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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 Evansville metropolitan region (including Gibson 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 208 in the Evansville region, 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 Evansville region to include Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, and Gibson Counties.2 We compare Evansville nonprofits to all other nonprofits in the state (labeled in the figures that follow as “Not Evansville”). We also compare Evansville nonprofits to nonprofits in six other Indiana metropolitan areas: Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Northwest, South Bend, Bloomington, and Muncie (we refer to these as “Other Metro” nonprofits – dark colored regions in Figure 1).3 Thus for every figure presented here we conducted two analyses. One compares Evansville nonprofits to all other nonprofits in the state (i.e. Evansville vs. Not Evansville); the other compares Evansville nonprofits to other metro area nonprofits (i.e. Evansville 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 the apparent differences. Interestingly, and to our surprise, Evansville 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.

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 Evansville” and “Other Metro” categories are not mutually exclusive since all Other Metro nonprofits are included in the Not Evansville category.
In this report, we examine several broad themes: the characteristics of nonprofits in Indiana and Evansville, 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 state. This is followed by an analysis of Evansville 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 Evansville 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 in which the characteristics of Evansville nonprofits deviate from those of nonprofits located elsewhere in the state (keeping in mind that overall, they are far more similar than dissimilar).

- **Less likely to target by race/ethnicity:** While only small minorities of nonprofits statewide (15 percent) and in other metro areas (16 percent) target by race or ethnicity, Evansville nonprofits are even less likely (8 percent) to do so.

- **Smaller annual revenues:** Only 7 percent of Evansville nonprofits have revenues of $1 million or more, compared to 17 percent of nonprofits in other metro areas.

- **More likely to depend on special events:** Evansville nonprofits mirror statewide patterns in most of the sources of revenue. However, they are slightly more likely to depend on revenue generated from special events (13 percent) than nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas (8 percent each).

- **Fewer program-related challenges in some areas:** Evansville nonprofits (24 percent) are less likely to report challenges in delivering quality programs than are nonprofits in the rest of the state (32 percent) and in other metro areas (33 percent). They are also less likely than other metro area nonprofits to report challenges in communicating with clients (13 percent vs. 23 percent).

- **Less likely to have Internet access:** Just under half (49 percent) of Evansville nonprofits have direct Internet access, compared to 59 percent of nonprofits in other metro areas.

- **Less likely to collaborate:** Evansville nonprofits are slightly less likely to report that they collaborate in informal or formal relationships than nonprofits in other metro areas (49 percent vs. 59 percent).

- **More likely to collaborate with for-profit organizations:** Almost half (45 percent) of Evansville nonprofits identify for-profit organizations in their most important relationship, compared to 1 in 5 nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas. This is perhaps Evansville’s greatest divergence.

- **More heterogeneous networks:** Evansville nonprofits tend to network with greater varieties of entities than other nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas, with 21 percent of Evansville nonprofits reporting 5 or more different types of organizations in their most important relationship, compared to 7 percent statewide and 8 percent in other metro areas.

- **Varying perceptions of community conditions:** Evansville nonprofits are more likely to report increases in employment opportunities and household income, and less likely to report increases in population size and crime and violence.

- **Varying impacts from changing community conditions:** Evansville nonprofits are less likely to say they are impacted by changes in population size, racial diversity, and crime and violence.
I. PROFILE

Missions, Size, Age, Targeting, and Demands: In order to understand Evansville’s nonprofit sector we first assess some basic characteristics of nonprofit organizations, such as their field of activity, size, age, targeting patterns, and how the demands for their goods and services have changed over time. We present an overview of state patterns before discussing how Evansville nonprofits compare to nonprofits in other metro areas as well as to all other nonprofits in the state. Overall, Evansville nonprofits resemble other nonprofits in metro and non-metro regions throughout the state, but they 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 (reporting between 0.5 and 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.

