Literature Review

Frances Huehls

is Assistant Librarian for the Joseph and Matthew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. She holds master's degrees in philanthropic studies and library science, as well as a Ph.D. in higher education from Indiana University. Dr. Huehls is editor of *Philanthropic Studies Index*, an online periodical literature index and *PRO: Philanthropy Resources Online*, a full-text resource for the field of philanthropic studies.

The reviews for this issue cover a variety of topics: ethical issues in fund raising, an evaluation of the use of information technology to mass market higher education, and three explorations of university/community partnerships—

technology transfer from the university to the community, the connection between higher education and long-term civic engagement, and a comparison of Japanese and US service learning initiatives.

W. W. Clohesy (2003), "Fund-raising and the articulation of common goods," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32, 1, pp. 128–40

Nonprofit organizations are viewed as an important component of the American democratic society. This relationship to democracy is echoed in the roles nongovernmental organizations are playing in former Soviet republics. Although the concept of civil society has long existed, the modern version is represented by the sector of organizations that are privately organized to provide goods and services for the benefit of society rather than for profit.

Although the nonprofit sector is duly noted in political theory, it has not received much attention in the field of applied ethics. Perhaps the emphasis on doing good has been a shield from the scrutiny that ethics has applied to other fields of study. The third sector itself has examined ethics in the area of charitable

fund raising. The author's purpose is to examine broad issues of fund-raising ethics, particularly the relationship between fund raisers and donors.

Having "public purpose" is the commitment to better the collective rather than the individual. This runs counter to the exchange principle of business, which aims to improve conditions and situations for individuals. Clohesy sees "public" as an attitude of individuals that is directed toward the common good rather than denoting government. Although both public and private in this sense need to coexist, the public aspect is the least dominant in business, where the rights of individual shareholders transcend other social responsibilities of corporations.

The classic venue of public discourse is the political voice of the citizen. The

public actions of meeting, discussion, and debate can result in a consensus which could not have been forged outside of the collective effort. Actions that result are not without conflict and continued debate, but that is a risk of life in a democratic society.

Clohesy, however, believes that in the modern world the nonprofit organization might also be this venue. He does not include nonprofit organizations which primarily fund their operations through fees for service. They are too close to the business model to be a vehicle for the public voice. Both liberals and conservatives agree that the third sector is the appropriate venue for public action for the common good—particularly in areas where the government cannot or will not act.

Nonprofit organizations—with their tremendous diversity and representing numerous viewpoints—are seldom acknowledged as an important arena for public debate. The mandated actions that are the product of public discussion can be carried out by both government and nonprofit organizations. Government represents the majority and has the power to act with coercive authority. Nonprofits, on the other hand, more often represent the will of minorities and act without the force of law.

Fund raising is one means of financing the work of nonprofit organizations. The work of fund raisers is to find people interested in contributing to the organization on an ongoing basis. This activity is viewed as “instrumental work that makes possible the organization’s real mission-based work.” (p. 133)

Albert Anderson’s *Ethics for Fundraisers* focuses on the donor. The emphasis is on respect for donor intent and privacy. The donor is encouraged to understand the

mission of the organization and have trust in both the fund raiser as agent and in the nonprofit organization as the service provider. Clohesy respects Anderson’s work but thinks he puts too much emphasis on the donor. Although it is important to respect donor intent and ideas, there is also a risk of “donor dominance” (p. 133). The purpose and mission of the organization should be the driving force. Donor dominance rears its head in the professional literature in three venues or metaphors: the donor as customer, fund raising as marketing, and donors equated to stockholders. If the donor is a customer, the donation must buy something. In the case of donations, the purchase is for a collective good.

The customer metaphor is frequently used in conjunction with the metaphor of fund raising as marketing. The business orientation poses a number of problems. The most pressing is the potential loss of the organizational cause. Clohesy reminds us that commercial marketing no longer centers on educating customers about product options but about creating needs where they did not previously exist. The emphasis needs to be on marketing that is primarily concerned with sharing information in the hope that people will be inspired to participate by the worthiness of the cause.

Clohesy also does not see donors as stockholders. Donors do not support nonprofit organizations to turn a quick profit. Those that embrace this metaphor are most likely interested in the tax breaks that come with charitable contributions and the idea that there are fast and sure solutions to social problems.

