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The study begins with an examination of the boundaries, definition, and scope of the nonprofit sector. A review of the literature documents the discipline growth, as well as limitations of its academic texts and the lack of defined direction for research.

A review of the literature reveals the following distinctive areas which define the field of nonprofit organization management: charity and philanthropy, volunteerism, tax exemption, and management practice. These distinguishing characteristics are used as focal points for a historical analysis of the development of the field. The current state of the field is a result of the convergence of these important historical areas.

A definitional model of a discipline that was conceptualized by King and Brownell (1966) is used comparatively to describe the "match" between the 10 factors associated with the model with factors existing in the evolving discipline of nonprofit management.

A discussion on curricular needs in the nonprofit sector serves as a foundation for a descriptive research study.
A survey tool was designed for this study and distributed to the membership of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, an organization of academicians, scholars, researchers, and practitioners. The survey findings report on a number of interesting results, namely, that there exists a belief that a discipline is emerging; that Business Management is the field which influenced the roots of a nonprofit discipline; that Public Administration is the best place to house a program; and that courses in Resource Development, Program Evaluation, and Voluntary Management are noted as most important for a graduate level program. Other findings are reported which describe the respondents, the universities in which they are employed, and other areas of curriculum development.

A concluding chapter focused on the respondents' opinions about the future direction of the discipline, the scholarly activity that will be required to enhance the developmental progress, and finally the career paths that may result from the further development of the academic discipline of nonprofit organization management.

The form and content of this abstract are approved. I recommend its publication.

Signed

Faculty member in charge of thesis
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I feel grateful to be working within the nonprofit sector. Hopefully, this dissertation study will contribute to the sector's growth as I intended.

There are many people deserving of acknowledgment for their influences on my writing and research assignment. Among these, many are the authors that I referenced; others include those who have chosen the nonprofit sector as the area to which they have dedicated their careers.

Specifically, my appreciation goes to members of my doctoral committee. I wish to thank Robert W. Gage who agreed to assume the position of Chair of the doctoral committee and directed this thesis to completion. Dr. Gage provided the right blend of support and scholarly direction that was needed. For his efforts, Dr. Gage deserves meritorious credit. I also owe thanks to Jay M. Shafritz for his earlier activities as Director of the Doctoral Program and my first dissertation advisor. Dr. Shafritz recognized the value of my topic; and more important, he saw the value of nonprofit management as a concentration area for graduate study.

Eileen Tynan and Ron Calinger were the other important committee members, who, like Drs. Gage and Shafritz, were patient with my writing deadlines and helpful in seeing me to my goal of defending this dissertation before 1988. Their advice, Dr. Tynan in areas
of methodology and Dr. Calinger in historical analysis, was most appreciated.

The Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management (INPOM) provided the backdrop for this study. Not only was it the leading organization for developing curricula in nonprofit management, but also it was the environment that encouraged my research and provided my employment. Robert F. Leduc especially deserves recognition as a leader and teacher in this field. A colleague and friend, Bob helped me in the selection of this topic and provided personal and organizational support that I found most helpful. My thanks also go to the INPOM staff and Board of Directors for their ongoing encouragement.

Other colleagues were also very valuable. Jon Van Til's critique of earlier drafts were, at times, sobering. I appreciated Jon's challenging questions and words of support. David Gies helped me feel comfortable around the computer room and working with SPSS-X, and for their advice, support, mentoring and friendship through different stages of my doctoral education and dissertation process, I thank Martin Bloom, Ed LaPedis, Phil Burgess, Peter Judd, and Al Hyde.

This dissertation was expertly crafted by the typing of Toby Cohen. When it comes to the final stages of typing and proofreading, it is important to have someone as skilled as Toby. Early printouts of my drafts and corrections to them were assisted by the most talented word processor I know, Trini Clark.
To my family: my everlasting thanks to my parents who instilled the values of pursuing an education and always provided encouragement, and to my sister, whose timely visits and phone calls were often filled with interest and encouragement of my progress.

Finally, I recognize that working full-time and concentrating much effort and time to this dissertation study, sometimes was a sacrifice of time that I otherwise would have spent with my lovely wife April, and my stepchildren Beth and Nathan. Nevertheless, through this dissertation period, April and I shared the joy of the birth of our son, Filip Zachary. Now that the writing task is behind me, I hope to enjoy more time with my family. My love and special thanks to April for her support and understanding . . .
## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER

#### I. INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Dissertation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Note on Methodology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Profession of Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Concept of Nonprofit Professionalism</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pattern of Literary Action</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nonprofit Textbook</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Literature Through the Past Decade</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. A HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Roots of Charity and Philanthropy</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development of the Volunteer Role and Its Importance</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation and Its Influences on the Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Protestant Patrician Influence</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Ethnic Influence</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER

The Free Professional Influence ........... 72

The Organizational Influence ............. 73

The Interorganizational Influence ......... 74

The Corporate Philanthropic Influence .... 75

The Evolution and Impact of Tax-Exempt Status ............ 76

From Management to the Emergence of Nonprofit Management .......... 82

Management Technologies Applied to the Nonprofit Sector ............ 92

IV. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT DISCIPLINE .......... 98

A Discipline is a Community ............... 99

A Discipline is an Expression of Human Imagination .............. 103

A Discipline is a Domain .................. 104

A Discipline is a Tradition--It Has a History .................. 104

A Discipline is a Syntactical Structure--Mode of Inquiry ............ 105

A Discipline is a Conceptual Structure ............. 106

A Discipline is a Specialized Language or Other System of Symbols .......... 108

A Discipline is a Heritage of Literature and a Communications Network ............. 108

A Discipline is a Valuative and Affective Stance ............. 109
A Discipline is an Instructive Community ............................................. 110

V. CURRICULAR NEEDS OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR .......................... 112

Case Example: The University of Colorado ........................................... 125

The Need for Shared Institutional Insights ............................................ 129

VI. RESEARCH METHODS ........................................................................ 131

Objective and Purpose ................................................................. 131

Population Selection ................................................................. 132

Population Under Study .............................................................. 134

Instrument Design ................................................................. 135

Data Collection ................................................................. 139

VII. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY ............................................................. 142

Conclusion ................................................................. 163

VIII. THE FUTURE ............................................................................. 165

What Are the Scholars/Practitioners Thinking About the Future? ........... 167

Enhancing the Development of an Emerging Academic Discipline .......... 171

Research and Publication .............................................................. 172

Professional Symposia ................................................................. 175

Career Paths ................................................................. 176

BIBLIOGRAPHY ............................................................................. 181

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONNAIRE ........................................................................... 197
APPENDIX

B. RESPONDENTS' IDENTIFICATION OF TOP THREE "IMPORTANT" AUTHORS .......................... 205

C. PERIODICALS MOST READ BY RESPONDENTS ................................................. 207
TABLES

Table


2.2. The American Volunteer: Voluntary Activity by Selected Characteristics ............ 27

2.3. Philanthropic Giving in 1985 ..................... 28

2.4. Contributions in Billions During 1985 ............ 29

2.5. Selected Examples of Practice Focused Textbooks for Use in Teaching Nonprofit Coursework .................. 44

2.6. Number of and Category of Written Contributions to the Academic Discipline of Nonprofit Organization Management: The Results of Examining Three Bibliographic Sources, 1973-1983 .................. 49

3.1. Organizations Protected From Tax Liabilities .................. 78


3.3. Management Aims and Major Target Groups in the Three Sectors .................. 96

5.1. Fifteen Academic Institutions Reported to Offer a Graduate Course of Study With a Concentration Area in Nonprofit Management .................. 117

7.1. Importance of Eighteen Possible Nonprofit Management Courses in a Graduate Program Plan of Study: Number of Votes Cast and Ranked by Weighted Scores .................. 152
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Three Most Important Courses Central to a Nonprofit Management Curriculum: By Most Votes Cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.</td>
<td>Departments/Schools With Primary Responsibility for Teaching Nonprofit Management Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.</td>
<td>Subjects Taught as Separate Nonprofit Management Courses: Reported by 44 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.</td>
<td>Number of Departments in Which the Respondent Has Teaching Responsibility Versus Number of Departments with Administrative Responsibility for the Delivery of Nonprofit Management Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.</td>
<td>Identification of Teaching Responsibility, and Number of Core and/or Elective Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.</td>
<td>Respondent's Expressions of the Future of an Academic Discipline of Nonprofit Organization Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The nonprofit sector has burgeoned during the past decade, exampled in such phenomena as the increase of the nonprofit workforce by more than two million employees, the doubling of private contributions received to support the nonprofit sector, a tripling of operating expenditures for all nonprofit sector operations, and a doubling of the dollar amount of the nonprofit share of the national income. Its growth can be attributed to many factors including its diverse areas of interest, its locus of social responsibility and its important contribution to the American economy. Nonprofit organizations have had few constraints in developing and organizing groups, expressing advocacy support for popular or unpopular causes, and delivering specialized services to underserved populations (O'Connell, 1983).

As nonprofit organizations have grown in number and in their influence on public policy and the business community, the need for sophisticated managers with organizational acumen, technical skills and a commitment to the public interest has become a significant reality. The nonprofit sector now requires its own "brand" of trained and educated managers because of the specialized nature of nonprofit organizations.
The unique nature of nonprofit entities is evidenced by the presence of particular characteristics. One fundamental element shared among all nonprofit organizations is the critical element of "voluntary action" (Smith, Baldwin, & White, 1980). Volunteers undergird the mission of nonprofit organizations. In addition, the mission of the nonprofit organization is focused on the provision of public goods (Keating & Keating, 1980). Unlike the mission of the public sector, however, nonprofit organizations define their own constituency, are not governmental entities (Orlans, 1980) and are bound by policies established by a voluntary board of directors. Unlike business organizations, nonprofit organizations do not exist to financially benefit the organization's shareholders or board of directors (Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975).

In appearance, the nonprofit sector has grown unfettered but also unplanned. Even in the absence of a "blueprint," nonprofit organization management has experienced a recent surge of academic and practitioner interest. This growing interest is exemplified by a budding number of graduate degree programs in nonprofit management. There has also been a considerable increase in non-degree training programs, research and writing activity. The recent boom in academic activity suggests a timely need to recognize the nonprofit organization management field as an academic discipline.
When the field is acknowledged as a legitimate discipline, deliberate and systematic attention and testing can be generated focusing on examination of content of proliferating nonprofit literature, which now offers expositions on the field's new ideas, controversial issues, and principles of practice. In addition, scholars within the discipline will be induced to establish a core knowledge base and practice skill requirements which will become necessary standards for acquiring recognized levels of professional competencies.

Given the uneven growth in formal education programs and research activity, and the complex challenges which are confronting today's nonprofit organizations, a nonprofit management discipline characterized by an increasing breadth and depth of knowledge is a practical necessity. If this "field" is to become purposeful in its service to the American public, then it must evolve into a self-conscious discipline.

This dissertation seeks to sound a "clarion call" to acknowledge nonprofit management as an explicit and distinctive field of study. The dissertation study will consist of a systematic exploration of the development and intellectual trends of this field, including the origins of the field, its norms, and influencing factors that have assisted in its growth and refinement. It is the writer's hope that this study will assist the field of nonprofit organization management with a structure toward becoming a self-conscious, self-directed, learned profession.
Purpose of Dissertation

Nonprofit organization management has been portrayed as a tax-exempt economic sector and a field of administrative/management practice, but overlooked as a field of intellectual study. However, nonprofit organization management also may be seen as (a) the activity of managing private voluntary nonprofit organizations, (b) a conduit for voluntary activity or philanthropic contribution to a charitable cause, and (c) an academic discipline.

There has been little, if any, effort to trace the origins of nonprofit organization management as a professional field of study. Nevertheless, the field has grown "like Topsy." A body of professional literature has come into existence; university and college curricula have been developed on both the undergraduate and graduate levels; degree programs are in place and under development throughout the United States (Gray, 1985). The existence of books, journals, curricula, and degree programs in nonprofit management provide a strong indication that there are formal sets of knowledge, skills, and methodology to be taught and transferred to students and practitioners.

The field of nonprofit management will be examined in its development, its current standing, and its future potential.

Therefore, the objectives of this dissertation are as follows:
1. To provide the nonprofit management field with an initial systematic examination as a legitimate field of study.

2. To provide shape to the field by acknowledging its historical basis as a field of learning.

3. To contribute to a knowledge base of what is currently happening in the discipline and what may happen in the future.

**Methodology**

In order to achieve these objectives, four key areas will be addressed. First, a definition of nonprofit management will be developed to identify the topic at hand and determine the boundaries of the field. Second, a history of the professionalization of the field will be traced. Third, an examination of the field will be undertaken through reporting results of a comprehensive survey of academics, scholars, and practitioners who teach or write literature, or in other ways have contributed to the academic development of the field of nonprofit management. Finally, predictions about the future will be made in the context of evolution of the field.

The first objective, defining the field, will be addressed in two ways. First, a clarification of terms will be reviewed in this introductory chapter. In Chapter II, a profile detailing the distinguishing characteristics of the nonprofit sector will be presented along with a comprehensive description of its size and scope. Included in this examination is a discussion of the
concept of a "profession" and how the activities in the field of nonprofit management fit part of the conceptualization. Finally, a review of the literature provides further evidence of the field's state of development as a distinct and scholarly discipline.

The second objective, tracing the historical development of the field, will be met in Chapter III by examining four of the field's major origins, including the following: its roots in charity and philanthropy, the development of the role of the volunteer, the evolution of tax exemption, and the adaptation of management technologies into the nonprofit sector. The current state of the field is a result of the convergence of these important historical developments. These developments have changed the perspective, practice and scope of the field and can be characterized through certain important and major milestones. The product of history is an evolving discipline marked by the growth of the professional literature, the development of university coursework, degree programs, and professional membership associations.

The third objective, reporting on what is happening and what might happen in the future, will be met by accomplishing three tasks. The first task, covered in Chapter IV, will be to explore a model of an academic discipline and to examine the curricular needs of the nonprofit sector. In addition to providing insights about how the field of nonprofit management fits the model
of an academic discipline, the discussion on curricular needs serves as a foundation for initiating a descriptive research study.

The second task, addressing the objective of contributing a database of knowledge about the field, is the analysis and reporting of the survey results. In Chapter V, the report of the survey results will attempt to illustrate the trends in the direction of curriculum development as a reflection of the growth and potential development of the field. The third and final task of this objective is addressed in Chapter VI. Based on the results of the survey and other information gleaned through interviews with experts in the field, a discussion of future directions of the academic discipline of nonprofit management will complete the narrative of this study.

A Note on Methodology

This study was undertaken to gain an understanding of the emergence of the academic discipline of nonprofit organization management. To gain a full perspective on the development of the discipline required an extensive examination of different dimensions of the profession including the boundaries of the field, a historical analysis, an examination of the current status, and future possibilities.

The first key task for this study was to examine the boundaries and scope of the nonprofit sector. Distinguishing the special characteristics of the nonprofit sector was necessary for
establishing a contextual understanding of the field. Flowing out of the discussion about the parameters of the nonprofit sector, it became clear that a discussion of the "profession" of nonprofit organization management was the next important focal area of this study. In order to adequately discuss the dimensions of the nonprofit profession, first, a definition of "profession" was required. Three general approaches which have been used to evaluate the professional identity of occupations were reviewed and applied to the field of nonprofit management. One approach looks at structure traits, such as the existence of a body of knowledge or code of ethics (Greenwood, 1972). Another evaluates the attitudes of the individual members. A third approach is an assessment of the competency level of the individuals who constitute the professional group.

Among the most valued aspects of a profession is a distinctive knowledge base, which is a prerequisite both for a profession and for its scholarly arm, the discipline. An extensive review of the literature was necessary to demonstrate that a body of literature does exist and to also understand the limitations of this literature base. In reviewing the literature, one critical issue stood out: there is not a defined direction for the field's research or publication efforts.

In reading through the literature, the following four subject areas stood out: charity and philanthropy, volunteerism, tax exemption, and management practice. These areas were referred to
many times as distinguishing features of the nonprofit sector; therefore, it seemed that their historical influence on a discipline should be known. A historical analysis of the roots of the profession required the use of some historical research tools. Specific sources or documentary evidence included published documents, letters, and an examination of the existing literature (Gottschalk, 1969; Pitt, 1972).

Since the development of nonprofit management as a field of study is more recent, the use of interviews was also a valuable method for investigating its current growth. Experts in the field chose not to debate whether nonprofit management is science or art. They generally agreed that it is an applied discipline and like other applied fields—such as law, medicine, education—nonprofit managers are engaged in applying principles, theories and techniques in the course of their work, but in a specialized setting, i.e., a nonprofit organization setting. However, identifying the field as an applied discipline did not satisfactorily explain the dimensions of the field as an academic discipline.

Since the intention of this dissertation was to develop a distinctive explanation of nonprofit organization management as a discipline, two additional assignments emerged. The first was to locate an appropriate model of a discipline and compare the discipline of nonprofit management to the found model in the terms of that model. Toward this end, a model of a discipline that was
conceptualized by King and Brownell (1966) was useful in describing the evolving discipline of nonprofit management.

Growing out of the examination of the profession as discipline, the second assignment required an examination of the curricular needs of the nonprofit sector. In other words, the discussion went from the theoretical to the practical. Despite any of the limitations of the profession fitting neatly into a prescribed model of a discipline, there is, in fact, expansive activity in the field's development of coursework and degree programs.

A substantive part of a study of this type requires more information from individuals closest to the development of its knowledge base. In this case, experiential data were sought from those who have detailed and factual information describing the current level of scholarly activity, and development and direction in the field; the use of survey research was appropriate (Isaac & Michael, 1979, p. 18). This study also produced a descriptive data base through a survey questionnaire, mailed to academicians, scholars, researchers, and practitioners in the nonprofit voluntary sector.

The information from the survey respondents was useful in gaining an understanding of the respondents' views on important matters of curriculum inclusion, reflecting what is actually the situation in the universities in which they teach. The survey also helped to raise other issues about the future direction of the
discipline. The last chapter, in fact, concludes with a discussion of the future of nonprofit organization management as an emerging and evolving discipline. The information for that chapter is a product of the survey findings, interviews with experts in the field and the researcher's own opinions.

Definition of Terms

A study devoted to an analysis of nonprofit organization management will surely raise some immediate, interesting and pertinent questions, including the following:

1. What is meant by nonprofit organization management?
2. What is meant by the term discipline?
3. Why is there a need to acknowledge a discipline of nonprofit management?
4. Have there been any other scholarly attempts to examine professional disciplines and distinguish them from fields of practice?

An immediate problem in discussing this subject is the need to define or review some important terms. The whole arena of nonprofit organization management has been called the nonprofit sector, the voluntary sector, the third sector, and the independent sector. All four terms are used interchangeably in the professional literature. However, the derivations of the terms differ. The Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975) attempted to define the nonprofit sector by a process of
elimination. In other words, the Commission explained in what ways the sector was not governmental and not business. The Commission did explain that the term "third sector" was used because it was the third economic sector, overshadowed by government and the business worlds. David Horton Smith (1973, 1980, p. 7) explains that the term "voluntary sector" refers to a broad range of activities, goals, and organizations which involve non-paid action on behalf of individuals who want to achieve some societal ideal. Smith (1980, p. 18) further indicates that the voluntary sector provides "the social risk capital of human society." Elsewhere, Smith et al. (1980, p. 3) describe the "nonprofit sector" as the "collective forms of individual voluntary action." Sometimes, this sector is referred to as the "independent sector" because of its democratic characteristic of independence (Independent Sector, 1985a, p. 16). Other key definitional efforts are those of Levitt (1973), Van Til (1981, 1986), and Sumariwalla (1983).

For purposes of consistency, the term "nonprofit sector" will be used in this study when speaking of the arena in which nonprofit organizations exist. In addition, the organizations that fit within the broadest understanding of a nonprofit organization are those nongovernmental organizations, agencies, and groups which exist for purposes other than to further the financial and economic interests of its governing board members. Many small organizations, clubs, or collective groupings of people may
be involved in furthering a cause in which there is no personal economic gain, and these organizations may be referred to as nonprofit organizations. However, for the purpose of this study, Wolf's (1984) definition of a nonprofit organization serves most productively. According to Wolf, nonprofit organizations are "nongovernmental entities, incorporated under state laws as charitable or not-for-profit corporations that have been set up to serve some public purpose and are tax exempt according to the United States Internal Revenue Service" (p. 3). Although Wolf further delineates the characteristics of the (501(c)(3)) nonprofit organization to include a legal status in which gifts to the organization are tax-deductible, it is also operationally important to recognize the thousands of (501(c)(6)) professional trade associations in the United States which do not have this special gift arrangement. Yet in almost all other respects these membership organizations are nonprofit, incorporated, have a public purpose, are exempt from paying taxes on any income related to the mission or purpose of the organization, and are governed by a board of directors whose membership precludes private financial gain.

The status of nonprofit organization management as a "profession" also requires clarification. The literature on professions is vast and selections from it will be reviewed in Chapter II. However, for the purpose of establishing a theoretical underpinning for this study, nonprofit organization management
may be considered an emerging profession, now in the throes of
developing one of the more central criteria common to widely
accepted professional groups, namely, a definitional statement of
policies and principles which provide the foundation upon which
the field can build comprehensive professional educational
programs. Logically, the nonprofit field will not reasonably be
able to develop or even engage in meaningful discussions of educa­
tional policy and curricular direction without first formally
acknowledging the existence of itself as a discipline.

The term "nonprofit organization management" or "nonprofit
management" is used in this study to refer to a professional
field concerned with two designated areas: (a) the practice of
management applied in the nonprofit sector, and (b) the area of
intellectual inquiry about the practice and technologies of non­
profit management and its issues or concerns about how profes­
sional nonprofit managers are to be educated. While this
dissertation study is mainly concerned with the second area (the
conception of nonprofit organization management as a discipline),
there is one point on the practice of nonprofit management that
merits a brief commentary at this time.

Most reports on the activity of organizations within the
nonprofit sector usually categorize these organizations into
"subsectors." These subsectors include health services, education,
religion, social services, foundations, and arts and culture
(Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1984). These categories have been very
useful for reporting financial earnings, volunteer activity, and charitable contributions in these subsectors. However, the categorization of organizations into subsectors gives a portrayal of unrelated groupings of nonprofit organizations. This portrayal of unrelated groupings does not enhance the concept of a unified profession. In fact, this subsector delineation may reinforce an existing problem found among nonprofit managers, which is a tendency to discuss their role, positions, and responsibilities in terms of "agency practice" rather than "professional practice."

Failure to make the distinction between agency practice and the professional practice of nonprofit management may not easily be resolved. However, referring to the subsector categories as "fields of practice" instead of "subsectors" may provide a unifying solution by its suggestion of a distinctive practice within an integrated profession.

As for the terminology of "discipline," it is defined as a distinctive academic area subject to study. This dissertation uses the term "nonprofit organization management discipline" or "nonprofit management discipline" to refer to an acknowledged field of study of the management practice, technologies, or other special activities relevant to service delivery in the nonprofit sector, such as governing boards of directors and the utilization of volunteers. The term "discipline" may also be used in conjunction with other encompassing academic activities such as teaching, writing, engaging in knowledge-building research, or developing curriculum policy.
Conceptual Framework

The importance of acknowledging the academic component of a profession is not a new idea. In fact, the examination of the boundaries of a discipline, its character, and its roots have been thoroughly studied in other fields, such as public administration, social work, education, and political science.

