. Danziger, A. Kalil, and K. S. Seefeldt. 2000. "How welfare reform is affecting women's work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:241-269.

De Vita, Carol, J. 1999. "Nonprofits and devolution: What do we know?" in *Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and conflict*, edited by Elizabeth T. & Steuerle Boris, C. Eugene. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Devaney, Barbara, Johnson, Amy, Maynard, Rebecca, and Trenholm, Chris. 2002. "The Evaluation of Abstinence Education Programs Funded Under Title 5 Section 510: Interim Report." Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

DiMaggio, Paul, J. and Anheier, Helmut, K. 1990. "The sociology of nonprofit organizations and sectors." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:137-159.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose, Pipes, Paula, F., Chafetz, Janet Saltzman, and Daniels, Martha. 2003. "Where's the religion? Distinguishing faith-based from secular social service agencies." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(3): 411-426.

Evaluation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and. 2000. "2000 Annual Summary: Abstinence Education Grant Program, Section 510 of Title V of the Social Security Act." Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.

Farnsley, Aurthur, E., II. 2001. "Can faith-based organizations compete?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30(1): 99-111.

Gronbjerg, Kirsten, A. 1987. "Patterns of institutional relations in the welfare state: Public mandates and the nonprofit sector." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 16(1-2): 64-80.

_____. 1991. "How nonprofit human service organizations manage their funding sources: Key findings and policy implications." *Journal of Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 2(2): 159-175.

_____. 2001. "The U.S. nonprofit human service sector: A creeping revolution." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30(2): 276-297.

Katz, Michael B. 1996. *In the shadow of the poorhouse: a social history of welfare in America*. New York: BasicBooks.

Kirby, Douglas. 1997. "No easy answers: Research findings on programs to reduce teen pregnancy." Washington, DC: The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.

Lennon, Mary Clare, and Tom Corbett. 2003. *Policy into action : implementation research and welfare reform*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Luker, Kristin. 1996. *Dubious conceptions : the politics of teenage pregnancy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mink, Gwendolyn. 1998. *Welfare's end*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

—. 2001. "Faith in government?" *Social Justice* 28:5-10.

Orloff, Ann Shola. 2001. "Ending the entitlements of poor single mothers: Changing social policies, women's employment, and caregiving in the contemporary United States." Pp. 133-159 in *Women and welfare: Theory and practice in the United States and Europe*, edited by Nancy J. Hirschmann, & Liebert, Ulrike. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Peck, Jamie. 2001. *Workfare states*. New York: Guilford Press.

Powell, Walter, W. and DiMaggio, Paul, J, Eds. 1991. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rose, Nikolas, S. 1999. *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ruggie, Mary. 1996. *Realignments in the welfare state: health policy in the United States, Britain, and Canada*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Salamon, Lester M. 1987. "Partners in public service: The scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations." In *The Nonprofit Sector Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

—. 2002. *The state of nonprofit America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

—. 2002. *The resilient sector: the state of nonprofit America*, in *The state of nonprofit America*, edited by Lester M. Salamon. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Smith, Steven Rathgeb and Sosin, M. R. 2001. "The varieties of faith-related agencies." *Public Administrative Review* 61:651-669.

Smith, Steven Rathgeb. 1999. "Government financing of nonprofit activity." Pp. 177-212 in *Nonprofits and government: Collaboration and conflict*, edited by Elizabeth T. & Steuerle Boris, C. Eugene. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

—. 2002. "Social Services." Pp. 149-186 in *The state of nonprofit America*, edited by Lester M. Salamon. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Steuerle, C. Eugene and Hodgkinson, Virginia A. 1999. "Meeting Social Needs: Comparing the Resources of the Independent Sector and Government." in *Nonprofits and Government: Collaboration and Conflict*, edited by C. Eugene Steuerle Elizabeth T. Boris. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Twombly, Eric, C. 2002. "Religious versus secular human service organizations: Implications for public policy." *Social Science Quarterly* 83:947-961.

Unruh, Heidi Rolland and Sider, Ronald, J. 2001. "Religious elements of faith-based social service programs: Types and integrative strategies." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion.

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

White House. 2001. "Rallying the armies of compassion." <www.whitehouse.gov>