



**NONPROFIT SURVEY SERIES
COMMUNITY REPORT #7**

SOUTH BEND NONPROFITS: SCOPE AND DIMENSIONS

A JOINT PRODUCT OF

**THE CENTER ON PHILANTHROPY
AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

AND

**THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

NOVEMBER 2006

**KIRSTEN A. GRØNBJERG,
KERRY S. BROCK
AND
PATRICIA BORNTRAGER TENNEN**

Copyright © 2006 Kirsten A. Grønbjerg
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Acknowledgments

We express our deep-felt gratitude to the many Indiana nonprofits that completed our survey. Without their cooperation, we would have nothing to report. We also thank members of the project advisory board for their assistance with the survey and for their valuable feedback and suggestions on the analysis.

This report was prepared as part of an ongoing project on the **Indiana Nonprofit Sector: Scope and Community Dimensions** made possible by a grant from the Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Sector Research Fund and by support for the Efroymson Chair in Philanthropy by the Indianapolis Foundation at the Central Indiana Community Foundation and the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy's Indiana Research Fund, supported in part by Lilly Endowment Inc. Additional funding and in-kind support has been provided by WBH South Bend, Inc.; The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment at I.U.P.U.I.; the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University on the Bloomington, Indianapolis, South Bend, Northwest, and Fort Wayne campuses; Ball State University; and the University of Southern Indiana. We are grateful to Kerry Brock for help in finalizing the report. Finally, we thank members of the Advisory Board for the Indiana Nonprofit Sector: Scope and Community Dimensions project for helpful comments and suggestions.

The survey instrument is based on key concepts developed by the Donors Forum of Chicago. Laurie Paarlberg did much of the initial work in developing the survey instrument and we received much valuable feedback on several versions of the instrument from a large number of individuals. We also acknowledge the work by Ange Cahoon, Amy Horst, Hun Myoung Park, Allison Leeuw, Julie Schaefer and Erin Nave in carrying out a variety of follow-up tasks to the survey, by Linda Allen, Curtis Child, Abigail Powell, Andrea Lewis and Richard Clerkin for their related work on other reports from this survey, and by the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University for managing the survey process itself. The support and efforts of all of these strengthened this work enormously and we are grateful to them all. Of course, any remaining problems remain our responsibilities entirely. We are grateful to the many project research assistants who have worked on the survey in various capacities.

Copies of this report are available on the Indiana Nonprofit Sector website (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof).

Suggested Citation

South Bend Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, Nonprofit Survey Series Community Report Number 7, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg, Kerry S. Brock, and Patricia Borntreger Tennen (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs, November, 2006).

SOUTH BEND NONPROFITS: SCOPE AND DIMENSIONS

INDIANA NONPROFITS: SCOPE & COMMUNITY DIMENSIONS

NONPROFIT SURVEY SERIES COMMUNITY REPORT #7

A JOINT PRODUCT OF

**THE CENTER ON PHILANTHROPY
AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

**THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC &
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

AND

**THE JOHNS HOPKINS
NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT
DATA PROJECT**

**KIRSTEN A. GRØNBJERG
KERRY S. BROCK
AND
PATRICIA BORNTRAGER TENNEN**

NOVEMBER 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Key Findings	4
I. Profile.....	5
Missions, Size, Age, Targeting, and Demands	5
Indiana Nonprofits	5
South Bend Nonprofits.....	5
II. Managing Human and Financial Resources	7
Financial Conditions.....	7
Indiana Nonprofits	7
South Bend Nonprofits.....	8
Financial Challenges and Tools.....	9
Indiana Nonprofits	10
South Bend Nonprofits.....	10
Staff, Volunteers, and Board Resources, Challenges, and Tools	10
Indiana Nonprofits	11
South Bend Nonprofits.....	11
Other Management Challenges and Capacities	12
Indiana Nonprofits	12
South Bend Nonprofits.....	13
III. Affiliations, Collaborations, and Competition	14
Formal Affiliations	14
Indiana Nonprofits	14
South Bend Nonprofits.....	14
Networks and Collaborations	15
Indiana Nonprofits	15
South Bend Nonprofits.....	15
Most Important Relationship	15
Indiana Nonprofits	16
South Bend Nonprofits.....	16
Effects of Networks and Collaborations.....	17
Indiana Nonprofits	17
South Bend Nonprofits.....	17
Competition	18
Indiana Nonprofits	18
South Bend Nonprofits.....	18
IV. Community and Policy Conditions	19
Community Conditions and Impacts	19
Indiana Nonprofits	19
South Bend Nonprofits.....	19
Policy Conditions and Impacts	20
Indiana Nonprofits	20
South Bend Nonprofits.....	20
Nonprofit Advocacy	21
Indiana Nonprofits	21
South Bend Nonprofits.....	22
Appendix A	23
Project Publications and Reports.....	25

INTRODUCTION:


As part of the *Indiana Nonprofits: Scope and Community Dimensions* project, we and a team of colleagues have undertaken a comprehensive study of the nonprofit sector in Indiana. Through a series of reports, we have looked broadly at the distribution of different types of nonprofits across the state, but have also focused more in depth on the internal structure and operations of individual nonprofit organizations. Drawing on a large survey of 2,206 nonprofits of all types,¹ we have profiled Indiana nonprofits by assessing their basic organizational features and characteristics: revenues, funding sources, employees, volunteers, age, service capacity, and so on. We have also analyzed how they relate to the communities in which they operate and the types of relationships that they have developed with other organizations. And we have presented in-depth analyses of their financial conditions, management challenges and capacities.

In this report, we take a different approach by focusing on a specific geographic region – the South Bend metropolitan region (including St. Joseph County) – to see how these nonprofits differ from or resemble others in the state. We are able to do so because the statewide survey of Indiana nonprofits, on which our analysis is based, included expanded samples of nonprofits in twelve communities across the state, including 207 in South Bend, shown in Figure 1. Though our overall state survey draws from a very large sample, we must note that these expanded community samples may not be fully representative of the nonprofit sectors in these communities.

For purposes of this analysis, we define the South Bend region to include St. Joseph County.² We compare South Bend nonprofits to all other nonprofits in the state (labeled in the figures that follow as “Not South Bend”). We also compare South Bend nonprofits to nonprofits in six other Indiana metropolitan areas: Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Northwest, Evansville, Bloomington, and Muncie (we refer to these as “Other Metro” nonprofits – dark colored regions in Figure 1).³ Thus for every figure pre-

sented here we conducted two analyses. One compares South Bend nonprofits to all other nonprofits in the state (i.e. South Bend vs. Not South Bend); the other compares South Bend nonprofits to other metro area nonprofits (i.e. South Bend vs. Other Metro). To conserve space, we present these in the same figure.

Figure 1: The Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project, selected communities



For each analysis, we also conducted statistical tests to determine whether differences in responses to survey questions are sufficiently different that we can rule out random chance as the reason for any apparent differences. Interestingly, and to our surprise, South Bend nonprofits exhibit many similar characteristics to other nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas for most of the questions we asked. When there are statistically significant differences, we flag this by including a note at the bottom of the figure.

In this report, we examine several broad themes: the characteristics of nonprofits in Indiana and South Bend, the impact of community and policy changes on them, their relationships with other organizations, and their management of financial and human resources. For each topic we begin with a brief overview of all Indiana nonprofits, regardless of their geographic location in the

¹ For information on the survey and related results, please see www.indiana.edu/~nonprof

² In another series of reports on nonprofit employment we use the larger economic regional definition as originally developed by the Indiana Department of Commerce in order to present as much detail as possible.

³ Please note that the “Not South Bend” and “Other Metro” categories are not mutually exclusive since all Other Metro nonprofits are included in the Not South Bend category.

state. This is followed by an analysis of South Bend nonprofits, including how they compare to nonprofits in the rest of the state and those in other metropolitan areas.

KEY FINDINGS:

Our report shows that South Bend nonprofits resemble other nonprofits throughout the state of Indiana and in other metro areas in almost every dimension examined. They differ in only a few respects. Here we will summarize the ways that South Bend nonprofits deviate from those located elsewhere in the state (keeping in mind that overall, they are far more similar than dissimilar).

