

Nonprofits, NTAPs and Information Technology:

*A survey of nonprofit organizations'
attitudes toward technology, nonprofit
technology assistance providers (NTAPs),
and their most recent technology projects.*

January 2003

*Sponsored by:
the Nonprofit Technology
Enterprise Network*



www.nten.org

Survey conducted and report prepared by:

Paul-Brian McInerney

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II. INTRODUCTION	3
A. The Problem of Nonprofit Technology	3
B. The Growth of Technology Assistance	4
III. METHODS	5
A. Sample and Sample Selection.....	5
B. Survey Development and Testing.....	5
C. Survey Administration.....	6
IV. FINDINGS	6
A. Response Rate	6
B. Respondent Demographics	6
C. Nature of Projects	7
D. Attitudes about the most recent technology project	9
E. Attitudes about the technology assistance provider	10
F. Attitudes about nonprofit technology.....	11
V. RESPONDENTS' CONCERNS	12
VI. DISCUSSION	12
VII. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	13
APPENDIX A—LETTER OF INVITATION TO THE NTAPS	14
APPENDIX B—LETTER OF INVITATION TO NONPROFIT CLIENTS OF NTAPS.....	15
REFERENCES	16

I. Executive Summary

In December 2002, N-TEN and Paul-Brian McInerney conducted a web survey of 70 nonprofits that had participated in technology projects over the last year. The survey asked the nonprofit to assess their current technology status and provide global feedback about their interactions with nonprofit technology assistance providers. **The key findings from the survey are as follows:**

General Attitudes Toward Technology

- **96%** of respondents agreed (21%) or strongly agreed (75%) with the statement: **“Information technologies are important for my organization to achieve its mission.”**
- **95%** of respondents agreed (20%) or strongly agreed (75%) with the statement: **“Technology is important to the nonprofit sector as a whole.”**
- **87%** of respondents agreed (27%) or strongly agreed (60%) with the statement: **“Technology has improved our ability to reach more people in need of our services.”**

Specific Technology Projects

- The **most common technology projects** over the last year were:
 - Network installation/troubleshooting (45% of respondents)
 - Web design/update (45%).
 - Database development/troubleshooting (39%).
 - Technology planning (32%)
 - Technology assessment (29%)
- **95%** of respondents agreed (36%) or strongly agreed (59%) with the statement: **“My organization can better achieve its mission as a result of this (most recent) technology project.”**
- **84%** of respondents reported being satisfied (28%) or very satisfied (56%) with how their nonprofit technology consultant handled their engagement.
- **94%** of respondents would be willing to use their technology assistance provider’s services again.

Internet Access

- **85%** of respondents had **broadband access** to the Internet (42.6% had cable or DSL; 42.6% had a T1 line or better). Only 11.8% were using 56k dialup lines.

Funding for Technology Projects

- **63%** of respondents had a line item in their budget dedicated to technology.

Overview

While the organizational divide has not yet been bridged, nonprofits clearly recognize the importance of technology both for the sector as a whole and within their own organizations. The services of nonprofit technology assistance providers (NTAPs) are highly valued by their clients. A major next step for the nonprofit technology community will be to help organizations raise funds explicitly for technology-related expenses, particularly the support services required for successful implementation of technology projects.

II. Introduction

Technology can be an extremely powerful way for nonprofits to become more effective both organizationally and programmatically. For a host of reasons, nonprofit organizations rarely use technology as effectively as they could. Some lack the money to purchase technology. However, access to technology is less an issue than it once was (Robertson 2001). Most nonprofits lack the knowledge to plan, purchase, and implement information technologies appropriately. To address this issue, nonprofit technology assistance providers (NTAPs) offer technological know-how to support nonprofits IT capacity building needs. Unlike earlier studies of nonprofit technology, this study is directed toward the services NTAPs deliver.

This study was directed at understanding issues facing nonprofits today as they relate to the use of technology assistance providers. As NTAPs play an increasingly important role in the nonprofit sector, the community must better understand this role, how these organizations affect their clients, and ultimately what impacts they are having on the social problems with which the organizations they help grapple.

