

**Philanthropic Studies P664: Philanthropy and  
Nonprofit Organizations in Society**  
Fall 2010 Syllabus

**Faculty:** Rich Steinberg is the main instructor for this class, but he will be assisted by Professors Bielefeld. Here is the relevant contact information:

Wolfgang Bielefeld, PhD  
Professor, SPEA and Philanthropic Studies  
BS 4072  
Office: 317-278-0306  
[wbielefe@iupui.edu](mailto:wbielefe@iupui.edu)

Richard Steinberg, PhD  
Professor, Economics, Philanthropic Studies, and Public Affairs  
CA509E  
Office: 317-997-6540  
[rsteinbe@iupui.edu](mailto:rsteinbe@iupui.edu)

### **Course Objectives**

**This course is the sole required doctoral course that emphasizes social science rather than humanities.** If your doctoral minor and intended thesis topic lie in the humanities, we won't address those primary needs here, but rather attempt to enhance your multidisciplinary literacy and ability to teach on a broad range of topics you may be called upon to teach in a Philanthropic Studies, Nonprofit Management, or American Humanities program. We define the social sciences broadly as including research-based contributions to nonprofit management and behavioral sciences. Here are some of the disciplines on that list: economics, sociology, anthropology, political science, public administration, organizational behavior, psychology, linguistics, social neuroscience, geography, regional science, managerial science, marketing science, accounting, operations research, human resources, demography, communications studies. Some of the disciplines classified as humanities contain a modicum of social science (e.g., cliometrics, the statistical analysis using historical data; religious studies; legal studies) and may be cautiously employed in our course. But leave most history and ethics for the other courses.

Beyond understanding key findings in the social sciences, we hope to develop your understanding of the social scientific research process so that you are able to assess the rigor and validity of new research from social scientists. Upon successful completion of this course, the student will be able to:

- Understand major works in the nonprofit and voluntary sector literature that take a social-scientific perspective

- Analyze theories used to explain philanthropic and nonprofit organizational behaviors and describe the roles that donors, volunteers, and nonprofit organizations play in society.
- Know where to begin in designing courses and curricula for educational programs in Philanthropic Studies or Nonprofit Management outside the student's field of specialization.
- Critically evaluate published research using a variety of research tools common to the social sciences.
- Identify gaps in the research base.

### **Course Organization**

The first class will provide an overview of each of the topics below, and then we will select two related topics per week for discussion in a seminar format. This semester, we expect that each student will lead the discussion of about 2 topics. At least one of those topics should be from the “core topic list” or address aspects of the core topics that do not receive sufficient attention in a single overview presentation. Some discussions will also be led by the faculty and guest lecturers. The schedule will be posted on Oncourse. Be sure to check oncourse frequently for updates. Alternatively, you can opt in to receive an email whenever there is an update posted on oncourse.

### **Evaluation**

Seminar Presentations 20% each, 40% total  
 Classroom Participation 25%  
 Homework Participation 10%  
 Research Grant Proposal Project 25%

Seminar Presentations: Seminar leaders have the following responsibilities: selection of readings, in-class presentation, preparation of handouts, developing review questions, and commenting on the answers to these review questions submitted by your classmates.

- a) Selection of readings. You will assign two required readings to the rest of the class, and may suggest additional optional readings. Readings must be posted on oncourse by late Wednesday of the week preceding your presentation so that everyone has time to read them carefully. Typically, one of those papers will be a survey of the literature and the other will be an article in a refereed academic journal representing new research. (If no suitable survey of the literature is available, both articles can present new findings.) Some suggestions for readings on each topic are found below,

but you can also locate and select your own readings and can consult with the faculty or other students in making your choices.