- **More likely to be involved in health-related fields:** South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely to be involved in health-related fields (11 percent) than are their counterparts in other metro areas (5 percent) and the rest of the state (4 percent).
- **More large nonprofits in the region:** While only 4 percent of nonprofits in the rest of the state report more than 50 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, 10 percent of South Bend nonprofits report these very large staff sizes.
- **More likely to rely on government funding:** South Bend nonprofits mirror statewide patterns in most of their sources of revenue. However, they are significantly more likely to depend mainly on revenue from government funding (13 percent) than nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas (7 percent each).
- **More likely to utilize formal volunteer recruitment programs:** South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely to engage in formal volunteer recruitment programming (26 percent) than are their statewide counterparts (18 percent).
- **More likely to have organizational email addresses and websites:** While some statewide nonprofits have organizational email addresses and websites (47 and 33 percent respectively), South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely to utilize these key information technologies (57 and 49 percent respectively).
- **More likely to collaborate with faith-based organizations:** South Bend nonprofits are more likely to report that their most important collaborative relationships include other faith-based organizations (47 percent) than are their counterparts in other metro areas and the rest of the state (29 percent and 30 percent respectively).
- **Less likely to feel competition from government agencies:** South Bend nonprofits are significantly less likely to report competition with government agencies (4 percent) than are their counterparts statewide and in other metro areas (10 percent each).
- **Fewer perceptions of change in community conditions:** Fewer South Bend nonprofits report increases in population size (22 percent) than their statewide and other metro counterparts (43 and 40 percent respectively). Additionally, fewer nonprofits in the South Bend area report increases in racial diversity (27 percent) than nonprofits in the rest of the state (34 percent).
- **Varying impacts from changing community conditions:** Related to the fact that they perceive fewer changes in population size, South Bend nonprofits also report fewer impacts from changes in population size (14 percent) than their counterparts in other metro areas and the rest of the state (27 percent and 28 percent respectively). Interestingly, however, there were no significant differences between South Bend nonprofits and nonprofits in the rest of the state in the way they reported impacts in changes in racial diversity, despite the fact that South Bend nonprofits reported experiencing fewer of these changes overall.
- **Perceptions of greater impacts from changes in selected policy conditions:** While differences between South Bend nonprofits and others in the state regarding perceptions of stricter health and safety regulations were only marginally significant (31 percent vs. 21 percent), significantly more South Bend nonprofits reported impacts from these stricter policies than their statewide and other metro counterparts (26 percent vs. 14 percent and 13 percent, respectively).

I. PROFILE

Missions, Size, Age, Targeting, and Demands: In order to understand South Bend’s nonprofit sector we first assess some basic characteristics of nonprofit organizations in the area, such as field of activity⁴, size, age, targeting patterns, and how the demands for their goods and services have changed over time.⁵ We present an overview of state patterns before discussing how South Bend nonprofits compare to nonprofits in other metro areas as well as to all other nonprofits in the state.⁶ Overall, South Bend nonprofits resemble other nonprofits in metro and non-metro regions throughout the state, but differ notably in a few cases.

- **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- **Fields of Activity:** Indiana nonprofits pursue a broad array of missions, but half focus on just two fields: human services and religious-spiritual development.
- **Employees:** Only 52 percent of Indiana nonprofits have paid staff, and of these 41 percent have two or fewer full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. On average, staff compensation absorbs half of all expenses.
- Health and education nonprofits tend to have a larger number of paid staff members, with 32 percent and 24 percent, respectively, reporting more than 50 FTE staff, while mutual benefit (64 percent), public benefit (56 percent), and arts, culture, and humanities (35 percent) nonprofits tend to have a small number of paid staff members (0.5 to 2 FTEs).
- **Year of Establishment:** Almost one-half (48 percent) of nonprofits were established since 1970,


including one-fifth (21 percent) since 1990. However, one-quarter of all nonprofits are very old and were established before 1930.

- **Targeting:** Many target their services to particular groups, especially based on age and geographic regions.
- **Change in Demand:** Many face increasing demands for services.

- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Fields of Activity:** While South Bend nonprofits were involved in most fields of activity at the same rate as their counterparts in the rest of the state and in other metro areas, South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely to be involved in the health field (11 percent) than statewide (4 percent) and other metro area nonprofits (5 percent). See Figure 2.

Figure 2: Distribution of nonprofits by major field of activity and region



(* Significant difference between South Bend and Not South Bend
+ Significant difference between South Bend and Other Metro)

Note: South Bend n=207; Not South Bend n=1,999; Other Metro n=1,142

- Similar to their counterparts elsewhere, almost one-third (32 percent) of South Bend nonprofits work in human services; almost one-fifth (19 percent) in religion; 16 percent in public benefit; 8 percent in education; 7 percent in mutual benefit organizations; 6 percent in arts and culture; and the rest in some other field.⁷

⁴ For our definitions of nonprofit fields, see Appendix A.

⁵ For a more detailed description see Kirsten A. Grønberg & Linda Allen: *The Indiana Nonprofit Sector: a Profile*. Report #2, January 2004. South Bend and other regions were described briefly in the appendices of this report. Available online:


www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insprofile.html.

⁶ Please note that “Indiana Nonprofits” refers to all nonprofit organizations captured in the survey; while “Not South Bend” (portrayed in the figures) refers to all nonprofits *aside from* South Bend nonprofits. Consequently, the data presented for all Indiana nonprofits will not necessarily match the data for any of the regional segments presented under the “Not South Bend” heading.

⁷ The apparent differences between South Bend and Not South Bend in the proportion of nonprofits operating in the field of religion, suggested by Figure 2, are only marginally significant.

- **Employees:** South Bend nonprofits, other metro area nonprofits, and nonprofits throughout the state have a median of 0.5 to 1 full-time equivalents (FTEs). However, the South Bend region contains a significantly larger proportion of nonprofits with more than 50 FTEs (10 percent) than the rest of the state (4 percent) or other metro areas (5 percent). Despite this difference in the proportion of larger nonprofits, half (50 percent) of South Bend nonprofits do not have any employees at all, which is on par with nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas. See Figure 3.


Figure 3: Number of nonprofit FTE staff, by region



Note: South Bend n=188; Not South Bend n=1,853; Other Metro n=1,051


- **Year of Establishment:** Similar to nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas, the mean age of South Bend nonprofits is 48 years. The median age is 8 years younger than that, at 40 years old, indicating that there are relatively few very old organizations. See Figure 4.⁸
- About one-quarter (24 percent) of nonprofits in South Bend were established before 1930 and almost another quarter (23 percent) between 1930 and 1959. South Bend’s pattern is very similar to nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas. See Figure 5.⁹

Figure 4: Nonprofit age, by region



Note: South Bend n=194; Not South Bend n=1,841; Other Metro n=1,062

Figure 5: Year of establishment of nonprofits, by region



Note: South Bend n=194; Not South Bend n=1,841; Other Metro n=1,062


- **Program Targeting:** As with nonprofits across the state and in other metro areas, age and geographic location are the most common targets for programs offered by South Bend nonprofits. Half (50 percent) of South Bend nonprofits target their programs based on age and almost half (47 percent) target by geographic location. See Figure 6.¹⁰

⁸ There is no statistical test for the difference between medians, so any apparent differences between median ages cannot be tested for statistical significance.

⁹ While Figure 5 portrays apparent differences between South Bend and Other Metro in the proportion of nonprofits established between 1930 and 1959, these differences are not statistically significant.

¹⁰ The apparent differences between South Bend and Not South Bend in nonprofits that target their operations based on geographic location, suggested by Figure 6, are only marginally significant.

Figure 6: Percent of nonprofits targeting some or all programs to specific groups, by region




(No statistically significant differences)

Note: South Bend n=155-166; Not South Bend n=1,432-1,585; Other Metro n=799-901

- **Change in Demand:** Like other nonprofits in Indiana, most South Bend nonprofits say demands for their services or programs stayed the same (46 percent) or increased (43 percent) over the last three years. Very few said that demand decreased (10 percent). See Figure 7.