A. The Problem of Nonprofit Technology

Innovation in the nonprofit sector has been a concern for policy makers in recent years (Light 1998). Capacity building has become a key interest of funders and nonprofits alike as a means of enhancing organizational effectiveness in the nonprofit setting. With early models founded in the mid-1990s, NTAPs are a recent development in the history of capacity building efforts. In recent history, the economic and political landscape has changed, forcing nonprofits to seek alternative structures and revenue generation schemes (Frumkin 2001), as they are forced to do more with less. Many nonprofits have turned to fee-for-service models of revenue generation (Salamon 1999), (Gronbjerg 1991) and commercial organizational structures (Tuckman 1998). With such demands comes the need for more efficient ways of delivering services and accounting for

them. Information technologies often hold the key to meeting these demands. However, fiscal constraints and a lack of expertise conspire to keep nonprofits perpetually behind their for-profit counterparts, even as they increasingly compete with such organizations (Ryan 1999).

As nonprofits attempt to bridge the “organizational divide” (Kirschenbaum and Kunamneni 2001) that exists between them and private firms, nonprofit technology assistance providers are increasingly important actors in capacity building efforts. Seley and Wolpert (2002) find that more than half the nonprofits in New York City lack personnel with the technical training to make use of technology. Their findings are even stronger for smaller organizations. A lack of personnel leads to a lower technology capacity within the organization and ultimately throughout the sector, as talented technology staff persons are drawn to higher paying for-profit jobs.

B. The Growth of Technology Assistance

With reductions in the cost of computing as well as the proliferation of the Internet and the World Wide Web as communication tools, the 1990s saw the rise of technology assistance as a new field within the nonprofit sector. The market for technology has changed along with the rest of the nonprofit sector, including altered funding streams, workforce and training issues, and renewed calls for accountability and organizational effectiveness.

The introduction of information technology profoundly alters the way organizations operate (Zuboff 1983). For nonprofits, these changes can be disruptive (Prasad and Prasad 1994). Technology assistance providers are organizations and individuals dedicated to helping nonprofits make better use of technology. As nonprofits begin to realize the improvements technology can make in their delivery of services, NTAPs are increasingly important actors in the capacity building efforts of nonprofit organizations. Though the finding is substantively but not statistically significant, McNutt and Boland (1999) report that advocacy organizations that use consultants to install their information technologies find those technologies more effective at achieving the organizations mission.

Many NTAPs gauge their impacts and the satisfaction of their clients. However, no one has yet attempted a global assessment of their efforts. This study is a first attempt at such an endeavor. The goal of this research is to present the NTAP community not with a report card but with broadly captured feedback regarding how organizations perceive their engagements. This study does not claim to be conclusive. Rather, it is a first cut at addressing these issues. While we have learned much from the study itself, we have also learned about how better to conduct future studies of this kind in the future.

III. Methods

A. Sample and Sample Selection

The survey was targeted at nonprofits that have completed a technology project in the last year. As a population, this group is impossible to identify outright. Accordingly, we had to rely on technology service providers to identify the population. To identify an appropriate sample of technology assistance providers, the researcher began with a list of N-TEN's membership. From that list, the names of independent consultants and nonprofit technology assistance organizations were culled. From there, the researcher added names from the attendance list of the 2002 Roundup, a yearly conference of NTAPs organized by N-TEN. Finally, the researcher identified active contributors to the Circuit Riders email list. All the names, once compiled, were verified either on the web or through email contacts to determine their eligibility to participate. To be eligible, NTAPs had to be either independent consultants or nonprofits whose primary mission was providing technology assistance to nonprofit organizations. This definition was loose enough to include a variety of models of technology assistance, while excluding for-profit consulting firms who also contract with nonprofits.

The final list consisted of 165 contact persons. Once the list was generated and verified, an introductory email (see Appendix A) was sent to the list asking the NTAPs to forward an invitation and link to the web survey (see Appendix B). This introductory message asked NTAPs to identify clients with whom they have completed a technology engagement in the last year and forward the message to them.

B. Survey Development and Testing

Extensive research was conducted prior to the development of the survey to determine what kinds of questions nonprofits were being asked about technology. This served two purposes: 1) it allowed us to avoid duplicating earlier studies and 2) it allowed us to establish the face and criterion validity of our questions. The survey was developed and tested using nonprofit technology assistance providers to determine whether they felt their clients would adequately understand the items on the instrument. Additionally, the survey draft was sent to William Vesneski, director of E-Valuate and formerly of InnoNet for comments and revisions. Once the instrument was constructed and tested, it was formatted and uploaded to SurveyMonkey, a web site that hosts online surveys.