If a business metaphor is needed, stakeholder theory is more acceptable. There is a sense of mutual benefit from

considering the needs of all stakeholder groups: profits are earned rather than made since the products benefit society. Stakeholder theory brings the donor, fund raiser, and organization into a more realistic relationship with each other, a relationship which includes employees and the parties served by the nonprofit organization. The donor is still there but does not dominate the scene.

Perhaps the most viable approach is for fund raisers to emphasize to donors the activities of the organization and the need for resources to do the work. Fund raisers should not hesitate to “make their requests in moral terms” (p. 136), stating the needs of recipients or society and the potential for the gift to improve life. In this paradigm, donors are invited to participate in social change.

Fund raisers need to find donors who are genuinely interested in the work of nonprofits and are not merely looking for recognition. Their role should be to bring

together organizations, the people they serve, and the donors. In short, fund raisers can make it possible for citizens to act through nonprofit organizations.

An additional role for fund raisers is to educate the public about the third sector. Their understanding may not go beyond the local congregation and the United Way. Citizens who are educated about how the three sectors interact will be more likely to give and volunteer. Overall, they should be better citizens.

Clohesy concludes that the work of nonprofits is integral to a social cycle that seeks to identify, provide, and evaluate the need for public goods. The provision of public goods by nonprofit organizations is countered by a public that actively defines, sifts, and evaluates the goods it wants and those that are being provided. Fund raisers can be integral to this cycle by bringing together donors and organizations, making it possible for that segment of the cycle to flourish.

S. Clegg, A. Hudson, and J. Steel (2003), “The Emperor’s New Clothes: globalization and e-learning in higher education,” *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24, 1, pp. 39–53

As the title suggests, the purpose of this research is a critical examination of information and communication technologies (ICT) as a vehicle for mass higher education in a global market. Two problems with the popular view of globalization are that it ignores both the possibility that some things will remain the same and also contradictions to the idea that globalization is inevitable and universally accepted.

The higher educational policy of the British government is pervaded by the notion of globalization. David Blunkett’s “Greenwich speech” in 2000 was organized around the concept (pp. 40–1). Technology is presented as going hand in hand with globalization. Technology is also the means and the end of mass higher education. The economic survival of British democracy depends on being able to keep up technologically with the

rest of the Western world.

ICTs are included in policy statements as if reliance on them is a given. "This implies that the technology itself has an understood impact and that moreover the problems, if there are any, are largely implementational rather than fundamental" (p. 42). The cost of electronic course delivery is presented as being up front for both research and course module development, implying that course delivery costs are a minimal part of the whole. The language of policy statements emphasizes infinite numbers of students who can be served. The pace of e-learning development is stated as "striding," and "driving"; the implication is that it is "desirable and unstoppable" (p. 42).

The authors' primary argument with globalization theory is the tone that globalization is both a given and a fact. For higher education, the pervasive acceptance of globalization is an additional danger as it gives technology an expanded power. The acceptance of globalization theory is not warranted for higher education because it has been tested against political economics, analysis, and theory and has been found wanting.

Overemphasizing media and the way it drives and is being driven by globalization ignores the social aspects of information technology. In higher education, technology supplements but does not replace the traditional institution. At this point, there is no strong indication that electronic learning is more effective than the traditional classroom. Some of the more sophisticated technologies that are available to bridge the gap between the online and in-person classroom environment are not even being widely used.

Although technology-driven globalization of mass higher education is presented as a grand scheme, the activity is truly at the local level where there are still chasms between elite university education and postsecondary education for the working-class masses. A major issue for faculty is the control of curriculum and teaching. The trend has been toward bureaucratic management and away from faculty control. There is no indication that faculty accept or approve of this situation. The authors acknowledge that the faculty are currently faced with a variety of issues but they see the acceptance of globalization theory and the accompanying technology as more threatening than bureaucratic management.

Three models describe how higher education is adapting to technology at the local level. Some accept the shift to technology without question. In these cases, implementation has more to do with economies of scale than with student learning and flexible participation in higher education. The authors question whether student interaction with technology constitutes student-centered learning, if the technology functions merely as a vehicle to provide information.