Figure 7: Changes in demand for programs and services over the last three years, by region



(No statistically significant differences)

Note: South Bend n=196; Not South Bend n=1,892; Other Metro n=1,076

II. MANAGING HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Financial Conditions: We asked Indiana nonprofits to provide information about their revenues, expenses, assets and liabilities, as well as about how these have changed over the past three years.¹¹ Overall, the financial condition of South Bend nonprofits is very similar to that of other nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas, differing only in one major respect.

• Indiana Nonprofits:

- **Amount of Revenues:** Most Indiana nonprofits have low revenues (half have less than \$40,000 in annual revenues), but education and health nonprofits are quite large—respectively 15 and 14 percent have revenues of \$10 million or more, compared to 3 percent overall. More health nonprofits (37 percent) have assets in excess of \$1 million than those in other nonprofit fields (20 percent overall).
- **Change in Revenues and Expenses:** Aside from nonprofits in the health field, a greater proportion of nonprofits report at least a moderate increase in expenses (65 percent) than report a moderate increase in their revenues (57 percent), indicating that a large number of Indiana nonprofits face a challenge in developing a cushion of financial reserves to meet unforeseen organizational and community needs.
- **Funding Sources:** One-third (32 percent) receive half or more of their funding from donations and gifts, and 28 percent receive at least half of their funding from dues, fees, or private sales of goods and services. Another 14 percent of nonprofits receive at least half of their funding from special events or other sources, while government funding is the dominant source of funding for only 7 percent of nonprofits. The remaining nonprofits rely on a mix of funding sources (12 percent) or they have no revenues (6 percent).


¹¹ For a more detailed description see Kirsten A. Grønberg & Richard M. Clerkin, *Indiana Nonprofits: Managing Financial and Human Resources*, Report #4. August 2004. Available online: www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insman.html.

- **Change in Funding Sources:** Larger nonprofits are more likely than smaller ones to report changes in the level of revenues they receive from government sources. Smaller nonprofits are more likely than larger ones to report changes in the level of revenues they receive from donations, dues/fees/sales, special events, and other sources of income.
- Nonprofits that depend upon a single type of revenue are the most likely to report a change in that revenue stream. Nonprofits that rely on a mix of funding are the second most likely group to report changes in each source of revenues, potentially allowing them to off-set decreases in one type of revenue with increases in a different type of revenue.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Amount of Revenues:** Median annual revenues for South Bend nonprofits are approximately \$27,000, which is less than the median annual revenues of nonprofits statewide (\$45,000) and in other metro areas (\$61,926). Two-fifths (40 percent) of South Bend nonprofits have revenues under \$25,000 (an additional 9 percent have no revenues at all), while only 11 percent have revenues over \$1 million. On average, South Bend nonprofits appear slightly smaller than nonprofits in the rest of the state and other metro areas, but these apparent differences are not statistically significant. See Figure 8.


Figure 8: Annual revenues of nonprofits, by region



Note: South Bend n=161; Not South Bend n=1,563; Other Metro n=883

- **Change in Revenues and Expenses:** Reflecting the statewide pattern, the majority of South Bend nonprofits indicate that their revenues stayed the same (37 percent) or increased (36 percent) over the last few years, although a substantial minority (26 percent) say that they decreased. See Figure 9.¹²

Figure 9: Percent of nonprofits reporting changes in revenues and expenses, by region



Note: South Bend n=168-170; Not South Bend n=1,619-1,621; Other Metro n=915-916


- More than 9 out of 10 South Bend nonprofits said that expenses stayed the same (44 percent) or increased (49 percent). This is also true for nonprofits in other metro areas and for all nonprofits throughout the state. South Bend nonprofits follow the statewide pattern of more pervasive increases in expenditures than in revenues.

- **Funding Sources:** Revealing the only major difference in financial conditions between South Bend nonprofits and those in the rest of the state, South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely than nonprofits outside of South Bend to rely on government funding for more than one-half their revenue (13 percent vs. 7 percent). See Figure 10.¹³

¹² The apparent differences between South Bend and Other Metro in changes in expenses, suggested by Figure 9, are only marginally significant.

¹³ The apparent differences in reliance on donations between South Bend and Not South Bend, suggested by Figure 10, are only marginally significant. The same is true for the apparent differences in reliance on government funding between South Bend and Other Metro


Figure 10: Percent of nonprofits that receive more than one-half of their annual revenues from selected source, by region



Note: South Bend n=183; Not South Bend n=1,815; Other Metro n=1,026

- However, paralleling statewide and other metro area patterns, South Bend nonprofits are most likely to rely on dues/fees (28 percent) or donations (25 percent) for more than half of their revenues. One in 10 relies primarily on revenue generated from special events (10 percent).
- [Change in Funding Sources](#): Changes in revenues from different sources for South Bend nonprofits reflect similar changes at the state level and in other metro areas. See Figure 11.

Figure 11: Percent reporting changes in revenues from government funding, donations and dues or fees by region




Note: South Bend n=83-112; Not South Bend n=901-1,365; Other Metro n=475-748

areas, and in reliance on a mix of sources between South Bend and Not South Bend / Other Metro.

- Revenues from dues/fees stayed the same for 59 percent and increased for 24 percent of South Bend nonprofits. Revenues from donations and from government funding stayed the same for approximately half (50 percent) and for approximately three-quarters (76 percent) of South Bend nonprofits, respectively. These patterns are nearly identical to the rest of the state and other metro areas.
- Revenues from special events, private sales or other sources stayed the same for most South Bend nonprofits (62 percent, 76 percent and 73 percent respectively), in a pattern similar to nonprofits from other parts of the state. See Figure 12.¹⁴

Figure 12: Percent reporting changes in revenues from special events, private sales, or other sources of funding, by region



Note: South Bend n=74-91; Not South Bend n=866-1,093; Other Metro n=449-593

Financial Challenges and Tools: We asked Indiana nonprofits to report on the level of challenges they face in managing finances and the management tools they have to address these challenges. We find that South Bend nonprofits face very similar challenges to and possess the same tools as other Indiana nonprofits.

¹⁴ The apparent differences between South Bend and Not South Bend in the number of nonprofits that saw a decrease in reliance on revenue from special events, suggested by Figure 12, are only marginally significant.


- **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- **Challenges in Financial Management:** Many Indiana nonprofits face major challenges in obtaining funding. Those in the health (78 percent) and the environment and animals (72 percent) fields are the most likely to say that obtaining funding is a major challenge.
- **Financial Management Tools:** Larger nonprofits are more likely than smaller ones to report facing financial management challenges. However, they are also more likely to have organizational tools to address these challenges.
- Nonprofits that rely on government sources for more than half of their revenues are more likely to report financial management challenges than nonprofits with other resource dependencies (83 percent of government-dependent nonprofits say obtaining funding is a major challenge vs. 43 percent of nonprofits overall; 20 percent say managing finances is a major challenge vs. 10 percent overall). At the same time, those that rely on dues/fees/sales for more than half of their resources appear to face the lowest level of financial management challenges, but they are also the least likely to report having financial management tools.
- Older nonprofits are more likely to have reserves dedicated to maintenance or capital needs than younger nonprofits.

- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Challenges in Financial Management:** South Bend nonprofits are not immune to the financial challenges that nonprofits face in other metro areas and in the state more generally. More than two-fifths (41 percent) say that obtaining funding is a major challenge, although relatively few indicate that using information technology (12 percent), managing facilities (12 percent), and financial management (8 percent) are challenges. These patterns generally resemble those reported by nonprofits elsewhere. See Figure 13.