Online surveys solve a number of problems, while creating others (Gunn 2002), (Schmidt 1997). In many ways, they are similar to mailed surveys (Solomon 2001). As such, we would expect response rates to be similar. The web survey was developed according to the guidelines of survey design (Nardi 2003), (Nardi 2003) and then adapted according to the principles of web survey design (Manfreda, Batagelj, and Vehovar 2002), (Gould, Gurevich, and Pagerey 1998).

Web surveys must address the constraints of the medium. For example, since respondents type answers, short-answer questions are preferred over long-answer formats.

C. Survey Administration

The questionnaire was self-administered by the contact persons at nonprofits who received technology services in the last year. Once the NTAPs were selected to participate, an email was sent to the compiled list, explaining the purpose of the project, asking them to participate, describing the incentive structure, and discussing the confidentiality of the results. NTAPs were instructed to forward a preformatted email to clients they had serviced in the last year. The NTAPs were offered a chance to win a \$250 gift certificate to the online retailer of their choice for participating in the administration of the survey. Clients of the NTAPs who participated were offered two chances to win a \$250 gift certificate to the online retailer of their choice. The email invitation to the NTAPs was sent the week before the Christmas holiday. Respondents were given two weeks to respond to the survey invitation. Throughout the introductory week, the researcher sent out several email reminders, as well as called several key participants on the phone. Several NTAPs indicated that they could not participate because of the timing of the survey; however, many others were able to participate and lent their support.

IV. Findings

A. Response Rate

The response rate, though low, was high enough to draw statistical inferences from the data. Three factors conspired to keep the response rates low: 1) it is the nature of web surveys to attract little attention; 2) the survey was administered during the peak of the holiday season; and 3) the difficulty identifying the sample population brought intermediaries into the fold. Even with such factors at play, 70 respondents from across the country took part in the survey (n=70).

B. Respondent Demographics

Organizations responding to the survey participated in many facets of civil life. Most were health and human service organizations (30%), followed by education (12%), arts and culture (9%), legal/advocacy (8%), and civic/community development (6%). Organizations participated from throughout the US. New York reported the highest number of respondents, followed by Massachusetts. However, organizations from the South and Midwest were represented among the responses. This is important as many studies of nonprofits neglect such areas. Organizations on the West Coast were underrepresented in the survey,

as NTAPs in those areas were less able to participate or could not justify doing so before the holidays.

Organizations of various sizes were represented in the sample.

Respondent organizations by budget size:	
Budget	Percentage of respondents
< \$250K	22.0%
\$250K to \$500K	15.3%
\$500K to \$1M	22.0%
\$1M to \$5M	27.1%
\$5M to \$10M	5.1%
> \$10M	8.5%

The majority of respondents (63.2%) had a line item in their budget dedicated to technology. And the overwhelming majority had broadband access to the Internet (42.6% had cable or DSL; 42.6% had a T1 line or better). Only 11.8% were using 56k dialup lines. Broadband access to the Internet was slightly (but statistically significantly) correlated with the budget size of the organization ($R=.399$, $p=.002$), meaning the higher the budget size, the faster the connection to the Internet. Larger organizations could afford higher bandwidth connections. Surprisingly, organizations with budgets as high as the \$500K-\$1M mark reported using 56k dialup lines. All organizations with budgets over \$1M were using broadband accounts. All organizations at or above the \$10M mark used T1 lines or better.

C. Nature of Projects

Most organizations participating in the survey report computer network installation/troubleshooting and web design/update as the nature of their last project (45.2% of respondents each). Database development/troubleshooting followed (38.7%). Technology planning (32.3%) and technology assessment (29%) round out the top five most common services among respondents. The nature of the technology projects was not correlated with the size of the organization. In other words, organizations of all sizes were participating in technology projects of all kinds. Though the correlations are not strong, Seley and Wolpert (2002) find that smaller organizations tended to use only basic applications, while larger nonprofits were using more advanced applications. However, their study examines technology use in only the broadest of categories. Contradicting their findings, Corder (2001) finds no correlation between budget size and access to information technology. Neither finds that nonprofits are particularly innovative in their use of technology.