Analysis of these various disciplines provides considerable guidance and legitimacy for this study. In social work, for example, Bartlett (1970) examined the basis for social work practice. She states that her main purpose was "to carry on the stream of broad thinking about practice" (p. 3). Dinerman and Geismar (1984) provided a thorough exploration of social work education over the past 25 years. Their edited contribution examined historical forces, the growth of social work knowledge, and the complexities involved in curriculum decisions, training, and degrees. The development of the discipline of political science shows a similar pattern, as Wasby (1970) notes that his volume aims to provide the practitioner and student of political science with, "a knowledge of what is happening in the discipline . . . to provide the student with a better basis for the study of specific substantive areas of politics" (p. xvii). Wasby's analysis includes an examination of the discipline's history, organization, current issues, and its scope. The discipline of public administration has undergone similar scrutiny. For example, Waldo
(1955) stated that his purpose for writing *The Study of Public Administration* was to convey the importance of public administration both as a human activity and an intellectual discipline, and beyond that, to introduce some important concepts and controversies involved in its study; and still beyond that, to give a view of some present frontiers of human knowledge. (p. vi)

As with the development of other disciplines, a major purpose for delineating nonprofit organization management as a discipline is to assist the profession in creating boundaries as well as important linkages between education and practice. In a recent paper addressed to leaders in the field of nonprofit management, the following supporting rationale for this type of study was presented:

- to establish the tradition of studying the independent sector. Support of research leads to teaching, to new doctoral students, to new research and to new teaching. Thus, support of research at colleges and universities will help us implement the longer-term goals of establishing the importance of this sector as worthy of academic attention. (Independent Sector, 1985b, p. 7)

In addition, one of the leading contributors to the field of voluntary action research, David Horton Smith (1974), expressed a similar opinion about the need for a substantive examination of the field:

At present, there is a good deal of voluntary action research at the level of individual projects and a good deal of practical voluntary action. There is much less of the kind of review-of-the-literature and theoretical synthesis activity that is needed both for scientific and for practical implications of theoretical synthesis of voluntary action research, with still less of the necessary sort of practical planning for voluntary action with significant voluntary action research inputs. . . .
Clearly a great deal needs to be done to expand and improve the knowledge transformation process, especially in those phases that involve actually building scholarly knowledge into the practical plans for voluntary action of specific organizations and programs. (p. 126)

The state of development of educational processes is often viewed as one important measure of a profession's status. An exploration of the intellectual base of the profession can provide a stepping stone for many other research opportunities, such as developing a unified policy on curricula for graduate schools and departmental programs which offer nonprofit management as a concentration. Following this dissertation study, others also may begin to develop a core requirement of skills, knowledge, and abilities which will provide the basis for establishing competency levels in the practice of nonprofit management. Another major purpose for an explanation of this nature is to open opportunities to the profession to discuss and debate whether there is a substantive base of knowledge to warrant separate graduate schools or departments of nonprofit management, or at least, a separate course of study.

Similar to the disciplinary studies conducted in other professions, the purpose of this dissertation study is to assist the nonprofit management discipline to assume its rightful place in the overall context of the profession. Based on the completed examinations of other professions, the accomplishment of this task will require an examination, clarification, and understanding of the discipline's character, purpose, and activities.
CHAPTER II

THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

The field of nonprofit organization management has grown rapidly in public awareness over the past decade. This increasing awareness follows from the importance of the nonprofit sector in America and from its mission of public service. The nonprofit sector, Gardner (1983) informs us, "enlivens our communities, nurtures individual responsibility, stirs life at the grassroots, and reminds us that we were born free" (p. XV). It may be said, then, that the vitality of America is a by-product of the many services that is offered to the American community through institutions in the nonprofit sector. Among the services offered are education, social services, health, scientific research, religion, and cultural and leisure opportunities.

Besides the tangible types of public services, the nonprofit sector provides other, more amorphous, types of benefits. One such benefit is an environment which fosters innovation and tolerates nonmajoritarian positions. Thus, as John W. Gardner (1983) explains:

Government bureaucracies are simply not constructed to permit the emergence of countless new ideas, and even less suited to the winnowing out of bad ideas. An idea that is controversial, unpopular or "strange" has little chance in either the commercial or political marketplace. In the nonprofit sector, someone with a new idea or
program may very well find the few followers necessary to help nurse it to maturity. Virtually every significant social idea in this country has been nurtured in the nonprofit sector. (p. XIV)

Through its strong tradition of autonomy, the nonprofit sector also provides a necessary checks and balance system against the excesses of government (Nielsen, 1979). Checking against the potentially obtrusive forces of government and also serving as a conduit between government and its citizenry (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977), the nonprofit sector provides an important means for Americans to express opinions and new ideas. This opportunity or tolerance of others to pursue and express new ideas has been fundamentally responsible for shaping the pluralistic character of America.

The impact of the nonprofit sector is highly significant in other important ways, asserts David Horton Smith (1980), informing us that the varied "functions' or 'roles' of the voluntary sector" comprise the following 10 essential ingredients which give shape and substance to our society:

1. Similar to Gardner's viewpoint, the nonprofit sector provides opportunities to take risks and experiment with new ideas and "social innovations."

2. The nonprofit sector serves as the social conscience of society, and will challenge "the prevailing assumptions about what exists" and provide the leadership and vision for change.

3. The nonprofit sector offers individuals an opportunity to engage in socially satisfying play or leisure activities.
4. Similarly, the nonprofit sector can provide a sense of kinship or social comfort particularly to the degree in which "social integration" is facilitated when individuals and families have been uprooted.

5. Unlike the social testing ground for new ideas and innovations, the nonprofit sector also offers individuals and groups a place to preserve old ideas. Nonprofit organizations can assist in the preservation of religious and cultural events, beliefs, and customs which can be used, examined, and valued by future generations.

6. Likewise, the nonprofit sector contributes to society by providing an opportunity for both existing and new forms of religious beliefs and worship to cultivate and experiment.

7. In addition to sacred expression, the nonprofit sector provides opportunities for other forms of emotional expression and personal development through interest groups, clubs, support groups, or other voluntary groupings.

8. Another contribution to society is the nonprofit sector's role as society's watchdog. Through advocacy and education, nonprofit organizations can attempt to correct the injustices of organizations in all three sectors, i.e., business, government, and the nonprofit sector.

9. The nonprofit sector can also provide strong support for business and government. This form of support to the American economy can be particularly evident through the
activities of professional membership organizations and trade associations.

10. Nonprofit social service organizations comprise another important contribution to society. Social welfare has long been a major responsibility area of the nonprofit sector by providing care and services for at-risk populations such as the homeless, poor, and other disadvantaged people.

According to Smith (1980), there is an 11th type of major impact that the nonprofit sector has on society, although admittedly "a rather subtle one." The nonprofit sector has a vast potential or "latent resource" to help society achieve goals. Under certain, albeit rare, circumstances, the nonprofit sector can mobilize charitable giving and voluntary activities for societal goal attainment.

Besides the explication and boosterism that the nonprofit sector has given to its ideals and irrepressible attributes, the sector has also made great inroads recently into the uncovering of hard evidence which can sharpen our understanding of the nonprofit sector and its impact on America. Hopefully, what will emerge from these research efforts is a more definitive analytical and qualitative understanding of the contributions of this sector on American society in addition to a more exact idea about the impact and role that the individual plays in giving money and volunteering time. Writing in the *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, Virginia Hodgkinson (1985) observes that the important
efforts to examine the research the nonprofit sector is in its earliest stages:

The hills and peaks in this effort can be enumerated very quickly. Gabriel Rudney has attempted to build a quantitative profile for the nonprofit sector, and Lester Salomon of the Urban Institute has studied the impact of federal budget cutbacks on the nonprofit sector . . . and, finding a fledgling organization, the National Center for Charitable Statistics, a future repository for statistics on nonprofit organizations from both private and public sources, is engaged in a project of supreme importance to all of us, a classification system for not-for-profit organizations. (p. 18)

Hodgkinson also expresses the shared hope that these various research efforts will add to the building ground of a unified, knowledgeable profession; "We hope this system will provide a common language and a common base for all of us to begin to build a basic body of knowledge which is coherent and continuous."

The efforts to build an understanding of this sector have been further advanced by Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1984) who, in *Dimensions of the Independent Sector*, place some statistical "meat on the bones" of earlier typologies. Through such ground-breaking data collection efforts, the nonprofit sector now has a baseline of historical data which can be used for the analysis of major trends. For example, America's reliance on the nonprofit sector is not only an outlet of pluralistic opportunities, but it is also reliant on the sector for economic opportunity, as exampled below.

- From 1974 to 1980, total employment in the nonprofit sector increased by approximately 2 million (from 8.5% to
9.2%) to 10.2 million, which includes 4.1 million volunteer employees, up from 3.5 million employees.

- From 1974 to 1980, the nonprofit sector increased its share of the national income from $62 billion to $123 billion.
- Total earnings, from 1974 to 1980, also increased in the nonprofit sector from $59 billion to $116 billion.

A comparative overview of the nonprofit sector to business and government for 1984 is summarized in Table 2.1. The profile describes the scope of the nonprofit sector in relation to national income (total earnings from labor and property earnings), earnings from work (includes salaries and wages for the employed, self-employed, and work contributions from volunteers), and estimated employment (includes full-time, part-time, and unpaid employment, i.e., volunteers or family workers). As indicated by the information contained in the table, the nonprofit sector appears as an integral component of the national economy. In fact, the nonprofit sector's share of national income was $194.3 billion, which includes $176.3 billion from organizations which have a 501(c)3 and 501(c)4 tax exempt status. Included in this share is an assigned value of volunteer time amounting to $82.6 billion. The value of the volunteers' time is another measure of distinctiveness. Individuals contribute their time and skills to further the public missions of nonprofit organizations. If the volunteers were paid a salary, earnings from the 10.4
Table 2.1

Comparative Summary of Three Sectors in 1984: National Income, Earnings from Work, and Estimated Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>National Income (Billions)</th>
<th>Earnings (Billions)</th>
<th>Employment (Number 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>$194.3 (6.2%)</td>
<td>$173.1 (8.0%)</td>
<td>12,392 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$2,492.5 (79.3%)</td>
<td>$1,632.7 (75.3%)</td>
<td>86,322 (72.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>$456.8 (14.5%)</td>
<td>$363.3 (16.8%)</td>
<td>21,086 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong>b</td>
<td><strong>$3,143.6 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,169.2 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,801 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Includes all types of Internal Revenue Service recognized private nonprofit organizations.

*b*Totals may not add because of rounding.

million volunteers in all types of nonprofit organizations would have exceeded $100 billion (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1984).

In addition to a descriptive profile of the nonprofit sector in terms of its normal income, earnings, and employment force, the size of the nonprofit sector can also be estimated by historical data on financial contributions. For example, while expenditures for nonprofit organizations increased from $10.9 billion to $143.1 billion between 1944 and 1980, during the same period, contributions from individual bequests, foundations, and corporations increased from $6.7 billion to $48.2 billion.

A 1981 Gallup Organization Poll describes characteristics of the over 80 million adult volunteers and over 80 million teenagers who give their time to promote voluntary organizations. Table 2.2 is a selected comparison of characteristics of volunteers based on the national survey, conducted by Gallup Poll, on the nature and scope of volunteering in America.

As suggested by Table 2.2, women tend to volunteer more than men, and persons with higher education as well as whites tend to volunteer more in proportion to the total population. The poll also demonstrates that people with higher incomes tend to give more volunteer time to nonprofit organizations and, thus, are likely also to make charitable contributions. In fact, the 1981 Gallup Survey reported that slightly more than 90% of the volunteers give a monetary contribution as well, compared to 66% of charitable non-volunteer givers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-$6,999</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000-$9,999</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 and over</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and other races</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School graduate</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 17 years</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety of sources and amounts of charitable contributions are very telling. Not only does it suggest the priorities of givers, but it also indicates the level of integration of the nonprofit sector in American life. For example, according to the American Association of Fundraising Council (1986), $79.84 billion in financial contributions, as shown in Table 2.3, have been made to nonprofit organizations during 1985 in the following service areas.

Table 2.3
Philanthropic Giving in 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Billions</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>$37.73</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Hospitals</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and Public</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$79.84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Table 2.4 identifies the sources of the $79.84 billion in contributions which were given in 1985.

Table 2.4
Contributions in Billions During 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$66.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The nonprofit sector is entrusted with a great responsibility for providing social and community services through the financial support of individuals, corporations, foundations, and government in addition to a dedicated labor force of paid staff and volunteers. Indeed, the nonprofit sector is a pervasive and powerful force in America, involved in almost every service arena, human endeavor, and interest area imaginable. Besides the vast services and benefits that are offered through the nonprofit sector, nonprofit organizations are the recipients of great wealth and in the many instances of foundations, they are also in control of great wealth.
The Profession of Nonprofit Management

Along with this growth of information about the size and position of the nonprofit sector, a range of activity indicates the growing professionalization of this field. Training programs, formal education programs, and professional literature have all increased considerably. Despite this advance, it could be problematic if the field of nonprofit organization management would not yet fit prevailing definitions of a "profession." The ambiguity over what is or is not a profession is unsettling in the literature; and, in some cases, many applied professions could arguably be considered a profession while others might not. However, the importance of being viewed as a profession is clear, since it can affect how one's expertise and credibility of program service delivery are perceived. Personal and occupational rewards and prestige generally follow from professional status, and recognition as a profession is a sine qua non to the development of an academic discipline.

From the outset of this study, the field of nonprofit organization management was defined as an inchoate profession, one in its youthful stage. To fully understand and appreciate the rudimentary development of this field as a (practice area and a) discipline, a discussion of how professions are defined or operationalized is in order. However, an immediate problem in communicating about this subject is the scholarly confusion that surrounds the definition of "profession." While definitional
disputes exist, professionalism has been uniformly seen as a result of industrialization and urbanization (Hughes, 1967). For most, the term professional is a commonly used word which denotes certain occupations which provide a service rather than engage in the production or distribution of goods (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1979). On the other hand, the usage of the term has become so commonplace that it has been loosely applied to "actors, musicians, athletes, and even shoeshine boys" (Cheek, 1967). Although used in a pejorative sense, even criminals, gamblers, and prostitutes have been referred to as professionals (Cheek, 1967).

Besides these commonplace applications, there have been attempts to be more exacting in the use of the term professional. Writing on the nature of professionalism in the nonprofit sector, Van Til (1986) informs us that professionalism is more than the assignment of a label to a function. "The core of the concept of the professional, then, lies in the possession of skills" which are applied with "dedication" and a sense of ethics and morality. Thus, Van Til implies that professionalism includes the presence of the service mission or public good orientation of the nonprofit sector in addition to the skillful intervention of one's work. Paul DiMaggio (1986) raises a different set of issues about the use of the term professional in the nonprofit sector. On the one hand, DiMaggio offers fodder to the debate about the field of nonprofit organization management not being ready to call itself
a true profession. He states that it is a "technobureaucratic" profession, a term borrowed from Larson (1977), which means that nonprofit managers "claim" their stake to being a professional based on their administrative post and not by demonstrated knowledge or skill. On the other hand, DiMaggio (1986) recognizes the virtues associated with the benefits of being recognized as a professional, and he notes,

The implications of such internal political considerations for management training are several and revolve around the inescapable fact that management education programs must do double duty, imparting both usable skills and, equally important, formal credentials upon which can be based credible claims of specialized expertise and competence, without which the nonprofit manager will find it difficult to assert his or her authority relative [to] that of trustees and professional staff. (pp. 29-30)

The status of professional is a highly prized symbol which assigns special attributes to the role and activities of one occupational group over another. Indeed, the concept of professionalism is emotionally charged because of its status in a work situation. It can, for example, lead to positional influence and controls over work assignments and other employees. Professional activity can also impose itself on the participation of volunteers, and in a more global sense, on society's expectations and trust. Additionally, as in other professions, individuals may seek training or formal education in relation to how well the field is perceived as a professional body.

In light of the difficulties and limitations of applying the definition of profession, this chapter will review briefly some
of the major ideas that are often used to operationalize the
concept of profession. After building on a brief discussion of the
concept of professionalism, the focus will be on one of the funda-
mental areas that established professions have relied on for
demonstrating and highlighting a profession's existence, identity
and development, namely, the body of literature that accompanies
the rise of a profession.

The Concept of Nonprofit Professionalism

There are three approaches that can be used to evaluate the
professional identity of occupations. One approach looks at the
existence of a knowledge and theory base from which all profes-
sional activity is derived. A second approach evaluates the
internal attitudes of individual professional members. A third
approach compares a profession with a set of structural traits,
such as the existence of a body of knowledge or a code of ethics.

Greenwood's (1972) criteria are used to examine the
existence of a profession by way of an established knowledge and
theory base:
The skills that characterize a profession flow from and
are supported by fund of knowledge that has been organized
into an internally consistent system, called a body of
theory. A profession's underlying body of theory is a
system of abstract propositions that describe in general
terms the classes of phenomena comprising the profes-
sion's focus of interest. Theory serves as a base in
terms of which the professional rationalizes his opera-
tions in concrete situations. Acquisition of the profes-
sional skills requires a prior or simultaneous mastery of
the theory underlying the skill. Preparation for profession, therefore, involves considerable preoccupation with systematic theory, a feature virtually absent in the training of the non-professional. (p. 208)

The field of nonprofit management has not yet articulated its own set of scientific principles or theory of nonprofit management. However, known elements of the field which are also the basis for theory development are as follows: tax-exempt status, a volunteer board of directors, a public mission, etc. In the absence of a nonprofit management theory, the field has borrowed appropriate management concepts and theories from related fields. Borrowing and integrating theories from other fields is a recognized practice which is common to many applied disciplines and has been a documented practice in the professions of public administration (Caiden, 1971) and social work (Bartlett, 1970), among others.

A second approach to examining the existence of a profession looks at the personal, internal meaning of being a member of a profession (Marutello, 1981). This approach avoids the usual trappings of a profession and is characterized by the following explanation:

An individual engages in a profession when there is the application of a body of knowledge or principles seemingly available only to select (Mystique) which has been "scientifically" or practically proven to be applicable to special contexts to bring about certain defined and largely predictable or hoped for outcomes over a relatively short period of time (Denouement) about very vital matters for particular individuals (Cruciality). (p. 250)
While the internalized approach is a difficult one to subject to objective measurement, an individual can examine his or her own beliefs about their participation or belonging to the profession of nonprofit management. In either situation, this internalized approach is not as easily discernible as the more traditional and popular examination of a profession through the use of a checklist. This third approach, that of the checklist, is the easiest of the professionalization models to apply. It works by determining whether a profession can claim to possess a set number of prescribed qualities or characteristics. Barber (1965), for example, stated that professionalism exists when the following four characteristics are present:

(a) a high degree of generalized and systematic knowledge; (b) primary orientation to the community interest rather than to individual self-interest; (c) a high degree of self-control of behavior through codes of ethics internalized in the process of work socialization and through voluntary associations organized and operated by the work specialists themselves; and (d) a system of rewards (monetary and honorary) that is primarily a set of symbols of work achievement and thus ends in themselves, not means to some end of individual self-interest. (p. 8)

The utility of a checklist model may be obfuscated, however, by a number of elements used to determine the state of professionalism. For example, Riggs (1981) outlines seven criteria for testing a group's professionalism:

1. A body of knowledge
2. A primary community orientation
3. A professional organization
4. Licensure and a Code of Ethics
5. Monopoly of practice
6. Communication sanction, and
7. Autonomy within the society. (pp. 286-287)
In addition to the discrepancy in the number of factors needed to constitute professional status, certain common characteristics of many professional groups may not be applicable to the field of nonprofit management. For example, it seems unlikely that legal autonomy or licensure will become a necessity to practice in the field of nonprofit management. More fundamentally, autonomy through legal regulation may be inappropriate for a profession like this that operates on a basis of providing public oriented services with a significant involvement of volunteers.

While it seems apparent that there are diverse viewpoints on how to document the existence of a profession, there seems to be at least one common factor that is highly valued throughout each approach. That one factor is the existence of a "body of knowledge." Indeed, professional literature serves a very important purpose for demonstrating the status of a profession and the recognition of its discipline. In fact, the existence of a knowledge base through a body of professional literature is viewed, worldwide, as a scholarly measure of a profession's intellectual existence and productivity. A record of publication is also one of the prime tools for challenging a field's abstract knowledge and theory base, fostering new approaches and improving standards of practice. As important, publications are vehicles that individuals can use to share practice wisdom and research results and, thus, create a literary core used for teaching and study.
A Pattern of Literary Action

While there seems to be a general understanding about what the nonprofit sector is, there is no single generally accepted taxonomy or definition (Kramer, 1981). A growing research record, as indicated in the reports of Sumariwalla (1983), Weitzman (1983), and Rosenbaum and Smith (1983), would suggest that in time the nonprofit sector will create a more unified understanding and common language or taxonomy of the sector. Meanwhile, Sumariwalla (1983), writing on the scope, size, and classification of the nonprofit sector, refers to the problem of a lack of a common language as a "fundamental problem" and "one of the most neglected areas of the sector" (p. 215). Evidence of a missing common language is indicative of the many names that are given to this sector; this arena is referred to variously as the nonprofit sector, the independent sector, the charitable sector, the voluntary sector, or the third sector, and some narrowly define it as the tax-exempt sector. While descriptors of the nonprofit field may vary, it is apparent that there are similarities in both content and meaning. However small the diversity in terminology, the minor differences in conceptual explanations are positive indicators of a growing pattern of scholarly written activity in this field of study. In fact, one of the most important trends in the development of a discipline is the contribution of a body of professional literature, a common set of terms, and thoughtful challenges to the meaning of terms or approaches to practice.
Although not exhaustive, an existing body of professional literature does exist. The current literature in the nonprofit field can be classified into three types or levels of intellectual contribution, namely: explanatory, adaptive, and exclusive. The explanatory category includes works which attempt to provide definitions or parameters around the field of nonprofit management. An example of an explanatory work is O'Connell's (1983) contribution which furthers an understanding of the values or "spirit" of the nonprofit sector. There have also been explanatory contributions in other important subject areas, including tax exemption (Hansmann, 1981; Hopkins, 1983), volunteerism (O'Connell, 1983; Schindler-Rainman & Lippitt, 1975), and philanthropy (Koch, 1979).

Adaptive works are those which consist of borrowed theories or technologies from other fields which are then creatively applied to the nonprofit arena. For example, Montana (1978) and Kotler (1974) have taken successful marketing principles from the business management field and applied them to the nonprofit field. Certain public relations principles that are known to work elsewhere have also been adapted to the nonprofit sector (Bates, 1976; Naver, 1981). Brinkerhoff (1979) and Kanter (1979) have adapted proven program effectiveness and evaluation technologies and Hardy (1972) applied known planning tools to this sector. Leduc and Block (1985) borrowed Mintsberg's 10 managerial concepts to clarify and
suggest important roles for the executive director and board members of nonprofit organizations. Callaghan and Connors (1982) have provided the field with sound financial management and accounting principles that address the unique needs of the nonprofit sector but remain consistent with generally accepted accounting principles found in the business sector.

The exclusive category consists of literature whose principles or ideas only pertain to the nonprofit sector. The ideas behind these works are not adopted from other fields, although other fields may have clearly influenced the thoughts. For example, Conrad and Glenn's (1976) book on nonprofit boards of directors was an early contribution to effective governance principles and was clearly influenced by the earlier contribution of Houle (1960). O'Connell (1976) recognized the growing interest in the concept of effective leadership, and he discussed this role of leader within the context of a nonprofit organization. Nielsen (1979) and Levitt (1973), both influenced by the American notion of pluralism, wrote about the sociopolitical environment and the role of the nonprofit sector. Bakal (1979) did a provocative and extensive analysis of the concept of charitable giving and a description of many charitable organizations. Oleck (1980) wrote a comprehensive book on the legal aspects of the nonprofit organization, as did Hopkins (1983).
The Nonprofit Textbook

An examination of both early and contemporary textbooks can provide valuable clues about the developmental growth of an academic discipline. As exampled by the writings of Waldo (1955) and Sayre (1958), an examination of a field's textbooks can assist in determining the scope of its academic discipline and help to codify the concepts of the field during its pioneering period.

Among the earliest books in the last century which can be traced to the field of nonprofit management is Andrew Carnegie's (1900) *The Gospel of Wealth*. In this book, Carnegie shared his philosophy on philanthropic giving. This era also produced other important statements. For example, Mary Richmond (1898), a historical figure in the field of social work, called for the development of a university affiliated training program in "applied philanthropy." While the writings of Carnegie, Richmond, and others were instructive, and conceptually important to the historical development of the field of nonprofit management, they would probably not fall into the generally recognized category of academic textbooks; nor would they be considered management practice books. A textbook, in this context, is a book which contains principles of a subject of study or is used in whole or part as an instructive aid to teach substantive areas of practice.

By comparison, many nonprofit management textbooks currently exist which cover a variety of individual practice topics. To
date, not one book has captured the honor of being considered the "first" textbook in the field of nonprofit organization management, and no single individual has been bestowed credit as the "father" or "mother" of the field. With accolades aside, Connors (1980) edited a textbook entitled The Nonprofit Handbook that was the first to offer a major examination and comprehensive overview of the field. In this volume, Connors did not utilize the opportunity to make any bold, direction-setting statements about the field; to his credit, he captured the essence and scope of the field with chapters on taxonomy, governance, financial controls, and marketing.

Connors' model for a nonprofit textbook has not yet been replicated. While several "how to" management workbooks have attempted to present an array of nonprofit topics, there have been no recent volumes which have offered as thorough an overview as Connors and which have intended to integrate the chief components of this field's practice concepts. However, one of the newer additions to this field's literature is McLaughlin's (1986) The Management of Nonprofit Organizations. This volume addresses both the theoretical and skill bases needed to practice in a nonprofit organization. McLaughlin's textbook is modeled after the more traditional texts used in graduate business administration courses; because of its intellectual depth, it should raise the field's expectations related to how a nonprofit management course
textbook should be modeled. McLaughlin's book is divided into 14 chapters within 5 sections:

Part One: The Management Task in Nonprofits
Part Two: Theories for Understanding Nonprofits
Part Three: Strategic Decision Making for Nonprofits
Part Four: Management and Operational Control Systems
Part Five: Looking Ahead

In addition, McLaughlin's book contains case examples for demonstrating the application of the principles that are presented in the book.