Figure 13: Percent of nonprofits that indicate select issues are a major challenge, by region



Note: South Bend n=187-189; Not South Bend n=1,756-1,765; Other Metro n=996-1,006

- **Financial Management Tools:** Like nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas, some nonprofits in South Bend have acquired tools to help them address potential or real financial challenges. While a majority (but not all) has recently completed financial audits (65 percent) and computerized financial records (65 percent), a smaller proportion has reserves dedicated for maintenance (41 percent) or capital needs (33 percent). See Figure 14.

Figure 14: Percent of nonprofits that have select organizational components, by region



Note: South Bend n=190-191; Not South Bend n=1,807-1,835; Other Metro n=1,022-1,042

Staff, Volunteer, and Board Resources, Challenges, and Tools:

We asked Indiana nonprofits about how many volunteers and paid staff they have, as well as about the challenges they face in managing them and the

tools they have to address these challenges. We found that South Bend nonprofits closely resemble other Indiana nonprofits in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in this respect.

- **Indiana Nonprofits:**


- **Paid and Volunteer Staff:** Just over half (52 percent) of Indiana nonprofits report that they have paid staff. However, volunteers are vital to Indiana nonprofits. Almost three-fourths report using volunteers (other than board members) over the past year. Of these, 74 percent report that volunteers are essential or very important to their organization. Volunteers tend to be more important to older nonprofits than to younger ones.
- **Challenges:** We find no statistically significant difference by nonprofit field in the challenges related to managing human resources, recruiting/retaining qualified staff.
- **Tools:** We also did not find statistically significant differences by nonprofit field in the challenges related to the tools associated with managing paid employees (written personnel policies or written job descriptions).
- Nonprofits that rely on government sources for more than half of their revenues have more employees (25 percent have over 50 FTEs), are more likely to have basic organizational structures in place to manage employees, and are also more likely to face challenges in managing employees than those with other funding profiles.
- Larger nonprofits, most likely because they tend to have more employees, are more likely than smaller ones to face challenges in managing employees, but are also more likely to have the tools to manage their staff.
- Health nonprofits are more likely than any other group to report having a written conflict of interest policy (70 percent vs. 30 percent on average), most likely reflecting special pressures associated with funding, accreditation, or professional licensing requirements.

- Few nonprofits have volunteer recruitment (18 percent) or volunteer training (21 percent) programs.

- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Paid and Volunteer Staff:** Over half (54 percent) of South Bend nonprofits have paid staff. Nearly three-quarters (71 percent) of South Bend nonprofits report that they used volunteers (other than board members) during the most recent fiscal year. This is on par with nonprofits throughout the state. See Figure 15.


Figure 15: Percent of nonprofits utilizing paid staff and volunteers, by region



Note: South Bend n=189-195; Not South Bend n=1,874-1,894; Other Metro n=1,071-1,078


- **Challenges:** South Bend nonprofits are no more or less likely than other nonprofits in the state to indicate that recruiting and retaining volunteers, board members, and staff is a major challenge. The same is true for managing human resources or board and staff relations. See Figure 16.
- **Tools:** Similar to other Indiana nonprofits, most South Bend nonprofits have written governance policies (85 percent); about one-half have written job descriptions (56 percent) and personnel policies (49 percent). Only one-third (36 percent) have written conflict of interest policies. See Figure 17.

Figure 16: Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region



Note: South Bend n=183-207; Not South Bend n=1,746-1,999; Other Metro n=998-1,142


Figure 17: Percent of nonprofits that have selected organizational components, by region



Note: South Bend n=187-190; Not South Bend n=1,795-1,844; Other Metro n=1,016-1,046

- Over one-quarter of South Bend nonprofits have a formal volunteer recruitment program (26 percent) and a formal volunteer training program (27 percent). While the percent with volunteer training programs is on par with nonprofits throughout the state, the percent with formal volunteer recruitment programs in South Bend is significantly larger than in the rest of Indiana (26 percent vs. 18 percent). See Figure 18.

Figure 18: Percent of nonprofits that have selected organizational components, by region



Note: South Bend n=189; Not South Bend n=1,810-1,822; Other Metro n=1,025-1,035

Other Management Challenges and Capacities:

We asked Indiana nonprofits about other challenges they face and the organizational tools they have to address various challenges. South Bend nonprofits are nearly identical to other Indiana nonprofits; however, they vary notably in the dimensions related to information technology.

Indiana Nonprofits:

- Challenges:** We asked Indiana nonprofits whether certain aspects of delivering and managing programs are a challenge. According to their responses, we find that attracting clients and members is perhaps most challenging, with approximately one-half of Indiana nonprofits citing it as a challenge. This is especially the case for nonprofits in the environment and religion fields.
- Approximately one-third of Indiana nonprofits report that meeting the needs of members and clients is a major challenge, though religion nonprofits are disproportionately more likely to cite this challenge. Another one-third find that delivering high quality programs is a major challenge, with nonprofits in the religion and human services fields more likely to say so.
- Health nonprofits are particularly likely to face major challenges in enhancing the visibility or reputation of their organization. Over half (53


percent) report such challenges, compared to 31 percent of Indiana nonprofits overall.

- Strategic planning is most widely reported as a major challenge by religion nonprofits.
- Arts, culture and humanities nonprofits (36 percent) are more likely than human services nonprofits (17 percent) to say they face a major challenge in evaluating their outcomes or impacts.
- Only 9 percent of Indiana nonprofits report major challenges in maintaining good relations with other entities.
- **IT Tools:** A majority of Indiana nonprofits have computers (65 percent) and internet access (54 percent) available for key staff and volunteers. Some 47 percent of organizations have their own e-mail address and 34 percent have their own website.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**


- **Challenges:** Similar to other nonprofits, attracting clients/member is the most common challenge reported by South Bend nonprofits (38 percent). One-third of South Bend nonprofits (34 percent) also report major challenges in delivering quality programs.
- Challenges related to meeting clients’ needs are considered a challenge by 28 percent of nonprofits in South Bend. Communicating with clients and members also poses a challenge for 15 percent of nonprofits in the area. These challenges faced by South Bend nonprofits are on par with those in the rest of the state. See Figure 19.
- Enhancing visibility and strategic planning are major challenges for one-quarter or more of South Bend nonprofits (27 percent and 25 percent respectively). Evaluating programs is challenging for 1 in 5 nonprofits in the area (20 percent), and maintaining good relations for almost 1 in 10 (8 percent). These percentages also reflect those found in other metro areas and across the state. See Figure 20.

Figure 19: Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region



Note: South Bend n=189-207; Not South Bend n=1,774-1,999; Other Metro n=1,013-1142


Figure 20: Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region



Note: South Bend n=207; Not South Bend n=1,999; Other Metro n=1,142

- **Tools:** Information and communication technology, among other things, helps nonprofits organize records and files, develop and maintain relationships with other organizations, keep up to date with funding opportunities and deadlines, and retrieve important information and data from the Internet. Nonprofits in South Bend are significantly more likely to have organizational email addresses and websites than are their counterparts in the rest of the state (57 percent of South Bend nonprofits have email addresses vs 47 percent of nonprofits statewide, and 49 percent have websites vs. 33 percent statewide). See Figure 21.

Figure 21: Percent of nonprofits that have selected organizational components, by region



(* Significant difference between South Bend and Not South Bend)

Note: South Bend n=189-191; Not South Bend n=1,803-1,843; Other Metro n=1,028-1,044

- However, South Bend nonprofits are similar to their statewide and other metro counterparts along the other IT dimensions surveyed. Just under two-thirds (65 percent) of South Bend nonprofits have computers, and more than one-half (57 percent) are connected to the Internet.

III. AFFILIATIONS, COLLABORATIONS, AND COMPETITION

Formal Affiliations: We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they are affiliated with another organization as a headquarters, local subsidiary, or in another way.¹⁵ South Bend nonprofits are nearly identical to other nonprofits statewide and in metropolitan areas in this respect.