- b) In-class presentation. We do not expect you to become an expert on your topic, but rather to begin development of expertise by reading around 4 articles in addition to the two you assign us. Your presentation should be designed to take no more than 1 hour so there will be time for questions and general discussion. Ability to synthesize several papers, rather than just outlining the points made, is valued. We will look for understanding of what the main issues are in the selected area, what we know or think we know about these issues, and what we don't know (or are incorrect in thinking we know) but can and should try to find out.
- c) Handouts. To assist you in your presentation, you should prepare a set of lecture notes or power-point-type slides. You may also want to add a brief annotated bibliography, telling us a little about the other articles you read and possibly a few of the widely cited key articles summarized in your other readings.
- d) Review Questions. To help your classmates retain what they have learned from your presentation, you will write two review questions. In most cases, one of these review questions should require your classmates to reflect on an integrating theme such as how your analysis relates to other topics in philanthropic study. Another kind of integrating question would ask whether any of the results you summarize ought to belong in the common core of literature that everybody in philanthropic studies should be familiar with. The other question should be about research findings or methodology of the material in the required readings and handouts.
- e) "Grading" the answers to review questions. Well, we don't want some students to assign a letter grade to other students – that is no way to build enduring social networks and social capital. Instead, the seminar leader will be responsible for reading everybody's answers to the review questions they assigned, and writing constructive comments back to the authors.
- f) Overall. Each presentation will be evaluated with respect to six criteria: literature depth and breadth, attention to nuances in the literature (precise formulations of ideas, hypotheses, and conclusions contained in the literature), lessons for philanthropic studies generally, quality of handouts (including clarity and organization), quality of oral presentation and classroom management of discussion, and quality of review questions.

Classroom Participation. It is important to attend this class regularly, **do the required readings in advance of the seminar**, and actively participate in the discussion of

topics. In some cases, your discussions with seminar leaders will precede the classroom meeting and extend past the end of class, and I will try to take this form of participation into account, hard as it is to assess.

**Homeworks.** These contain your answers to the review questions posed by seminar presenters. In order to keep your workload manageable (or at least finite), you only have to answer the review questions from 8 of the seminar presentations. You can pick which ones you want to answer, but if you choose a particular presentation, you should answer both questions for that presentation. Further, at least five of the seminars you write on should be designated as a core topic for the course. Your answers should not be longer than 1 to 2 pages (double spaced). The faculty will grade you on meeting this requirement, not on the quality of your answers but it is in your own interest to do a good job and to read any comments returned to you by the seminar presenter because you'll need to know this for the qualifying exams.

**Research Grant Proposal Project.** This term project is designed to help you learn how to conduct original research. From the presentations during the semester, you will learn of the many unanswered questions in any active area of research. We want you to select one of these and discuss how you would go about learning an answer. We are interested in the creative and analytic part of formulating researchable questions and coming up with a detailed plan to conduct research, not the time consuming and tedious task of carrying that research out. The format of a research grant proposal forces you to do precisely that.

- a) **Contents.** Research grant proposals, particularly the most prestigious and selective of them (like proposals to the National Science Foundation or National Institutes of Health) are entirely unlike the kind of grant proposal you would write to a foundation to get funds to help with service provision. You will have to convince the funder of the following:
- That your research will contribute to an important area;
  - That your specific research question is well-formulated, so that the exact interpretation of any results you obtain will be clear;
  - That the answer to the specific research question you ask will be important (in that it could affect management practice, public regulation, or provide a deeper understanding of important patterns of behavior). Most research does not have immediate importance of this sort, but when combined with other findings and a larger research program shows promise of eventual importance.
  - That you are sufficiently familiar with the literature to authoritatively assure the funder that the precise question you are asking, or the precise way you will try to obtain an answer, has not appeared elsewhere in the literature.

- That you have thought through and presented a methodology that is practical and likely to produce persuasive answers to your research question.
- That you understand the limitations of your methodology, which future researchers may be able to overcome with alternative methodologies, data sources, or clever ideas.

b) Format. Every granting agency has its own formatting requirements, and it makes no sense for us to worry about this. Generally, there is a page limit and you should plan on about ten to twenty pages for this exercise. In real research grant proposals, you would also include a lot of things we don't want you to include in your project. These other real world requirements might include a budget, timeline, expected deliverables (papers, presentations, etc.), curriculum vitae for the principal researchers and other key members of the team, letters of approval indicating that those you need to cooperate with you are willing to cooperate (by providing access to data, allowing you to survey or interview board members, clients, donors, or whoever) and often a statement of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval obtained from the university's Human Subject Review committee.

c) The main things we will grade you on are the precision of the research question and the methodology you propose.

d) A few tips.