The use of case examples in a textbook is well recognized as a learning tool throughout all academic professions. Case examples promote dialogue between instructor and students and among students. The only nonprofit management textbook extant which is based exclusively on the case example method is Young's (1985) *Casebook of Management for Nonprofit Organizations*. In this book, Young presents a series of 14 case studies of nonprofit human service organizations, providing nonprofit managers and students an opportunity to learn, via the case method, the process of organizational change and techniques necessary for monitoring and guiding that change.

While this field has produced many books on specific operational elements in the practice of nonprofit management, glaring voids exist both for books about the field as a profession and for books about the education of nonprofit managers. The absence
of these volumes at this time is less an indictment of the field's level of intellectualism than an indication of the discipline's place in its period of evolution. In the field of public administration, for example, it took approximately 50 years after the profession was acknowledged as a field of study (Wilson, 1887) before discussions of science and principles were commonplace. While no one is yet writing systematically about nonprofit management as a science or field of study, there have been several textbooks which focus on specific management practice elements in the field. For example, Montana's (1978) edited book, like Kotler's (1975), is a comprehensive sourcebook on marketing the nonprofit organization. Similarly, several other single subject, focused textbooks have been written to support the teaching of specific courses in a nonprofit curricula. The range of subjects covered include financial management, resource development, governance, marketing, and volunteerism. Selected examples of these textbooks are identified in Table 2.5.

The books listed in Table 2.5 are illustrative of the current trend to publish practice-oriented nonprofit organization management books. Most of these textbooks stress the practical application of management technologies and emphasize theory building to a lesser degree. For example, Wolf's (1984) book is an excellent primer for the nonprofit novice in need of an overview about the role and functions within the nonprofit organization. Unterman and Davis (1984) also provide an overview and description of the
Table 2.5

Selected Examples of Practice Focused Textbooks for Use in Teaching Nonprofit Management Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Textbook Title</th>
<th>Author/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing in Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Montana 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Kotler 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Strategic Marketing for Not-For-Profit Organizations</td>
<td>Lauffer 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise in the Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td>Crimmins &amp; Keil 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Raising: The Guide to Raising Money from Private Sources</td>
<td>Brooke 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
<td>Leadership for Volunteering</td>
<td>Naylor 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs</td>
<td>Wilson 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Management Control in Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Anthony &amp; Herzlinger 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>The Board Member's Book</td>
<td>O'Connell 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Effective Voluntary Board of Directors</td>
<td>Conrad &amp; Glenn 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations</td>
<td>Hopkins 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Corporate Planning for Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Hardy 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Overview</td>
<td>Strategic Management in Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Unterman &amp; Davis 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Nonprofit Organization</td>
<td>Wolf 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>The Endangered Sector</td>
<td>Levitt 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America's Voluntary Spirit</td>
<td>O'Connell 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>To Empower People</td>
<td>Berger &amp; Neuhaus 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe listing of books in this table are not exhaustive, but rather representative examples of the types of books that are available for supporting nonprofit organization management courses.
management needs of the nonprofit organization. Their approach, however, is to present strategic management techniques from the business sector with advice for applying them to the nonprofit sector organization. Other books which discuss the application of management tools include Anthony and Herzlinger's (1980) book, which provides case examples for utilizing the management tools of strategic planning, management control, and operational control in nonprofit organizations. In addition, McConkey (1975) presents a management by objectives system for application in nonprofit organizations. Case examples are used to provide clarification about the management responsibilities which are part of the MBO planning and implementation process. Hardy (1972) also addresses the planning process through his collection of monographs, which provides instructions, guidelines, and forms for leading a nonprofit organization through a strategic or "corporate" planning session.

While most of the nonprofit management texts appear to be written for the generalist manager, there are other books which are geared to an audience which may have or need to sharpen skills in specialized areas of nonprofit practice, such as accounting and law. An example of these types of books includes Callaghan and Connors (1982), Ramanathan (1982), and Hopkins (1983). In Callaghan and Connors' (1982) comprehensive approach to accounting in nonprofit organizations, the authors focus their concern on the necessity for a sound control and evaluation management mechanism,
including budgeting, record keeping, and reporting. Ramanathan (1982) similarly emphasizes the use of financial management as a nonprofit management control tool. Hopkins' (1982) specialty area is nonprofit law. Hopkins originally developed his text for an introductory law course on tax-exempt organizations at the George Washington University National Law Center, in Washington, DC. In his volume, Hopkins reviews the rationale for tax exemption and reviews several statutes, cases, and rulings which relate to the operations of several different types of nonprofit organizations.

The nonprofit sector's dependence on resource development activities is another subject area for practice-oriented books. One example is Crimmins and Keil's (1983) edited work which reports on a newer resource development trend taking place in the nonprofit sector. This book reviews case examples of earned income and business ventures among very entrepreneurial organizations in the nonprofit sector. Armand Lauffer (1984) also takes a novel approach to resource development activities, by applying a marketing orientation for thinking about and approaching the task of proposal writing to garner both public sector and private sector support. Lauffer's text includes instructive chapter exercises for increasing skill and gaining a better grasp of the concepts that he presents. This volume is an expanded and more instructive version than Lauffer's (1983) earlier text on grant writing. There are several other authors who have focused on resource development strategies, from special event fund raising
projects (Flanagan, 1982) to earned income projects (Brown, 1986), to philanthropy, grants and proposal writing (Kurzig, 1980; White, 1975).

The subject of the volunteer and volunteering continues to be an important focal point of nonprofit practice oriented textbooks. In Harriet Naylor's (1976) book, the many resource roles of the volunteer are emphasized in addition to providing a good overview of training and supervision needs of the volunteer. Likewise, Wilson (1976), Ellis and Noyes (1978), and Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1971) provide information on the different types of volunteers and the many uses of the volunteer for impacting the nonprofit organization in a community. Other books which focus on the volunteer as board member includes Conrad and Glenn (1976) and O'Connell (1985).

As can be seen from the review of the professional literature there is much more of the practice oriented type of book than the type that speaks to theory and science. This result is not surprising since the growth of the discipline is being advanced from the practice arena. Also, practice oriented books which help the nonprofit manager achieve at work have a very practical appeal. As the academic discipline evolves, there will be more evidence of scholastic books which reflect on definitional and conceptual questions, and a good deal more empirical research will find its way into the professional literature and onto the shelves of the nonprofit manager.
Trends in Literature Through the Past Decade

In 1975, the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (also known as the Filer Commission) sought to identify the size, scope, and classification of the nonprofit sector. While recognizing the enormous breadth and scope of the nonprofit sector, the Filer Commission also observed, with their following statement, that this sector is largely uninvestigated:

On the map of American Society, one of the least charted regions is variously known as the voluntary, the private nonprofit or simply the third sector. Third, that is, after the often overshadowing worlds of government and business. While these two other realms have been and continue to be microscopically examined and analyzed and while their boundaries are, for the most part, readily identified by experts and laymen alike, the third sector—made up of non-governmental, nonprofit associations and organizations—remains something of a terra incognita, barely explored in terms of its inner dynamics and motivations, and its social, economic and political relations to the rest of the world. (p. 31)

Since the Filer Commission reported its findings, it is interesting to note how much progress has taken place in the literature of the field. In the past decade since the Filer Commission report, there has been measurable growth in the profession's literature. The number of written contributions and the range of subject matter is recasting the notion that the field is "something of a terra incognita." In order to get a grasp of the field's scholarly written development in the past 10 years, the following three bibliographic sources were examined: The Subject Guide to Books in Print, an electronic computer offline bibliography prepared by Bibliographic Retrieval Services,
Inc., and the bibliography in use in the master's level curriculum on nonprofit management at the University of Colorado at Denver, Graduate School of Public Affairs. A summary of the number and categories of books and articles on nonprofit organization management is found in Table 2.6. This table was constructed by reviewing the bibliographic sources, comparing titles, eliminating the duplications, and classifying other books and materials based on title heading.

Table 2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As revealed in this chart, a significant number of writings have entered the field of nonprofit management in the last decade. Because this chart was limited to three bibliographic sources, it would be inappropriate to suggest that it provides an exhaustive account of all contributions to the field in this time period. However, this impressive number of volumes listed in Table 2.5 does support the following three themes: First, the rate of scholarly input can be characterized as being associated with major developmental issues facing the field of nonprofit management. Second, because of the lack of a centralized plan mapping the direction of the field, the development of literature in the field has been stimulated by both philosophical and substantive interest in the discipline. Third, the growing professional literature is a result of fulfilling a genuine need to develop a knowledge and skill base for the increasing number of nonprofit managers who are recognizing their need for information and continuing their professional development.

Interestingly, Petersen's (1985) examination of six key resources also led him to conclude that the emergence of a professional nonprofit literature may be directionless, and is at the very least so widespread across an array of journals that it may be an impossible task to regularly monitor the relevant professional literature. In his analysis, Petersen reviewed the items below:
Petersen found an impressive number of topics being researched and reported in the literature. For example, topics that were previously neglected include comparisons of proprietary and nonprofit health organizations, women's participation in nonprofits, seniors' participation in voluntary associations, and a number of studies on the economics of the nonprofit sector with comparisons across economic sectors. Finally, while acknowledging the limitations in available research funds, Petersen calls for continued research efforts in a variety of topic areas such as case studies and comparative studies of voluntary associations, and the influences of cultural factors on voluntary associations.

In a very real sense, the authors of nonprofit management articles and books are modern proponents of this growing discipline. It is important, however, to at least recognize that the spawning of the professional literature is currently based on an individual collection of intellectual vision rather than a concrete locus or prevailing mind set. Even without an overriding agenda a
number of recurrent themes and concepts found in this (un orderly) assemblage of professional literature is further evidence of an evolving academic discipline or what Kuhn (1962) might describe as a developing "scientific community." A more orderly professional literature may be expected after the field of nonprofit management either develops principles and rules or, at least, after a common paradigm is accepted (Kuhn, 1962).

Even with the absence of shared paradigms, there is further documentation of determined activity to build a common base of professional knowledge and literature. Three additional reference sources, Yale University's Program on Nonprofit Organizations Work-In-Progress (1985), Middleton's (1985) Report on Current Research and Areas For Development and Independent Sector (1986a) Research in Progress, identify and specify the character and to some extent the quality of the recent efforts of many authors involved in establishing a knowledge base in the field. The linkage between the written work and the ability to access that knowledge is enhanced by these three reference sources. Although a basic body of professional knowledge is paralleling the growth of the academic discipline, there continues to exist one shortcoming. Nowhere, in these three reference works, does anyone isolate the question and ask, "What should be studied or toward what end?" In Chapter VII, this question is pursued by asking a group consisting of scholars, academicians, and practitioners their opinion about a number of issues. By drawing together the
opinions of many in the field, perhaps we can begin to shape the professional literature and structure the growth of the discipline.
CHAPTER III

A HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLINE

The discourse of any intellectual field of study is built upon its history. Nonprofit management is both a new and old discipline. Unlike the study of political science which can more easily be traced to Plato and Aristotle, or the field of medicine capable of being traced to Hippocrates of Cos, the lineage of nonprofit management is not as clear-cut and precise. The ancestry of nonprofit management descends from several areas. To understand the historical development of the discipline of nonprofit management, it will be essential to trace four of the field's major origins: (a) the roots of charity and philanthropy; (b) the development of the role of the volunteer; (c) the evolution of tax exemption; and (d) the adaptation of management technologies into the nonprofit sector. In addition to these four major areas, the nonprofit sector is steeped in the traditions of Americans' associating and joining in order to further a cause, to become integrated into a community or to form social and business ties. On this subject, Milofsky (1979) proposes that nonprofit organizations are rooted in at least six traditions of American participation. An examination of the philosophical and contextual differences between the six participatory traditions may shed some additional light on the foundation of nonprofit
management knowledge, in addition to gaining an understanding of the remarkable fortitude of today's nonprofit organizations. Knowledge about the organizations' historical participatory roots may also help us understand the contemporary nonprofit organization's management policy preferences, in addition to explaining why the nonprofit organization can become what Max Lerner (1983) has called a "collective expression which belies the outward atomism of American life" (p. 82).

The goal of this chapter is to see how the roots of the discipline have an impact on what scholars have done and what they may do. Without a historical perspective, research in the field lacks continuity and cumulative relevance. There has been little, if any, self-scrutiny as a discipline and a dearth of information about the evolution of this emerging profession as a whole. However, there are many signs to suggest that charity, philanthropy, and volunteerism fit squarely in the evolutionary design of the discipline. There is less clarity or evidence of events that historically led to management technology transfers or the significance of tax exemption in the development of a nonprofit curriculum. Nevertheless, attention will be given to these areas as a "kind" of conceptual bridge leading from a vast arena of activities and interest in charity, philanthropy, and volunteerism to a new "promised land" marked by books, courses, degree programs, and research.
While it is important to describe the developmental phases that have helped shape the discipline, one limitation must be acknowledged. There do not appear to be clean boundaries, no clear line at which one stops and another begins, between these fields of concern. But, the new discipline of nonprofit management did start from somewhere. Indeed, as we stand in the midst of volumes of books, courses, training programs, and development of university degree programs, it is possible to look back and trace the emergence of a discipline from the relative dominance of these core areas.

The Roots of Charity and Philanthropy

Ideologically, nonprofit organization management is derived quite centrally from the historical ethos of charity and philanthropy. Early precepts of giving and taking care of community needs are part of the evolutionary development of today's nonprofit organization (Academy for Educational Development, 1979). Even if a contemporary nonprofit organization is not directly concerned with the compassionate service program interests of charity and philanthropy, it cannot deny, as part of the voluntary sector, that its heritage includes accumulated contributions of those that served and gave to others in need.

Sir Arthur Keith (1949) suggests that the concept of charitable giving may have biological aspects. According to Keith, the concept of altruism is "both inborn and instinctive" (p. 451).
While Keith's evolutionary notion is quite interesting, there is no biological human trait known as altruism. Perhaps Keith's idea is not too far afield, however, given the innate altruistic qualities which are known to exist among certain insect and animal groups (Kalmus, 1963). Nevertheless, it is more likely that the origins of charity and philanthropy began with early human civilizations. For pragmatic reasons, primitive societies were the first to develop and exhibit the concept of charity or philanthropy (Bakal, 1979). In these early societies, the welfare and preservation of individuals and families required the community to share in the tasks of good gathering, hunting, and providing shelter.

As ancient societies became more complex, the idea of sharing in order to help, protect, and preserve the community was also advanced through the incorporation of rules and structure. It is known, for example, that the Babylonians were instructed through their Code of Hammurabi to protect the less fortunate of the community (Harper, 1904). This Code instructed the community to care for the poor, the widows, and the orphans. In addition to the instructive charitable nature of the Code, George (1972) indicates that the Code is one of the earliest illustrations of management thought which is characterized by a set of inscribed laws relating to a variety of business practices.

Religious doctrines, ideology, and influences on giving, compassion, and personal sacrifice are a significant part of the
heritage of charity and philanthropy which eventually resulted in the development of the nonprofit sector. The notion of blessed giving existed in ancient Egypt at least 2,300 years before the Christian era (Weaver, 1967). At that time, the Egyptian aristocracy would be buried with rich gifts for the gods as well as with records of gifts that were given to the poor and needy during the aristocrat's lifetime. Propitiating the gods with gifts and records of good deeds was an attempt to satisfy the gods and assure the preservation of a restful afterlife for the giver. On the other hand, charity in the pre-Christian Greek tradition was exemplified by a different type of giving. The Greek philosophy of charitable giving aimed to fortify the community by giving community-oriented gifts rather than to help individuals who were poor. In this respect, Weaver (1967) suggests that the Greek concept of giving is closer to the guiding philosophy of modern philanthropic foundations than to the Judeo-Christian concept of charity. For example, Greek benefactors were known to have given their cities gifts of theaters and stadiums, and modern philanthropists have similarly donated large community-oriented structures such as libraries, universities, and museums.

Ancient roots also appear to extend to Biblical and religious concepts of charity. The Old Testament, for example, in the Book of Deuteronomy, commands individuals to tithe a portion of their produce and share it with the widows and hungry children in one's own community and with transients. Similar to the early Jewish
concept of community giving (Frisch, 1969), as outlined by Maimonides, the early Christian communities valued the idea of helping the infirm and the poor. In fact, the scriptures of Matthew detail the Christian expectation of sharing. These Christian expectations to help the poor and needy were exacerbated during a crisis period brought on by the Bubonic Plague, and also in response to the period of the Reformation. In fact, during the period of the Reformation, individual begging was looked on askance and organized community responses were developed not only to assist the poor and homeless, but also to deter individual alms-begging and alms-giving.

In England, the influence of the Reformation and the breakup of the feudal system were among the social changes which led to an organized response to the plight of the poor. Municipalities, responding to the discontent caused by the social instability of unemployment and vagrancy, created ordinances about begging and work expectations (Leonard, 1965). As problems controlling the begging behavior of the indigent poor and the able-bodied poor increased and were not fully deterred by the laws in the townships, the Parliament responded by the creation of the English Poor Laws in 1601. The Poor Laws of 1601 codified the following three principles for overseeing the plight of the poor: public responsibility, local responsibility, and relatives' responsibility (Leiby, 1978). The fundamental element in the poor laws was the expectation that individuals should work and take care of their
individual needs and the needs of their families. In the event that an individual could not fulfill this work ethic, the community was obliged and responsible for providing, at least minimally, for the needs of these poor individuals. While the English Parliament was the first to establish these laws (Rose, 1971), the early colonial settlers adopted similar principles. The advance of the poor laws in the United States became guiding principles for the development of both charitable and philanthropic activity. In addition, the poor laws set a philosophy and community ethos for the eventual creation of government intervention to problems of welfare and American statutes on social welfare.

The early implementation of poor laws in the United States were mainly at the state level. In different communities, responsibility for looking after the poor was delegated to county officials. In some situations, local churches assumed this responsibility. As the population of the country grew, the ability to monitor the poor became unwieldy. This led to the development of almshouses (also known as the "poorhouse" or sometimes referred to as "the workhouse"). These early prototypes to the modern concept of work-relief programs were intended to discourage loafers, and simultaneously to provide some adequate support to the real needy.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century, urban centers began to become overpopulated as a result of the industrial revolution and immigration of millions of people from Europe. During this period, the responsibility to oversee the poor was overwhelming
and the ability to provide adequate care, services, or almshouse shelters was beginning to come under scrutiny. For example, members of the Conference of Charities and Correction reported on a variety of concerns and difficulties found in the state's role and ability to administer the almshouse. In many cases, admissions were made to the deplorable and harsh living condition in the almshouses (Bruno, 1957). In response to the recognition that there was a significant contrast in the quality of life for the rich and the poor, the charity organization and settlement movement began to flourish.

As with the poor laws, the concept of the settlement house was an English invention. In fact, many American settlement houses were modeled after the Toynbee House settlement in England, including Hull House in Chicago (Addams, 1910), the Neighborly Guild in New York, South End House in Boston, and Northwestern University Settlement House in Chicago (Bruno, 1957). The settlement house consisted of a home situated in poor neighborhoods whose residents consisted of more fortunate individuals, committed to working with community members and helping them to improve their situation. In fact, the goal of the settlement house was to provide social change through a community center of hope and opportunities, and to improve one's condition in life (Trolander, 1975). For example, many settlement houses offered day nurseries, playgrounds, lecture series, meeting places, and advice on civic matters. In addition, some settlement houses
offered counseling services to promote the growth of individuals and families.

Concurrent with the settlement house movement, the Charity Organization Society movement, again an English invention, took hold in the United States. Originally, the advocates of this secular movement were inspired by clergymen who were committed to an effective system of private charity (Leiby, 1978). The framers of this movement advanced the concept of indiscriminate almsgiving to a rationalized approach where conscientious thought was given to long term consequences and outcomes. Indeed, this movement appears to have been the forerunner of the modern philanthropic foundation or corporate contribution, based on a rationale of purpose or philosophy to achieve a prescribed outcome. Furthermore, this movement attempted to be scientific by both collecting data about charitable agencies and by coordinating the effects of several of the charities. Members of a Charitable Organization Society, like the modern foundation, would review applications for financial assistance. In addition to providing some emergency relief, the Society might arrange for a host of individuals to provide professional services to the poor, such as legal advice, spiritual guidance, and medical care. This movement became stronger after the turn of the twentieth century with growing interest and financial support among businessmen and Chambers of Commerce in addition to the traditional support of wealthy family contributors.
Support for the organized charities interested businessmen because they expected that private charities would be better administered than public charities. Following from this expectation, donors began to push for the development of a federated organization of charities which would regulate fundraising efforts and the distribution of monies. In addition, the federation would be able to oversee the quality of management of the charitable organizations. The development of the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy in 1913 was one such example and also was a pioneering model for financial federations in other cities (Waite, 1960). The development of federations was also a critical step towards the creation of paid staff positions to manage the federations and the charitable organizations.

During the same developmental period, the creation of periodicals devoted to furthering knowledge about the charitable interests and the settlement house interests appeared. In 1909, Paul Kellogg produced The Survey with the financial underwriting of the Russell Sage Foundation. The Survey was a national magazine directed toward both the paid and volunteer charitable worker; it was intended that this magazine should envelop earlier periodicals which had a local, not a national, constituency. The Survey supplanted at least three periodicals—the Boston magazine Lend-A-Hand; the New York City publication, Charities Review; and the Chicago publication, The Commons (Chambers, 1971).
The Development of the Volunteer Role and Its Importance

While volunteerism has been said to be a very American tradition (Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975), the rise and development of the concept and the practice of volunteerism parallels the evolution of charity and philanthropy. One way of viewing the Americanization of volunteerism is that it springs from the phenomena of early American community participation. In 1835, Tocqueville (1969), among the earliest observers of America's rich tradition of volunteerism, described voluntary association as uniquely American and influential for promoting America's democratic character. Tocqueville's astonishment with the Americans' propensity toward volunteerism is evident in his following quote:

Americans of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of disposition are forever forming associations. There are not only commercial and industrial associations in which all take part, but others of a thousand different types—religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and very limited, immensely large and very minute. Americans combine to give fêtes, found seminaries, build churches, distribute books, and send missionaries to the antipodes. Hospitals, prisons, and schools take shape in that way. Finally, if they want to proclaim a truth or propagate some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form an association. In every case, at the head of any new undertaking, where in France you would find the government or in England some territorial magnate, in the United States you are sure to find an association. (Tocqueville, 1969, p. 513)

While its American heritage and evolvement may be similar to charity and philanthropy, volunteerism reflects some different and
special aspects which deserve separate attention. Indeed, volunteers may be philanthropic or charitable but there is a wide range of voluntary activity open to individuals that goes beyond the intentions of charity. Manser and Cass (1976) define volunteerism as follows:

those activities and agencies arising out of a spontaneous, private (as contrasted with governmental) effort to promote or advance some aspect of the common good, as this good is perceived by the persons participating in it. These people are volunteers--persons who, motivated by varying degrees of altruism and self-interest, choose to give their time and talents freely. (p. 42)

To differentiate the role of volunteerism from acts of charity or philanthropy is a difficult task. While all three activities require some form of action, the actions of charity and philanthropy may require little, if any, direct involvement with the beneficiaries. Volunteerism, on the other hand, is a very active process which requires active involvement with either the beneficiaries directly or an organization or group which serves a specific population. Unlike the action of charity or philanthropy, however, the activities in volunteerism do not necessarily benefit an underprivileged, poor, or needy group. In fact, many associations, agencies, or groups which utilize the volunteer may be far from experiencing financial deprivation.

Clarification of this concept and role of volunteer is useful for a broader understanding of the role of the volunteer and its importance to nonprofit organization management. In fact, an examination of the role of the volunteer has an important place in
the study of nonprofit organization management because voluntary action undergirds the foundation of leadership of the nonprofit organization through the volunteer's legal/public commitment of the Board of Directors role. In addition to the governance aspect, quite often there are other critical and valuable areas in which the volunteer has impact on the management of the nonprofit organization, such as the development of financial resources, or in some cases, assistance in the service delivery of programs.

Smith and Freedman (1972) report that sociologists have written the most about the subject of the volunteer and the activity of joining or associating to fulfill a group objective. Looking at this source of literature, one finds it speaks mainly to the distinction between types and functions of voluntary groupings, reasons for joining, and personal satisfaction, and success in volunteering. For example, in an early work, Rose (1954) distinguished between two types of voluntary associations, "expressive groups" and "social influence associations" (pp. 50-71). Expressive groups are defined as volunteers who band together to fulfill a personal interest such as involvement in a hobby or sport. In contrast, the social influence association is comprised of volunteers who are interested in creating political or social changes which impact on the broader society. The settlement house movement of the early twentieth century would be characteristic of this type of social influence association. Merton (1976), on the other hand, examined the internal structure of the voluntary
association, particularly the leadership role of the volunteer versus the skilled professional. Likewise, Sills (1957, 1968) and Zald (1970) were concerned with the internal processes of the voluntary association. While Sills (1957, 1968) suggests that conscious controls over positions or responsibilities of the volunteers will influence the satisfaction and success levels of the volunteers, Zald (1970) believes that a written protocol or standard for tasks and responsibilities can attribute to voluntary action success.