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**
  - **Fields of Activity:** One-third (33 percent) of Evansville nonprofits work in human services; one-quarter (23 percent) in religion; 18 percent in public benefit; and between 5 and 7 percent each operate in the fields of health, arts, mutual benefit, and education. The distribution of Evansville nonprofits across the different fields of activity is similar to the distribution of nonprofits at the state level and in other metro areas. See Figure 2.

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

![Figure 2: Distribution of nonprofits by major field of activity and region](image)

Note: Evansville n=208; Not Evansville n=1,998; Other Metro n=1,141

- **Employees:** Evansville nonprofits, other metro area nonprofits, and nonprofits throughout the state have a median of 0.5 to 1 full-time equivalents (FTEs). Some 44 percent of Evansville nonprofits do not have any employees at all.

---

4 For our definitions of nonprofit fields, see Appendix A.
5 For a more detailed description see Kirsten A. Granbjer & Linda Allen: *The Indiana Nonprofit Sector: a Profile*. Report #2, January 2004. Available online at www.indiana.edu/~nonprof/results/npssurvey/insprofile.html. Evansville and other regions were described briefly in the appendices of this report.
6 Please note that “Indiana Nonprofits” refers to all nonprofit organizations captured in the survey; while “Not Evansville” (portrayed in the figures) refers to all nonprofits aside from Evansville 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 Evansville” heading.

7 The apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion of nonprofits operating in education, suggested by Figure 2, is only marginally significant.
which is on par with nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas. See Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Number of nonprofit FTE staff, by region**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of nonprofit FTE staff by region](chart1.png)

- **Program Targeting:** As with nonprofits across the state and in other metro areas, geographic location and age are the most common targets for programs offered by Evansville nonprofits. Almost two-thirds (61 percent) of Evansville nonprofits target their programs based on geographic location and over half (52 percent) target by age. See Figure 6.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of nonprofits by program target](chart2.png)

---

**Figure 4: Nonprofit age, by region**

![Bar chart showing the mean and median age of nonprofits by region](chart3.png)

- **Year of Establishment:** Similar to nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas, the mean age of Evansville nonprofits is 46 years. The median age is 13 years younger than the mean, at 33 years old, indicating that there are a few very old organizations. See Figure 4.

**Figure 5: Year of establishment of nonprofits, by region**

![Bar chart showing the year of establishment by region](chart4.png)

- About one-fifth (21 percent) of nonprofits in Evansville nonprofits were established before 1930 and another one-fifth (22 percent) between 1930 and 1959. Evansville’s pattern is very similar to nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas. See Figure 5.

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

![Bar chart showing the percentage of nonprofits by program target and region](chart5.png)

- Compared to other metro areas (16 percent) and the rest of the state (15 percent), Evansville nonprofits are slightly less likely to target their programs and activities to racial, ethnic, and cul-

---

8 The difference between Evansville and Not Evansville in the percent of nonprofits that target by “other” groups, suggested by Figure 6, is only marginally significant.
tural groups (8 percent). Other than this divergence, Evansville nonprofits target their programs in similar ways as nonprofits in other areas.

- **Change in Demand**: Like other nonprofits in Indiana, most Evansville nonprofits say demands for their services or programs stayed the same (47 percent) or increased (45 percent) over the last three years. Very few said that demand decreased (7 percent). See Figure 7.

**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. Overall, the financial condition of Evansville nonprofits is very similar to that of other nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas.

- **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).

Note: Evansville n=197; Not Evansville n=1,891; Other Metro n=1,075

---

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.

Evansville Nonprofits:

Amount of Revenues: Median annual revenues for Evansville nonprofits are approximately $35,000; the median assets are $23,000. Two-fifths (39 percent) of Evansville nonprofits have revenues under $25,000 (with an additional 5 percent with no revenues at all), while only 7 percent have revenues over $1 million. On average, Evansville nonprofits appear slightly smaller than nonprofits in other metro areas, but they are not significantly different from nonprofits throughout the state. See Figure 8.

More than 9 out of 10 Evansville nonprofits said that expenses stayed the same (33 percent) or increased (58 percent). This is also true for nonprofits in other metro areas and for all nonprofits throughout the state. Evansville nonprofits follow the statewide pattern of more pervasive increases in expenditures than in revenues.