- **Give details about the methodology.** For example, if you propose a survey, tell me who would be surveyed, where you would get your sampling frame (the set of people who might answer the survey), the sampling strategy (e.g., random from within the frame), what types of questions would be asked, how you would test and refine the survey instrument, how you would analyze the data (in broad terms - i.e., cross-tabs; content analysis; regressions, etc.). It is usually helpful to include an appendix to your proposal with a draft of the survey.
- You may wish to specify that you would work with someone else whose expertise covers statistical methods, economics, or anything else, but **you need to have some understanding of the technique so that you can convince the funder that a technique like the one you propose will produce meaningful evidence on the question.**
- **In most cases, it is better to have an analytical question (e.g. "How does tax policy affect donations?)" rather than a descriptive question (such as "what is the pattern of giving to religious organizations.")** Sometimes description is ok – if nobody has done anything like an adequate description and you are proposing a clever way to gather the

- data, or if you are proposing a useful taxonomy (set of categories) to organize existing data into.
- **If your research question is empirical, it should result in one or more hypotheses you propose to test.** A good hypothesis must be potentially falsifiable (that is, it is possible your study will produce results that prove the hypothesis wrong). Hypotheses should be stated in “null form”(such as “There is no relationship between giving and family income”) because you can prove something is unlikely to be true, but you cannot logically prove that something is true. If it is not obvious what the alternative to your null hypothesis is, you should state this as well. In the example above, would evidence of a negative relationship between giving and income tend to disprove the null hypothesis, or is the only sort of disproof if the relationship is significantly positive?
  - **There are many useful social-scientific methodologies, and you should pick one.** These include: conducting and analyzing a survey; running an experiment with human subjects, in the lab or in the field; comparative case studies; ethnographic methods; and new analysis of data gathered by someone else.
  - **Be sure you understand the school’s policy on plagiarism.** In cases of doubt, consult with the faculty. Penalties and procedures for dealing with those claiming the ideas of others without attribution are spelled out in the School of Liberal Arts Bulletin.

## Core Topics

Seminars in this class can cover anything from the social and managerial sciences. But we think some topics are important for everyone in philanthropic studies to know something about, whereas others are important only for specialists in particular topics. Here are the core topics that someone should present seminars on this semester (additional topics are in the bibliography below):

Giving and/or volunteering: econometric studies  
 Giving and/or volunteering: experimental studies  
 Giving and/or volunteering: motivations, behavioral consequences  
 Psychological models of giving, volunteering, or other “pro-social behaviors.”  
 Social Capital  
 Basic Organizational Theory: Scott’s three perspectives  
 Basic Organizational Theory: Organizational Ecology models  
 Basic Organizational Theory: Neo-Institutional models  
 Basic Organizational Theory: Networks  
 “Three failures theory.”  
 Governance of nonprofit organizations  
 Relations among the nonprofit, for-profit, and government sectors  
 Nonprofit Revenue Streams  
 Nonprofit Entrepreneurship and Enterprise  
 Civil Society

## Topical Bibliography

### Topic 1 - Giving and Volunteering: Models, Motivations

- Vesterlund, Lise “Why do People Give?” In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Powell/Steinberg, eds.(hereinafter *P&S*)
- Andreoni, James. “Philanthropy” In *Handbook on the Economics of Giving, Reciprocity, and Altruism*, (hereinafter *GRA*)
- Steinberg, Richard. “Public Goods as a Window on Nonprofit Economics”, *Third Sector Review*.
- Schokkeart. “The Empirical Analysis of Transfer Motives”, in *GRA*.
- Dahl and Ransom. 1999. “Does Where you Stand Depend upon Where You Sit? Tithing Donations and Self-Serving Beliefs,” *American Economic Review*, 89(4).
- Schiff, Jerald. 1990. "An Economic Analysis of Volunteering" and "Volunteering: Empirical Evidence", *Charitable Giving and Government Policy*.
- Duncan, Brian 1999. “Modeling Charitable Contributions of Time and Money,” *Journal of Public Economics* 72.
- Clary, E. Gil, Mark Snyder and Arthur A. Stukas. 1996. “Volunteers’ Motivations: Findings from a National Survey”, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25:485-505.
- Harbaugh.. 1998. “What do Donations Buy? A Model of Philanthropy based on Prestige and Warm Glow,” *Journal of Public Economics* 67.