On the issue of why individuals join voluntary associations, Jacoby and Babchuk (1963) suggested that individuals join because of the level of personal agreement they have with the organization's objectives. However, in a survey of individuals graduating from a professional school of social work, Judd, Block and Jain (1985) found that an individual's agreement with a professional association's organizational policy or objectives actually had minor bearing on whether the individual joined that professional voluntary association. Instead, these researchers found that individuals joined a voluntary professional organization because of the tangible benefits that were available to them in addition to a sense of professional identity that was derived from belonging.

Were it not for a long-standing American tradition of volunteerism, it would seem odd that, in an economic democracy that promotes capitalism, there are individuals who are willing to
work for a voluntary cause/organization without financial compensation (Jones & Herrick, 1976). Marts (1966) suggests that the generosity and willingness of volunteers to give their time and energy is a result of the experiences and inspiration of American freedoms. This same concept was undoubtedly behind O'Connell's (1983) collection of readings entitled America's Voluntary Spirit. Bremmer's (1960) view is a bit more sober. According to Bremmer, the Americanization of volunteerism had its start in the colonization of the New World. The number of activities involved in the colonization required a variety of personal acts of benevolence: conversion of natives to Christianity, taming the wilderness, the cultivation of land and crops. Likewise, Max Weber spoke of the American tendency to participate in voluntary activities as a socially constructive process for bridging the Old World's hierarchical society to the New World's rugged individualism (Lerner, 1957). The joining process permitted individuals to form ties and develop positions of status in the community. Indeed, the idea of an individual joining and actually belonging to a voluntary association serves very important sociological and psychological needs.

Participation and Its Influences on the Nonprofit Sector

According to Hougland and Shepard (1985), the extent to which participation in voluntary organization is in reality a
voluntary response has been unresolved in the voluntary action literature. In fact, Palisi (1972) suggests that cultural factors such as group values, social influences, and opportunity may account more accurately for why individuals participate in voluntary organizations.

Whether one has been completely autonomous in deciding to "volunteer" is, in part, an important sociological question for understanding the dynamics of participation. A more important concern for this study, however, is the implication that participation in voluntary organizations has had a modifying influence on the culture of America. Related to this point, Milofsky (1979) suggests that an examination of six American traditions of participation will reveal how their influences on America have rooted the nonprofit sector and nonprofit organizations. The six traditions of American participation include the Protestant Patrician, Urban Ethnic, Free Professional, Organizational Professional, Interorganizational Coordination, and Corporate Philanthropic traditions.

The Protestant Patrician Influence

The Protestant tradition was first influential in America in the mid-1800s, during the development of a strong Protestant middle class. Protestant followers were interested in community reforms as reflected in their belief in the "Protestant Ethic." One aspect of this ethic was that individuals are responsible for developing their own Christian character and for assisting other
individuals to develop as well. Furthermore, ecclesiastical authority associated with this ethic asserted that individuals have a moral responsibility to contribute their own personal skills and monies to help others in need. This resolve or philosophy created a framework and a sense of moral obligation for an individual to participate in voluntary efforts.

According to Seeley, Junker, Jones, Jenkins, Haugh, and Miller (1957), the Protestant tradition draws certain social boundaries around an individual's willingness to volunteer. Generally, individuals are willing to donate money or services that will assist others in need, but the volunteers would prefer not to become directly involved with those they assist. Verba and Nie (1972) explain this ideology as a typical expression of wealthy or upwardly mobile, powerful individuals. In other words, voluntary leadership in nonprofit organizations preserves or creates a civic leadership position consistent with Protestant ideas about civic association.

Milofsky (1979) characterizes the influences of the Protestant Patrician Tradition on nonprofit organization management to include a distinctive style of leadership. Leadership in this mode is strongly committed to a community-based model with an emphasis on resource development and concrete services to those in need, such as providing hot meals and shelter. In addition, this style of leadership is weakest in responding to organizational crises and will tend to replace managers rather than revise program services.
The Urban Ethnic Influence

Unlike the Protestant influences of concern for helping others, the urban ethnic tradition evolved as a reactive response by ethnic groups who believed they were being poorly treated in American society. To protect themselves, ethnic groups began forming their own nonprofit organizations in the form of mutual aid societies. In addition to preserving cultural traditions, mutual aid organizations were helpful in assisting community members with recreational events, religious celebrations, and personal crises, such as death or illness. The development of these ethnic-related nonprofit organizations appears to have been greatest during a surge of refugee resettlement after the turn of the century through the 1920s.

The emphasis on ethnic-related community development nonprofit organizations continues to play an important role in culturally diverse communities. Interestingly, the recognition that ethnic communities have played a valuable support and assimilation role in America accounts for more recent federal incentive grants to establish Mutual Assistance Associations for America's newest pool of refugees from Southeast Asia (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1986). However, there is a down side to ethnic-related service organizations. By providing services to members of only one type of cultural heritage or religious system, these organizations may unwittingly reinforce cultural separation and isolation from other ethnic groups. This may also account for a vast duplication of social services in a community.
In the ethnically oriented organization, management decisions may be strongly influenced by ethnic beliefs rather than by commonly held management principles. Even with the introduction of the professionally educated nonprofit manager into this work setting, the cultural traditions of the organization may still have prevailing influence on service delivery. This is surely the case with religion-affiliated nonprofit organizations which grew out of the ethnic urban tradition, such as Jewish Family Services, Lutheran Social Services, and Catholic Community Services. In addition, Berger and Neuhaus (1977) suggest that organized ethnic/cultural groups have a strong mediating role in society which can have a strong influence on the type of policy and services developed and offered by nonprofit and governmental entities.

The Free Professional Influence

Unlike the religious and sociopolitical needs of individuals, which influenced the Protestant Tradition, or the need to protect cultural and ethnic identities, evidenced in the Urban Ethnic Tradition, the Free Professional Tradition extends beyond these distinctive dimensions and is characterized by individuals sharing similar professional interests. This tradition is representative of controls over educational and technical skills that have been defined as critical for entering into, belonging to, and practicing within a particular profession. For example, all attorneys
must attend a law school and pass a bar exam and all physicians
must attend medical school and serve an internship and residency
in addition to passing exams.

As a response to the acquired skills and achievements that
must be attained in order to become a member of a profession,
many nonprofit organizations have been spawned to protect the
distinctive interests of their professional members. In fact,
many professionals join trade associations to protect the values
of their discipline, to assist in their own definition of being a
professional, and to receive special support and tangible products
like journals and continuing education programs (Judd, Block, &
Jain, 1985). The National Association of Social Workers, the
American Society for Public Administration, and the American
Medical Association are just three examples of nonprofit organi-
zations which exist to protect the practice domain of its members.
In addition to the influence on standards and policies that
professionals have over their own professions, Milofsky (1979)
suggests that professionals also have an influencing effect on
the norms and policies of society by controlling reports of
professional research and determining what will be considered
acceptable performance criteria for delivering professional
services.

The Organizational Influence

This participatory tradition is a direct outgrowth of the
professionalization of occupations and is characterized by many
of the larger nonprofit organizations which have had both staff and volunteer involvement. Furthermore, the organizations that can be described by this tradition are church organizations or sect-like groups which have a large constituency, such as the "Ys." In this situation, professional staff are oriented toward their job out of professional/occupational and career interests. In contrast, volunteers affiliate with an organization based on a personal ideology or belief system. Frequently, policy decisions or management styles are reflected by the influences of the constituency served by the organization rather than by the leadership of the organization.

The Interorganizational Influence

After World War I, the successful development of the urban ethnic tradition's ability to create community support and social services organizations found itself in a conflict. Many organizations with similar service delivery missions were in competition with one another for funding. Rather than create a situation which could discourage "giving," the concept of the community chest was introduced. The community chest movement permitted agencies to focus on service delivery while the community chest organizers would specialize in the task of fundraising.

In the 1960s and 1970s, many specialized service delivery organizations embarked on their own resource development programs relying largely on government funded grant programs. In the
1980s, with severe cuts in federally funded grant-in-aid programs, the reliance on a community-based fundraising effort has become, once again, more predominant and necessary for many nonprofit organizations to survive.

The Corporate Philanthropic Influence

There are three important influencing factors which led to the development of American corporate philanthropy. One factor is represented by the personal giving philosophy of Andrew Carnegie (1900), who believed that philanthropic giving was a social obligation, akin to the Protestant Patrician Tradition, rather than a religious obligation. Carnegie's personal point of view is illustrated through his often cited remark that "The man who dies rich, dies disgraced." He was an adherent of providing philanthropic support to programs and special projects which would benefit and provide strength to the community. A second factor is characterized by the philanthropic philosophy of John D. Rockefeller, I (1908). Unlike Carnegie, Rockefeller followed a traditional, religious doctrine of giving. Both Carnegie and Rockefeller paved the way for large, organized, corporate giving.

The third important influencing factor was the development of tax credits and tax deductions which led to corporate incentives to give to tax-exempt nonprofit organizations. The practice of giving to nonprofit organizations benefits both the nonprofit organizations and the corporate giver (Galaskiewicz, 1986). The
corporation gains important public relations and community benefits, while the nonprofit's financial capacity to deliver services is improved.

The Evolution and Impact of Tax-Exempt Status

Tax exemption is an essential element of the American economy and the advantages of obtaining the 501(c)(3) tax exempt status for the nonprofit organization is an integral part of forming and maintaining charitable, educational, scientific, as well as religious organizations. In fact, the review provided by Clotfelter (1983) demonstrates the importance of tax deductions as incentives to giving to charitable causes. The relationship between tax credits and charitable giving is so strong that the contemporary nonprofit organization would adversely suffer if not for the benefit of not having to pay income taxes, as well as the incentives of the tax deduction given to its contributors (Clotfelter, 1983). While tax exemption is a popular inducement for present day charitable giving, the concept of tax exemption is not a twentieth century phenomenon. In fact, Lashbrooke (1985) dates at least the implementation of tax exemption to the Old Testament in Ezra 7:24:

also we certify you, that touching any of the priests and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinim, or Ministers of this House of God, it shall not be lawful to impose toll, tribute, or customs upon them. (p. 3)
In the modern era, government endorsed tax exemption in the United States has been a common practice since the nation's founding (Hopkins, 1983). In fact, religious organizations have been spared the burden of paying taxes by statutory omission at all levels of government, and this practice was sustained during the first federal income tax that spanned 10 years from 1862 to 1872. It was not until 1894, however, that expressed tax exemption was defined in tax legislation and became the official policy of the United States (Smith & Chiechi, 1974). Section 32 of the Revenue Act of 1894, imposed a flat 2% tax on profitable income and complete tax exemption on charitable income. The 1894 statute also provided for the tax exemption of charitable, religious, educational, fraternal organizations, as well as certain savings and insurance institutions.

The 1894 Act was overturned by a constitutional challenge to the rental income tax portion of the law which was not apportioned by population. Although the 1894 Act was repealed, its influence on subsequent revenue legislation was measurable. Every revenue act since 1894 has bestowed tax-exempt status to religious, charitable, and educational organizations.

In addition to the historical precedent which established an unwritten rationale for tax exemptions for nonprofit organizations, Congress articulated a supporting rationale in its Revenue Act of 1909, exempting organizations which by their nature could not generate sufficient income. In seven revenue acts, Congress
identified the many different types of organizations, noted in Table 3.1, which would be protected from tax liabilities. According to Gelb (1971), the Federal Government was concerned about the possible reduction of gifts to charitable organizations following the 1917 increase in individual income taxes to pay for the expenses of World War I. In response to their concern, the tax law was expanded to permit the deduction for an individual's gift to charitable organizations.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Act By Year</th>
<th>Tax Exemption by Type of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Charitable, Educational and Religious Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Labor, Horticulture, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Business Leagues, Chambers of Commerce, Scientific Organizations, Social Welfare Organizations, Mutual Cemetery Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Public Utilities, Social Clubs, Land Banks, Title Holding Companies, Farming Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Societies for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Foundations, Community Chest Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Homeowner Associations, Fishing Associations, Organizations Promoting National and International Sporting Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another rationale which has supported the existence of tax exemption is the government's recognition that without tax-exempt organizations, the burden for many social programs undertaken by the nonprofit sector would need to be assumed by the government. On the other hand, Hansmann (1981) suggests that there are not sufficient arguments for justifying the exemption of taxes for the range of nonprofit organizations that Congress has allowed. Weisbrod (1977), for example, determined that the nonprofit sector and the governmental sector often imitate its services to the general public.

Since 1954, tax exemption has been described best in the Internal Revenue Code 501(c)(3). Organizations which fit into this category agree to devote their net earnings to the mission of the organization and they further agree that individual directors and officers will not receive any part of the net earnings. Another common thread in all organizations with the 501(c)(3) status is the advantage of attracting deductible contributions. It is largely this "benefit" that adds to the unique management characteristic of the nonprofit organization and sometimes its preoccupation with fundraising events and grant proposal writing. In fact, in 1984, the nonprofit sector received 68 billion dollars from private contributions and approximately an equivalent amount from all levels of government sources. Clearly, the incentive for both the individual and
corporate giver has been tied to the deductibility of tax-exempt gifts.

The nature of the giving/tax-exempt relationship is such an important phenomenon it can only gain increased importance as an area for research and study within the nonprofit discipline. More recently, Harvard Professor Lawrence Lindsey (Independent Sector, 1986b) has studied the potential impact of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 and its consequences on the nonprofit sector. Lindsey projects an $11 billion loss in charitable giving as a result of tax reform:

1. $6 billion from the expiration of the charitable deduction for non-itemizers.
2. $1 billion from inclusion of gifts of appreciated property on the alternative minimum tax.
3. $4 billion from lowered marginal tax rates.

The implications of a large financial shift in the nonprofit sector is another consideration for the need for nonprofit managers to be astute managers. According to the Independent Sector, the financial losses due to the Tax Reform Act of 1986 will be distributed among the subsectors (fields of practice) in the following way (see Table 3.2):

In addition to Lindsey's projections, there is agreement among nonprofit tax policy researchers that the level of an individual's after-tax income will have an important consequence on whether the individual gives, and how much to charitable
organizations into very active fundraising campaigns. In the situation of severe losses in charitable donations as projected by Lindsey, nonprofit organizations could point out to potential contributors the increased need for contributions as a result of drastic reforms. The outcome of such appeals is, of course, unpredictable. Beyond this, the impact on the creation or maintenance of private foundations is another area that is potentially affected by shifting tax liabilities. On this point, Odendahl (1985) reported that since the Tax Reform Act of 1969, there has been a decline in both the number of new grant-making foundations and the number of grant awards over $10,000.

Table 3.2
Projected Loss of Charitable Giving: A Result of the Tax Reform Act of 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Amount of Loss</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>-5.24</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In summary, a history exists which interweaves the development of the field of nonprofit management with the history of tax
exemption and other tax policies which impact propensities toward charitable giving. In addition, there is a continued need for data collection to study the ongoing patterns of giving and its relationship to the effective management of nonprofit organizations.

From Management to the Emergence of Nonprofit Management

A common thread among the three sectors (business, government, and the nonprofit sector) is the necessity for organizational management. There are, however, distinguishing features in each sector's orientation to the practice and study of management. In fact, the distinctive characteristics of each sector have given rise to the three types of professional fields of management practice and disciplines: business, public administration, and now, in emergent form, nonprofit management. The term "nonprofit management" is a singularly difficult one. It denotes a function of management in the nonprofit sector and implies a different type of "management" than the type found in business or in government. To understand the critical differences between nonprofit management, business management, and public management, and to learn more about the emergence of this younger (nonprofit management) practice field and discipline, it is imperative to trace its management roots beginning with the development of management as a professional field of business practice and as an academic discipline which grants degrees, such as the MBA and DBA. There is
also a kinship to the field of public administration which requires identification.

Although the evolution of management is difficult to reconstruct (George, 1972), the activity of management is ubiquitous throughout the history of humankind. Some forms of management activities were a likely part of prehistoric civilization. When men hunted in bands, traveled in groups or developed tribes and villages, some form of division of labor and leadership surely marked the arrangement of management functions. According to George (1972), the imposition of taxes, the amassing of wealth, the management of major construction projects, such as pyramids, and the creation of city governments are examples of traceable practices of management during ancient civilizations.

Clearly, the advance of management tasks, functions, and management tools evolved over time. At the end of the Dark Ages, financial management and control tools such as record keeping and double entry bookkeeping were developed in response to the growth of commerce in the Mediterranean (Drucker, 1974). Shipbuilding and outfitting the ships during the Middle Ages also saw the development of business-related activities such as warehousing, assembly line practices, and personnel supervision. But, it was the period of the Industrial Revolution, predominantly in England, which witnessed the introduction of improved manufacturing technologies and improved methods of production. These improvements were largely responsible for the shift from home-based production.
activities to the factory system and its need for a large labor pool. The need for factory employees influenced a shift from an agrarian society to an industrial one.

The development of the capitalistic system and a growing interest in economics were highlights of this era (Massie, 1979). Adam Smith stressed economic concepts in his 1776 publication *The Wealth of Nations* and contributed greatly to the fundamental management concept of "division of labor." There were other important economic and management concepts and practices which resulted from the boom in manufacturing. One such important practice included the idea of incorporating a business for the purpose of raising capital through the sale of shares in the business. This development in entrepreneurism also paved the way for later thinking about the functions of ownership as separate from the functions of management.

The impact of the new industrial methods was also felt in the United States by the mid-nineteenth century. America's growing reliance on a railroad system provided an opportunity for railroad investors to pursue profits, while engineers pursued the mastery of management over complex organizations. The administration of complex railroad organizations became the focus of information sharing and the subject of papers presented at meetings of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME).

At one of the ASME meetings in 1886, Henry R. Towne, president of the Yale and Towne Manufacturing Company, presented his
paper on "The Engineer as Economist." Towne called for the recognition of industrial management as a science and equal in importance to that of engineering. Towne emphasized the need for management to be an independent field of study with its own professional literature and professional membership society. Towne's comments marked the beginning search for a science of management and is the one event that is most often referenced as the pioneering inspiration for the development of the scientific management movement (Bedeian, 1978).

While Towne called for an independent field of study, an interesting and related development occurred just 5 years prior to his eventful address. A Philadelphia manufacturer, Joseph Wharton, recognized the need for a special management curriculum to educate and prepare individuals for a career in management. Acting on his belief, Wharton financed America's first school of management, the Wharton School, at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1898, 17 years after the Wharton School was started, the University of California and the University of Chicago launched their own business schools. A little more than a decade later the idea of business management education was becoming well institutionalized with at least 30 schools of business management in the country.

The promulgation of ideas about management as a profession inspired another Philadelphian, Frederick Taylor, to seriously question the role and responsibilities of management. As an
engineer, Taylor became very interested in the idea of maximizing the performance of workers with a minimal level of stewardship. Taylor envisioned a system of cooperation and improved production through appropriate standards and rewards, a system also based on the harmonious relationship between worker and management. The development of these pioneering ideas gave Taylor recognition as the "father of Scientific Management" (Massie, 1979).

Taylor's four major concepts and philosophy of management appeared in his 1911 book, The Principles of Scientific Management. Taylor (1911) stressed the following:

1. Develop a science for each element of a man's work, which replaces the rule-of-thumb method.
2. Scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop the workman.
3. Heartily cooperate with the men so as to insure all of the work being done in accordance with the principles of science which have been developed.
4. There is an almost equal division of the work and the responsibility between the management and the workmen. The management should take over all the work for which they are better fitted than the workmen. (pp. 36-37)

Aside from Taylor, the insight of other supporters of scientific management figured predominantly in the development of management thought, especially in areas of efficiency (Brandeis, 1914) and motion studies (Gilbreth, 1911). Henry L. Gantt (1916, 1919), for example, contributed to the ideas of pay plans and managerial leadership, but is probably best known for his development of a charting system (the Gantt Chart) for the planning and controlling of production tasks. Another staunch advocate of the scientific method was Harrington Emerson, best
known for his book *The Twelve Principles of Efficiency* (1913). Emerson was among America's first management consultants (George, 1972) who attempted to guide managers to focus on the creation of wealth through the fulfillment of company objectives while preserving company resources through the use of conservation policies. Henry Fayol, a French industrialist, who also focused his study and writing on management principles, was among the first writers to classify different management functions. In 1916, he published *Administration Industrielle et Generale*, which was later translated into English in 1930 and 1949. In Fayol's schema, management was divided into five major functions, including planning, organizing, commanding, coordination, and control. In addition, Fayol developed 14 management principles to emphasize the managerial functions (Fayol, 1949).

The first 20 years following the turn of the twentieth century were critically important for the development of management as a field of professional practice and as an emerging academic discipline. It was during this era that Towne's earlier dream of the creation of professional societies, books, and university programs was fulfilled. In 1911, for example, approximately 300 educators and practitioners assembled at Dartmouth College's Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance. This meeting marked the first formal attempt to pave an academic direction for the field of management. Another academic first came in 1915, when Horace B. Drury of Columbia University published
Scientific Management: A History and Criticism. This publication is considered to be the first doctoral dissertation in management (Mee, 1963), and, therefore, a hallmark for the fledgling academic discipline. During this same period, in 1914, the first professional management society was founded as the Society to Promote the Science of Management, later evolved into the Taylor Society, and eventually became the Society for Advancement of Management. The American Management Association, another bastion in the management field, was also formed during this developmental period.

Although the scientific management movement contributed greatly to the growth of management practice and thought, it was not without criticism. Critics claimed that the application of scientific management was a dehumanizing process because its primary concern was production and not the needs of the individual worker. As a response to the criticism of scientific management, the behavioral school of management emerged. Advocates of the behavioral school believed that management must focus on the individual worker and his/her relationship to other workers and the work environment.

One of the most important developments in this behavioral management movement was a research project launched in 1924 at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company. The original study intended to examine the relationship between changes in environmental illumination on worker productivity. Worker productivity was not adversely affected by changing the level of
illumination, and, surprisingly, worker productivity increased. In 1927, Elton Mayo was invited to conduct another experiment to further examine and explain the unanticipated worker reactions of the previous experiment. Five years of various testing procedures and manipulating the working environment conditions did not adequately explain increases in worker productivity. In retrospect, Mayo and his colleagues were able to determine that the workers were responding to improved morale, supportive supervision, and other conditions which enhanced interpersonal relationships (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939).

The decade between 1930 and 1940 witnessed further advances in management's understanding of human behavior in the work environment, including the psychological needs of the individual, the effect of motivation, and the role of executive leadership. This era was marked by the contributions of Follett on the motivating desires of the individual and the influences of the group (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942). Another major contributor was Chester Barnard (1938) whose insight into the organization as a system led him to introduce a system's orientation to management with his concept of the cooperative system. Bernard saw the organization consisting of an individual's willingness to serve, having a common purpose, and communication as a linking force. Attention to the social organization and the work of an organization's chief executive was also the concern of Luther Gulick (1937). Gulick expanded Fayol's five managerial functions into seven. The seven managerial
functions have become widely identified by the mnemonic POSDCORB, which represents planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

Movement away from the physical factors of scientific management continued between 1940 and the 1960s. The period marked the refinement of management techniques and principles which emerged during and following World War II. Drucker (1974) suggests that interest in management as a field of practice and an academic discipline was triggered by the performance of American manufacturing industry during World War II. It was during the mid 1950s which unfolded a significant increase in the number of professional management books and periodicals (Bedeian, 1978). In fact, Management Science, one of the field's major journal publications, started in 1954. The journal reflected the field's direction into management science and operations research.

The cumulative development of the management field from the turn of the twentieth century into the 1970s eventually blended the concerns of the founders of scientific management efficiency, and the concerns of the human relations behavioralists with the needs of the workers. Thus, the focus of the 1960s gave rise to organizational behavior and theory (Thompson, 1967), including matters of supervision (McGregor, 1960), leadership (Fielder, 1967), and motivation (Herzberg, 1959).

In the 1970s, two particular trends were identified as important to the development of management thought. The two
integrative trends include the contingency approach and the systems approach (Huse, 1979). According to George (1972),

The concepts of management have shifted today from the level of gang bosses to the systems concept because growing complexities in our society have moved management from a relatively simple task to that of evolving information systems into patterns of management. (pp. 187-188)

The complexities of today's organizations also have required its managers to be more flexible and discriminating in applying management theory into practice. Thus, the contingency approach in management allows managers to be more eclectic in their style and to adapt to changing organizational needs and environments.