- **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- **Affiliations:** More than half of Indiana nonprofits are affiliated with another organization in some way. This is especially the case for nonprofits in the public and societal benefit (e.g., advocacy, community development, philanthropy) and religion fields, older nonprofits, and medium-sized and large organizations. Besides religious bodies, with whom most religion nonprofits are affiliated, Indiana nonprofits in every field are most likely to be affiliated with various mutual benefit or membership associations (e.g., fraternal organizations, professional or trade associations and the like).
- **Support from Federated Funders:** Some 14 percent of Indiana nonprofits received funds from federated funders during the most recently completed fiscal year. This is disproportionately so for nonprofits in the health and human services fields.


- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Affiliations:** Over one-half (56 percent) of South Bend nonprofits are formally affiliated with another organization. This mirrors the statewide and metro area patterns. See Figure 22.
- **Support from Federated Funders:** Some 6 percent of South Bend nonprofits indicate that they received funding from the United Way during the past fiscal year. Eight percent received support from religious federated funders and just 3 percent received revenue from other federated

¹⁵ For a more detailed description of all Indiana nonprofits see Kirsten A. Grønberg & Curtis Child, *Indiana Nonprofits: Affiliations, Collaborations, and Competition*. Report #5. November 2004. Available online: www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insaffil.html.


funders. In all, 15 percent of South Bend nonprofits received financial support from any one of these types of federated funders. This pattern is similar to other nonprofits throughout Indiana. See Figure 23.

Figure 22: Percent of nonprofits formally affiliated with another organization, by region



Note: South Bend n=191; Not South Bend n=1,890; Other Metro n=1,088

Figure 23: Percent of nonprofits that receive grants or support from federated funders, by region



Note: South Bend n=165-167; Not South Bend n=1,749-1,761; Other Metro n=980-989

Networks and Collaborations: We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they participate in formal collaborations or informal networks with other entities. South Bend nonprofits resemble other Indiana nonprofits (including those in other metro areas) in this respect.


• **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- More than half (57 percent) of Indiana nonprofits are involved in collaborations or networks. Informal networks are more common than formal collaborations.
- Overall, participation in collaborations or networks relates most significantly to the nonprofit’s size and access to technology—larger nonprofits and those with basic information technology components are most likely to indicate that they participate in such relationships.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- Two-fifths (40 percent) of South Bend nonprofits participate in informal networks, while approximately one-quarter (27 percent) are involved in formal collaborations. Overall, the number of nonprofits in South Bend that indicate that they participate in informal or formal relationships (55 percent) is similar to their counterparts in other metro areas and the rest of the state. See Figure 24.

Figure 24: Percent of nonprofits involved in informal or formal relationships, by region



Note: South Bend n=187-190; Not South Bend n=1,838-1,879; Other Metro n=1,056-1,078

Most Important Relationship: We asked nonprofits that participate in networks or collaborations to focus on the one most important to them and to tell us how many and what types of organizations are part of the relationship. We found that South Bend nonprofits have collaboration patterns that differ slightly from others statewide.

- **Indiana Nonprofits:**


- **Size of Networks:** The median number of organizations in Indiana nonprofits’ most important network or collaboration is 5, although the number is disproportionately higher for health nonprofits and for religion nonprofits that provide human services.
- Nonprofits that are small in size and lack technology are disproportionately likely to participate in small networks and collaborations.
- **Types of Organizations in Networks:** About half of the relationships are homogeneous in scope, involving only one or two different types of organizations. The variety of organizations involved is positively related to how many organizations are involved in the relationship.
- Generally, Indiana nonprofits are most likely to say that secular service organizations (42 percent) and religious bodies (41 percent) are involved in these relationships, although this varies according to the field of service in which they are active. Many nonprofits are also involved with government agencies (33 percent) or for-profit organizations (23 percent).

- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Size of Networks:** In South Bend, as well as in the rest of the state, the majority of nonprofits that participate in relationships (55 percent) say that there are 5 or fewer members in their most important collaboration or network. See Figure 25.
- **Types of Organizations in Networks:** We asked nonprofits to identify the types of organizations with which they collaborate in their most important relationship. For the most part, nonprofits in South Bend collaborate with other types of organizations to the same extent as nonprofits outside of South Bend. One striking difference, however, is the percentage of nonprofits that identify other faith-based organizations in their most important relationship. Almost one-half (47 percent) of South Bend nonprofits name faith-based organizations other than religious


bodies as members of their most important collaboration or network, compared to not even one-third of nonprofits outside of South Bend (30 percent) and in other metro areas (29 percent). See Figure 26.¹⁶

Figure 25: Number of organizations involved in most important relationship, by region



Note: South Bend n=81; Not South Bend n=818; Other Metro n=499

Figure 26: Types of organizations identified in most important relationship, by region




Note: South Bend n=90-94; Not South Bend n=1,001-1,025; Other Metro n=610-623

- The vast majority (78 percent) of South Bend nonprofits say that their most important relationship includes 1 to 3 different types of organizations. The same is true for nonprofits statewide

¹⁶The apparent difference between South Bend and Not South Bend in the number of nonprofits that identify advocacy organizations as part of their most important relationship, shown in Figure 26, is not statistically significant.

(82 percent) and in other metropolitan areas (80 percent). See Figure 27.

Figure 27: Number of types of organizations in most important relationship, by region



Note: South Bend n=86; Not South Bend n=940; Other Metro n=571

Effects of Networks and Collaborations: We asked Indiana nonprofits to indicate whether their involvement in networks and collaborations makes it easier, harder, or has no impact on maintaining key organizational capacities. South Bend nonprofits respond in a pattern similar to nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas.

• **Indiana Nonprofits:**


- Respondents are most likely to say that participation in networks or collaborations makes it easier for them to enhance their visibility or reputation, meet client or member needs, and obtain funding.
- Arts, culture and humanities nonprofits stand out as most likely to indicate that they benefit from involvement in networks and collaborations.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- A large majority of South Bend nonprofits (68 percent) indicate that participating in networks and collaborations helps enhance their visibility or reputation. A majority (61 percent) also say that their relationships make it easier to meet client or member needs. Inter-organizational relationships make obtaining funding easier for almost one-third (32 percent) of the nonprofits in South Bend. These patterns are similar to other

nonprofits, metro and non-metro, throughout the state. See Figure 28.


Figure 28: Effect of participation in networks or collaborations on maintaining key organizational capacities, by region



Note: South Bend n=94-95; Not South Bend n=940-945; Other Metro n=576-580

- South Bend nonprofits, like other nonprofits throughout the state, are relatively unlikely to say that their participation in networks and collaborations helps them address some of the challenges of human resources management, such as recruiting and retaining volunteers (27 percent), staff (21 percent) and board members (18 percent). See Figure 29.

Figure 29: Effects of participation in networks or collaborations on maintaining key organizational capacities, by region



Note: South Bend n=95-96; Not South Bend n=932-941; Other Metro n=569-576

Competition: We asked Indiana nonprofits to identify the arenas in which they compete with other organizations, as well as the different types of organizations with which they do so. South Bend nonprofits face competition along similar dimensions as other metro and non-metro nonprofits in the state, although the types of organizations with which they compete differ slightly.

• **Indiana Nonprofits:**


- **Extent of Competition:** Two-fifths of Indiana nonprofits compete with other organizations (both in and outside of the nonprofit sector) for a variety of resources.
- **Types of Competitors:** They compete most extensively with secular nonprofits (29 percent), followed by religious nonprofits (22 percent), businesses (13 percent), and governments (10 percent).
- Generally, the prevalence of competition with other organizations increases with size and access to technology. Nonprofits that participate in formal or informal relationships are also more likely to compete than those that do not.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Extent of Competition:** South Bend nonprofits are no different than other nonprofits throughout the state in that more than one-quarter (27 percent) compete with other organizations for financial resources; one-quarter (25 percent) compete to attract clients and members; almost one-quarter compete with other organizations in their efforts to recruit staff or volunteers (24 percent) and deliver programs or services (21 percent); and 15 percent compete to recruit and keep board members. See Figure 30.
- **Types of Competitors:** Reflecting statewide and metro area patterns, nonprofits in South Bend are most likely to compete with secular nonprofits (27 percent), followed by religious nonprofits (19 percent) and businesses (13 percent). One noted difference between South Bend nonprofits and those in the rest of the state is that South Bend nonprofits are significantly less likely to say that they compete with government agencies


(4 percent vs. 10 percent of nonprofits in both the rest of the state and other metro areas). See Figure 31.