### Topic 2 – Giving and Volunteering 2 (social aspects; other empirics)

- Mark Wilhelm, The Quality and Comparability of Survey Data on Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36 (2007).
- René Bekkers and Pamala Wiepking. Accuracy of Self-reports on Donations to Charitable Organizations. *Quality & Quantity*, forthcoming.
- Patrick Rooney, Kathy Steinberg, and Paul Schervish, Methodology is Destiny: The Effect of Survey Prompts on Reported levels of Giving and Volunteering, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (4): 628-654, 2004.
- René Bekkers and Pamala Wiepking, Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1015507>
- Marc A. Musick and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Berking, Helmuth. 1999. *Sociology of Giving*. Sage
- Hann. “Giving and Volunteering in Economic Anthropology,” (*GRA*)
- Bourdieu, P. 1997. “Marginalia—Some Additional Notes on the Gift.” In Alan D. Schrift. *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity*. New York: Routledge.
- Bracken, C. 1997. *The Potlatch Papers: A Colonial Case History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Parry, J. 1986. “*The Gift*, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'.” *Man*, 21, 453-73.
- Godelier, M. 1999. *The Enigma of the Gift* . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

- Bergstrom, Theodore "Evolution and Social Behavior: Individual and Group Selection," in *GRA*.
- Eisenberg and Fabes. 1998. "Prosocial Development," in *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 3 (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*, edited by Eisenberg.
- Mark Wilhelm and René Bekkers. 2010. Helping Behavior, Dispositional Empathic Concern, and the Principle of Care. *Social Psychology Quarterly* (73).
- René Bekkers 004. *Giving and Volunteering in the Netherlands: Sociological and Psychological Perspectives*
- Mark Wilhelm, Eleanor Brown, Patrick Rooney, and Richard Steinberg. 2008. The Intergenerational Transmission of Generosity. *Journal of Public Economics* 92 : 2146-2156.
- Elster, "Altruism and Social Norms", in *GRA*
- Simon. *Sociobiology*.



### **Topic 3 – Giving and Volunteering 3 (public policy)**

- Steinberg. 1991. “Does Government Spending Crowd Out Donations? Interpreting the Evidence.” *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*.
- Payne. 1998. “Does the Government Crowd-Out Private Donations? New Evidence from a Sample of Nonprofit Firms”, *Journal of Public Economics*, 69.
- Ribar and Wilhelm. 2002?. “Altruistic and Joy-of-Giving Motivations in Charitable Behavior,” *Journal of Political Economy*.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 1986. “Do Government Grants to Charity Reduce Private Donations?” in Rose-Ackerman, ed., *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions*.
- Eckel and Grossman. 2003. “Rebates vs. Matching: Does How We Subsidize Charitable Contributions Matter?.” *Journal of Public Economics*
- Clotfelter, C. T. 1985. “Tax Policy and Support for the Nonprofit Sector: An Overview.” *In Federal Tax Policy and Charitable Giving*. University of Chicago Press.