At the median are faculty and institutions who see the potential for technology but who are also concerned with pedagogy. The bottom-up efforts of the faculty are trying to meet and be reconciled with the top-down pressures from the administration to implement technology in teaching. These situations require strong institutional support of faculty experimentation with technology.

At the far end are faculty and institutions who will embrace technology

if and when its use enhances teaching and learning. The decision to reject technology is as valid as the decision to use it.

Clegg, Hudson, and Steel conclude that the idea of producing a mass of educated

workers by globalizing higher education through the use of technology is a simplistic solution. Market pressure should not dictate educational practice.

D. Di Gregorio and S. Shane (2003), “Why do some universities generate more start-ups than others?”, *Research Policy*, 32, 209–27

Technology Licensing Office (TLO) start-ups—new companies formed to commercialize the intellectual property of universities—are an important mechanism for technology transfer and also generate revenues for universities. This type of activity varies widely by campus; some institutions generate many start-ups, while others do not generate any. There is no research to explain these variations.

This research is significant because it sheds light on at least four areas of inquiry: the mechanisms for and economic effects of “knowledge spillover” (p. 210) from inventions; understanding the effect of start-ups on local economic development; the ability of universities to harness the wealth generated by initial capital offerings of start-ups; and understanding how institutional policies toward technology transfer affect the norms of teaching, research, and the sharing of intellectual property.

Why do some institutions generate more TLO start-ups than others? The authors looked at “macro-level factors that vary across universities over time on the rate at which new firms are created to exploit university inventions rather than to develop an overall behavioral model of the decision to found a firm to exploit

university inventions” (p. 210). The authors were given access to data on start-ups from 1994 to 1998 for 116 institutions that are tracked by the Association of University Technology Management. An institution was defined as an entity that used a common set of policies regarding TLO start-ups, even where multiple campuses existed. The research also utilized survey methodology and the use of databases to collect information, including the US Patent and Trademark database, the Venture Economics database, and the Gourman reports that rank graduate school quality. A five-year panel was compiled using negative binomial models in generalized estimating equations.

The authors tested four hypotheses on the effects of local venture capital activity, commercial orientation of the institution, intellectual eminence of the institution, and university policies on TLO start-up activity. Venture capitalists provide both financial backing and start-up assistance on a local level. The hypothesis was that greater availability of venture capital in the university area would result in higher rates of TLO start-ups. Venture capital activity was measured within a sixty-mile radius of each institution by examining

the number of venture capital-funded companies and dollar amounts of venture capital received in a given year, as well as measuring the available venture capital within the geographic area for a given year.

The mission of some universities steers them toward research on industrial problems—such as the land grant institution interest in agriculture. Because their industry-based funding would lead to discoveries with commercial potential, the hypothesis was that universities with commercial research orientation would have more TLO start-ups. Industry funds lower risk projects than does the government. Government-funded research also tends to be more basic; marketability of discoveries is not always obvious. The authors examined the sponsored research that came from industry in total and the ratio to government funding.

Intellectual eminence is a measure of the prestige of institutions and individual researchers. It is assumed that higher quality researchers are found in eminent institutions and that eminent researchers are more likely to form start-ups than are less eminent researchers. Prestigious institutions are also viewed as more likely

to provide resources for start-ups. In the absence of other assurances, investors will trust the reputations of institutions and researchers. The hypothesis that the more intellectually eminent the institution, the higher the rate of start-up activity was tested by comparing start-up rates against the academic ratings of graduate schools (Gourman reports).

The fourth hypothesis investigated a cluster of institutional policies that should promote the rate of start-ups. The policies that were investigated were the inverse allocation of royalties to the researcher versus the institution, the availability and use of research incubators, the availability of internal venture capital funds, and institutional willingness to contribute funds to reduce start-up costs.

For the cluster of universities studies, the analysis showed that only two university policies influenced start-up rates: the willingness of the institution to contribute funds to alleviate start-up costs and a low inventor share in royalties. The only other significant factor was intellectual eminence. The availability of local venture capital and commercial orientation played little or no role in start-up rates.

M. Edgerton (2002), “Higher education and civic engagement,” *British Journal of Sociology*, 53, 4, pp. 603–20

The research presented here examined the relationship of education to membership and participation in British voluntary organizations. Research on college students suggests that they are more likely to socialize and engage in political activity

than are nonstudents in the same age groups. The educational system itself encourages these behaviors as part of citizenship education. The author was particularly interested in the inclination for and opportunity to participate in

political organizations and the relationship of participation to both education and social class.