Most respondents (50.8%) reported engagements took between one week and three months. Only 5.1% reported being involved in engagements that took less time. 23.7% reported their engagements lasted between three and six months. 13.6% said their engagements lasted six to 12 months. Only 6.8% of respondents reported taking part in engagements that lasted more than one year.

Most clients (>80%) had engaged in at least one technology project before the last one was completed. Almost 30% had taken part in more than 5 engagements. Only 19.7% reported participating in their first engagement this year. This demonstrates that nonprofits are willing to hire experts in areas, like technology, where they may lack knowledge. As one person exclaimed, “The best part of working with the consultant was their ability to assess clearly and accurately the needs of the organization and in such a manner that no member of the staff, regardless of their level of understanding or involvement with technology was excluded or unable to grasp the importance of the changes proposed.”

Remarkably few respondents reported fundraising exclusively for technology. Only 10.2% of respondents reported paying for their last engagement with funds raised specifically for that purpose. 25.4% of clients paid for the services out of their general budgets, and 20.3% of respondents paid for their projects out of technology budgets. This reflects a common complaint regarding the funding community’s understanding of technology: foundations and other grant sources frequently treat technology as overhead, unrelated to an organizations’ mission programmatic goals. Accordingly, funders can be reluctant to pay for technology installations and improvements, choosing to support programmatic areas where demonstrable outcomes can be more visible. NTAPs are skilled in working with organizations with limited budgets. Their clients are aware of this skill—one survey respondent commented on a consultant’s “willingness to help us achieve our goals with limited financial resources.” However, if nonprofits are to use technology more effectively, they need to break this pattern and convince funders to invest more readily in their organizations’ technology capacity.

Overall, most respondents reported being very satisfied (56.1%) or satisfied (28.1%) with how the consultant handled their engagement. 94.4% reported willingness to use their technology assistance provider’s services again.

D. Attitudes about the most recent technology project

Statements about your most recent technology project	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The technology project had a recognizable impact on our delivery of services	2% (1)	2% (1)	27% (15)	64% (36)	5% (3)
The technology project was worth the money our organization spent on it	2% (1)	4% (2)	25% (14)	64% (36)	5% (3)
Our organization has altered the way we do things as a result of this technology project	5% (3)	11% (6)	43% (24)	36% (20)	5% (3)
Information technologies (e.g., computers, networks, databases, and the Internet) are important for my organization to achieve its mission	2% (1)	2% (1)	21% (12)	75% (43)	0% (0)
My organization can better achieve its mission as a result of this technology project	0% (0)	5% (3)	36% (20)	59% (33)	0% (0)
My organization can serve more clients as a result of this technology project	4% (2)	11% (6)	16% (9)	62% (35)	7% (4)
As a result of this technology project, my organization can dedicate more time to mission-critical activities	2% (1)	9% (5)	50% (28)	38% (21)	2% (1)
This technology project helps us better meet funder requirements	2% (1)	14% (8)	32% (18)	34% (19)	18% (10)
As a result of this technology project, our organization can better understand the job we are doing	0% (0)	14% (8)	45% (25)	32% (18)	9% (5)
Total Respondents	57				
(skipped this question)	14		Margin of Error +/- 5%		

Most respondents report a discernable impact of technology enhancements on the way they do their work. While reliable and valid methods of measuring those impacts have yet to be developed, respondents feel that technology has recognizable effects on their organization, on the quality of their work, and ultimately on their outcomes and goals. We can see the strength of this perception as respondents agreed (and most respondents strongly agreed) with all statements about the technology project delivered in the past year. 64% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, “The technology project had a recognizable impact on the delivery of services.” 75% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, “Information technologies are important for my organization to achieve its mission,” leaving only 4% to disagree with the statement. While nonprofits are most often in the business of making the world a

better place, they understand the role of information technology in achieving their goals and fulfilling their missions. One respondent reported appreciating their NTAPs' "excellent advice about utilizing technology to match the mission and purpose of our organization." McNutt and Borland (1999) also find that nonprofits understand the need for technology to improve their ability to provide more effective services.