Management of the 1980s is characterized by future-oriented thinking and planning for future courses of action. This approach to planning has changed dramatically since Fayol recognized planning as a critical task of management (Radford, 1980). The newer brand of management operates within a scope of complex activities and concerns. The modern organization has many competing interests and must pay attention to several conditions besides profit. These developments have led to an emphasis on learning about different management styles in order to maximize opportunities for success (Peters & Waterman, 1982). In addition, modern organizations have been primarily concerned about responding to the social pressures of the organization's internal and external environments. In the internal environment, management has attempted to satisfy the needs of employees through the management of benefits and creating satisfying working conditions. In
the external environment, management is sometimes practiced to influence the opinions of consumers as well as the need to prevent circumstances which might lead to potential litigation against the company. Management in the modern organization has also been shaped by the demands of governmental regulatory agencies and the power of the mass media.

Management Technologies Applied to the Nonprofit Sector

Because of a lack of solid data, any attempt to suggest when the management technologies of the business (for-profit) sector or the management technologies of the public sector were first adapted into the nonprofit sector is fraught with some difficulty. However, review of the historical development of management practice can provide an important context for understanding how management thought and practice has evolved over time. Examination of the development of management thought and practice provides the basis for at least speculating about the development of management practice in the nonprofit sector.

Scientific management was just beginning to develop at the time that Congress passed legislation in 1894 creating a public policy supporting the tax exemption of nonprofit organizations. Although charitable and voluntary activity has always been a fundamental part of the history of the United States, it was this formal Congressional action on behalf of the nonprofit sector
which can be considered a landmark for the beginning development of the contemporary practice of nonprofit management.

It was also during the early twentieth century that the establishment of foundations and national service organizations concerned with charitable activities were on the rise (Bakal, 1979). During this period, efficiency management influenced both the activities of the business sector and public administration (Hill & Hebert, 1979). Since attention to techniques and procedures characterized the administration of the day, the nonprofit sector was undoubtedly influenced by this (Taylor's) pragmatic approach to management.

An outgrowth of the scientific management movement was the development of management principles. The principles approach was also generalized to public sector management. It was hoped that the study of important public administration activities would yield the best way or "principles" of administrative practice. Perhaps the principles approach also influenced the operations of charitable and voluntary organizations. By 1946, however, Herbert Simon (1946) demonstrated that the principles of public administration were no more than proverbs, or good, general "rules of thumb."

Simon's work along with that of Dahl (1947) and Waldo (1948) seemed to create more interest in describing organizational behavior than in theorizing about it. The objections of these scholars to the notion that administrative management was a generic process of management, equally applicable in all settings and
sectors, was an early recognition of the special process of management that is required in the three sectors.

The disillusionment of the administrative management approach assisted the rise of the behavioral science approach, also known as the human relations movement, which evolved next in both the business and public sectors, and the nonprofit sector as well. The experience of the business sector in the 1950s was marked by the integration of social science into management practice. The business sector did so for purposes of increasing profitability. The involvement of the social sciences was also an important development for the public sector, which recognized the powerful influences of the informal structures or social side of the organization. The public sector was struggling with its formal bureaucratic role and beginning to experiment with the idea that public administrators should assert their values into the formulation of policy. The fact that organizations appeared concerned about the humanistic needs and reactions of the individual may explain the climate of the period which supported the creation of tax-exempt legislation which gave definition to the contemporary charitable, 501(c)(3), organization.

In the 1954 establishment of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code, the statutory provisions for recognizing tax-exempt organizations were firmly put into place. In addition, certain collateral benefits were created through the adoption of Code 501(c)(3). By imposing certain requirements for recognition as
a charitable organization, the boundaries between the three sectors became clarified, and management responsibilities were also further distinguished between organizations located in the nonprofit sector with those in the business or public sectors.

For the first time, the nonprofit organization was subject to meeting two different types of tests to either qualify or maintain the tax-exempt status of the 501(c)(3) organization—the organizational test and the operational test. First, the organizational test is one in which the organization's articles of incorporation and bylaws clearly limit the activities of the organization to one or more tax-exempt activities, such as educational, charitable, scientific, or religious activities. The second test, known as the operational test, is demonstrated by the organization's resources being primarily devoted to the activities which were outlined in the organizational test. Furthermore, the net earnings of the organization may not inure to the board of directors. Together, the operational and organizational tests provide quasi-guidelines concerning the administration of the nonprofit organization. In other words, the use of management technologies from the business or public sector must be adapted for use to further the tax-exempt mission of the nonprofit organization. In this context, the concepts that envelop management ideas of governance, marketing, financial management, planning, among other management tools, are applied to achieve different ends in the three sectors: in business, the aim of management
practice is the achievement of profit; in government, the administration of laws and public policy are the end product; and, in the nonprofit sector, management is focused on the satisfactory accomplishment of the organization's service mission. Another distinction of management in the three sectors can be drawn from the target groups shown below in Table 3.3 to be served by the three sectors. In the private sector, organizations are managed in the interest of their stockholders. In the public sector, governmental entities are managed for the interest of the general public. In the nonprofit sector, organizations are managed to sometimes serve the public interest and sometimes to serve only the interests of an unfortunate (or, sometimes, even an unpopular) few who are the clients or constituents that benefit from the organizational mission.

Table 3.3
Management Aims and Major Target Groups in the Three Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Administration of Laws and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Stockholders</td>
<td>Generate Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>General Public or Minority</td>
<td>Organizational Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A little more than 30 years ago, IRS Code 501(c)(3) was created. Since that time more than two-thirds of all nonprofit organizations have been incorporated (Salamon, 1984). Following
the rise in the number of new nonprofit organizations, the adaptation of management technologies have become evident in the nonprofit sector and identified in a blossoming professional literature on nonprofit management (see Chapter II). The trend in the literature has shown that recognized management tools are being widely used in the nonprofit sector and applications of those tools are being modified to achieve different goals and objectives than in the business or public sectors.
CHAPTER IV

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT DISCIPLINE

The aim of this chapter is to assess the discipline of nonprofit organization management against a model of an academic discipline. Hence, an exposition of the tenets of a discipline is necessary to establish the foundation for the analysis of various conceptualizations of the field. This chapter is particularly concerned with the model of a discipline that is set forth by King and Brownell (1966). King and Brownell's formulation is a systematic and adequate inventory of concepts and designations which have considerable transferability across disciplines and is particularly suitable as a yardstick for measuring the development or maturity of a discipline.

In their attempt to develop a generalized curriculum theory which would characterize the relationship between the activity of scholars and a course of study in schools, King and Brownell developed a model which would illuminate common elements shared by all disciplines. The features shared by all disciplines, according to King and Brownell, include the following 10 aspects:

1. A discipline is a community of persons
2. A discipline is an expression of human imagination
3. A discipline is a domain
4. A discipline is a tradition
5. A discipline is a syntactical structure—a mode of inquiry
6. A discipline is a conceptual structure—a substance
7. A discipline is a specialized language or other system of symbols
8. A discipline is a heritage of literature and artifacts and a network of communications
9. A discipline is a valuative and affective stance
10. A discipline is an instructive community

The following passages will provide a comparison of the 10 characteristics of an academic discipline, as described by King and Brownell, to the current state of the discipline of nonprofit organization management. The purpose of comparing their model is to determine whether the nonprofit management discipline meets the criteria they have established for recognition as a formal academic discipline. During the course of this examination, the depth and breadth of this evolving discipline will become apparent, and thus provide a better understanding of the maturity of the discipline, the progress it has made, and to some degree how much further it must go to be considered truly an autonomous field of study.

A Discipline is a Community

King and Brownell describe a discipline as a community "of scholars who share a domain of intellectual inquiry or discourse."
As part of their metaphor, King and Brownell liken the concept of community to a house shared by scholars. To expand the metaphor, the occupants would be involved in independent activity, but would occasionally meet to discuss the household and its needs for repair, upkeep and improvements.

Conceiving of a nonprofit management discipline as a community of individuals who, on a spectrum, create new information, direction, ideas or constructs, can easily be accomplished. One such sign of an intellectual community is the existence of a professional society. King and Brownell observed that a teaching or research position are also a badge of membership in a shared discipline.

There currently exists an array of membership organizations in the nonprofit sector with goals to create, maintain, and advance a sense of community among the professionals and organizations which are part of the nonprofit sector. Among these membership organizations are the Independent Sector, The Nonprofit Management Association, The Society for Nonprofit Management, and The Association of Voluntary Action Scholars.

The Independent Sector, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036, is a membership organization funded by membership dues, foundations, and corporate support. Founded in 1980 through the leadership efforts of Brian O'Connell and John Gardner, and the merger of the National Council on Philanthropy and the Coalition of National Voluntary Organizations, the Independent Sector describes itself as
a nonprofit Coalition of 650 corporate, foundation and voluntary organization members with national interest and impact in philanthropy and voluntary action. The organization's mission is to create a national forum capable of encouraging the giving, volunteering and not-for-profit initiative that help all of us to better serve people, communities and causes.

The Nonprofit Management Association is a professional society largely consisting of practitioners who provide technical services in the nonprofit sector. The organization is administered by a volunteer board of directors and committees. Inquiries to the Nonprofit Management Association are addressed to its Board Chairman, Thomas W. Russell, at the Gathering Place, 347 E. 1200 South, Orem, Utah 84058. As a group of service providers, the purpose of the organization is to stimulate ideas and increase the flow of information and energy among professionals who provide management and technical resources to nonprofit organizations.

The Nonprofit Management Association, funded through dues, corporate sponsorship and conference income, has sponsored more than 10 national conferences. The conferences generally focus on skill development workshops for the nonprofit professional who provides training and technical assistance to nonprofit organizations. The Association also provides opportunities for professional networking through committee and special project activities.

The Society for Nonprofit Management is among the newest of membership organizations. Funded through dues and income generated projects, the organization is headquartered at 6314 Odana Road, Madison, Wisconsin 53719. This organization describes its purpose as,
dedicated to bringing together those who serve the nonprofit world in order to build a strong network of professionals throughout the country.

The Society publishes a bi-monthly practice digest and provides other types of membership benefits including insurance programs, conferences, and some brokered fundraising opportunities.

The above organizations exist to improve the conditions of the nonprofit sector and to build a sense of professional community through a network of activities which focus on skill-building and knowledge sharing; however, another membership organization in the nonprofit sector, the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, has a more specific focus of creating a sense of an academic community. According to its self-description, the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS), with executive offices at the Filene Center, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, is

an autonomous interdisciplinary and interprofessional association of scholars and professionals interested in and/or engaged in research, scholarship or programs related to voluntary action in any of its many forms.

In addition, the Association seeks not only to stimulate and aid the efforts of those engaged in voluntary action research, scholarship and professional activity, but also to make the results of that research, scholarship and action more readily available both to professionals and scholars and to leaders of the participants in voluntary associations and voluntary action agencies. Thus, AVAS attempts to foster the dissemination and application of social science knowledge about voluntary action in order to enhance the quality of life and the general welfare of mankind through effective and appropriate voluntary action.
Among its community building activities, AVAS sponsors an annual conference, publishes both a newsletter as well as a scholarly journal titled the Journal of Voluntary Action Research. In addition, the Association periodically publishes the Citizen Participation and Voluntary Action Abstracts.

A Discipline is an Expression of Human Imagination

According to King and Brownell, communities of scholars engage in various styles of creative imagination in their pursuit of ideas and meaning. Theoretic activity, they report, consists of a creative dimension with the discovery, development, and critical analysis of new ideas. A second dimension is the assimilation of ideas of others.

While it is difficult to observe the creative potential of the members of the nonprofit scholarly community, it is possible to see the consequences of the collective spontaneous activity of knowledge building that has marked this field in recent years. One can observe the increase of training and formal education programs, for example, and can comfortably draw a conclusion that this scholarly activity has been affected by the occurrence of imaginative ideas and the recognition among disciplined scholars and practitioners for the need to develop and express new ideas.
A Discipline is a Domain

According to King and Brownell (1966), "the domain of a discipline is that natural phenomenon, process, material, social institution, or other aspect of man's concern on which the members of the discipline focus their attention" (p. 74). The existence of a nonprofit sector is evidence that its members recognize it to have a specific focus in society which is not precisely duplicated in either the business or government sectors. It exists because of concerns generated by societal needs which call for distinct competencies on issues of governance, leadership, and management related to philanthropy, volunteerism, and charity.

King and Brownell also note that the domains of disciplines can center on many areas of phenomena, a point well exhibited in the varieties of nonprofit institutional missions. Most often the domain of a discipline is simply that which its members declare it to be, or in other words, a declaration of purpose and recognition of specific functional turf.

A Discipline is a Tradition--
It Has a History

Every discipline has a heritage upon which intellectual discourse is built. King and Brownell, citing Phenix (1964), liken the development of a discipline to biological evolution. New species of knowledge emerge from time to time as a result of structural mutations that prove viable. In recent times, with the rapid expansion of knowledge in
all fields, many new disciplines have sprung up and there is every reason to expect that these developments will continue at an accelerated pace. (p. 43)

While the nonprofit sector has a long and rich history, as reviewed elsewhere in this study, it often does not receive appropriate attention because contemporary scholars are too occupied with carving out a new course of knowledge. In addition, while rooted in rich traditions, the field does not have recognizable intellectual heroes from the past to which it owes reference for strains of modern thought.

A Discipline is a Syntactical Structure—Mode of Inquiry

King and Brownell posit that students will advance in their field by developing fluency with the modes of inquiry of that field. As King and Brownell describe how certain disciplines have recognized arrangements for inquiry or discovery such as in mathematics, physics, or biology, it becomes unquestionable by comparison that nonprofit management does not yet have a recognized syntax or process of discovery and verification.

In fairness, the scholars in the field of nonprofit organization management have only recently begun to converse among themselves. At this early stage, it is too soon to expect these disciplined scholars to have a syntactical structure which, as King and Brownell (1966, p. 78) ascribe to Joseph J. Schwab (1964), is a criteria "for measuring the quality of data, how strictly it can apply its canons of evidence, and, in general,
to determine the pathway by which the discipline moves from its raw data to its conclusions."

King and Brownell warn, however, not to oversimplify the concept of syntactical structure as simply a scientific method with the universal four step method of noting data, conceiving a hypothesis, testing the hypothesis and asserting the verification of the hypothesis. Indeed, different methods of verification will apply to different fields. This point was certainly evident while public administration entered its phases of "science of management" and its attempt to deepen the analytical focus of that field of study. Unlike public administration, however, the field of nonprofit management has not yet embarked on a literary path to examine "principles of science," human relations or generic management.

**A Discipline is a Conceptual Structure**

King and Brownell distinguish syntactical structure from conceptual structure, characterizing syntax as the underlying arrangement of ideas which makes possible a systematic methodology for following a "path of inquiry," while conceptual structure refers to the actual substance and ideas of a discipline: one is the plan for dissection and analysis, the other is the body that is to be dissected. They go on to expand the idea of conceptual structure as:
1. The organized ensemble of . . . (the discipline's) principles.
2. The scheme of categories by which the meaning and the discipline are symbolized, making it possible to interpret the significance of the field within the total framework of meaning.
3. . . . Systematic . . . body of interrelated propositions.
4. . . . The fundamental ideas of a discipline. (King & Brownell, 1966, p. 81)

While nonprofit organization management is in the process of developing its own syntactical structure, its conceptual structure is more prominent and presently serves as the basis of origin for inquiry into the field. For example, the concept of volunteerism, charity, philanthropy, and the concept of nonprofit itself, are important conceptual structures or symbolic representations which can be used as the basis for furthering knowledge in the field.

As a conceptual structure, the discipline of nonprofit organization management is the full set of ideas, not necessarily facts, about the field at any one time. Therefore, it is helpful to consider the conceptual structure of the field as an evolving and developmental activity as opposed to isolated subject matter. Paraphrasing from King and Brownell (1966), "in the pattern of existing concepts, laws, theories of a nonprofit discipline (its conceptual structure) and the mode of inquiry (its syntactical structure) the scholar will find his or her resources and guides for further intellectual exploration."
A special language in the nonprofit field does exist. While certain terms may be cross-referenced among various disciplines, there is a jargon or an accumulated set of connotative meanings which is indispensable to the nonprofit discipline.

While King and Brownell purposefully avoid the task of examining language patterns among scholars, they make it a point to suggest that joining a professional community requires the individual to assume the special language or jargon which is used by members of the discipline. In the foreword to *The Facts on File Dictionary of Nonprofit Organization Management* (Ott & Shafritz, 1986), an entire book devoted to the terms that are used in the nonprofit sector, Elizabeth Boris observes:

> There are unique aspects of organizations in the nonprofit sector which require a vocabulary that is somewhat different from that found in government and profit making organizations.

Boris explains that the unique differences between the sectors requires a special language which is reflective of these differing aspects. She states, "Governance, funding, staffing and oversight are areas of the greatest difference."

A Discipline is a Heritage of Literature and a Communications Network

The existence of a community language in nonprofit management is nowhere more evident than in the professional literature.
A growing literature of books and journal articles exists and it can be considered in the terms of King and Brownell as "a system for communication among the membership."

There are several channels for publication and distribution, although the obstacles of publication, as in any other academic discipline, does exist.

King and Brownell also emphasize the import of the professional society for serving as a clearinghouse of information and providing a stimulus for discourse among its membership. Through its journal publication, newsletter, and annual conference, the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars appears to be an active conduit for a community which is dedicated to learning about the nonprofit sector. Furthermore, through access to different service institutions, such as The Foundation Center in New York City, the Independent Sector in Washington, DC, Program on Non-Profit Organizations, at Yale University in New York, or the Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management in Denver, there is an availability of writings and working materials of the nonprofit community. This availability is essential to the continuous development of scholarship in the field.

**A Discipline is a Valuative and Affective Stance**

Members of an intellectual community are bound together by more than a cognitive link. They have an affective or emotional bond as well and a value system which is expressed in terms of
how humankind is viewed. King and Brownell refer to the pleasures of engaging in a discipline as an "emotional dynamism" and a lure to learning and discovery.

There is almost an aesthetic quality or romantic appeal to the process of intellectual discourse. According to King and Brownell (1966),

The processes of striving to comprehend the structure of a field of imposing new conceptions on the phenomenon of the field; of testing concepts logically and possibly experimentally; of laying one's intellectual soul bare to the criticism of colleagues; of rejoicing in a line of reasoning that proves productive; and of enduring the darts of criticism are all part of the drama of intellectual life. Each part of the pattern of activity which is the life of the intellect is charged emotionally for the scholar who would hold a dream or vision that the principles of thought of the discipline will have wider application to human thought and human affairs. (p. 89)

Whatever might be the intellectual pleasures of being part of a nonprofit discipline, few have been formally enunciated. However, the discipline has a characteristic view of humankind based on the field's appreciation of pluralism and its dependence on the generosity of individuals who share their time and financial resources. One might also speculate that this characteristic value about humankind is not merely derived from being socialized into the discipline, but, rather, this attribute is what attracted individuals into this discipline in the first place.

A Discipline is an Instructive Community

A distinguishing feature of a discipline is its ability to promote further inquiry and generate newer ideas and concepts.
It is this generative feature which makes discipline knowledge instructive. King and Brownell cite several authors to make their point that a discipline can be conceived of as a foundation for curriculum. In fact, subject matter which is taught as part of a plan of study is "a translation of a discipline into a pattern of learning" (Foshay, 1962, p. 5).

Since there is a dearth of published information about non-profit curricula, one can only speculate that the knowledge which comprises the field is instructive. The fact that there has been a surge of growth in nonprofit educational programming does suggest that it is particularly suited for teaching and learning. Through evolvement of the discipline, the field of nonprofit management may come to formally identify and mark the structures and knowledge requirements which are pertinent for learning the field. This dynamism will be a distinguishing feature of the field and is yet to come.
CHAPTER V
CURRICULAR NEEDS OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

Colleges and universities have only recently begun to acknowledge needs of the nonprofit manager for formal education. Having responded slowly and sporadically to the academic requirements of the nonprofit sector (Christopoulos & Hafner, 1982), universities and colleges have not yet resolved the question of what should be taught to graduate students of nonprofit management. Some universities and colleges might argue, however, that they have paid attention to this question and have a long history of providing professional education programs for the nonprofit manager, particularly in fields that are often practiced within the nonprofit sector such as social work, health care, and education, among others.

The level of comprehensiveness of these management-type programs may be difficult to challenge, although students in these professional degree programs are usually required to take a cross section of courses within the domain of that profession. And, while the student of social work, for example, may be versed in applying social casework principles to the administration of human service agencies, there may be a question of transferability to the administration of a different type of nonprofit agency. There is also the question of whether the curriculum in
these programs is appropriately labeled as a core management concentration and actually does focus on the fundamental concerns of managing a nonprofit organization, such as resource development, working with boards of directors, and financial controls and management.

In order to accommodate the greater number, types, and sizes of nonprofit organizations, there is, indeed, an instructional need to address this diversity of nonprofit organizations.

O'Neill and Young (1986) state,

The fact that such organizations fall not only outside the sectors of business and government, but also outside the functional disciplines that attend to the education of administrators, appears to argue for some new, more comprehensive approach to nonprofit management education.

Their statement also implies that an approach to the education of nonprofit managers, as in business schools, should focus on an in-depth approach to sound nonprofit management and governance principles and skills. Also arguing for a specialized course of study for nonprofit managers, Magat (1981) correctly observes that the mid-70s brought increased government regulations on nonprofit organizations; and, the 1980s brought a decline in federal funding. In Magat's view, surviving the imposed hardships requires the type of management knowledge, capabilities, and skills that should come from a specialized academic study.

It is not surprising that at this early stage in the development of the nonprofit academic discipline in universities and colleges, there should be such a paucity of literature and
resource material on curricula for nonprofit management. Despite a dearth of information about appropriate curricula, universities are recognizing the existence of a new market of students and are forging ahead with coursework and degree programs in nonprofit management. For example, the number of recently installed master's programs concentrating in nonprofit management has been estimated by experts in the field to be 32. There is no known list, however, which identifies or catalogs all of these programs and since there is not, as yet, an accreditation body, actual verification of the number of formal education programs in nonprofit management remains difficult to ascertain. In fact, a careful review of Gray's (1985) Resource Directory of Education and Training Opportunities sheds little light on this subject. Although the Resource Directory lists several universities and colleges, in many cases the titles of courses and degree programs do not suggest an emphasis in nonprofit management. Instead, the institutions that are described in the Resource Directory are largely public administration programs which offer a range of educational opportunities in public management, public policy, and leadership. Given the potential market of students interested in graduate education in nonprofit management and the additional relatedness between the government and nonprofit sectors' goal to accomplish a service mission, it is not altogether surprising to find public administration programs referring to their curricula as appropriate for the preparation of professional nonprofit managers.
Over time, one would also expect an expansion of this trend among public administration programs of referring to their professional degree programs as an appropriate vehicle for preparation to work in the nonprofit sector. In fact, a Task Force on the Future of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) recently drafted a recommendation which would provide impetus to this effort. The NASPAA report (chaired by Maxwell School Dean Guthrie Birkhead) suggests a redefinition of the concept of "public service" in order to recognize the blurring boundaries between the government and non-government sectors, and, specifically, to account for the appropriate role that voluntary nonprofit organizations play in carrying out public policies and services (Birkhead, 1986). A NASPAA redefinition of the concept of public service, and the incorporation of nonprofit organization management into that concept, could eventually have far-reaching implications on the accreditation standards of graduate public administration degree programs, particularly if graduate programs were required to alter their curricula to integrate coursework on nonprofit management. Because of the opportunities and potential problems that can arise from a redefinition of public service, the Birkhead Report recommended to NASPAA that it appoint a Task Force to examine the character of public service and the issues of educational relatedness between the two sectors. In fact, NASPAA has recognized the growing interest in the nonprofit sector and appointed an Ad Hoc
Committee on Nonprofit Management. Eventually, this Ad Hoc Committee on Nonprofit Management will draft a report which covers several issues, including the redefinition of public service and the nonprofit sector; the role of public administration programs in interdisciplinary efforts to develop nonprofit courses of study; standards for integrating nonprofit management into public administration programs; an appropriate research agenda; and the opportunities for developing a broad based network of nonprofit scholars.