### **Topic 4 -- Nonprofit Organizations and their Environments**

- Scott, Richard. 2003. “Part II – Three Perspectives on Organizations.” In *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. Prentice Hall
- Morgan, Gareth. 1996. *Images of Organization*. Sage
- Pfeffer, J. 1997. “Five Models of Behavior.” In *New Directions in Organization Theory*. Oxford.
- Galaskiewicz, J and Bielefeld, W. 2003. “The Behavior of Organizations.” In H. Anheier and A Ben-Ner, *The Study of the Nonprofit Enterprise*. Kluwer/Plenum.
- Knoke, David. 1985. “Political Economies of Associations” *Research in Political Sociology*.
- Aldrich, Howard. 1999. “The Evolutionary Approach.”, How the Evolutionary Approach Relates to Other Approaches.”, and Emergence: New Organizations.” In *Organizations Evolving*. Sage.
- Wiewel and Hunter. 1985. “The Interorganizational Network as a Resource.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, V30, 4: 482-92.
- Nohria, N. 1992. “Introduction: Is a Network Perspective a Useful Way of Studying Organizations?” In N. Nohria and R. G. Eccles, *Networks and Organizations*. Harvard
- Baker, W. E. 1992. “The Network Organization in Theory and Practice.” In N. Nohria and R. G. Eccles, *Networks and Organizations*. Harvard
- DiMaggio, P. J. and Anheier, H. K. 1990. “The Sociology of Non-Profit Organizations and Sectors.” *Annual Review of Sociology*.
- Smith, D. H. 2000. “Parts I & II” In *Grassroots Associations*. Sage.
- Steinberg and Bilodeau, “Donative Nonprofit Organizations,” In *GRA*.
- Steinberg, “Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization”, in P&S

## **Topic 5 – Role and Behavior of Nonprofits 1 (public)**

- Salamon, Lester. 1995. Ch 1, 6, 7, 13, 14. *Partners in Public Service*. Johns Hopkins.
- Boris E. T., and Steuerle, C. E. (eds.). 1999. Section One: An Overview of the Nonprofit-Government Relationship. *Nonprofits and Government*. Urban Institute
- Powell, W. W., and Clemens, E. S (eds.). 1998. Part One Philanthropy and the Public Good (Ch 1, 2) and Part Two: Private Provision of Public Services. *Private Action and the Public Good*. Yale.
- Kingma, B. R. 2003. "Public Good Theories of the Nonprofit Sector: Weisbrod Revisited." In H. Anheier and A. Ben-Ner (eds.) *The Study of the Nonprofit Enterprise*. Kluwer/Plenum.
- Slivinski, A. 2003. "The Public Goods Theory Revisited: Comments on Kingma's Revisitation of Weisbrod." In H. Anheier and A. Ben-Ner (eds.) *The Study of the Nonprofit Enterprise*. Kluwer/Plenum.
- Gronbjerg, K. and Smith S. R. "The Scope and Theory of Government/Nonprofit Relations," In *P&S*
- Steinberg, "Introduction" to *The Economics of Nonprofit Enterprises* (edited by Steinberg).
- Estelle James, "How Nonprofits Grow," in Rose-Ackerman, ed., *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions*.
- Demerath III, N. J., Hall, P. D., Schmitt, T. and Williams. R. H. (eds.). 1998. *Sacred Companies: Organizational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organizations*. Oxford University Press (DiMaggio, P. "The Relevance of Organization Theory to the Study of Religion"; Jeavons, T. H. "Identifying Characteristics of 'Religious' Organizations"; Demerath III, N. J. & Terry "Transcending Sacred and Secular: Mutual Benefits in Analyzing Religious and Nonreligious Organizations")
- Prewitt, "Foundations," in *P&S*
- Anheier and Leat. Selections. *From Charity to Philanthropy*

## **Topic 6 – Role and Behavior of Nonprofits 2 (market)**

- Frumppkin, P. 2002. "The Idea of a Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector", "Service Delivery" In, *On Being Nonprofit*. Harvard.
- Brown and Slivinski, "Nonprofits and the Market" in *P&S*
- Hansmann. 1996. Part IV. Nonprofit and Mutual Enterprise. *The Ownership of Enterprise*. Belknap (Harvard)
- James, Estelle. "Commercialism Among Nonprofits: Objectives, Opportunities, and Constraints," In Burton A. Weisbrod, ed., *To Profit or Not to Profit: The Commercial Transformation of the Nonprofit Sector*. Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 271-286
- Weisbrod, Burton A. "Institutional Form and Organizational Behavior," In Walter W. Powell and Elisabeth S. Clemens, eds., *Private Action and the Public Good*. Yale University Press, 1998, pp. 69-84.
- Hirth, Richard A. "Consumer Information and Competition Between Nonprofit and For-Profit Nursing Homes," *Journal of Health Economics* 18, 1999, pp. 219-40.