E. Attitudes about the technology assistance provider

Statements about the technology assistance provider	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The TA provider understood the mission of our organization	2% (1)	5% (3)	43% (24)	46% (26)	4% (2)
It is important that the TA provider understand the mission of our organization	4% (2)	5% (3)	32% (18)	57% (32)	2% (1)
The TA provider understood what we are trying to accomplish as an organization	2% (1)	4% (2)	43% (24)	50% (28)	2% (1)
It is important for the TA provider to understand what we are trying to accomplish as an organization	4% (2)	2% (1)	32% (18)	61% (34)	2% (1)
The TA provider understood the culture of our organization	2% (1)	7% (4)	46% (26)	41% (23)	4% (2)
It is important for the TA provider to understand the culture of our organization	5% (3)	2% (1)	38% (21)	53% (29)	2% (1)
The consultant kept me informed of his/her activities	2% (1)	9% (5)	38% (21)	52% (29)	0% (0)
Total Respondents	56				
(skipped this question)	15		Margin of Error +/- 5%		

As stated earlier, the overwhelming majority of respondents had positive experiences with their technology assistance providers. Almost everyone said they would call upon that person to deliver services again. Most respondents agreed that it is important that NTAPs understand their missions and what they are trying to accomplish, as well as the culture of their organization (the *how* of the organization). As one respondent added, the best part of working with the consultant was, "excellent advice about utilizing technology to match the mission and purpose of our organization." Most respondents also felt that the NTAPs they hired accomplished these tasks satisfactorily. One respondent stated they liked, "his expertise, efficiency in getting project completed, flexibility, genuine interest in our work." Another agreed saying they liked, "The care they [the TA provider] took to understand our organization: our work, our needs, our strengths & weaknesses as related to technology. This care was matched by the intelligence & commitment of the particular person assigned to our work."

Nonprofits reported appreciating the professionalism of their NTAPs. Some trusted the NTAPs for all the reasons above, but also because of their lack of affiliations to vendors. As one respondent said, “They are not a hardware or software reseller and have no relationship to groups that are. This made it much easier to trust their recommendations.” Technical expertise is important, but being able to relay such expertise to a large audience with disparate technology skills proved key to a successful engagement. As one respondent who marked their TA provider particularly favorably remarked, “She thought of everything we could never think of ourselves. She also scheduled phone meetings with us at least weekly. She had us look over all her drafts to get our opinions. She knows how to talk to people with all levels of technology knowledge.”

F. Attitudes about nonprofit technology

Statements about nonprofit technology	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
Technology is an important part of our organization	2% (1)	4% (2)	39% (22)	55% (31)	0% (0)
Technology has improved our ability to reach more people in need of our services	2% (1)	9% (5)	27% (15)	60% (33)	2% (1)
Technology has improved our ability to reach people in need of our services faster	4% (2)	12% (7)	35% (20)	42% (24)	7% (4)
Technology has enhanced our ability to identify new areas of needs and services	4% (2)	18% (10)	40% (22)	33% (18)	5% (3)
Technology has enabled our organization to develop and deliver critical new services to communities	7% (4)	18% (10)	41% (23)	27% (15)	7% (4)
Technology has enabled our organization to secure additional funding	2% (1)	25% (14)	38% (21)	23% (13)	12% (7)
Technology is important to the nonprofit sector as a whole	2% (1)	2% (1)	20% (11)	75% (42)	2% (1)
Total Respondents	57				
(skipped this question)	14		Margin of Error +/- 5%		

From the evidence presented above, nonprofit organizations understand the importance of technology to their organizations and to the sector as a whole. 75% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, “Technology is important to the nonprofit sector as a whole.” While organizations see the ability of technology to help them do their present work and serve their present audiences better and faster, they are less clear about using technology to identify new service areas and new clients. Other studies (Seley and Wolpert 2002) have found a lack of technology use among nonprofits regarding marketing. Additionally, (Burt and Taylor 2001) find that nonprofits tend to use information

technologies in traditional ways, rather than seek out innovative uses. A direction for technology planners might be to help nonprofits use technologies for creating and marketing new services, as well as identifying new markets for their services. Further research, including qualitative studies, is necessary to determine how nonprofits presently use technology on a fundamental level.

V. Respondents' Concerns

Not all the news from the survey was good. Respondents raised some concerns that need to be investigated further in answering the question, "What was the worst part about working with the NTAP?" Granted, this is only a single question and not a fully systematic account of the dark side of technology assistance. However, some concerns warrant the address of this study.