Funding Sources: Paralleling statewide and metro area patterns, Evansville nonprofits are most likely to rely extensively on either donations or dues/fees, with 32 percent and 20 percent, respectively, reporting that those sources account for more than half of revenues. Approximately 1 in 10 relies on revenue generated from special events (13 percent), on a mix of funding sources (12 percent), and on government funding (11 percent). Evansville nonprofits are slightly more likely than nonprofits outside of Evansville to indicate that more than one-half of their revenue comes from special events. See Figure 10.

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

Figure 8: Annual revenues of nonprofits, by region

Note: Evansville n=156; Not Evansville n=1,568; Other Metro n=888

The apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion of nonprofits that rely primarily on special events funding, suggested by Figure 10, is only marginally significant. The same is true of the difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion...
Change in Funding Sources: Changes in revenues from different sources for Evansville nonprofits reflect similar changes at the state level and in other metro areas. See Figure 11.

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 Evansville nonprofits face very similar challenges and possess the same tools as other Indiana nonprofits.

- **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 facil-
ing 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.

**Evansville Nonprofits:**

- **Challenges in Financial Management:** Evansville 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 (43 percent) say that obtaining funding is a major challenge, although relatively few indicate that using information technology (13 percent), financial management (10 percent), and managing facilities (7 percent) are challenges. See Figure 13.

- **Financial Management Tools:** Like nonprofits throughout the state and in other metro areas, some nonprofits in Evansville have acquired tools to help them address potential or real financial challenges. While a majority (but not all) has computerized financial records (59 percent) and recently completed financial audits (57 percent), a smaller proportion has reserves dedicated for maintenance (47 percent) or capital needs (33 percent). See Figure 14.¹²

**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 Evansville 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 us-

---

¹² The apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion of nonprofits with a recent financial audit, suggested by Figure 14, is only marginally significant.
ing 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 or 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.

- **Evansville Nonprofits**:

  - **Paid and Volunteer Staff**: Over half (56 percent) of Evansville nonprofits have paid staff. Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of Evansville 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.

  - **Challenges**: Evansville 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 15.

  - **Tools**: Similar to other Indiana nonprofits, most Evansville nonprofits have written governance policies (91 percent); one-half or more have written job descriptions (64 percent) and personnel policies (50 percent). Only one-third (35 percent) have written conflict of interest policies. See Figure 16.

  - One-fifth of Evansville nonprofits have a formal volunteer recruitment program; one-quarter have a formal volunteer training program. This is on par with nonprofits throughout Indiana and in other metro areas. See Figure 17.
Other Management Challenges and Capacities:

We asked Indiana nonprofits about other challenges they face and the organizational tools they have to address various challenges. Evansville nonprofits are nearly identical to other Indiana nonprofits; however, they vary notably in a few dimensions.

- **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.

  - **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.

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**

  - **Challenges:** Similar to other nonprofits, attracting clients/members is the most common challenge reported by Evansville nonprofits (45 percent). One-third of Evansville nonprofits report major challenges in meeting client/member needs. See Figure 18.

  - Delivering quality programs and services are slightly less challenging to Evansville nonprofits (24 percent) than nonprofits not in Evansville (32 percent) as well as those in other metro areas (33 percent). Similarly, communicating with clients and members is less of a challenge for
Evansville nonprofits (13 percent) than for nonprofits in other metro areas (23 percent).\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Figure 18: Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure18}
\caption{Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region}
\end{figure}

Note: Evansville n=181-186; Not Evansville n=1,766-1,790; Other Metro n=1,007-1,025

\textendash; Enhancing visibility and reputation is a major challenge for 3 in 10 Evansville nonprofits; strategic planning for 1 in 4; evaluating programs for 1 in 5; and maintaining good relations for 1 in 10. These percentages reflect those found in other metro areas and across the state. See Figure 19.\textsuperscript{14}

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

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure19}
\caption{Percent of nonprofits that indicate selected issues are a major challenge, by region}
\end{figure}

Note: Evansville n=184-185; Not Evansville n=1,767-1,779; Other Metro n=1,010-1,012

\textsuperscript{13} The apparent difference between Evansville and Not Evansville in the proportion that consider communicating with clients to be a challenge, suggested by Figure 18, is also marginally significant.