- Schlesinger and Gray, "Nonprofits in Health..." in P&S
- Badelt, C. 2003. "Entrepreneurship in Nonprofit Organizations: Its Role in Theory and in the Real World Nonprofit Sector." In H. Anheier and A Ben-Ner, *The Study of the Nonprofit Enterprise*. Kluwer/Plenum.
- Young, D. R. 2003. "Entrepreneurs, Managers, and the Nonprofit Enterprise." In H. Anheier and A Ben-Ner, *The Study of the Nonprofit Enterprise*. Kluwer/Plenum.

### **Topic 7 - Redistribution**

- Clotfelter, Charles. 1992. Selections. *Who Benefits from the Nonprofit Sector?* Chicago
- Steinberg, Richard and Burton A. Weisbrod. "Pricing and Rationing by Nonprofit Firms with Distributional Objectives." In Burton A. Weisbrod, ed., *To Profit or Not to Profit: The Commercial Transformation of the Nonprofit Sector*. Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 65-82
- Bowles, Fong, and Gintis. "Reciprocity, Redistribution, and the Welfare State," in *GRA*

### **Topic 8 – Advocacy and Pluralism**

- Jenkins, "Nonprofit Organizations and Political Advocacy," In P&S
- Knoke, David. 1990. "Choosing Collective Action." and "A Theory of Association Political Economy." In *Organizing for Collective Action*. De Gruyter.
- Boris E. T., and Steuerle, C. E. (eds.). 1999. "Section Three: Nonprofits and the Development of Public Policy." *Nonprofits and Government*. Urban Institute
- Marquez, B. 2003. "Mexican-American Political Organizations and Philanthropy: Bankrolling a Social Movement". *Social Service Review*, 329.

### **Topic 9 – Expressive Dimension**

- Frumppkin, P. 2002. "Values and Faith", "Social Entrepreneurship", "Balancing the Functions" *On Being Nonprofit*. Harvard.
- Mason, D. E. 1996. "Ch 1 – 3" *Leading and Managing the Expressive Dimension*. Jossey-Bass.

### **Topic 10 - Civil Society and Social Capital**

- Baron, S., Field, J., and Schuller, T. 2000. Selections. *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford
- Edwards, B., Foley, M. W., and Diani, M. 2001. Selections. *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Tufts.
- Seligman. Selections. *Idea of Civil Society*.

### **Topic 11 – Power and Dominance**

Domhoff, G. W., and Dye, T. R. 1987. *Power Elites and Organizations*. Sage.  
(including: “Elite Domination in Private Social Service Agencies: How it Happens and How it is Challenged”, Ostrander. “Elite Organization and the Growth Machine: The Nonprofit Development Corporation”, Bowman. “Invitation to Elite Theory: The Basic Contentions Reconsidered”, Burton/Higley)  
Ostrower, F. and Stone, M. A. Governance: Research Trends, Gaps, and Future Prospects. In *P&S*.  
6-city trusteeship study (Book by Abzug – need proper cite)

## **Topic 12 – International, Comparative, Global**

Anheier, et al. 2001. Selections. *Global Civil Society*. Oxford.  
Boli, “International Nongovernmental Organizations,” in *P&S*.  
Florini, ed. 2000. Selections. *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*.  
Hulme and Edwards, eds. 1997. Selections. *NGOs, States and Donors*.  
Anheier and Toepler. 1999. Selections. *Private Funds, Public Purposes*. Kluwer/Plenum.  
Weisbrod. (Voluntas article on cross-national comparison of tax regimes).

## **Other Topics (To be Developed)**

### **Specific Nonprofit Industries**

Education, Social Care, Health, Arts, Research, etc.

### **Management Issues**

Volunteer management, fundraising, social marketing, finance, financial management, human resources, accounting, strategic planning, governance, etc.

### **Public Policy Controversies**

Regulation of fundraising, Entity taxation, Personal taxation, regulation of competition, nondistribution (including executive compensation, intersectoral conversions, cross-sectoral partnerships), contracting out, minimum distributions, etc.