It is difficult to determine the extent to which social and political participation is the result of education as opposed to other factors including occupation, social class, or simply being in a family of educated people. The author used the British Household Panel Study to look at the social and political activity of youths both before and after they participated in higher education. The purpose was to determine if higher education encouraged social participation before the student started his or her career and was exposed to the social networking opportunities provided by that career. The author also wanted to know if social class affected participation in social and civic organizations independently of higher education. Does higher education matter if people are socialized into civic participation by their families?

The British Household Panel Study collects information annually about membership and participation in voluntary organizations. Edgerton's study sampled only young people and required that data on both educational and organizational participation be available for five to six years (approximately 470 cases). Observations were made at age 17 or 18 (or the year prior to entering higher education) and then again at age 22 or 23 (the year of completion). Participation in civic and social organizations was compared at both points. The same data was also compiled for young people who did not go on to higher education. A small group of mature students was also studied to isolate the effect of higher

education on maturation in the traditional age group. Social class and social participation at age 17 was examined to isolate family ties to participation that were separate from the effect of higher education or entering the working world. Membership data was compiled for 12 to 13 types of organizations, ranging from political parties and trade unions to church organizations and feminist groups. Higher education was also segmented into five areas: graduate, undergraduate, A-level, NVQ3 (vocational equivalent of A-level), and below NVQ3.

The results indicated that higher education does have an effect on engagement, but it is not the only factor. Differences in participation predate higher education and result from family influences and socialization, including social class. Attending higher education positively influenced participation in civic organizations. For mature students, attending higher education had a marked affect on civic participation, even when the student was not from a professional family. Children of managers were not more likely to participate than the children of manual laborers, a finding that calls into question assumptions about middle-class commitment to voluntarism. Managers are apparently not socializing their children into civic participation. This may be because this group does not see civic participation as a source of career networking and upward mobility. The ongoing trend of participation by the children of professionals may be a holdover of nineteenth century social values that still has influence in the professions and the universities.

Y. Nishide (2002), "University-community partnerships: Cases from the U.S. and Japan," *The Nonprofit Review (The Journal of the Japanese NPO Research Association)*, 2, 2, pp. 95-109

Universities in both Japan and the USA are faced with redefining their wider social roles. These roles have traditionally been the threefold mission of teaching, research, and service. Both service and teaching that is directed to education for a democratic society are given secondary importance. Existing literature has stressed the need for institutions to play a greater role in both of these areas. Where universities have written formal statements of responsibility for service, they are directed toward localized geographic areas. The author compares the history and form of university-community partnerships (UCPs) in both countries through an examination of social roles, models of successful UCPs, examples of partnerships in both the USA and Japan, and an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the examples presented.

Historically, both the USA and Japan have experienced a shift from elite to mass higher education. In the USA, the diversity of the student body has increased but this gain has been countered by criticism of high costs and poor quality. Higher education in the USA needs to face the challenge of broader social engagement in order to regain public trust.

Since World War II, higher education has been available to more Japanese. Wider availability of higher education has contributed to strong economic growth. However, there is some feeling among the Japanese that educational quality has suffered and that academic competition among students has been morally

degrading. Challenges to the Japanese system of higher education include declining birthrates, excessive standardization, lowered standards of quality, and inadequate financing. Because education now centers in the institution instead of the Japanese household, the overall system of education needs to be stronger and more articulated. Bridges from secondary to higher education are especially needed. On economic, social, and legislative fronts, Japanese higher education is undergoing radical reform.

The literature on university and community partnerships (UCPs) casts a wide net but invariably seeks to persuade universities of the need to be more engaged in their communities. Topics of research include the mutual dependency of the university and the surrounding community, the effect of economically depressed university neighborhoods on faculty retention and enrollments, the value of enlisting community nonprofit organizations in UCPs, the value of service learning, and the need to reevaluate faculty reward structures to place more emphasis on service. There is also a substantial body of research that points to the idea that participation in higher education encourages civic engagement, including developing skills needed for active and effective civic participation.