\textsuperscript{14} The apparent differences suggested by Figure 19 are not statistically significant.

\textbf{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. Just under two-thirds (63 percent) of Evansville nonprofits have computers. Only one-half (49 percent) are connected to the Internet, significantly less than nonprofits in other metro areas (59 percent). Even smaller percentages have an organizational e-mail address (47 percent) or website (41 percent), similar to nonprofits elsewhere in the state. See Figure 20.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Figure 20: Percent of nonprofits that have selected organizational components, by region}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure20}
\caption{Percent of nonprofits that have selected organizational components, by region}
\end{figure}

Note: Evansville n=186-191; Not Evansville n=1,808-1,842; Other Metro n=1,033-1,043

\textsuperscript{15} The difference between Evansville and Not Evansville in the proportion with an organizational website, suggested by Figure 20, is only marginally significant.
III. AFFILIATIONS, COLLABORATIONS, AND COMPETITION

Formal Affiliations: We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they are affiliated with another organization as a headquarter, local subsidiary, or in another way.\(^{16}\) Evansville nonprofits are nearly identical to other nonprofits statewide and in metropolitan areas in these areas.

- 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.

- Evansville Nonprofits:
  - Affiliations: Just over one-half (54 percent) of Evansville nonprofits are formally affiliated with another organization. This mirrors the statewide and metro area patterns. See Figure 21.
  - Support from Federated Funders: In patterns similar to those seen elsewhere, some 8 percent of Evansville nonprofits indicate that they received funding from the United Way during the past fiscal year, and only 5 percent received support from religious federated funders. An even smaller amount (just 2 percent) received revenue from other federated funders. In all, 11 percent of Evansville nonprofits received financial support from any one of these types of federated funders overall. Evansville nonprofits seem slightly less likely than their counterparts in other metro areas to receive support from any federated funders, though this difference is only marginally significant. See Figure 22.\(^{17}\)


\(^{17}\) The apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion that receives support from “other” federated funders, suggested by Figure 22, is also marginally significant.
tions or informal networks with other entities. Evansville nonprofits differ slightly from other Indiana nonprofits in metropolitan 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 nonprofits’ size and their access to technology—larger nonprofits and those with basic information technology components are most likely to indicate that they participate in such relationships.

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**
  - Just over one-third (36 percent) of Evansville nonprofits participate in informal networks, while approximately one-fifth (22 percent) are involved in formal collaborations. Nonprofits in Evansville (49 percent) are slightly less likely than nonprofits in other metro areas (59 percent) to indicate that they participate in both informal and formal relationships. See Figure 23.\(^{18}\)

### 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 Evansville nonprofits tend to have more heterogeneous networks than other nonprofits 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).

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**
  - **Size of Networks:** For Evansville nonprofits that participate in networks and collaborations, the median number of organizations in these relationships is 5. The same is true for nonprofits in other metro areas and for nonprofits across the state.

  - In Evansville, as well as in the rest of the state, the majority of nonprofits that participate in relationships say that there are 5 or fewer members

---

\(^{18}\) The difference between Evansville and Not Evansville in the percent that report both formal and informal relationships, suggested by Figure 23, is marginally significant. The apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the percent that report formal relationships, suggested by the same figure, is also marginally significant.
in their most important collaboration or network. See Figure 24.