While future reports and commissions will assist in clarifying the scope and character of this evolving academic discipline, meanwhile we are faced with the difficulty of identifying the range of programs designed specifically for the student seeking more information, knowledge, and skill for managing a private, nonprofit organization. Nevertheless, several master's programs have been reported to exist or are in the process of development. The Nonprofit Executive (1984), for example, cites the existence of 15 programs which were identified by Blenda Wilson and listed in Table 5.1. The 15 programs exemplify the diversity of academic institutions who wish to become involved in this emerging field. According to Gray (1985) there is a varying scope of coursework and program emphasis among these 15 and other schools. Concentration areas can vary and may include: the arts, human service administration, fund-raising, community service, health planning, volunteer administration, and generalized nonprofit management/administration.
Table 5.1

Fifteen Academic Institutions Reported to Offer a Graduate Course of Study With a Concentration Area in Nonprofit Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School for Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College, City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York--Binghamton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch–New England Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In addition to these 15 programs, interviews with scholars in the nonprofit management field indicate that there are several other prominent universities that are undertaking plans to begin a graduate program in nonprofit management. These institutions
include Case Western Reserve, Harvard, Duke, and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Furthermore, Duke University, the City University of New York, and Indiana University have recently established Centers which focus on the study of philanthropy. Elsewhere, in September of 1987, 9 colleges will be introducing undergraduate courses on philanthropy under a grant program organized through the Association of American Colleges (Teltsch, 1986).

With the advent of several master's degree programs in nonprofit management, the questions of what should be taught to aspiring professional nonprofit managers is only steps away from the field's examination table. Curriculum, after all, is the substance of professional education, in that,

All professions move through a similar process of knowledge development. The initial phase calls on the unique talents of a few individuals who practice idiosyncratically. This is followed by the pooling of acquired wisdom into the beginnings of shared knowledge and eventually into a shared knowledge base, which is added to, tested, and disseminated through organized patterns and educational structures. (Humphreys & Dinerman, 1984, p. 192)

As with other emerging disciplines, the development of curricula in nonprofit management has been advanced by its field of practice. Following the process outlined by Humphreys and Dinerman (1984), the field of practice will continue to have a decisive influence in the shaping of course content, syllabi, and learning materials in graduate degree programs for some time. In fact, the cultivation and advancement of today's nonprofit academic programs are in large measure the result of the
creativity of a few individuals, often working closely with the field's management support organizations and other leading non-profit organizations in a partnership with institutions of higher learning. In Denver, for example, Robert Leduc, while CEO of a management support organization known as the Technical Assistance Center (TAC), sought a formal educational relationship with the University of Colorado, as a natural extension of the training and consultation efforts of TAC (Foster, Leduc & Danosky, 1982). Later, the idea of a community based organization linking with a university to extend professional educational/training services in the nonprofit sector was further advanced by Leduc and his associates at the Denver-based, Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management (INPOM). Under their arrangement, INPOM assists the University of Colorado's Graduate School of Public Affairs in the development and delivery of the curricula for a master's and doctoral program concentration in nonprofit management. Another university-community organization partnership was reported by Christopoulos and Hafner (1982). In this case, the American Heart Association (AHA) and Central Michigan University (CMU) entered into an agreement to design a mutually agreeable curriculum leading to a master's degree concentrating in voluntary agency management. The CMU-AHA program would be open to managers and volunteers of the American Heart Association and eventually to other nonprofit managers from other agencies.
There are several other related instances where nonprofit organizations have created a bridge to higher education, although perhaps not as direct as assisting in the creation of a master's degree curriculum. Nevertheless, relationships to universities and colleges can have an influencing or catalyst effect on educational programming and raise the sensitivity of educators about the learning needs of the nonprofit sector. For example, Stoel (1982) reports that the American Red Cross, the Girl Scouts of America, the YWCA, and the Junior League participated in the development and use of a guide which relates functional competencies to volunteer positions for the purpose of gaining college credits through higher educational institutions which provide academic credit for life-experience. Rosenman (1982) addresses another partnership arrangement between colleges and universities with community-based nonprofit organizations. In this situation, nonprofit organizations are used as learning sites for college students to apply their new skills or engage in special projects. Of course, this type of field-based learning model, reliant on the cooperation of a nonprofit organization in partnership with a university, has been a distinctive and long-standing feature of professional social work education.

It is only after academic maturation and the development of a research protocol and reporting mechanism that the discipline will be in a position to reverse the level of practitioner influence and begin to shape the field of practice. The aim of a
standardized nonprofit curriculum, as in other professional degree programs, will be to assemble a curriculum which will develop the student's capacity to think critically, to analyze situations, to synthesize data, and to generalize theories into practice. Moreover, a nonprofit management curriculum should rest upon a comprehensive view of the nonprofit sector. Educational considerations should be given to the following:

1. Recognition of public policy, political and social influences on the voluntary organizations in America;

2. Projecting or anticipating program needs in a society that is gradually becoming more diffident about obtaining services through public sector agencies;

3. Advancing scientific and scholarly knowledge and developing standards of nonprofit management practice;

4. The development of productive career opportunities;

5. The analysis and study of ethics and values systems and its impact on the practice of nonprofit management; and

6. The varied cultural, educational and work experiences of the students, including educational limitations or special competencies.

In their analysis of educating managers of nonprofit organizations, O'Neill and Young (1986) suggest that a curriculum in nonprofit management should draw both broadly and selectively from the roles of the nonprofit agencies and the characteristics of nonprofit management practice. One might conclude from the
remarks of O'Neil and Young (1986) as well as Keane and Merget (1986) that there are general kinds of substantive knowledge which can be framed into a coherent and unified curriculum. They suggest that a professional curriculum for nonprofit management can be achieved by grouping sources to address specific management functions such as the application of analytical methods, classical management functions (e.g., planning, directing, coordinating, budgeting, etc.), and policy. Such grouping might effectively respond to the contextual environment of the nonprofit sector. This kind of curriculum could also address spheres of practice concerns, such as resource development and working with a board of directors and volunteers. Focusing on pure management practice or functional concerns may raise an argument of whether curriculum should be oriented towards the production of a generalist practitioner, or either a specialist practitioner within a functional area, such as fundraising, or a specialist within a practice setting such as an association, foundation, arts organization, or human service agency.

While the field has not yet begun to debate the curriculum policy objectives of specialist versus generalist, the stage is being set for such a future curriculum dialogue. Currently, the complexity and breadth of a professional school's course of study in nonprofit management probably relates to the educational resources and/or educational opportunities and objectives of each specific school without regard to--because it does not exist--the
profession's official curriculum policy. As an example of the
generalist-specialist divergency, O'Neill and Young (1986) observe
that the graduate program at the University of Colorado, Graduate
School of Public Affairs is inclined toward "a high degree of
[nonprofit management functional area] specificity," while
programs out of the business or management schools at Stanford,
Yale, and Northwestern tend to be more generalist in nature.
Further, even more specialized are the educational programs which
focus on a type of nonprofit management practice such as George
Washington University's Master's degree program in Association
Management. While, no doubt, the diversity of educational
programs expands the opportunities for students who wish to
pursue professional education in nonprofit management, it remains
unfortunate that at this time students, academicians, and prac­titioners do not have a basis for appraising the quality of an
educational program against a set of nationwide standards which
would delineate the type of substantive knowledge that is required
in this field.

As with the issue of educating a generalist versus a
specialist practitioner, the balance between field initiated
learning and classroom-theory-based learning will be another
important issue to reckon with. This certainly was the case,
and still remains a heated issue, for example, in the field of
social work, where it has been implied that field-work practice
under the tutorial relationship with a supervisor is the type of
learning experience which leaves the deepest of imprints (Towle, 1954). However, McAdam (1986a) diplomatically suggests that the issue of practice-based learning versus science or theory-based learning should be a moot issue in the nonprofit management field:

in my experience, local practitioners also can offer considerable depth in terms of concrete skills and practical experience which will be useful to the student. The use of adjunct professors who are practitioners also raises a related issue of practitioners vs. academic/scientist. I suspect this is something of a false issue since there are many people who function in both "worlds." (p. 5)

However, if given an opportunity to advance a curricula and a program especially for "the mature, highly motivated, self-starting and self-directed practitioner/scholar," McAdam (1986) shows his colors by favoring a practice-based model which emphasizes the use of tutors and mentorships. Indeed, internships or mentorships can be an important integrative means to facilitate the learning of theory into practice, or information into skills. Since the relationship between the student and the mentor/supervisor can be significant for guiding the student in the development of both professional integrity and competence, it would be well for the discipline to consider essential curricular policies which would facilitate the attainment of these educational aims.

As educational programs progress and expand, there will be opportunities for revising curricula and determining the appropriate model for educating the nonprofit manager. Questions which focus on the dimensions of the curriculum will necessarily be
raised in addition to others related to equally important issues such as the credentials of the faculty, team-teaching arrangements, the balance between major coursework and minor concentrations, the individualized nature of a professional education program, and the expected knowledge and skill base of graduates from degree programs. As a beginning to such a dialogue and as a starting point for comparison, it may be helpful to spotlight the established master's and doctoral degree programs at the University of Colorado's Graduate School of Public Affairs.

Case Example: The University of Colorado

While it is only recently that Graduate Schools of Public Administration have recognized that there is a potential pool of students for them who are employed in the nonprofit sector (Public Administration Times, 1985) and that there are career opportunities in the nonprofit sector for graduates of public affairs and administration programs (Birkhead, 1986; Weisenthal, 1985), the Graduate School of Public Affairs came to this awareness early in 1980. By 1981, through the joint efforts of faculty and nonprofit sector-bound students, courses were developed and introduced into the program of study in the master's degree program. Likewise, at least two doctoral students had received permission to concentrate their studies in a particular aspect of private nonprofit management. What eventually evolved from the success of these efforts and the cooperative efforts of the Institute for Nonprofit
Organization Management were the creation of an official concentration in nonprofit management at both the master's and doctoral level. The 45 semester hour Master's program requires certain core courses, elective courses, and track courses to complete the program. In addition, an internship is required of those students who have not had significant work experience. Currently, the master's curriculum in nonprofit management consists of 4 core courses (12 semester hours) toward the 45 hour requirement:

Fundamentals of Nonprofit Organization Management; Governance, Policy Management, and Planning in Nonprofit Organizations; Marketing and Resource Development for Nonprofit Organizations; and Nonprofit Management: Control and Evaluation. The objectives of the program are:

To acquaint the graduate student with the major aspects of nonprofit organization management. To develop a policy point of view—a capacity to identify, analyze, evaluate, and resolve nonprofit management issues; to integrate planning, marketing, and resource-development tasks; and to resolve issues concerning the efficient and effective use of scarce resources.

In describing the rationale for selecting the focus of the course content for the graduate program in nonprofit management, Foster, Leduc and Danosky (1982) have written:

Our experience indicates that nonprofit organizations have relatively strong capabilities for program management and service delivery. The fundamental management weaknesses concern policy and resource management . . . The courses on nonprofit organization management address the major policy and resource management problems facing nonprofit enterprises. These courses also complement current courses and clusters offered in the Graduate School of Public Affairs. (p. 87)
At this time, the University of Colorado offers the only doctoral program concentrating in nonprofit management. The program is designed for the experienced nonprofit manager who desires to conduct research, teach, or expand practice abilities and knowledge base while stressing theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and practical knowledge development. While the program requires 84 semester credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree and a demonstration of knowledge through the passage of both qualifying and concentration exams in addition to a dissertation thesis, the program is designed for the mid-career working professional. Another interesting dimension to the doctoral program is the use of student cohorts. In 1983, 22 leading nonprofit managers in Colorado were assembled to participate in doctoral studies as a cohort, taking all required classes together. The cohort provided its members with collegial support and familiarization with each other which enhanced intellectual stimulation and the comfort to challenge each other. Following the success of this "local" cohort a national cohort was established in 1985 which also included leading nonprofit managers from throughout the United States and Canada.

In addition to the selection of courses, there are other considerations that have gone into the development of the nonprofit curriculum at the University of Colorado. The six dimensions of curricular design as found in Berquist, Gould, and Greenberg (1981) are a helpful tool for explaining the approach
to graduate education for nonprofit managers. The six dimensions include: time, space, resources, organizations, procedures, and outcomes. Attention to these varied aspects is important for providing a creative learning opportunity and for meeting the learning needs of a student body which can be classified as the nontraditional adult learner. Class time is an important factor for accommodating the working professional. Most classes in this program are offered in the evening or on weekends. The convenience of class schedules is an important reason why many students choose to enter one program versus another, in addition to their consideration of space or location of class meetings (Young & Eddy, 1982). Learning in this program takes place both on and off campus. Some courses are held in traditional classroom settings, while others lend themselves nicely to off-campus, retreat-like settings. There are also opportunities for self-directed learning, especially when the students are back in his or her job setting, possessed of a real-life laboratory within which new ideas and skills may be tested.

The resources dimension includes both the use of full-time and adjunct faculty. The graduate program is enhanced through the assignment of noted experts, from inside and outside the state of Colorado, to serve as adjunct faculty. It is also noteworthy that the full-time faculty, the Dean, the Director of the Master's Program, and the Director of the Doctoral Program have made an organizational commitment to the nonprofit concentration evidenced
by the very existence of the concentration area leading to a
degree, further reflected by the appointment of an advisory
committee to help guide the concentration, and by efforts to
market the program to qualified potential applicants to the
master's and doctoral programs. In addition, the outcomes
dimension encompasses the varied competencies that are desired
by the student through the learning experience, maximized by a
joint formulation of educational objectives leading to a faculty-
student structured plan of study. The procedures dimension refers
to the planning and implementation of the graduate program in
addition to the formal and informal methods that are used to
evaluate course content and the instructional abilities of the
faculty; these procedures eventually influence the staffing
pattern in the classroom toward a match with program and course
objectives.

The Need for Shared Institutional Insights

In their description of the George Washington University
professional education program specializing in a segment of the
nonprofit sector, i.e., associations, Keane and Merget (1986)
conclude their paper with a section on "issues of intellectual
and institutional import." They correctly observe that after a
3 year program experience there is much information that needs to
be reviewed and shared, not only among their faculty but across
universities. Clearly, the veteran experience of the University
of Colorado could also yield much insight into issues of appropriate coursework, student interest, research needs, and curricular guidelines among several potential issue areas. In addition, the long established interdisciplinary research agenda at Yale University, and the hardships of establishing a chaired professorship in nonprofit management at Case Western Reserve University should also inspire noteworthy dialogue among a growing network of universities and scholars. In order to sustain support for education in nonprofit management, the time is ripe for some organization or university to create an annual or ongoing laboratory for sharing and examining the lessons learned from the pioneering programs in this evolving discipline, and to learn from the several more recent entrants who have begun to acknowledge the formal education needs of the nonprofit manager.
CHAPTER VI

RESEARCH METHODS

Objective and Purpose

The objective of this study is to assess the beliefs of prominent scholars/researchers/academicians regarding the level of scholarly activity, development, and direction in the field of nonprofit organization management. To accomplish this task, a survey was used to collect information from an identified group of knowledgeable individuals. According to Isaac and Michael (1979), the purpose of such a survey study is:

a. To collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena.
b. To identify problems or justify current conditions and practices.
c. To make comparisons and evaluations.
d. To determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions. (p. 18)

The use of survey research, as with other forms of research, is an attempt to approximate knowledge by describing the facts and characteristics of a given population or interest area (Warwick & Lininger, 1975).

Other methodological considerations included the following: the challenge of selecting an appropriate population to be studied; translating the objectives of the study into survey questions which would obtain useful information; and determining
procedures for data collection. These methodological considerations are discussed in the following passage. The analysis of data is reported in a separate section.

Population Selection

The population of this study consisted of the membership of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS). This population was selected over other target groups for a variety of reasons. First, AVAS is the pioneering association of academics, researchers, and professional practitioners who are actively involved in developing a body of knowledge in the field of nonprofit management through research activity, writing, teaching, and direct practice. Additionally, the organizational mission of AVAS complemented nicely the intent of this study. It was expected that the membership would welcome this study and would cooperate by completing a survey questionnaire which related closely with their intellectual and employment interests. The aim of AVAS is as follows:

The Association seeks not only to stimulate and aid the efforts of those engaged in voluntary research, scholarship, and professional activity, but also to make the results of that research, scholarship, and action more readily available both to fellow professionals and scholars and to leaders of the participants in voluntary associations and voluntary action agencies.

Although the AVAS group was selected, three other major professional groupings were also identified as potential sampling units for this study. The members of other professional organizations such as the Independent Sector (IS), Nonprofit Management
Association (NMA), and the Society for Nonprofit Organizations (Society) were each considered but rejected for a variety of reasons. The Independent Sector has been instrumental in sponsoring a number of forums and research studies to further the understanding of the nonprofit sector. However, its membership consists of organizational members and not individuals. Identifying individuals among its 600 organizational members might be a very cumbersome task, although probably feasible. Given the type of members within Independent Sector, it was expected that representatives would be selected from a higher concentration of philanthropic organizations and a disproportionately fewer number from academic institutions, and thereby not bring to the survey the necessary type of breadth or depth of understanding about the nonprofit sector as an evolving academic discipline. For similar reasons, the Society for Nonprofit Organizations, which consists of organizational members as well as some individual sponsors, was also found inappropriate for the study. The Society does not yet have the track record of sponsoring research activity or conference forums, although they publish a useful practice digest magazine. It primarily exists as a representor of nonprofit organization interests. The likelihood of identifying a sample of an appropriate number of individuals to complete a questionnaire among the Society members seemed dubious. Finally, the Nonprofit Management Association has individual members of which several members have made a number of important contributions to the practice of
nonprofit management. However, it was thought that the smaller membership of NMA may have too strong a practitioner bias and they may not be able to elucidate on areas of curriculum development in higher education.

Two other sampling strategies were also considered but disqualified. Since there is a still unknown number of universities and colleges providing coursework in nonprofit management, it was concluded that sending a questionnaire randomly to universities and colleges would yield an unsatisfactory number of useful returns. To send the questionnaire only to institutions which have been identified as offering coursework in nonprofit management also had a major drawback: it eliminated several institutions which are only beginning to develop a program of study, and would additionally eliminate many individual scholars who have contributed to the field's research and professional literature base but who now are not tied to an academic institution. Individuals affiliated with newly established programs and the individuals "without portfolio" would be covered more adequately in the AVAS population.

Population Under Study

The population under study consisted of the 235 individual members of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars. AVAS members are drawn from a variety of educational backgrounds who address research and practice issues in the nonprofit sector. Membership in AVAS can be divided into three sample categories: One, everyone who is a member of AVAS; two, those members who
reside in America; and three, those members who live in countries outside of the United States. For the purpose of this study the 32 international members from 10 foreign countries were excluded from the testing sample because the nature of the survey sought information on the development of the academic discipline of nonprofit management in America. While respondents from foreign countries might provide interesting answers to the questionnaire, a comparative analysis would be more appropriate as a separate study. Therefore, the small segment of the population whose answers might contaminate the intent of this study were eliminated as part of the sample group. The final population size consisted of the 203 individual members of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars who work and/or reside in the United States.

Instrument Design

A search of the literature did not reveal any prior instrumentation which would be appropriate for this study. Therefore, a preliminary questionnaire was designed and distributed to a select group of eight expert readers to field test the questions for both accuracy and relevancy. The eight individuals who pretested the questionnaire were chosen because they belonged to at least two of the following categories: (a) fellow colleagues; (b) the potential users of the data; and (c) individuals drawn from the population to be surveyed (Grinnell, 1985).

The procedure used in pretesting the survey instrument included mailing the questionnaire to the respondents and reviewing
their answers to the questions after the survey instrument was returned. A second copy of the survey instrument was also distributed to this select group for purposes of exploratory interviews aimed at evaluating the critical points of the questionnaire, including the adequacy of the survey instructions, the clarity of wording of the questionnaire items, regional differences in interpretation of the questions (Warwick & Lininger, 1975), the relevancy of questionnaire items, and the notable absence of important questions. Following the pretest interviews certain questions were eliminated, revised, and an additional question was added. In some cases, the format of the questions were also refined.

The final research instrument was designed in four sections. The first section was designed to measure the respondent's beliefs about the academic discipline of nonprofit management. A decision was made to start the questionnaire not with demographic questions, but rather to place those items in Section B. The intent of this decision was to create an immediate interest in the subject matter of the questionnaire by avoiding routine introductory survey questions (Dillman, 1978). The 10 questions in Section A provided a mix of questions which consisted of either close-ended with ordered choices, or partially close-ended questions which provided choices and the option of creating individual responses (Dillman, 1978). The 10 questions in this section were designed to provide information on the following
subjects: (a) beliefs about the existence of the discipline of nonprofit management, (b) the professional field of study which has most influenced the knowledge base of nonprofit management, (c) housing for a degree program in nonprofit management, (d) attitudes about the importance of a certifying body, (e) the identification of the most important authors, journals, and books in the field, (f) the most relevant courses in the design of a graduate, master's level plan of study, and (g) the emphasis of science and/or art in a plan of study.

Section B provided an opportunity for the respondents to describe themselves and to detail some of their former and current professional activities. The question structure in this section was similar to the question structure used in Section A. The 13 questions of Section B focused on some typical and nontypical demographic questions. The typical questions, for example, were designed to provide information about the respondent's employment status, sex, and educational background. However, other questions about the respondents were designed to find out about their level of professional involvement in the field of nonprofit management including: (a) whether they have ever engaged in research, (b) taught in degree or nondegree programs, (c) hold memberships in professional organizations, (d) published articles and/or books, and (e) what capacity they have served as a member of a nonprofit organization's board of directors.
The completion of questions in Section C only was a requirement for respondents who were affiliated or employed by a college or university which has coursework in nonprofit management. If the section was not applicable, respondents were advised to skip to the final part of the questionnaire, i.e., Section D. If the respondent was affiliated with an academic institution that offers coursework in nonprofit organization management, then Section C, consisting of a variety of close-ended and open-ended questions, provided an opportunity to describe the many elements of that educational program. In fact, the 12 questions of this section were designed to provide information on: (a) the type of institutional funding, (b) whether the program has written curriculum objectives, (c) the type of subject matter that is offered, and (d) the nature of departmental and faculty responsibility for the delivery of the coursework.

The last part of the questionnaire, Section D, was designed to assess what respondents thought about the future direction of the academic discipline of nonprofit management. For this purpose, only one open-ended question was presented to the sample group: "What direction do you anticipate for the academic discipline of nonprofit management?" A concluding note on the survey instrument invited the respondents to comment on the study and clarify any of their answers.
Data Collection

The survey instrument was distributed to the population group through the mail. In order to increase the likelihood of the instrument being examined, self-administered, and returned by the respondents, several items received initial consideration including the appearance of the questionnaire and the type of enclosures which would enhance the return of the questionnaire. On the matter of appearance, the survey instrument was typeset and printed in order to convey an air of importance and professionalism.

In addition to the survey instrument, enclosures included a cover letter, a postcard for requesting survey results, and a postage paid business reply envelope. The cover letter was designed to explain the nature of the study and to motivate the respondent to complete and return the questionnaire. As for motivation, the letter reminded the respondents that their membership in AVAS suggested they had both the experience and commitment to furthering the development of knowledge about the nonprofit sector.

The letter also addressed the issues of confidentiality and sharing research results. Although there was no space on the questionnaire for identifying oneself, the letter also promised confidentiality. Since many survey respondents are often interested in the results of a study in which they participated, the cover letter indicated that a summary of the results would be forwarded upon request. To facilitate the request for the survey
results, the letter also referred the respondent to an enclosed postcard to be mailed to the researcher. A separate postcard for the request of the survey results was used rather than using a space on the questionnaire for the respondent's name and address. The intent of providing a postage paid postcard for the respondent's use was another way of providing evidence to the respondent that the survey was important and their participation was meaningful. The use of the separate postcard also demonstrated the researcher's sincerity about confidentiality.

Six weeks after the survey instrument was sent by first-class mail, approximately 40% of the survey instruments were returned. Although the number of returns were respectable, an attempt was made to increase the return of additional questionnaires. A follow-up mailing was sent during the 6th week to the entire sample group. The letter in the second mailing acknowledged the researcher's appreciation for the many returned questionnaires. There was also a statement of regret for not being able to be more personal in the expression of thanks, but the anonymity of the returns precluded the opportunity. The main message in the cover letter was intended to encourage the completion and return of the survey instrument. Another set of questionnaire and business reply envelope were enclosed in this second mailout package.

After both the first and second mailing, any returned questionnaires were immediately opened, assigned an identification
number, and scanned for results or unusual messages (Babbie, 1983). The response after the second mailing increased the number of completed questionnaires to 105. A total of 52% of the population chose to participate in this study.
CHAPTER VII

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

One hundred five of the 203 members of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars returned their questionnaires (a 52% response rate). The respondent group was comprised of 47 (54.3%) men and 46 (43.8%) women. Two additional respondents did not classify their gender. For a study which was focusing on issues of scholarly activity and development, an appropriately well educated group answered the questionnaire. In fact, 64 (61%) of the respondents held doctorates. Twenty-five (23.8%) held a Master's degree and 9 (8.6%) held a Bachelor's degree. The remaining 7 (6.7%) held other types of degrees or credentials. More than one-half of the group (56, 53%) earned their highest degree at least 11 years ago and another 27 (25.7%) received their highest earned degree between 6 and 7 years ago. Based on the number of years since earning their degrees, this group of respondents can be considered well-educated and experienced in the work place.