Figure 30: Percent of nonprofits reporting competition with other organizations, by arena and region



Note: South Bend n=207; Not South Bend n=1,999; Other Metro n=1,142

Figure 31: Percent of nonprofits reporting competition, by type of competitor and region



Note: South Bend n=207; Not South Bend n=1,999; Other Metro n=1,142

- Overall, almost two-fifths (38 percent) of South Bend nonprofits say that they compete with at least one of these types of organizations in some way.

IV. COMMUNITY AND POLICY CONDITIONS

Community Conditions and Impacts: We asked Indiana nonprofits for their perceptions of changes in seven community conditions and whether the changes have an impact on them.¹⁷ In this respect South Bend nonprofits appear to be more unusual. We found that South Bend nonprofits report conditions and impacts somewhat differently from other metro and non-metro nonprofits statewide.

- **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- **Changes in Community Conditions:** The majority of Indiana nonprofits report that one or more of the seven community conditions changed in their communities during the last three years and half report that multiple conditions changed. Overall, perceptions of changes in community conditions depend significantly on where the nonprofits are located and, in some cases, their size or target group. Perceptions do not vary according to age, field of activity, or primary source of funding.
- Just over half (51 percent) of Indiana nonprofits report that employment and business opportunities changed in their communities, with the majority of these (33 percent overall) saying they decreased.
- Changes in employment opportunities are followed by perceived changes in population size with half noting a change, of which most (42 percent overall) say it increased.
- About two-fifths (39 percent) say household income changed, with the majority (22 percent overall) of those saying it decreased.
- A third (36 percent) say ethnic or racial diversity changed, with almost all (34 percent overall) noting an increase. One in four say crime and

violence changed, with most (19 percent overall) noting an increase.

- About one in ten (11 percent) noted a change in tension or conflict among community groups, with almost all of those (8 percent overall) saying it increased.
- For some conditions there are striking similarities between how nonprofits perceive community conditions and official indicators of the conditions, but in other cases there are notable differences between perceptions and the actual conditions.
- **Impacts from Community Conditions:** One-half of Indiana nonprofits indicate that at least one of the community conditions impacted their organization. Almost every condition tends to impact a higher percentage of mid-sized and large nonprofits than small ones, as well as those that target their programs to people of a particular income, gender, and/or race.
- For the most part, neither the age of an organization nor the field in which it operates helps explain why a given condition impacts nonprofits.


- **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Changes in Community Conditions and Impacts:** South Bend nonprofits are less likely to report that population size increased within the geographic areas in which they operate (22 percent), compared to nonprofits across the state (43 percent) and in other metro areas (40 percent). As might be expected, they are also less likely to say that changes in population size impacted them (14 percent vs. 28 percent and 27 percent, respectively). See Figures 32 and 33.
- Additionally, South Bend nonprofits are less likely to report increases in racial diversity in the area (27 percent) than are nonprofits in the rest of the state (34 percent). However, this difference is not reflected in the way in which South Bend nonprofits report the impact of changes in racial diversity in the area – 16 percent of South Bend nonprofits report such an impact, which is similar to the 19 percent of nonprofits in the rest

¹⁷ For a more detailed description on all Indiana nonprofits see Kirsten A. Grønberg & Curtis Child, *Indiana Nonprofits: Impact of Community and Policy Changes*. Report #3. July 2004. Available online: www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscom.html.


of the state who also reported feeling an impact from these changes.

Figure 32: Percent of nonprofits reporting changes in selected community conditions, by region



Note: South Bend n=149-162; Not South Bend n=1,516-1,644; Other Metro n=845-911

Figure 33: Percent of nonprofits reporting being impacted by selected community conditions, by region



Note: South Bend n=156-170; Not South Bend n=842-911; Other Metro n=1,515-1,647

- Aside from the perceived changes and impacts related to population size and racial diversity, South Bend nonprofits report similar changes and impacts as their counterparts in other metro areas and the rest of the state across all of the other issues about which they were asked.

Policy Conditions and Impacts: We also asked Indiana nonprofits about changes in five government policies and whether the changes affect their organization. While, as we’ve discussed, perceptions of commu-

nity conditions in South Bend differed from perceptions in the rest of the state, perceptions of policy conditions are nearly identical to those of other nonprofits and metropolitan organizations statewide, although perceptions of the impacts of these conditions differ in some cases.

• **Indiana Nonprofits:**


- **Changes in Policies:** More than one-third of Indiana nonprofits indicate that at least some policies have changed during the last three years, although this varies considerably depending on the type, size, and funding structure of the nonprofit. For almost every policy, health and human services nonprofits, large organizations, and those that depend primarily on government funding are the most likely to say that multiple policies changed. In almost all cases, the policies became stricter.
 - Changes in health and safety regulations are the most commonly reported (23 percent say that such policies changed). These were followed by client eligibility requirements for government programs (16 percent), personnel and legal regulations (15 percent), professional licensing requirements (14 percent), and government contract procurement policies (11 percent).
- **Impacts from Policies:** One-quarter of all Indiana nonprofits says that at least one of these policies had an impact on their organization. As with perceptions of policy changes, significantly more of the health and human services nonprofits, large organizations, and those that rely primarily on the government for funding say that this is the case. Overall, the policies were at least four or five times as likely to impact the nonprofits when the policy became stricter versus when they became more lenient.

• **South Bend Nonprofits:**

- **Changes in Policy and Impacts:** For every policy condition about which we asked, South Bend nonprofits do not substantially differ from nonprofits across the state in the percentage that indicate that the policies became stricter, more lenient, or did not change. While there appears to be a difference between nonprofits in South Bend and those elsewhere in the state in terms of

the proportion that perceive that health and safety regulations have become stricter, these differences are only marginally significant. See Figure 34.¹⁸


Figure 34: Percent of nonprofits reporting changes in selected policy conditions, by region



Note: South Bend n=98-131; Not South Bend n=916-1,377; Other Metro n=492-762

- South Bend nonprofits generally do not differ from nonprofits elsewhere in reporting impacts from most of the policy changes about which we asked. However, for one policy condition, health and safety regulations, South Bend nonprofits (26 percent) are significantly more likely than their counterparts in other metro areas (13 percent) and in the rest of the state (14 percent) to say that they are impacted by this set of policies. See Figure 35.

Figure 35: Percent of nonprofits impacted by selected policy conditions, by region



Note: South Bend n=99-132; Not South Bend n=921-1,382; Other Metro n=496-765

Nonprofit Advocacy: We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they promote positions on certain policy issues or on issues related to the interests of certain groups. South Bend nonprofits show patterns that vary in this respect from the patterns of other Indiana nonprofits, both metropolitan and statewide.

• **Indiana Nonprofits:**

- **Participation in Advocacy:** More than one-quarter of Indiana nonprofits indicate that they participate in some form of advocacy (although only 3 percent say it is one of their three most important programs or activities). Health nonprofits are the most likely to say that they engage in advocacy, followed by religious, public benefit, and human services nonprofits. Mid-sized and large organizations are also more likely to engage in advocacy than smaller ones.
- **Resources for Advocacy:** Many nonprofits that engage in advocacy devote only limited resources to it. One in ten of the organizations that say they participate in advocacy do not commit any financial, staff, or volunteer resources to it.
- Many Indiana nonprofits that are involved in advocacy lack key information technology tools for it. While three-quarters of them have computers available, only two-thirds have Internet access and/or e-mail, and less than half have a web site.


¹⁸ Apparent differences between South Bend and Not South Bend / Other Metro in perceptions of licensing requirements are not statistically significant.

- Health and education nonprofits that participate in advocacy tend to be better equipped with such tools, while human services, arts, and especially mutual benefit nonprofits involved in advocacy tend to lack these tools. Large nonprofits and those that receive the majority of their funding from the government are considerably more likely to have all four technology tools we mentioned.