Figure 24: Number of organizations involved in most important relationship, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>3 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 20</th>
<th>20 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Evansville</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Metro</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences)

Note: Evansville n=81; Not Evansville n=818; Other Metro n=499

- **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 Evansville collaborate with other types of organizations to the same extent as nonprofits outside of Evansville. One striking difference, however, is with the percentage of nonprofits that identify for-profit businesses in their most important relationship. Almost one-half (45 percent) of Evansville nonprofits name businesses as members of their most important collaboration or network, compared to only one-fifth of nonprofits outside of Evansville. See Figure 25.19

- Although Evansville nonprofits’ most important relationship is approximately the size of relationships reported by nonprofits throughout the state, nonprofits in Evansville do indicate that their most important relationship is slightly more heterogeneous. Over one fifth (21 percent) of Evansville nonprofits name 5 or more different types of organizations in their most important relationship, compared to only 7 percent of other nonprofits statewide. See Figure 26.20

Figure 25: Types of organizations identified in most important relationship, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Organizations</th>
<th>Evansville</th>
<th>Not Evansville</th>
<th>Other Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Body</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit Org.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Org.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agency</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faith-Based Org.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Benefit Org.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Org.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Significant Difference between Evansville and Not Evansville + Significant Difference between Evansville and Other Metro)

Note: Evansville n=95-96; Not Evansville n=1,000-1,023; Other Metro n=608-621

Figure 26: Number of types of organizations in most important relationship, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Types</th>
<th>Evansville</th>
<th>Not Evansville</th>
<th>Other Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Significant Difference between Evansville and Not Evansville)

Note: Evansville n=90; Not Evansville n=936; Other Metro n=567

**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. Evansville nonprofits respond in a pattern similar to nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas.

19 The apparent differences between Evansville and Not Evansville / Other Metro in the percentage of nonprofits that include government agencies or other faith-based organizations in their most important relationship, suggested by Figure 25, are marginally significant.

20 The apparent differences between Evansville and Other Metro, suggested by Figure 26, are also marginally significant.
• **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.

• **Evansville Nonprofits:**
  
  - A large majority of Evansville nonprofits (71 percent) indicate that participating in networks and collaborations helps enhance their visibility or reputation. A majority (65 percent) also say that their relationships make it easier to meet client or member needs. Inter-organizational relationships make obtaining funding easier for just over two-fifths (44 percent) of the nonprofits in Evansville. This pattern is similar to other nonprofits, metro and non-metro, throughout the state. See Figure 27.

**Figure 27: Effect of participation in networks or collaborations on maintaining key organizational capacities, by region**

- **Enhance Visibility**: 18% in Evansville, 27% in Not Evansville, 29% in Other Metro.
- **Meet Client Needs**: 25% in Evansville, 30% in Not Evansville, 39% in Other Metro.
- **Obtain Funding**: 46% in Evansville, 42% in Not Evansville, 36% in Other Metro.

(Note: Evansville n=89-90; Not Evansville n=938-947; Other Metro n=575-582)

**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. Evansville nonprofits face similar competition and competitors as nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas.

• **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.

**21** Apparent differences between Evansville and Other Metro in the effect of collaboration on recruiting and keeping board members, suggested by Figure 28, are marginally significant.
Evansville Nonprofits:

- **Extent of Competition:** Evansville nonprofits are no different than other nonprofits throughout the state in that approximately one-third (28 percent) compete with other organizations for financial resources; one-quarter compete to attract clients or members; and one-fifth or less compete with other organizations in their efforts to recruit staff or volunteers, deliver programs or services, and recruit board members. See Figure 29.

Figure 29: Percent of nonprofits reporting competition with other organizations, by arena and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arena</th>
<th>Evansville</th>
<th>Not Evansville</th>
<th>Other Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Funding</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting Clients</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Staff/Volunteers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering Services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Board Members</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences)

Note: Evansville n=208; Not Evansville n=1,998; Other Metro n=1,141

- **Types of Competitors:** Reflecting the statewide and metro area patterns, nonprofits in Evansville are most likely to compete with secular nonprofits (26 percent), followed by religious nonprofits (23 percent), businesses (13 percent), and government agencies (8 percent). Overall, two-fifths (40 percent) of Evansville nonprofits say that they compete with at least one of these types of organizations. See Figure 30.