Nishide proposes a model that includes all factors and players but redirects the targets of higher education. The function of research is the creation of knowledge; its role in civic life is the contribution to understanding; the target is the

community at large. The function of teaching is the communication of knowledge; the impact on civic life is the formation of stronger citizens; its target is students and citizens. The function of service is the application of knowledge; the impact is felt in increased participation at the community level; the target is community-based nonprofit organizations.

The USA has a strong legislative history of support for UCPs. Starting with the Morrill Act of 1864, the idea of the university-community partnership caught hold during the Progressive era. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 encouraged the flow of information from universities to communities. The 1960s were marked by initiatives such as the Peace Corps and VISTA as well as the Higher Education Act of 1965, which funded university-community service programs. The National Center for Public Service Internships Programs (1971) was followed in the 1980s by the formation of the Campus Compact and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League. The 1990s produced the National and Community Service Act and the formation of the Corporation for National Service, including Learn and Serve America and AmeriCorps.

Service learning—in which voluntarism in the community is an integral part of an academic course—is the most common type of university-community collaboration. Four characteristics common to virtually all service learning programs are that they are designed to meet a community need, the goal is to encourage civic participation, and the courses incorporate experiential learning and utilize reflection and integration of the experience into the curriculum.

Although growth of service learning programs has been constant in the USA, the level of individual institutional support varies. Funding has been provided by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of University Partnerships and also by private and corporate foundations including Annie E. Casey, Ford, Kellogg, and Surdna.

The bulk of the research on service learning examines student outcomes but not community outcomes. Research on students covers the effect of service learning on academic progress, civic participation, leadership skills and choice of career. There is also substantial literature on obstacles to service learning programs including financial support, nonparticipation by faculty, and misunderstandings about the benefits that accrue from such programs. Research on community impacts reflect the challenges organizations face with erratic student volunteer schedules, lack of volunteer commitment, and poor communication with academic institutions.

In Japan, the support for UCPs comes from individual faculty members and not from institutions. Service learning does not yet fit the current model of university education in Japan. Youth voluntarism is also significantly lower in Japan than in the USA. Although nonprofit organizations have flourished since the Great Hanshin-Awaji earthquake in 1995, they face significant economic challenges. The most common type of UCP is the internship. These are generally initiated by individual faculty members and tend to be only a week or two in length.

Through an analysis of fourteen publications, the author compiled a table of 37 criteria for successful UCPs. The single most important criterion was

“engagement and active participation of all the stakeholders” (p. 102).

Examples of UCPS for both the USA and Japan are cited. The University of Pennsylvania’s Center for Community Partnerships is an example of a comprehensive program. The university’s efforts, which are centered in the community schools, have created trust between the institution and the community. This model shows the importance of committed academic leadership and the value of insisting on mutual gains for both the university and the community. Pennsylvania has always tried to include community voices and has also been able to demonstrate positive outcomes.

Syracuse University’s Center for Public and Community Service was formed in 1994 and centers its program on service learning. Participation is open to all organizations in the community. Syracuse also offers the Service Learning Pedagogy Project, which tries to implant the philosophy and learning objectives of service learning across the curriculum. This model also points to the importance of administrative commitment, as well as the need for strong communication between the university and participating organizations, and the value of assisting faculty in implementing service learning in their courses.

The Consortium of Universities in Kyoto (CUK) is a nonprofit foundation

that was formed in 1998 to coordinate internships between the universities in Kyoto and all economic sectors, including nonprofit organizations. “The NPO School” (p. 105) provides programs to promote student interest and participation in nonprofit internships. CUK’s intermediary and coordinating function saves the universities time and the cost of operating individual programs. Student participation has been limited but those involved have been satisfied with the program.

Nishide closes with a discussion of the lessons that can be learned from both the US and Japanese UCPs. The comparison of institutions does not imply that US programs would transplant well to Japan or vice versa; cultural and demographic differences must be taken into account. A model that adopts components of both cultures is recommended. It would incorporate a comprehensive approach that emphasizes institutional commitment and leadership, features pedagogically supported service learning programs, and is coordinated on a community basis through the use of an intermediary agency. Through this system “universities will become more significant members of their communities, students will be more active citizens, faculties’ research will contribute more to real life, the capacity of nonprofit organizations will increase, and the community will enjoy increased social capital” (p. 107).