- South Bend Nonprofits:**

- Participation in Advocacy:** South Bend nonprofits are significantly more likely to participate in advocacy (41 percent) than their counterparts in other metro areas (27 percent) and the rest of the state (26 percent). See Figure 36.


Figure 36: Percent of nonprofits that participate in advocacy, by region



Note: South Bend n=187; Not South Bend n=1,775; Other Metro n=1,010

- Resources for Advocacy:** Despite a greater likelihood of participating in activities related to advocacy, South Bend nonprofits do not differ significantly from nonprofits in other metro areas and the rest of the state in the amount of volunteer or staff time devoted to these activities. However, they are significantly less likely to devote some amount of financial resources to these activities than are their counterparts in other metro areas. See Figure 37.

Figure 37: Extent of nonprofit resources devoted to advocacy, by type of resource and region



(+ Significant difference between South Bend and Other Metro)

Note: South Bend n=52-55; Not South Bend n=438-483; Other Metro n=267-288

APPENDIX A

NTEE MAJOR CATEGORIES AND MAJOR FIELDS

NTEE Major Fields	NTEE Major Groups and Decile Categories	
I Arts and Culture	Arts, Culture and Humanities (A)	
	A20 Arts, cultural organizations	A60 Performing arts organizations, activities
	A30 Media, communications organizations.	A70 Humanities organizations
	A40 Visual art organizations, services	A80 Historical societies and related
	A50 Museums, museum activities	A90 Arts service organizations and activities
II Education	Education (B)	
	B20 Elementary, secondary education	B60 Adult, continuing education
	B30 Vocational, technical schools	B70 Libraries, library science
	B40 Higher education institutions	B80 Student servcs & organizations of students
	B50 Graduate, professional schools	B90 Educational services & schools—other
III Environment/Animals	Environment (C)	
	C20 Pollution abatement and control services	D20 Animal protection and welfare
	C30 Nat. resources conservation & protection:	D30 Wildlife preservation, protection
	C40 Botanical, horticultural, & landscape	D40 Veterinary services, n.e.c.
	C50 Envirnm't'l beautification & open spaces	D50 Zoo, zoological society
	C60 Environmental educ. & outdoor survival	D60 Other services—specialty animals
		Animal-Related (D)
IV Health	Health Care (E)	
	E20 Hospitals, primary medical care facilities	F20 Alcohol, drug, & subs. Abuse, dependency prevention & treatment
	E30 Health treatment facilities, outpatient	F30 Mental health treatment
	E40 Reproductive health care facilities, allied	F40 Hot line, crisis intervention services
	E50 Rehabilitative medical services	F50 Addictive disorders, n.e.c.
	E60 Health support services	F60 Counseling support groups
	E70 Public health programs	F70 Mental health disorders
	E80 Health (general and financing)	F80 Mental health association
	E90 Nursing services	
	Diseases, Disorders & Medical Disciplines (G)	
	G20 Birth defects and genetic diseases	H20 Birth defects and genetic diseases
	G30 Cancer	H30 Cancer research
	G40 Diseases of specific organs	H40 Specific organ research
	G50 Nerve, muscle, and bone diseases	H50 Nerve, muscle, and bone research
	G60 Allergy related diseases	H60 Allergy related diseases
	G70 Digestive diseases, disorders	H70 Digestive diseases, disorders
	G80 Specifically named diseases, n.e.c.	H80 Specifically named diseases, n.e.c.
	G90 Medical Disciplines, n.e.c.	H90 Medical Specialty Research, n.e.c.
	V Human Services	Crime & Legal Related (I)
I20 Crime prevention		J20 Employ. procurement assist. & job training
I30 Correctional facilities		J30 Vocational rehabilitation
I40 Rehabilitation services for offenders		J40 Labor unions, organizations
I50 Administration of justice, courts		
I60 Law enforcement agencies		
I70 Protect, prevent: neglect, abuse, exploit.		
I80 Legal Services		
Food, Agriculture & Nutrition (K)		
K20 Agricultural programs		L20 Housing devel., construction, management
K30 Food service, free food distribution		L30 Housing search assistance
K40 Nutrition programs		L40 Low-cost temporary housing
K50 Home economics		L50 Housing owners, renters' organizations
		L80 Housing support services: other
		Housing & Shelter (L)

NTEE Major Fields	NTEE Major Groups and Decile Categories	
V. Human Services (continued)	Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief (M)	Recreation & Sports (N)
	M20 Disaster preparedness & relief services M40 Safety education	N20 Recreational & sporting camps N30 Physical fitness, recreational facilities N40 Sports training facilities, agencies N50 Recreational, pleasure, or social club N60 Amateur sports clubs, leagues N70 Amateur sports competitions N80 Professional athletic leagues
VI International	Youth Development (O)	Human Services (P)
	O20 Youth centers & clubs O30 Adult, child matching programs O40 Scouting organizations O50 Youth development programs, other	P20 Human service organizations P30 Children's & youth services P40 Family services P50 Personal social services P60 Emergency assist. (food, clothing, cash) P70 Residential, custodial care (group home) P80 Services to promote independence of groups
VII Public and Societal Benefit	International, Foreign Affairs & National Security (Q)	
	Q20 Promotion of international understanding Q30 International development, relief services Q40 International peace & security	Q50 Foreign policy research & analysis Q70 International human rights
	Civil Rights, Social Action & Advocacy (R)	Community Improvement, Capacity Building (S)
	R20 Civil rights, advocacy for specific groups R30 Intergroup, Race Relations R40 Voter Education, Registration R60 Civil Liberties Advocacy	S20 Community, neighborhood devel/imprvm't S30 Economic development S40 Business & industry S50 Nonprofit management S80 Community service clubs
	Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Foundations (T)	Science & Technology (U)
	T20 Private grantmaking foundations T30 Public foundations T40 Voluntarism promotion T50 Philan., charity, voluntarism promotion T60 Non-grantmaking, non-operat. foundations T70 Fund-raising organizations var. categories T90 Named trusts, n.e.c.	U20 Science, general U30 Physical, earth sciences research & prom. U40 Engineering & technology research, serv. U50 Biological, life science research
VIII Religious and Spiritual Development	Social Science (V)	Public & Societal Benefit (W)
	V20 Social science research institutes, services V30 Interdisciplinary research V40 Mystic, paranormal studies: incl. astrology.	W20 Government & public administration W30 Military, veterans' organizations W40 Public transportation systems, services W50 Telephone, telegraph, telecommunication W60 Financial institutions, services W70 Leadership development W80 Public utilities W90 Consumer protection & safety
IX Mutual Benefit	Religion-Related (X)	
	X20 Christian X30 Jewish X40 Islamic X50 Buddhist	X60 Confucian X70 Hindu X80 Religious media, communications orgs X90 Interfaith Issues
X Unknown	Mutual & Membership Benefit (Y)	
	Y20 Insurance Providers, Services Y30 Pension and Retirement Funds	Y40 Fraternal Beneficiary Societies Y50 Cemeteries & Burial Services
	Unknown (Z)	

PROJECT PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS

Over the last several years a number of reports and articles related to the Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project have been published, in addition to papers presented at various colloquiums and conferences. The following citations include project-related reports and papers as of May 2006. Online reports, as well as summaries of all other items, are available on the project website: www.indiana.edu/~nonprof. To obtain a complete version of an unpublished paper please contact Kirsten Grønbjerg (kgronbj@indiana.edu, (812) 855-5971).

Indiana Nonprofit Survey Analysis

This survey of 2,206 Indiana nonprofits, completed in spring and early summer of 2002, covered congregations, other charities, advocacy nonprofits, and mutual benefit associations. It used a stratified random sample drawn from our comprehensive Indiana nonprofit database and structured so as to allow for comparisons among (1) different nonprofit source listings (including those identified through the personal affiliation survey) and (2) twelve selected communities around the state. The survey included questions about basic organizational characteristics, programs and target populations, finances and human resources, management tools and challenges, advocacy activities, affiliations, and involvement in networking and collaboration. An almost identical instrument was used to survey Illinois congregations, charities and advocacy nonprofits for the Donors Forum of Chicago (report available Online at www.donorsforum.org, December, 2003).