Regarding the work place and job roles, the greatest number of respondents, 48 (45.8%) identified themselves as a faculty member: 30 (28.6%) full-time tenured, 13 (12.4%) full-time nontenured, 3 (2.9%) part-time tenured, and 2 (1.9%) part-time nontenured. Fifteen (14.3%) reported their primary role as
executive director of a nonprofit organization, while 6 (5.7%) were consultants. Twelve (11.4%) of the respondents indicated that their positions combined different job settings and the balance of 24 (22.9%) did not adequately describe their positions.

Overall, they possess a practical and useful experience base which adds an important dimension to answering questions about the development of an academic discipline. Ninety-three (88.6%) claimed professional experience in the dissemination of knowledge and/or skills, and only 12 did not report any direct experiences as either a teacher at a university/college or as workshop/seminar trainer. Furthermore, 80 (76.2%) of the respondents had prior experience or are now engaged in the process of research activity about nonprofit management or about issues related to the nonprofit sector.

Another dimension of expertise for answering the study questions came from the insights of the respondents or to their experiences as nonprofit board members. All but 15 (14.3%) did not report experience serving on a nonprofit organization board of directors, and 71 (67.6%) of the sample served in the capacity of an officer of the board (as President, Vice-President, Secretary, or Treasurer).

Responding to Section A of the questionnaire, the respondents reported some interesting and insightful answers to questions concerning their beliefs about the present stage of development of the academic disciplines of nonprofit management. Eighty-three
(or 79%) indicated that the academic discipline is in a developing stage. This compares to 20 respondents (19%) who do not think that the discipline even exists. These doubters include 9 of the full-time faculty members and 11 practitioners. Only 1 person (a practitioner) thought the discipline was well developed, and 1 (a faculty member) also chose not to answer the question.

Those respondents indicating a belief that the discipline is in a developing stage or well developed, were also asked to select the degree to which five elements are present in the discipline. The elements under consideration were ones described by King and Brownell (1966) as partial indicators of the presence or development of an academic discipline. The elements include: a specialized language; a scholarly community; underlying principles or concepts; a tradition/history; and, a distinct mode of inquiry (a method of moving raw data to conclusions).

To describe the level of presence of these five elements, a Likert type scale ranging from 1 to 5 was used: the greatest presence of the element was signified by a number 1 and the greatest absence of the element was signified by a number 5. For scoring purposes, the number 1 equaled "a clear presence"; the number 2 was equivalent to "present"; number 3 was represented as "unsure"; number 4 was equivalent to "absent"; and the number 5 indicated a "clear absence."

An interesting variation of opinions existed regarding the elements under consideration. Only 19 (18.1%) respondents thought
that there was some degree of presence (4 indicated a clear presence) of a specialized language, while 27 (25.7%) indicated the absence (6 indicated a clear absence) of a specialized language. Almost one-third of the respondents (33, 31.4%) were unsure. Seven individuals chose not to take a position on this particular question, and another 19 were asked to skip this set of questions because of their earlier response which revealed that they did not believe a discipline currently exists at any level.

Oddly, as members of an Association whose mission and organizational title imply the existence of a scholarly community,* their response about the presence of a scholarly community revealed a somewhat surprising and almost inconsistent position. Only 27

---

*Some individuals may take exception to my wonderment about the response to the survey question on the presence of a scholarly community. In fact, in an interview I conducted with voluntary action expert, Ivan Scheier, Dr. Scheier stressed the point that some individuals practicing volunteer administration may view their activities as related but distinct from the nonprofit organization management field. Dr. Scheier suggested, however, that the professionalization of the practice of nonprofit management should be of benefit to volunteer administrators and others practicing in the sector. Also, in correspondence with Jon Van Til, Dr. Van Til made the point that voluntary action is not equivalent to nonprofit organization management. Therefore, while voluntary action activities may comprise nonprofit organization management activities, not all voluntary action professionals may view themselves as part of the emerging professional nonprofit organization management field. This may explain why some respondents were negative or may have been reticent in responding affirmatively to the survey question about recognizing a scholarly community. However, I am still struck with the point that the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars does state that it is an "inter-disciplinary and inter-professional association" of scholars and professionals and, therefore, I anticipated that more of the AVAS membership would see an overlap and a "fit" between their interest areas and that of a scholarly community of nonprofit organization management.
(25.7%) respondents indicated the presence of a scholarly community within the academic discipline of nonprofit management. Almost one-third (32, 30.5%) of the group were unsure, while 23 (21.9%) indicated that a scholarly community was not present (17 absent, 6 clear absence). Four respondents did not report their thinking about this question.

The respondents were even more cautious about any indications of existing principles or concepts. Thirty-four percent (36 respondents) indicated uncertainty, while 22% indicated some degree of presence. An almost equal amount, 21%, thought that underlying principles were to some extent absent in the discipline. The position of the respondents about the presence of a tradition or history of the discipline was more in keeping with what would be expected of a group which has acknowledged that the discipline is in at least a developing stage. Thirty-five (33%) acknowledged a tradition, while 27 (25.7%) indicated that there was no presence of a tradition or history. Twenty respondents remained on the border of this question and answered "unsure."

The last of the elements under consideration concerned a distinct mode of inquiry (a method for moving raw data to conclusions). For a young profession and discipline that does not have a strong scientific and research tradition, it was hardly surprising that only three of the respondents indicated any presence at all of this element. Sixty-three (60%) indicated an absence of a distinct mode of inquiry. Seventeen (16.2%) of the respondents were unsure whether this element was either present or absent.
The fact that almost 8 out of 10 respondents believe that there is an evolving discipline of nonprofit management sheds an important light on the findings about the presence of these critical 5 elements. The high degree to which the respondents demonstrated either uncertainty or indicated an absence of these elements, while believing there is a discipline, clearly reflects that this is an inchoative discipline. As a discipline in its rudimentary stages, the respondents reported that (excepting its progress in developing a research methodology), the profession has, indeed, made important developmental inroads.

As with other academic disciplines in their infancy stages, a knowledge base for the discipline of nonprofit management was influenced by other fields of study. Consistent with the historical dimensions of this discipline, 27 (25.7%) of the respondents indicated that the field of Business Management was the most influential of the related fields for contributing a base of knowledge. The field of Public Administration closely followed in the opinion of 22 (21%) of the respondents who believe that the dimensions of public sector study were most influential. Interestingly, 16 (15.2%) indicated that the field of social work was the primary field which influenced the base of knowledge of the nonprofit management discipline. Perhaps the nonprofit sector emphasis on volunteerism and charitable giving would explain the partiality towards the field of social work. Additionally, 16 (15.2%) respondents did not think only one field should be given
the major credit; instead, combinations of business management, public administration, social work, and other fields were reported to be influential by this group.

Selecting an appropriate place to "house" a new program of study could become a controversial issue among a faculty within a university or college. The best place to house a degree program in nonprofit management will probably not escape the hazards of institutional debate. Thirty-one (29.5%) of the respondents reported a definite preference for either a department or school of public administration. Interestingly, the preference for public administration also reflects the trend among a number of public administration programs which are currently planning to expand their programs to include a concentration area in (non-governmental) nonprofit organization management (see Chapter IV).

To fuel the debate over housing a nonprofit degree program, 26 (24.8%) of the respondents reported a preference for schools or departments of business management. Interestingly, 17 (16.2%) reported that nonprofit management should have its own separate department.

Accreditation is often thought to be an essential part of creating uniform learning standards, for monitoring the quality of academic degree programs, and for establishing educational requirements necessary for practicing within a profession. Yet, when respondents were asked to indicate how important the establishment of a national certifying body would be for the
development and monitoring of standards in academic programs in nonprofit management, there was some agreement but not the overwhelming mandate that was anticipated. In fact, 48 (45.7%) reported some level of agreement that a certifying body would be critically important to the development of the discipline, while 39 (37.1%) of the respondents disagreed about its importance.

In light of the value that academic institutions place on credentials and accreditation, it was most surprising that it was the nonfaculty respondents who more often favored the idea of a standard setting and monitoring body. Twenty-eight nonfaculty types supported the idea, while only 20 of the 48 faculty members in this sample supported the idea of a certifying body. Of the balance of the faculty respondents, 18 were flatly against the idea and 10 were undecided. It was not clear from the respondents who opposed a certifying body whether their negative opinions have been shaped by their experiences with certifying institutions, or whether the question of timing was at all an issue in their consideration of a current need for this type of regulatory organization. The fact that practitioners favored the idea, however, may suggest that those practicing in the field see more of the abuses in the practice arena and, therefore, would be inclined to support an institution which could promote uniformity in standards of practice and knowledge-building.

One of the more critical components of an academic discipline is the scholarly contributions that are made to the knowledge base of the profession. In order to learn more about this
area, the respondents were asked to identify the most important authors, journals, and books in the field. With 51 different author names mentioned by the respondents, it might be that some of the respondents listed their favorite author, rather than the most important (see Appendix B). Interestingly, Marlene Wilson and Brian O'Connell received the most "votes" (18 and 10, respectively). Both have contributed much to the nonprofit sector's literature on working with volunteers and have their roots in the practice field. Many of the current academics in the field received a scattering of votes of recognition. The fact that there is not a "leading" author on the mind of most respondents is not surprising given the newness of formal education. Over time, as more courses are taught and the names of authors appear on curriculum bibliographies, there will be a greater name recognition and identification of leading authors.

The number of book titles that were generated by the respondents was also quite remarkable. With no one book being mentioned more than 5 times among the 49 different titles that were listed, the field has not yet agreed on its most important tests. On the other hand, there was much more consistency of choice among the respondents about their preferences for journals which they "consistently read for articles on nonprofit management." The Journal of Voluntary Action Research was clearly the preferred choice among 55 (52%) of the respondents. The Journal of Volunteer Administration and Voluntary Action Leadership were also
favored journals when seeking information about nonprofit management (16, 15%; and 10, 10%, respectively). At least 15 other periodicals were mentioned by the group, but no other journal was mentioned by at least 10% of the respondents (see Appendix C).

The development of an appropriate curriculum is one of the most important considerations and challenging tasks for any educational institution (McNeil, 1981). Since the development or design of a formal plan of study in nonprofit organization management is relatively new to universities and college, steps were taken to use the collective wisdom of this study group for some curriculum planning activity. In an attempt to determine the ideal subject matter that should be stressed in a graduate, master's degree program, the respondents were asked to detail the level of importance of certain course topics that are likely to be offered in a plan of graduate study. In addition, they were asked to rank the three most important courses which they believe would be central or core to a nonprofit management curriculum.

For purposes of indicating the level of importance of certain courses in a plan of study, the respondents were asked to circle 1 of 5 possible numbers which were representative of their beliefs: the number 1 represented the least important choice in a plan of study and the number 5 represented the most important. According to the respondents' selections, as highlighted in Table 7.1, certain courses were clearly more important in a plan of study than others. Six of the 18 courses, for example,
Table 7.1

Importance of Eighteen Possible Nonprofit Management Courses in a Graduate Program Plan of Study: Number of Votes Cast\(^a\) and Ranked by Weighted Scores\(^b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Weighted Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N = 105, Row totals will not always add to 105, where some respondents chose not to answer the question.

\(^b\)Ranked by descending order of importance based on weighted scores closest to $\#5$. 
received at least an indication of being "most important" to a plan of study by at least 45 or more respondents: Financial Management, Resource Development, Planning, Volunteer Management, Human Resource Management, and Program Evaluation.

In addition, when tallying the number of times that either a "very important" (number 4) and "most important" (number 5) were cast for a particular course, three courses were selected by 85 or more respondents as important to a plan of study: Resource Development, Planning, and Program Evaluation. However, when the courses are ranked by weighted scores, then Resource Development, Program Evaluation and Voluntary Management are among the top 3 selections.

Although the role of a board of directors is one of the important distinguishing features of a nonprofit organization, the respondents nonetheless chose a separate course on Governance (the work of the board of directors) as "most important" in only 30 cases. (It may be that some of the respondents were of the opinion that issues of governance would be covered in courses related to leadership and volunteer management.) Of all the courses that were presented to the respondents, Nonprofit Organization History appeared to have the least appeal among the group.

When asked to rank the 3 courses that would be central to the development of a nonprofit management curriculum, Volunteer Management was selected by 14 (13%) respondents as their number one choice. However, when adding the number of times that a course
was ranked first, second or third, Human Resource Management received a total of 30 votes, and both the Volunteer Management and Resource Development was selected 29 times among the top 3 choices (as shown in Table 7.2).

Table 7.2

Three Most Important Courses Central to a Nonprofit Management Curriculum: By Most Votes Cast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum developers must be selective about educational goals and objectives and must have a clear idea of what they expect the student to ultimately learn (Tyler, 1949). As a growing discipline, the field of nonprofit management will also be challenged to decide upon objectives of education and the characteristics of the educational experience. In short, the question of how much "science" versus how much "art" is a matter of judgment that cannot escape the curriculum decision makers. Forty (38.1%) of the respondents identified science (principles) as the content area which should be stressed by a nonprofit management curriculum which prepares the individuals for the professional practice of nonprofit management. Only 6 (5.7%)
thought that art should be stressed. While the selection of either one or the other, science or art, is a legitimate consideration, 45 (42.9%) of the respondents urged the blending of both the practical and scientific approaches. Male respondents (28, 49%) were more inclined to stress science than the female respondents (11, 24%), and the female respondents favored a curriculum which stressed both science and art (54% of the females versus 35% of the male respondents).

While it would be intriguing to spell out a curriculum guided by the respondents, the intent in undertaking this survey was also to learn more about current programs and existing courses on nonprofit management. However, since universities and colleges are only now beginning to pay attention to the curriculum needs of the nonprofit sector, it was not expected that a large segment of the respondents would be in a position to address questions that comprised Section C of the questionnaire (which is described in the Research Methods chapter). Those 44 members of the sample group who are affiliated with a university or college which offered coursework in nonprofit management were asked to share information about the academic program.

The data reveal that 23 (21.9%) of the respondents are affiliated with a university or college which has integrated nonprofit management into the curriculum plan, including stated goals and objectives. Another 21 (20%) indicated that they were
affiliated with a program which has coursework in nonprofit management, but no written curriculum plans. Since there is more recent interest in the discipline it was not altogether surprising to learn that 11 educational programs have only started teaching nonprofit related courses within the past 5 years, while 12 reported that courses have been offered for only the last 10 years or more.

Considering that a nonprofit discipline is being shaped by individuals with backgrounds from varied professional fields, the research investigated which departments among the 44 respondents had primary responsibility for teaching nonprofit management courses. There was a lower incidence of courses being taught by departments or schools of Business (3, 7%) compared to the 10 (22.7%) reports of Public Administration departments/schools which have responsibility. The range of departments/schools which have primary administrative responsibility for the teaching of nonprofit courses was identified by 77% of this subgroup and is highlighted in Table 7.3. Although there is a wide diversity of interdisciplinary interest in the field, there may be a downside. The varied participation across different professional departments may make obtaining agreement on matters of the field's direction or for shaping a universally acceptable curriculum a difficult task. Finally, one other interesting trend for which there is no clear explanation concerns the type of institution which houses the departments or schools which are teaching courses in nonprofit management. Almost 75% of the institutions were publicly funded, while only 25% were privately funded.
Table 7.3

Departments/Schools With Primary Responsibility for Teaching Nonprofit Management Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/School</th>
<th>Number (N=44)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Consumer Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Departments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Departments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentage column may exceed 100% due to rounding.

Since the introduction of nonprofit management coursework is relatively new to institutions of higher learning, steps were taken to learn which nonprofit management courses were being taught. As indicated in Table 7.4, Financial Management and Program Evaluation were the courses which were most frequently offered, although they were not among the top three courses (see Table 7.2) thought by the respondents to be central to a curriculum plan. Both courses did rank highly, however, as important to a plan of study (see Table 7.1).
Table 7.4

Subjects Taught as Separate Nonprofit Management Courses: Reported by 44 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Times Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tools</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Law</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Given the level of anonymity provided by the research method employed, reports about the same institution are unrecognizable.

Since universities and colleges have only recently begun to offer graduate education in nonprofit management, the task of selecting an adequate faculty, with appropriate academic credentials, may not be an easy one. A closer look at the respondents who were answering this segment of the questionnaire seemed in
order. Forty-one of this sample group reported their present academic rank: 11 were full professors, 11 were associate professors, 6 had an assistant professor ranking, while 1 was a lecturer, 7 were adjunct faculty, and 5 reported no current academic rank.

Although several different departments were reported to have administrative responsibility for the delivery of nonprofit coursework (see Table 7.3), this group of teachers may or may not belong to those departments. In fact, some members of this sample group reported their primary association was with different departments from the department with administrative responsibility (as reported in Table 7.5). The fact that some faculty members are not primarily affiliated with the department which has administrative responsibility for the delivery of courses is a relatively important fact. This difference suggests that institutions are relying on faculty members from outside their discipline to assist in fulfilling departmental/school responsibilities. This activity represents an interdisciplinary approach to teaching nonprofit courses which has been suggested by some to be the best method of instruction for the nonprofit field (McAdam, 1986a).

The selection of elective course topics are generally left to a department faculty and the balance of core versus elective courses are usually decided in the context of the curriculum philosophy of the institution or department/school. The respondents reported the number of existing core and elective courses in
Table 7.5

Number of Departments in Which the Respondent Has Teaching Responsibility Versus Number of Departments with Administrative Responsibility for the Delivery of Nonprofit Management Courses (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Departments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addition to identifying whether they have responsibility for teaching a course, as identified in Table 7.6.

Table 7.6

Identification of Teaching Responsibility, and Number of Core and/or Elective Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of NPOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=44

Institutions of higher learning are not likely to commit many new resources to teaching nonprofit courses unless they want to pioneer a new curriculum effort, or, at least, until they see that there is a market of tuition-paying students. Given these
limitations, the level of teaching support among faculty can influence the type of degree programs that are offered, in addition to impacting the enrollments of students and, overall, the type of learning experience that will be provided to them. This group reported that both full-time faculty and part-time faculty are being used to support the delivery of nonprofit coursework. It is not surprising that the number of full-time faculty is almost double that of part-time teaching personnel, even if new faculty are not being hired for purposes of teaching nonprofit courses. Full-time faculty can self-select themselves as educators into the nonprofit arena (O'Neill & Young, 1986).

The extent to which students can have a learning experience in nonprofit management does not seem to be function of their enrollment status or their career experience. The students that attend these programs are split almost evenly between entry level students and mid-career professionals. There is also no clear trend as to whether students attend on a full-time basis or on a part-time basis. More than half of the respondents in this group (24, 54.5%) report that students can supplement their in-class activities with an internship experience in a nonprofit organization. Furthermore, some of the programs offer a major and minor field of study in nonprofit management, although it is unclear whether the specialization is in a subfield (such as health, social work, the arts, etc.) or specifically in the practice of nonprofit management. There was one report of a major leading to
a Bachelor's degree; seven offered a major leading to a Master's
degree; and, three reported that their institution offered both
Bachelor's and Master's degrees with a concentration in nonprofit
management. Three respondents reported the availability of a
minor field of study in nonprofit management leading to a degree
at the Master's level. Two indicated that a minor concentration
was available at both the Bachelor's and Master's level. Two
individuals also reported that it was possible to earn a doctoral
degree within their department. One of these individuals also
reported that it was possible to have a minor field of study at
every degree level (Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral) in their
institution. Finally, six individuals reported the availability
of a nondegree certificate program in nonprofit management.

Conclusion

This study does not indicate that a large number of institu­
tions and faculty are involved in the development and delivery
of nonprofit management courses and degree programs, but this was
not expected. There is strong evidence that academic programs do
exist and students are indeed demonstrating their interest by
enrolling as part-time and full-time students.

Obviously, there are no easy answers to questions about the
type of knowledge and skills that should be taught in profes­
sional education programs, or whether its emphasis should be on
science or art. Yet, this group of respondents have examined
these issues and suggest some definitive answers. As a group, they have expressed interest in the development of practice principles and have some ideas about which courses are most important to a plan of study and which are central to a core non-profit management curriculum. In addition to their recommendations, a subset of this sample have told us what core and elective courses are currently being offered in the institutions in which they are employed.

While some may want to challenge the suggestions and opinions of this sample group, it will be extremely difficult to dismiss the relative importance of their answers, since this is the first time that a study with this focus and scope has been instituted. Hopefully, the findings will be useful for developing, if not enhancing, dialogues about curriculum needs and other scholarly requirements for advancing this developing discipline. It is also hoped that the findings will encourage others to begin exploring research avenues for filling voids in the knowledge base of a young, but dynamic, academic discipline of nonprofit management.
CHAPTER VIII

THE FUTURE

The evidence seems clear: The discipline of nonprofit organization management is progressing through evolutionary stages, but it has not yet fully arrived. While the future of nonprofit organization management is open to prediction, its historical and contemporary trails have carved a certain developmental path which is leading it closer to fulfilling the essential definitions of a profession. As a part of this process, a body of organized knowledge is being formed and institutions of higher learning are advancing degree and nondegree educational programs to disseminate that body of knowledge. Indeed, for the field of nonprofit organization management to become a recognizable academic discipline, it is of paramount importance that the prerequisites of a profession be met and a knowledge base defined.

In many ways, the challenges that are faced by this emerging discipline are not new ones; they parallel the activities of earlier discipline pioneers. Over 20 years ago, for example, Harriett Bartlett (1970) raised an appropriate question for the "profession-building" field of social work. Bartlett's insightful query about the need for coordinating a deliberate self-examination and movement toward intellectual solutions has
meaningful applicability for today's field of nonprofit organization management:

How to engage itself to deal effectively with its great but unrealized potential is perhaps the most important single decision before the profession at this time. (Bartlett, 1970, p. 16)

Bartlett was sagacious in her response and her advice may become a timeless answer for many of the newer professions, like the field of nonprofit organization management, which are in pursuit of intellectual change and integrative thinking. Put simply, Bartlett (1970) stated, "practice and education work together" (p. 18). Clearly, how the practice world and the academic world perceive their mutual goals and how they view forward movement, growth, and opportunities will largely determine the speed in which the profession unfolds and how the academic discipline is shaped.

How the profession's practitioners and academicians will go about organizing the field's next course of action is still to be determined. While there may not be one single route to success or one "correct" answer about the future direction for the academic discipline of nonprofit management, it does seem quite reasonable that practitioners and scholars need to collaborate. Indeed, channels of communication need to be open between scholars and practitioners, scholars to scholars, and practitioners to practitioners to discuss the issues of professionalism and the field's intellectual growth. Since it is the goal of this chapter to assist in opening the doors for a beginning examination, exploration,
and discussion of the future of the discipline of nonprofit organization management, it seems appropriate to start with three issue areas which emerged out of the survey and overall study:

1. What are the scholars and practitioners presently thinking about the future direction of the discipline?

2. What scholarly activity is required to further enhance the developmental progress of this emerging discipline?

3. What career paths may result from an academic discipline of nonprofit organization management?

What Are the Scholars/Practitioners Thinking About the Future?

Crystal ball gazing is not the typical assignment for a population of test-takers. Nevertheless, the final question posed to the survey group did ask them to consider what direction they anticipated for the academic discipline of nonprofit organization management. Because the survey group did not have the benefit of reading the chapters on the history of the discipline or its contemporary issues, their answers depended more on their own knowledge of past and present circumstances and what they hoped would happen. Writing on "A Future For Social Work Education," Max Siporin (1984) explained eloquently the limitations of this type of forecasting when he stated:

Predictions for the future can be valid only for some small areas of life, for the short term, and must be hedged by conditional, probability qualifications. Predictions often represent our wishes, hopes, and promises; they are set forth in the hope or faith that
they will be self-fulfilling prophecies. Looking toward the future thus enables a proactive stance and a will, preparation, and action to accomplish valued purposes and desires. (p. 237)

The 63% of the respondents who provided an answer to the open-ended question about the future direction of the discipline had their opinions categorized into one of three areas: supportive, cautious, or against the idea of a discipline of nonprofit organization management (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1

Respondents' Expressions of the Future of an Academic Discipline of Nonprofit Organization Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expression</th>
<th>Number (N=66)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondent answers ranged in depth from concise statements of strong support, milder statements of interest, and a general resolve that a discipline will evolve. Three representative examples follow:

Allied with volunteerism, community development and citizen participation, it has a strong future.

It is a developing area, becoming more important all the time.

A slow general evolution strongly influenced by traditional academic models with minimal innovation or non-traditional features.
Some respondents indicated a supportive position, but also recognized some of the critical issues that the field may encounter:

There needs to be more specific guidelines for curriculum development; sharing among institutions of program ideas and developments . . .

[There needs to be] more consolidation and agreement on what is needed.

An uncertain, unfocused direction that will gradually pull from related streams those portions of information that are/can be applied to the nonprofit/voluntary sector . . .