Figure 30: Percent of nonprofits reporting competition, by type of competitor and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitor Type</th>
<th>Evansville</th>
<th>Not Evansville</th>
<th>Other Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secular NPO</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious NPO</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Competition</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences)

Note: Evansville n=208; Not Evansville n=1,998; Other Metro n=1,141
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. In this respect Evansville nonprofits appear to be more unusual. We found that Evansville 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.

- Evansville Nonprofits:
  - Changes in Community Conditions: Compared to other metro area nonprofits (16 percent) as well as nonprofits across the state (17 percent), Evansville nonprofits are more likely to report that employment and business opportunities increased within the geographic areas in which they operate (37 percent), but they are no more likely than nonprofits from other areas to say that these changes impacted them. See Figures 31 and 32.
  - Some 44 percent of Evansville nonprofits say that population size changed, although opinions differed on whether it increased (31 percent) or decreased (13 percent). This differs notably from nonprofits statewide and in other metro areas, only 7 percent of which reported population decreases. However, Evansville nonprofits are less likely than nonprofits statewide to say that

---

changes in population impacts their organizations.23

Figure 31: Percent of nonprofits reporting changes in selected community conditions, by region

Note: Evansville n=156-170; Not Evansville n=1,509-1,636; Other Metro n=838-903

Figure 32: Percent of nonprofits reporting being impacted by selected community conditions, by region

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

− Evansville nonprofits are also more likely than nonprofits in other metro areas to say that family and household income increased over the last three years (25 percent vs. 16 percent)24; however, they report similar impacts from those changes.

23 The difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion of nonprofits that report impacts from changes in population size, suggested by Figure 32, is also marginally significant.

24 The apparent differences between Evansville and Not Evansville in this dimension are also marginally significant.

− Impacts from Community Conditions: While Evansville nonprofits appear to be less likely than nonprofits in other areas to report that ethnic or racial diversity had changed over the last three years, this difference is only marginally significant. However, they are significantly less likely than these organizations to say that such changes in diversity impacted their organization (7 percent vs. 19 percent and 23 percent). See Figure 32.

− Evansville nonprofits are more likely than nonprofits in other metro areas and across the state to say that crime and violence stayed the same, and less likely to indicate that it increased (10 percent vs. 20 percent statewide and 22 percent in other metro areas). Along these same lines, relatively few Evansville nonprofits (9 percent) said that crime and violence impacted their organization, compared to 13 percent statewide and 18 percent in other metro areas25.

Policy Conditions and Impacts: We also asked Indiana nonprofits about changes in five government policies and whether the changes affect their organization. While perceptions of community conditions differed in Evansville, perceptions of policy conditions and their impacts are nearly identical to other nonprofits and metropolitan organizations statewide.

− 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

25 This apparent difference between Evansville and Other Metro in the proportion that report impacts from tension among community groups, suggested by Figure 32, is marginally significant.
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.

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**
  - **Changes in Policy and Impacts:** For every policy condition about which we asked, Evansville 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, and whether this impacted their organization. They also do not differ from nonprofits in other metro areas. See Figures 33 and 34.

**Nonprofit Advocacy:** We asked Indiana nonprofits whether they promote positions on certain policy issues or on issues related to the interests of certain groups. Evansville nonprofits show patterns quite similar in this respect to 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.
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.

- **Evansville Nonprofits:**

  - **Participation in Advocacy:** Similar to nonprofits throughout the state, approximately one-quarter of Evansville nonprofits participate in advocacy. See Figure 35.

  - **Resources for Advocacy:** Also reflecting the pattern throughout the state and in other metro areas, most Evansville nonprofits that do engage in advocacy do not devote substantial financial and staff resources to it. Only one-third devote most of their volunteer time to advocacy, and even fewer devote most of their staff time (14 percent) or financial resources (12 percent). See Figure 36.