The major concern for respondents was time. For some, the concern was scheduling time with a consultant who had limited availability. For others, the engagements took longer than originally stated. "Everything takes longer than you think/they tell you it will. Unrealistic expectations on all fronts," one respondent complained. Some respondent comments include, "That I would have to pay \$95.00 for any visit to office for assistance." "Managing the "clock time" to be billed." "Failure to meet deadlines." "Costs sometimes go over budget. She is sometimes very late on deliverables." "We had to be flexible to some of their timelines and had to follow their Project process which had a bit more overhead than what we might have done on our own."

The good news, however, is that many respondents had nothing negative to say about their engagements or the way their NTAP handled them.

VI. Discussion

The results from this questionnaire tell us much about the state of nonprofit technology assistance. Many nonprofits, rather than fundraising for technology and technology assistance, pay for it out of their general operating expenses. This represents a potential area of growth for technology assistance providers. While NTAPs have successfully encouraged nonprofits to make more effective use of technology, it may behoove them to turn their efforts toward courting foundations and other economic resources for the nonprofit sector. As demonstrated, nonprofits accept the important role technology plays in the sector. Many understand the important role it plays in their organization. One of the barriers to closing the organizational divide is generating fiscal resources to pay for technology improvements in individual organizations. In line with the findings of this study, Corder (2001) finds that access to information technology does not correspond with agency budget. For Corder (2001), the most important predictors of access to technology are workforce expertise and the loyalty of

private donors. In other words, the NTAP community should dedicate more time and resources toward training nonprofit workers in information technology and lobby funders to provide money for technology improvements.

VII. Directions for Future Research

This study opened the door for a grounded yet scientific discussion about the role NTAPs play in shaping the nonprofit sector as well as the organizations within it. From the findings presented above, we can see that the calls for more effective use of technology in the nonprofit sector have been heard, if not heeded. Future work should examine *how* to get nonprofits to implement technologies innovatively as well as how to generate the resources necessary to do so. With the use of wireless Internet technologies in Africa and the Amazon, the global NGO community has shown how innovative uses of information technologies can help nonprofits reach and service new populations as well as provide services they had not previously imagined. The domestic nonprofit sector can learn much from these experiments in thinking innovatively about the use of technology.

As mentioned earlier, researchers and practitioners should be exploring systematic ways to understand the organizational and programmatic impacts of their interventions. A common lament in the nonprofit sector is that foundations will only fund programs, not infrastructure. There are many ways to counter such a trend. One is to find ways to demonstrate how technology improvements yield programmatic improvements. This will not be an easy task, as many NTAPs already know. The solution involves strategic use of both qualitative and quantitative measures of impact as well as a sophisticated understanding of evaluation.

NTAPs already face many challenges in the nonprofit sector. Nonprofits have heard the call to improve their technology, but this does not mean the evangelizing is over. Rather, the audience for the message must shift from the service providers to the funding sources. NTAPs are the catalysts for technological change in the nonprofit sector. By leveraging this position, NTAPs can make individual organizations more effective, which contributes to sector-wide efficacy. With the increased role of nonprofits in the present economy, the role NTAPs play in capacity-building efforts could not be more salient.

Appendix A—Letter of Invitation to the NTAPs

NTEN and Paul-Brian McInerney, a grad student at Columbia University are conducting the first-ever national web survey about technology assistance services. The survey, which you are invited to peruse, focuses on the state of technology in the nonprofit sector, what NTAPs are doing to address this condition, and whether these activities are having an impact. This information is crucial to understanding and addressing the technology service needs of nonprofits throughout the United States. We will use this information to generate reports that will be distributed to the NTAP, funding, and nonprofit communities. Ed Batista promises to use the data to address issues at the next Riders Roundup in Oakland, CA.

Ed and I request that you forward the message and survey link below to the contact person at each of the nonprofits for whom you have *completed* a project in the last year (2002). The message asks them to participate to complete a 10 minute online survey. It is vitally important that you pass the message along to **all** nonprofit clients with whom you have completed a technology project in the last year. We understand that projects do not work out for a variety of reasons.

This survey is not an evaluation of **your** work. Rather, it is an attempt to understand the technology service needs of the nonprofit sector, such that those needs may be addressed. So that I may calculate my response rate, after you send the message to your clients, please respond to this email to let me know how many clients received it.