Some of the respondents predict there will be contextual constraints such as issues of competition:

Steady development, more focus, more specific courses and better borrowing from other disciplines. [There will be] more competition as additional Schools develop degree programs.

Universities have spotted a new income source. Initially, there will be tension between practitioners and [those] faculty who only know theory without real-life practice. After that stage, nonprofit management will mature as a discipline.

Some respondents expressed some cautionary notes in their response to the question about the future direction of the discipline of nonprofit organization management. Their predications included certain caveats that must be fulfilled or changed in order to assure future success. The following two statements are representative of the cautionary response:

Given the decrease in federal funds, I'm not sure that colleges, universities, etc., could bear the cost of engaging in a new field singularly. Without federal support, there does not appear to be much chance for a new discipline to emerge.
I believe there's a need for a more academic approach. However, given the low pay, status, and "women's work" nature of volunteerism, I am less than enthusiastic this will be achieved.

A small number of respondents chose not to offer a prediction, but offered, instead, their opinion about the limited need or desirability for a nonprofit management discipline. A representative example of this type of response is as follows:

Frankly, I don't see a need for a separate department, but a few nonprofit courses offered in a business school or school of public administration would probably be a good idea ...

I question if it can ever be an independent field. People who want to manage can get an MBA from a good school and supplement it with specialized courses and seminars ...

What have we learned from the respondents? The importance of reviewing the respondents' opinions is to see if there is a definite trend in their thinking about the future direction of the discipline. In fact, there appears to be a dominant expression of interest and need for a discipline. Several of the respondents, for example, advocated on behalf of the need for a common base of understanding and a common focus. Some of the respondents referred directly to the idea of a framework for integrating knowledge, practice, and professional values into an educational force, while many spoke of the product of the process, i.e., courses and degree programs. The academic and practitioner respondents also recognized the responsibility of the field to move forward, albeit deliberately, to acquire understanding between the practice field and the academic arena in order to shape the discipline.
The evolution of disciplinary activity in nonprofit management can be traced, as we have seen, to a long history of eleemosynary activity. With roots in volunteerism and philanthropy, the field was naturally set apart from the practices of management in the public sector and the private-for-profit sector. A unique system of formalizing private activities for the public good has become a relevant feature of the American economy.

With the advent of the nonprofit corporation, a special form of management and governance practice also emerged. Over time, the experiences of nonprofit managers and boards of directors determined the necessity to create methods and structures for effective and pragmatic approaches to the stewardship of a nonprofit organization. Additionally, the increasing number of nonprofit tax-exempt organizations has given rise to practical and theoretical questions such as the impact of the nonprofit organization on America’s economy, its ability to fulfill a social agenda, and the incentives and fairness of tax exemption.

Another corresponding measure of the field’s development was the significant increase of books, research papers, and training programs which emerged to address the concerns of practitioners and policy makers. More recently, there has been an expansion in the number of academic programs and university sponsored research centers which have been developed to increase the understanding of
the nonprofit sector and its specialized management needs. Following on the heels of this evolutionary progress, the question now is what more needs to be accomplished to fuel and enhance the further development of an academic discipline? Two answers seem to stand out: (a) more research and publications are required, and (b) a schedule of ongoing conferences to address professional practice issues and curricular needs of the field.

Research and Publication

There can be no greater gain among an emerging academic discipline than ongoing development of its knowledge base and the sharing of new theories and research findings. Research and publication activities are both vital components for enriching a profession and they are tasks that are expected of an academic discipline. In fact, the vitality of the profession and the depth of the academic discipline will, in large measure, be gauged by the intellectual pursuits of its members and the ability of these nonprofit professionals to exchange ideas and information. Traditionally, professions have found that research activity is the vehicle for discovering new ideas, confirming old ideas, or for building on to an existing and accepted knowledge base (Kuhn, 1962). It is time for the field to begin charting its traditions.

Similarly, professional writings or publication is the vehicle for sharing research results which enriches a profession by exchanging or challenging technical information and findings.
Although it may be an unwritten rule, there is a deep-seated code among practitioners and academicians to share ideas in writing.

On this matter of being obliged to write, Williams and Hopps (1987) observe that the activity of publishing or "Going public" is expected as a sign of professional maturity. This perception is grounded in a shared belief among the learned and professional bodies that professional experiences and knowledge derived from such experiences should be shared with other professionals and the laity. (p. 373)

There is evidence that more writing and research activity is in progress in the nonprofit sector (Independent Sector, 1986a). Despite the evidence of increased scholarly activity, the profession needs to provide a framework or some incentive system for assuring itself that practitioners and academicians will continue to engage in research and publication. The solution may require, at least, three component parts: increased funding, integrating the "value" of knowledge-building into the professional community, and determining the appropriate role for professional membership organizations and academic institutions.

The first effort is to educate the funding community about the need to finance research activity. The funding community supports much of the program activity in the nonprofit sector but it has done little in the way of underwriting research tasks and publication efforts. In fact, most of the research activity, as reported by the survey respondents, is being self-financed. While self-financed research activity demonstrates a commitment to knowledge development, relying on one's own funds also limits research
capabilities. In addition, it is important that a research agenda not be stunted by the constraints of a researcher's ability to finance their own research activity. Improvements in the area of funding research is necessary for assuring that research activity is continuous and its results are made available to the profession.

A second part of the solution is for the profession's members to impart to its students the attitude and obligation of adding to the knowledge base of the profession. Through a process of socialization or acculturation to the profession's values, students can learn to appreciate their responsibility to continue developing and sharing knowledge. Williams and Hoppe (1987) state the position this way:

The mature profession is dependent on a membership of equally mature practicing professionals, who have, in turn, achieved in their careers autonomy or self-directed practice guided by objective knowledge, rigorously gained from available sources of information in state-of-the-art practice. (p. 373)

Imparting the values and expectations of the profession to students is also an appropriate curriculum policy for institutions of higher learning. The curriculum should be structured to advance the ideals of the profession. Students should be provided with a model for thinking about the professional's role and responsibility to advance the profession and discipline through addressing the changing nature of nonprofit management practice and generating new knowledge. In this way, as students engage in the practice of nonprofit management, they will also be cognitive of
their role to contribute to the development of the profession through journal articles, books, and papers at professional symposia.

The third component part of the solution also involves the professional organizations and universities. The professional membership organizations have a responsibility to examine the appropriate role they should play in influencing their members to shape the knowledge base of the field. One major outlet or resource for information sharing that is typically the domain of a professional organization is a journal. There is a need for more journals in the field. However, a journal need not be an organ of a professional society. Instead, universities and colleges also have a responsibility to examine their ability to sponsor journals or other publication series which can promote the goals of research and publication. The university/college has a responsibility for fostering a climate that encourages research and publication that is usable for the profession (Schilling, Schinke, & Gilchrist, 1985).

**Professional Symposia**

Professional conferences are another outlet for reporting research activity and practice advancement. Indeed, both the Independent Sector and the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars have provided forums for the presentation of scholarly research work and practice issues. This type of meeting activity
needs to continue and invitations to submit papers or conference brochures announcing the programs should be more widely circulated among the nonprofit sector.

Besides serving as a conduit for sharing ideas, a conference could play a more important role in setting the profession's future agenda and encouraging the development of its academic discipline. Conference planning should be used like a strategic planning tool, to help set long-term direction for the profession, and to provide the steps for positioning the profession/academic discipline into the future. This type of planning requires the conference planners to have leadership qualities and a shared vision for the profession. Identifying individuals who can participate as conference/long-term planners is really not a difficult assignment. Some individuals seem to, naturally, rise to this level of position and responsibility through their research and writing activities and involvement in professional affairs. Additionally, the products of these conferences, such as articles and books, require more publicity, especially if they are intended to shape and provide direction for the profession. These materials are the foundation for an ongoing professional dialogue and the basis for building new knowledge.

**Career Paths**

One of the features of an academic discipline is to provide a course of study for improving one's level of knowledge, skill, and abilities, in order to provide the basis for a productive
career. Professional identities are also shaped by the rigor of study and the values that are transmitted from educator to student. Besides fulfilling a thirst for knowledge and skill, there is usually an expectation that professional education will improve an individual's opportunities in the work place or more competitive positioning in the larger (non-profit sector) work force.

Professional education mixed with professional experiences not only increases occupational opportunities, it also forces individuals to face career decisions about their own direction within the field. Len Tierney (1982) recognized this as the choice of either "Going the academic track" or "Going the practice track" (p. 231). The choices, however, may be more varied. In fact, Wolf's (1982) three concepts of "the academic cluster, a field speciality, and an organizational cluster" (p. 130) can be extrapolated to fit the career paths of individuals who undertake professional education and training in nonprofit organization management.

The academic cluster is a career path represented by teaching, research, and writing activity. This career theme is characterized as a scholarly position situated in a university/college setting. The individual would be in a position to shape or influence the thinking of students in the field, but is not likely to engage in the direct practice of nonprofit management.

The field speciality is a career cluster represented by a specialized practice in nonprofit management. Individuals in this
group would stand out for their abilities in a particular skill area or their commitment to working in a practice arena. In the skill area, the individual would possess an expertise in one or more nonprofit management abilities such as financial management, governance, strategic planning, or resource development, among others. The practice arena would place this individual in one of the "subsectors" of the nonprofit sector such as human services, arts, religion, education, etc. Because this career path is characterized by dominant strength in a focused area, the individual might also have the capacity to practice as a consultant, trainer, and serve as a valuable board member.

The organizational cluster can be described as a career path within an organization. A person selecting this option may serve in various management capacities within the same organization. This individual may, over time, be employed as a supervisor, program manager, associate director, and, perhaps, eventually serve as the chief executive officer (as president or executive director). Career choices for this individual may also vary if the agency has various branches, divisions, or a regional or national headquarters. Furthermore, this cluster of opportunities may be represented by a career path which provides longevity (from employment to retirement) within an organization.

A mutually reinforcing relationship may develop between an academic discipline, educational opportunities, and career opportunities. And as graduate educational opportunities expand, there
may also emerge an extended demand for a work force of managers who have professional training and education in nonprofit management. Such increasing demand for professional education programs in nonprofit management would also increase, of course, the demand for teaching faculty.

The need to attract competent and effective nonprofit managers and leaders into nonprofit career paths is another challenge that the nonprofit sector must face. Commenting in the foreword of McAdam's (1986b) book on Careers in the Nonprofit Sector, Brian O'Connell states that the nonprofit sector is the only one of the three sectors that does not yet invest heavily in the development of future leadership. We are so scattered and so preoccupied with immediate human needs and aspirations that almost no one has the time, money, and responsibility to attend to the fundamentals of future effectiveness. (McAdam, 1986b, p. xii)

The need for an academic discipline, increased professionalism, and effective leadership is at the heart of the challenge. According to John Gardner (1961):

The transformation of technology and the intricacies of modern social organization have given us a society more complex and baffling than ever before. And before us is the prospect of having to guide it through changes more ominous than we have known. This will require the wisest possible leadership. But it will also require the competence on the part of individuals at every level of our society. (p. 159)

To respond effectively to the increasing complexities and challenges that are faced by a technologically advancing American society, the nonprofit sector now needs its own brand of managers: professionally educated, competent, and sophisticated. To
accomplish this end, the emerging profession and academic discipline of nonprofit organization management must concentrate its efforts on identifying its leaders, coordinate and establish a research agenda and move the profession and its knowledge-building discipline forward.

Because of the vital contributions that the nonprofit sector makes to America, it is in the best interest of society that the emerging academic discipline of nonprofit management be advanced. As Brian O'Connell so correctly observes,

America needs to tend to its third sector, and the sector needs to be building for its next level of contribution. (McAdam, 1986b, p. xiii)
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
The purpose of this questionnaire is to assess the beliefs of identified scholars/researchers/academicians regarding the level of scholarly activity, development, and direction in the field of nonprofit organization management.

SECTION A.
This section concerns your beliefs about the academic discipline of nonprofit organization management.

1. Please circle the statement (a, b, or c) which closely reflects your belief about the state of the discipline of nonprofit organization management.
   a. THERE EXISTS A WELL DEVELOPED ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT.
   b. THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT IS IN A DEVELOPING STAGE.
   c. AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT DOES NOT CURRENTLY EXIST. (If 1c is your choice, then please skip questions 2 & 3.)

2. To what degree do you think the following elements are present in the discipline? (Circle a number 1-5 which reflects your closest belief. Number one would indicate a clear presence, number five a clear absence.)

   a. A SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE
   b. A SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY
   c. UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES OR CONCEPTS
   d. A TRADITION/HISTORY
   e. DISTINCT MODE OF INQUIRY
      (a method for moving raw data to conclusions)

3. The related field of study which has been the most influential in contributing a base of knowledge in the development of an academic discipline of nonprofit management is: (Circle number of your answer)
   1 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
   2 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
   3 SOCIAL WORK
   4 ECONOMICS
   5 LAW
   6 POLITICAL SCIENCE
   7 OTHER (Please specify)

4. A degree program in nonprofit management would be best housed in: (Circle number)
   1 ITS OWN SEPARATE DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL
   2 IN A BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL
   3 IN A PUBLIC AFFAIRS/ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL
   4 IN A SOCIAL WORK DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL
   5 OTHER (Please specify)

5. The establishment of a national certifying body to develop and monitor standards for academic degree programs in nonprofit management is critically important for the profession. (Circle number of your answer)
   1 STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2 MILDLY DISAGREE
   3 NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE
   4 MILDLY AGREE
   5 STRONGLY AGREE

6. The three most important authors in the field of nonprofit management are:
7. The three most important books in the field of nonprofit management are:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

8. The three journals that you consistently read for articles on nonprofit management are:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

9. If you were developing a graduate, masters level nonprofit curriculum from scratch, how important would the following semester/quarter length courses be in your plan of study. (Please indicate how important you feel the following subjects are by circling one of the responses for each subject)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>LEAST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKETING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC POLICY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT TOOLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY OF NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION LAW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILANTHROPY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM EVALUATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RELATIONS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (Please specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9a. Please go back to the previous list of courses in question #9, and rank the three most important courses that are central to a nonprofit organization management curriculum. Place a number 1 for your highest priority, then 2 and 3 in the spaces provided to the left of the courses that are listed.

10. It was once stated that in planning a professional education curriculum, one should avoid confusion of teaching tasks that can be learned on the job. A profession should base its techniques of operations on principles rather than upon rule-of-thumb procedures.

As a growing discipline, the field of nonprofit management will need to decide upon objectives of education and the characteristics of the educational experience. In short, we are left with the question of how much science and how much art.

In thinking about the content of knowledge and skill that must be attained to practice professionally as a nonprofit organization manager, please comment below on whether a curriculum should stress science (principles) or art (rule-of-thumb procedures).
11. Please circle the number(s) which most accurately reflects your current teaching/training role in nonprofit management.
   1. I AM CURRENTLY TEACHING AT A UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE.
   2. I AM NOT NOW, BUT IN THE PAST I TAUGHT AT A UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE.
   3. I AM CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN TRAINING SEMINARS OR WORKSHOPS WHICH ARE NOT AFFILIATED WITH A UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE SETTING.
   4. I AM NOT NOW, BUT IN THE PAST I LED TRAINING SEMINARS OR WORKSHOPS NOT AFFILIATED WITH A UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE.
   5. I HAVE NEVER TAUGHT COURSES.

12. Please circle the one situation which most accurately reflects your current research activity in nonprofit organization management.
   1. I AM NOT CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN A RESEARCH PROJECT BUT I WAS INVOLVED IN RESEARCH ACTIVITY DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS.
   2. I HAVE NOT PARTICIPATED IN RESEARCH ACTIVITY EITHER CURRENTLY OR IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS.
   3. I AM CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN A RESEARCH PROJECT WHICH IS FUNDED BY: (Circle letter)
      A. SELF-FINANCED
      B. FOUNDATION
      C. CORPORATION
      D. UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE
      E. GOVERNMENT
      F. OTHER (specify funding source) ____________________________
      G. COMBINATION OF ABOVE (circle letters of combination) A B C D E F

12a. The research I am engaged in addresses the following categories: (Check all that apply)

   - TAX POLICY
   - GOVERNMENT REGULATION
   - ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITIES
   - PROGRAM EVALUATION
   - FUND RAISING
   - PUBLIC-PRIVATE INITIATIVES
   - PHILANTHROPY
   - VOLUNTEERISM
   - INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
   - EDUCATION
   - OTHER (please specify) ____________________________

13. Employment status: (Circle number)
   1. AGENCY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
   2. FULL-TIME TENURED FACULTY
   3. FULL-TIME NONTENURED FACULTY
   4. PART-TIME TENURED FACULTY
   5. PART-TIME NONTENURED FACULTY
   6. SELF-EMPLOYED CONSULTANT
   7. OTHER (please specify) ____________________________

14. Your sex: (Circle number)
   1. MALE
   2. FEMALE
15. Highest earned degree: (Circle number)
   1 ASSOCIATE (or equivalent)
   2 BACHELORS (or other)
   3 MASTERS
   4 PROFESSIONAL OTHER THAN MASTERS (eg. MD, LLD)
   5 PhD, DPA, EdD or other DOCTORATE
   6 OTHER (please specify) ________________________________

16. How many years since you have earned your highest degree? (Circle number)
   1 5 YEARS OR LESS
   2 6 TO 10 YEARS
   3 11 TO 15 YEARS
   4 16 TO 20 YEARS
   5 MORE THAN 20 YEARS

17. I am a member of the following professional associations: (Check all that apply)
   □ ASSOCIATION OF VOLUNTARY ACTION SCHOLARS
   □ AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
   □ NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS
   □ AMERICAN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
   □ NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
   □ OTHER (please specify) ________________________________

18. How many articles have been published in refereed journals under your authorship (either alone or jointly) in the last ten years?
   ________________________________

19. How many books have been published under your authorship (either alone or jointly) in the last ten years?
   ________________________________

20. (Please complete) My areas of expertise in nonprofit organization management are: ________________________________
   ________________________________

21. Please circle the letter that represents your experience:
   a. IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS, I HAVE SERVED AS A BOARD MEMBER OF (please fill in number) ______ NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.
   b. I HAVE NOT SERVED ON A BOARD DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS.
   c. I HAVE NEVER SERVED ON A BOARD OF DIRECTORS. (If 21c is your choice, then please move on to Section C).

22. Please indicate the type(s) of organization that you served as a Board member. (Check all that apply)
   □ ASSOCIATION
   □ HUMAN SERVICES
   □ ARTS
   □ CIVIC
   □ EDUCATION
   □ RELIGIOUS
   □ HEALTH
   □ OTHER (please specify) ________________________________
23. Please indicate whether you had the experience of serving as an officer. (Check all that apply)
- [ ] PRESIDENT/CHAIR
- [ ] VICE-PRESIDENT
- [ ] TREASURER
- [ ] SECRETARY
- [ ] OTHER (please specify)

SECTION C.
The following statements are about the university/college educational program with which you are affiliated.

Questions #24-35 of this last section are to learn more about existing academic programs for individuals who are currently affiliated or employed by a university/college which has coursework in nonprofit management. If this section does not apply to you, then please skip to Section D.

24. The program has a written curriculum plan with stated educational goals and objectives about nonprofit management. (Circle number of your answer)
- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

25. Nonprofit courses have been taught in this program since 19 ___.

25a. Which department/school has primary administrative responsibility for the teaching of nonprofit courses?

25b. The institution is funded: (Check one)
- [ ] PUBLICLY
- [ ] PRIVATELY

26. The following subjects are covered as separate nonprofit management courses in the program: (Check all that apply)
- [ ] FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
- [ ] RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
- [ ] GOVERNANCE
- [ ] LEADERSHIP
- [ ] MARKETING
- [ ] PUBLIC POLICY
- [ ] MANAGEMENT TOOLS
- [ ] HISTORY OF NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT
- [ ] NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION LAW
- [ ] VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT
- [ ] ETHICS
- [ ] RESEARCH
- [ ] PHILANTHROPY
- [ ] PLANNING
- [ ] HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
- [ ] PUBLIC RELATIONS
- [ ] PROGRAM EVALUATION
- [ ] PUBLIC MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION
- [ ] OTHER (please specify)

27. Using the list from question #26 please indicate which courses you have responsibility for teaching. (Circle all that apply)
- [ ] a
- [ ] b
- [ ] c
- [ ] d
- [ ] e
- [ ] f
- [ ] g
- [ ] h
- [ ] i
- [ ] j
- [ ] k
- [ ] l
- [ ] m
- [ ] n
- [ ] o
- [ ] p
- [ ] q
- [ ] r
- [ ] s
- [ ] t
- [ ] u
28. Please indicate the number of faculty in your department that are teaching nonprofit courses.

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME FACULTY ______
NUMBER OF PART-TIME FACULTY ______

29. Please indicate which courses are core courses and which are elective courses. (Please circle the C next to all of the core courses and the E for all of the elective courses.)

C E FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
C E RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
C E GOVERNANCE
C E LEADERSHIP
C E MARKETING
C E PUBLIC RELATIONS
C E PUBLIC POLICY
C E MANAGEMENT TOOLS
C E HISTORY OF NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT
C E NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION LAW
C E VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT
C E ETHICS
C E RESEARCH
C E PHILANTHROPY
C E PLANNING
C E PROGRAM EVALUATION
C E HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
C E PUBLIC MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION
C E OTHER (please specify) ______________________________________
C E OTHER ______________________________________

30. Does your program offer any of the following: (Check each that is applicable.)

☐ INTERNSHIP IN A NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION
☐ A MAJOR IN NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT LEADING TO A (circle) BACHELORS, MASTERS, DOCTORAL DEGREE IN: (specify) ___________________________
☐ A MINOR IN NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT LEADING TO A (circle) BACHELORS, MASTERS, DOCTORAL DEGREE IN: (specify) ___________________________
☐ A NONDEGREE CERTIFICATE IN NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT

31. The students who attend the program are: (circle number)

1 MAINLY FULL-TIME
2 MAINLY PART-TIME
3 SPLIT EVENLY BETWEEN FULL AND PART-TIME

32. Most of the students in the program are: (circle number)

1 ENTRY LEVEL PROFESSIONALS
2 MID-CAREER PROFESSIONALS

33. Your present academic rank: (circle number)

1 PROFESSOR
2 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
3 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
4 LECTURER
5 ADJUNCT FACULTY
6 POSITION HAS NO FACULTY RANK
34. In what department do you teach? Please name: ____________________________

35. Do your teaching responsibilities apply primarily in graduate, undergraduate or continuing professional development areas? (Circle number of your answer)

1) ALL GRADUATE
2) HEAVILY IN GRADUATE
3) IN BOTH, BUT LEANING TOWARD GRADUATE
4) SPLIT EVENLY
5) IN BOTH, BUT LEANING TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE
6) HEAVILY IN UNDERGRADUATE
7) ALL UNDERGRADUATE
8) HEAVILY IN CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SECTION D.
CONCLUDING QUESTION FOR EVERYONE.

36. What direction do you anticipate for the academic discipline of nonprofit management?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

END

Thank you again for contributing to this study.

Any comments or clarifications would be welcome.

Please Return To: INPOM
ATTN: S. BLOCK
518 17th ST., SUITE 388
DENVER, CO 80202
APPENDIX B

RESPONDENTS' IDENTIFICATION OF TOP THREE "IMPORTANT" AUTHORS
Respondents' Identification of Top Three "Important" Authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors Mentioned 5 or Fewer Times (in alphabetical order)

- Argyris
- Babsuk
- Connors
- Conrad
- Cyert
- DiMaggio
- Dyer
- Etzioni
- Flanagan
- Gardner
- Hardy
- Hasenfeld
- Hennesey
- Hodgkinson
- Kadushin
- Karn
- Knowles
- Kotler
- Kramer
- Lauffer
- Lippit
- Lohman
- Lovelock
- Lovelock
- Lynch
- March
- Mason
- McAdam
- McCurley
- Merenda
- Naylor
- Nielsen
- Patti
- Pearce
- Powell
- Salamon
- Sarri
- Schier
- Schlinder-Rainman
- Selznick
- Shapiro
- Sills
- Slaven
- Smith
- Trekkers
- Van Til
- Vineyard
- Weisbrod
- Young
APPENDIX C

PERIODICALS MOST READ BY RESPONDENTS
Periodicals Most Read by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Three Periodicals</th>
<th>Number of Times Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Journal of Voluntary Action Research</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Journal of Volunteer Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Voluntary Action Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Periodicals Identified by Respondents
Nine or Fewer Times

- Academy of Management Journal
- Nonprofit World
- Foundation News
- Social Work Administration
- Harvard Business Review
- Public Administration Review
- Public Policy
- Social Work
- Administrative Science Quarterly
- Applied Behavioral Science
- Personnel
- Association Management
- Training
- Community Development