Online Statewide Reports

- Indiana Nonprofits: A Portrait of Religious Nonprofits and Secular Charities, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg, Patricia Bortrager Tennen. Online report. Survey Report #7. June 2006 (<http://www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insfaithbased.html>).
- Indiana Nonprofits: A Profile of Membership Organizations, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Patricia Bortrager Tennen. Online report. Survey Report #6. September 2005 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insmember.html).
- Indiana Nonprofits: Affiliation, Collaboration, and Competition, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Curtis Child. Online report. Survey Report #5. November 2004 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insaffil.html).
- Indiana Nonprofits: Managing Financial and Human Resources, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Richard M. Clerkin. Online report. Survey Report #4. August 2004 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insman.html).
- Indiana Nonprofits: Impact of Community and Policy Changes, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Curtis Child. Online report. Survey Report #3. June 2004 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscom.html).
- The Indiana Nonprofit Sector: A Profile, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Linda Allen. Online report. Survey Report #2. January 2004 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/insprofile.html).
- The Indianapolis Nonprofit Sector: Management Capacities and Challenges, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Richard Clerkin. Online report. Preliminary Survey Report #1. February 2003 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/indymanag.html).

Online Regional Reports

- South Bend Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg, Kerry S. Brock, and Patricia Bortrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #7. November 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscomsouthbend.pdf).
- Fort Wayne Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg, Abigail Powell, Andrea Lewis, and Patricia Bortrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #6. November 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscomfortwayne.pdf).

- Indianapolis Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #5. November 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscomindianapolis.pdf).
- Evansville Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg, Curtis Child, and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #4. June 2006, revised November 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscomevansville.pdf).
- Muncie Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #3. June 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscommuncie.pdf).
- Northwest Region Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #2. February 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscomnorthwest.pdf).
- Bloomington Nonprofits: Scope and Dimensions, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Online report. Community Report #1. September 2005 (revised, December 2005) (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npsurvey/inscombloomington.pdf).

Journal Articles and Conference Presentations

- Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Their Characteristics and Activities, by Curtis Child and Kirsten A. Grønbjerg. Social Science Quarterly, forthcoming.
- Infrastructure and Activities: Relating IT to the Work of Nonprofit Organizations, by Richard Clerkin and Kirsten A. Grønbjerg. In Nonprofits and Technology, edited by Michael Cortés and Kevin Rafter. Chicago: Lyceum Press (forthcoming).
- The Capacities and Challenges of Faith-Based Human Service Organizations, by Richard Clerkin and Kirsten A. Grønbjerg. Public Administration Review (forthcoming, January-February 2007).
- Nonprofit Networks and Collaborations: Incidence, Scope and Outcomes, by Kirsten Grønbjerg and Curtis Child. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meetings of ARNOVA, Washington, D.C., November 17-19, 2005.
- A Portrait of Membership Associations: The Case of Indiana, by Kirsten Grønbjerg and Patricia Borntrager Tennen. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meetings of ARNOVA, Washington, D.C., November 17-19, 2005.
- Examining the Landscape of Indiana's Nonprofit Sector: Does What You See Depend on Where You Look? By Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Richard Clerkin. Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly 34 (No. 2, June): 232-59. 2005.

Indiana Nonprofit Employment Analysis

An analysis, comparing ES202 employment reports with IRS registered nonprofits under all sub-sections of 501(c), using a methodology developed by the Center for Civil Society Studies at The Johns Hopkins University, to examine nonprofit employment in the state of Indiana for 2001 with comparisons to 2000 and 1995. The analysis includes detailed information by county, region, and type of nonprofit as well as industry and sector comparisons.

Online Statewide Reports

- Indiana Nonprofit Employment, 2005 Report. Nonprofit Employment Report No. 2 by Kirsten Grønbjerg and Erich T. Eschmann. May 2005 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/innonprofitemploy.htm).
- Indiana Nonprofit Employment, 2001. Nonprofit Employment Report No. 1 by Kirsten Grønbjerg and Hun Myoung Park. July 2003 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/innonprofitemploy.htm).

Online Regional Reports

- Evansville Economic Region Nonprofit Employment: 2005 Report. Nonprofit Employment Series No. 2D by Kirsten Grønberg and Kerry Brock. May 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/inemploy/Evansvilleempl05.pdf).
- Muncie Economic Region Nonprofit Employment: 2005 Report. Nonprofit Employment Series No. 2C by Kirsten Grønberg and Kerry Brock. May 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/inemploy/muncieempl05.pdf).
- Northwest Economic Region Nonprofit Employment: 2005 Report. Nonprofit Employment Series No. 2B by Kirsten Grønberg and Kerry Brock. February 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/inemploy/northwestempl05.pdf).
- Bloomington Economic Region Nonprofit Employment: 2005 Report. Nonprofit Employment Series No. 2A by Kirsten Grønberg and Erich T. Eschmann with Kerry Brock. January 2006 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/inemploy/bloomingtonempl05.pdf).
- Bloomington Nonprofit Employment, 2001. Nonprofit Employment Report No. 1, Supplement A, by Kirsten Grønberg and Sharon Kioko. August 2003 (www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/inemploy/Bloomingtonempl03.pdf).

Personal Affiliation Survey Analysis

We completed a survey of 526 Indiana residents in May 2001, designed to make it possible to evaluate the utility of an alternative approach to sampling Indiana nonprofits (as compared to drawing a sample from a comprehensive nonprofit database). The survey probed for the respondents' personal affiliations with Indiana nonprofits as employees, worshippers, volunteers, or participants in association meetings or events during the previous 12 months. We recorded the names and addresses of the church the respondent had attended most recently, of up to two nonprofit employers, up to five nonprofits for which the respondent had volunteered, and up to five nonprofit associations.

Journal Articles and Conference Presentations

- The Role of Religious Networks and Other Factors in Different Types of Volunteer Work, by Kirsten Grønberg and Brent Never. Nonprofit Management and Leadership 14 (Winter 2004, No. 3):263-90.
- Individual Engagement with Nonprofits: Explaining Participation in Association Meetings and Events, by Kirsten Grønberg. Paper presented at the ARNOVA Meetings, Montreal, Canada, November 14-16, 2002.
- Volunteering for Nonprofits: The Role of Religious Engagement, by Kirsten Grønberg and Brent Never. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Religion. Chicago, August 14-16, 2002.

Indiana Nonprofit Database Analysis

We developed a comprehensive database of 59,400 Indiana nonprofits of all types in 2001 (congregations, other charities, advocacy nonprofits, and mutual benefit associations) using a unique methodology that combines a variety of data sources, most notably the IRS listing of tax-exempt entities, the Indiana Secretary of State's listing of incorporated nonprofits, and the yellow page listing of congregations. We supplemented these listings with a variety of local listings in eleven communities across the state and with nonprofits identified through a survey of Indiana residents about their personal affiliations with nonprofits. The database was most recently updated in 2004 and is available in a searchable format through a link at www.indiana.edu/~nonprof.

Journal Articles and Conference Presentations

- Extent and Nature of Overlap between Listings of IRS Tax-Exempt Registrations and Nonprofit Incorporation: The Case of Indiana, by Kirsten Grønberg and Laurie Paarlberg. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 31 (No. 4, December, 2002): 565-94.

- Evaluating Nonprofit Databases. American Behavioral Scientist 45 (July, 2002, No. 10): 1741-77. Resources for Scholarship in the Nonprofit Sector: Studies in the Political Economy of Information, Part I: Data on Nonprofit Industries.
- Community Variations in the Size and Scope of the Nonprofit Sector: Theory and Preliminary Findings, by Kirsten A. Grønbjerg and Laurie Paarlberg. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 30 (No. 4, December, 2001) 684-706.



The Center on Philanthropy
at Indiana University

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis



The Indiana University
School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Making A World of Difference.