![Figure 35: Percent of nonprofits that participate in advocacy, by region](image_url)

**Figure 35:** Percent of nonprofits that participate in advocacy, by region

- Evansville: 25%
- Not Evansville: 27%
- Other Metro: 28%

(No statistically significant differences)

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

![Figure 36: Extent of nonprofit resources devoted to advocacy, by type of resource and region](image_url)

**Figure 36: Extent of nonprofit resources devoted to advocacy, by type of resource and region**

- Staff Time
- Volunteer Time
- Financial Resources

Note: Evansville n=45-53; Not Evansville n=443-485; Other Metro n=272-290
# APPENDIX A
## NTEE MAJOR CATEGORIES AND MAJOR FIELDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTEE Major Fields</th>
<th>NTEE Major Groups and Decile Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I  Arts and Culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arts, Culture and Humanities (A)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20 Arts, cultural organizations</td>
<td>A60 Performing arts organizations, activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 Media, communications organizations</td>
<td>A70 Humanities organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40 Visual art organizations, services</td>
<td>A80 Historical societies and related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50 Museums, museum activities</td>
<td>A90 Arts service organizations and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education (B)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20 Elementary, secondary education</td>
<td>B60 Adult, continuing education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30 Vocational, technical schools</td>
<td>B70 Libraries, library science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B40 Higher education institutions</td>
<td>B80 Student servcs &amp; organizations of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B50 Graduate, professional schools</td>
<td>B90 Educational services &amp; schools—other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III Environment/Animals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environment (C)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20 Pollution abatement and control services</td>
<td>D20 Animal protection and welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30 Nat. resources conservation &amp; protection:</td>
<td>D30 Wildlife preservation, protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C40 Botanical, horticultural, &amp; landscape</td>
<td>D40 Veterinary services, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C50 Environmental beautification &amp; open spaces</td>
<td>D50 Zoo, zoological society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60 Environmental educ. &amp; outdoor survival</td>
<td>D60 Other services—specialty animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV Health</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health Care (E)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 Hospitals, primary medical care facilities</td>
<td>F20 Alcohol, drug, &amp; subs. Abuse, dependency prevention &amp; treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30 Health treatment facilities, outpatient</td>
<td>F30 Mental health treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40 Reproductive health care facilities, allied</td>
<td>F40 Hot line, crisis intervention services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E50 Rehabilitative medical services</td>
<td>F50 Addictive disorders, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E60 Health support services</td>
<td>F60 Counseling support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E70 Public health programs</td>
<td>F70 Mental health disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E80 Health (general and financing)</td>
<td>F80 Mental health association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E90 Nursing services</td>
<td><strong>Mental Health &amp; Crisis Intervention (F)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diseases, Disorders &amp; Medical Disciplines (G)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medical Research (H)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G20 Birth defects and genetic diseases</td>
<td>H20 Birth defects and genetic diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G30 Cancer</td>
<td>H30 Cancer research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G40 Diseases of specific organs</td>
<td>H40 Specific organ research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G50 Nerve, muscle, and bone diseases</td>
<td>H50 Nerve, muscle, and bone research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G60 Allergy related diseases</td>
<td>H60 Allergy related diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G70 Digestive diseases, disorders</td>
<td>H70 Digestive diseases, disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G80 Specifically named diseases, n.e.c.</td>
<td>H80 Specifically named diseases, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G90 Medical Disciplines, n.e.c.</td>
<td>H90 Medical Specialty Research, n.e.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V Human Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Crime &amp; Legal Related (I)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I20 Crime prevention</td>
<td>J20 Employ. procurement assist. &amp; job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I30 Correctional facilities</td>
<td>J30 Vocational rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I40 Rehabilitation services for offenders</td>
<td>J40 Labor unions, organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I50 Administration of justice, courts</td>
<td><strong>Employment (J)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I60 Law enforcement agencies</td>
<td><strong>Housing &amp; Shelter (L)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I70 Protect, prevent: neglect, abuse, exploit.</td>
<td>L20 Housing devel., construction, management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I80 Legal Services</td>
<td>L30 Housing search assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food, Agriculture &amp; Nutrition (K)</strong></td>
<td>L40 Low-cost temporary housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K20 Agricultural programs</td>
<td>L50 Housing owners, renters' organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K30 Food service, free food distribution</td>
<td>L80 Housing support services: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K40 Nutrition programs</td>