Your and your clients' protection: We understand that your relationships to your clients are very important. We pledge complete confidentiality to you and your clients for participating in this study. Paul-Brian, as an independent researcher, will be the only person privy to the raw data. The results will only be reported in the aggregate. Any identifying information will be collected solely for the purpose of verifying our sample.

Again, if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me.

Thanks,

-Paul-Brian

Appendix B—Letter of Invitation to Nonprofit Clients of NTAPs

The Nonprofit Technology Enterprise Network (N-TEN), in conjunction with an independent researcher from Columbia University, is conducting the first-ever national web survey about technology assistance. The survey focuses on the state of technology in the nonprofit sector, what technology assistance providers are doing to address this condition, and whether these activities are having an impact. This information is crucial to understand and address the technology service needs of nonprofits throughout the United States as well as assist nonprofits' ability to fundraise for technology. We will use this information to generate reports that will be distributed to the funding, NTAP, and nonprofit communities.

As the contact person for a nonprofit who has completed a technology project in the past year, you are being asked to complete a 10 minute survey about these issues. The link below will take you to the survey. Please click on the link or copy and paste it into your address bar in your browser. Although you were directed to this survey by your technology assistance provider, s/he will not see your responses. All data will be compiled and analyzed by an independent researcher. All information will be aggregated and any identifying questions used solely for verification purposes will be removed from the final reports.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=66103143021>

We understand your time is valuable. To thank you for your participation, two lucky respondents will receive a \$250 gift certificate to the online store of their choice. Please respond to the survey by midnight December 27 to be eligible for the raffle.

If you have any questions about the survey, the data, how it will be used, or any other concerns, please email Paul-Brian McInerney at pm263@columbia.edu.

Thank you for your cooperation,

-Paul-Brian McInerney
pm263@columbia.edu

References

- Burt, Eleanor and John Taylor. 2001. "When 'virtual' meets values: Insights from the voluntary sector." *Information, Communication & Society* 4:54-73.
- Corder, Kevin. 2001. "Acquiring new technology: Comparing nonprofit and public sector agencies." *Administration and Society* 33:194-219.
- Frumkin, Peter. 2001. "Balancing Public Accountability and Nonprofit Autonomy: Milestone Contracting in Oklahoma." The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations The Kennedy School of Government Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Gould, Emilie W., Mark Gurevich, and Peter D. Pagerey. 1998. "Conducting surveys over the World Wide Web." vol. 2002: Society for Technical Communication.
- Gronbjerg, Kirsten A. 1991. "How nonprofit organizations manage their funding sources: Key findings and policy implications." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 2:159-175.
- Gunn, Holly. 2002. "Web-based surveys: Changing the survey process." vol. 2003: First Monday.
- Kirschenbaum, Josh and Radhika Kunamneni. 2001. "Bridging the organizational divide: Toward a comprehensive approach to the digital divide." PolicyLink, Oakland, CA.
- Light, Paul Charles. 1998. *Sustaining innovation : creating nonprofit and government organizations that innovate naturally*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Manfreda, Katja Lozar, Zenel Batagelj, and Vasja Vehovar. 2002. "Design of web survey questionnaires: Three basic experiments." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 7.
- McNutt, John G. and Mary Boland. 1999. "Electronic advocacy by nonprofit organizations in social welfare policy." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28:432-451.
- Nardi, Peter M. 2003. *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Prasad, Pushkala and Anshuman Prasad. 1994. "The ideology of professionalism and work computerization: An institutionalist study of technological change." *Human Relations* 47:1433-1458.
- Robertson, Bethany. 2001. "Beyond Access: A foundation guide to ending the organizational divide." National Committee on Responsive Philanthropy.
- Ryan, William P. 1999. "The new landscape for nonprofits." *Harvard Business Review* 77:127-137.
- Salamon, Lester M. 1999. *America's Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Schmidt, W. C. 1997. "World Wide Web survey research: Benefits, potential problems, and solutions." *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments & Computers* 29:274-279.

- Seley, John E. and Julian Wolpert. 2002. "New York City's Nonprofit Sector." The New York City Nonprofits Project, New York.
- Solomon, David J. 2001. "Conducting web-based surveys." *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation* 7.
- Tuckman, Howard P. 1998. "Competition, Commercialization, and the evolution of nonprofit organizational structures." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17:175-194.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 1983. "New worlds of computer-mediated work." *Public Welfare*:36-44.