<td><strong>Housing Support Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K50 Home economics</td>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTEE Major Fields</th>
<th>NTEE Major Groups and Decile Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Human Services (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness, Relief (M)</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sports (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20 Disaster preparedness &amp; relief services</td>
<td>N20 Recreational &amp; sporting camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30 Physical fitness, recreational facilities</td>
<td>N30 Physical fitness, recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M40 Safety education</td>
<td>N40 Sports training facilities, agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N50 Recreational, pleasure, or social club</td>
<td>N50 Recreational, pleasure, or social club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N60 Amateur sports clubs, leagues</td>
<td>N60 Amateur sports clubs, leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N70 Amateur sports competitions</td>
<td>N70 Amateur sports competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N80 Professional athletic leagues</td>
<td>N80 Professional athletic leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development (O)</td>
<td>Human Services (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O20 Youth centers &amp; clubs</td>
<td>P20 Human service organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O30 Adult, child matching programs</td>
<td>P30 Children's &amp; youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O40 Scouting organizations</td>
<td>P40 Family services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O50 Youth development programs, other</td>
<td>P50 Personal social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P60 Emergency assist. (food, clothing, cash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P70 Residential, custodial care (group home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P80 Services to promote independence of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI International</td>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs &amp; National Security (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 Promotion of international understanding</td>
<td>Q20 Promotion of international understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 International development, relief services</td>
<td>Q30 International development, relief services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40 International peace &amp; security</td>
<td>Q40 International peace &amp; security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50 Foreign policy research &amp; analysis</td>
<td>Q50 Foreign policy research &amp; analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q70 International human rights</td>
<td>Q70 International human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Public and Societal Benefit</td>
<td>Community Improvement, Capacity Building (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action &amp; Advocacy (R)</td>
<td>S20 Community, neighborhood development/improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20 Civil rights, advocacy for specific groups</td>
<td>S30 Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R30 Intergroup, Race Relations</td>
<td>S40 Business &amp; industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R40 Voter Education, Registration</td>
<td>S50 Nonprofit management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R60 Civil Liberties Advocacy</td>
<td>S80 Community service clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism, Foundations (T)</td>
<td>T20 Private grantmaking foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T30 Public foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T40 Voluntarism promotion</td>
<td>U20 Science, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T50 Philan., charity, voluntarism promotion</td>
<td>U30 Physical, earth sciences research &amp; prom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T60 Non-grantmaking, non-operat. foundations</td>
<td>U40 Engineering &amp; technology research, serv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T70 Fund-raising organizations var. categories</td>
<td>U50 Biological, life science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T90 Named trusts, n.e.c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (V)</td>
<td>Public &amp; Societal Benefit (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20 Social science research institutes, services</td>
<td>W20 Government &amp; public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30 Interdisciplinary research</td>
<td>W30 Military, veterans' organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V40 Mystic, paranormal studies: incl. astrology.</td>
<td>W40 Public transportation systems, services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W50 Telephone, telegraph, telecommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W60 Financial institutions, services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W70 Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W80 Public utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W90 Consumer protection &amp; safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Religious and Spiritual Development</td>
<td>Religion-Related (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>X60 Confucian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>X70 Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>X80 Religious media, communications orgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>X90 Interfaith Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Mutual Benefit</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Membership Benefit (Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Providers, Services</td>
<td>Y20 Insurance Providers, Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension and Retirement Funds</td>
<td>Y40 Fraternal Beneficiary Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries &amp; Burial Services</td>
<td>Y50 Cemeteries &amp; Burial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown (Z)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 colloquia 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


Online Regional Reports


**Journal Articles and Conference Presentations**


**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**


**Online Regional Reports**


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


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


