Understanding Structuring and Variation in a Nonprofit Subfield: Examining Institutional and Regional Pressures in U.S. Historic Preservation Nonprofits

Anne-Lise K. Velez – Virginia Tech

Public administration and management recognizes key subsectors in the public sphere as nested within and shaped by institutional fields. However, we know little about the forces that influence their development at different levels or how patterns in institutional fields and in forces shaping these fields vary by level and location. We therefore understand little about potential levels for shaping nonprofit advocacy, decision-making, and organizational capacity in nonhomogenous subsectors. This mixed methods study examines nested pressures shaping a U.S. nonprofit subsector, focusing on two ecological levels of influence in historic preservation nonprofits. I use data from 96 interviews with National Trust Partner organizations in 44 states to develop typologies of professional approaches to preservation and capacity. Findings indicate that both national and regional pressures shape scope and capacity in these nonprofits, underscoring the importance of considering institutional contexts structuring subsectors rather than assuming sector-wide patterns and behaviors. This study provides a baseline for future research on developments in the U.S. nonprofit historic preservation subsector and provides insight for practitioners and legislators into the levels that shape scope and capacity in nonprofit subsectors.

Keywords: Nonprofit Subsectors, Nonprofit Decision-Making, Regional, Historic Preservation

Introduction

We know organizations develop within institutional fields, and these fields shape how organizations behave. However, we rarely look at how fields evolve and react to nested pressures at institutional and regional levels (e.g., Hannan & Freeman, 1977). The need for such studies is salient in the nonprofit sector in part because "the behavior of nonprofit organizations [is] crucial to understanding sociopolitical behavior" (Anheier & Seibel, 1990, p. v). Additionally,

----

scholars need a study such as this to better understand the levels in decision-making among nonprofit organizations in subsectors that face competing national and regional pressures. We know little about how nonprofit subfields may react to layered pressures that differ regionally. Thus, legislatures and funders are essentially making decisions in the dark, according to their best judgments but without a clear understanding of which levels are most effective in shaping the decision-making behavior of nonprofits.

The field of historic preservation is an appropriate context in which to study these patterns, as a small population of organizations does much of the historic preservation work in the U.S. Despite the sociocultural (e.g., Woods, Ewalt, & Baker, 2013; Maloutas, 2012; Wells, 2010) and economic importance of cultural and historic preservation (Wojno, 1991), little is known about patterns in this field, and whether nonprofit organizations doing the work are shaped by national-level institutional pressures or regional pressures. As little is known about how nonprofit subfields may react to layered pressures that differ regionally, to address this gap, I ask: *1) What is the scope and capacity of U.S. nonprofit historic preservation?* and *2) What elements of scope and capacity in this U.S. nonprofit subfield display national patterns, and which show regional patterns?* This study aims to 1) provide the first known national study of the work and structure of U.S. historic preservation nonprofits, 2) leverage these findings to investigate how the institutional field is shaping nonprofit structure and strategy at national and regional levels, and 3) provide nonprofit managers with more complete information to facilitate learning and advocacy as well as providing public managers a better understanding of heterogeneity among nonprofits, even within the same subfield or geographic area.

The majority of academic literature on historic preservation focuses on case studies and materials preservation. While these areas are important, a current overview of how the field understands and defines the scope of preservation activities and of the capacity present in this organizational field is missing. This is particularly salient as defunding local government preservation positions increasingly makes sociocultural preservation the responsibility of nonprofits. It is necessary for us, as a culture, to better understand the field if we care about preserving cultural and historic monuments for enjoyment and education. This understanding is key to the success of nonprofit managers in this subfield in recognizing the pressures they face and how others may have successfully navigated such pressures and to the success of public managers seeking the best outcomes for their communities, now and in the future. The work of this field of nonprofit organizations becomes more important, as the occurrence of disasters increasingly threatens cultural and historic resources (e.g., Verderber, 2009) and as public managers may rely on nonprofit organizations to help address aspects of disaster planning and recovery activities for which they do not have in-house expertise.

The value of cultural preservation to Americans shows through activities like historic government investment in maintaining Revolutionary War monuments and private investment in individual historic sites (Benson & Klein, 2008). It is clear in legislative actions supportive of cultural and historic resource preservation, as in the American Antiquities Act of 1906, the 1949 congressional charter creating the National Trust for Historic Preservation, or the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Despite such legislation, supporting the preservation of built historic resources and a wealth of historic preservation case studies, it is unclear to what degree this legislation, combined with regional and local culture, is creating uniformity in expectations of what should be preserved and how preservation should be approached.

This study contributes to nonprofit studies by examining nested forces shaping, and variation present in, a particular subsector. The population of historic preservation nonprofit partner organizations affiliated with the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) is substantially

responsible for nonprofit historic preservation activities undertaken in the U.S., and there are clear nested layers of influence present in the field. Because of these nested influences, there are strong theoretical reasons to think isomorphic pressures from the national preservation community and decisions made by the NTHP will lead to national conformity in the scope of preservation and in organizational capacity (e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). However, there are equally strong reasons to suspect that regional conditions and pressures shape the scope and capacity of this nonprofit subfield (e.g., Tzonis & Lefaivre, 1981; Powell, 2007). This institutional field therefore makes a rich research context for examining how nested levels of influence shape a nonprofit subsector. This study provides a unique and important contribution to nonprofit management and administration literature. Historic preservation is largely unexplored in public administration despite its importance as an element of public management and sustainability concerns. For historic preservationists, this study may provide a better understanding of activities undertaken by colleagues, so practitioners can better learn from one another. It may also provide activists with a picture of the types of resources likely to be saved in a given area and those that may need extra attention or advocacy. The chance to study a population of nonprofit organizations within the context of their subsector allows a rare opportunity to examine forces that shape the subsector, rather than assuming homogenous behavior across the larger sector and, in doing so, make an important contribution to the nonprofit literature.

Additionally, this study contributes to public management literature informing those seeking to fulfill "responsibility to future generations: ensuring a viable future by preserving resources" (Lewis, 2006, p. 694). Public managers are in part responsible for safeguarding public goods and "...ensuring the capacity to sustain life and to preserve and transmit civilization's cultural, intellectual, artistic, and historical legacy" (Lewis, 2006, p. 694). This means it is important for public managers working to address ongoing sociocultural issues in subsectors that affect public goods to understand variability in these subsectors, so they can work with both nonprofit practitioners and the public to manage these goods in the best way possible. As such, public managers can benefit from understanding how this population of preservation organizations defines the scope of their responsibility as a field, how they make decisions, and what preservation foci are of interest in their area.

Background

Historic Preservation in the United States

A brief review of the relationship between nonprofits and the built environment provides a basis for understanding the physical and social context in which preservation nonprofits are operating and have operated historically in the U.S. (Palen & Bruce, 1984; Boyer, 1994; Stubbs, 2009). Because of tensions related to patterns of urban social change spurred by gentrification in the mid- to late twentieth century, the American public developed an increasingly negative perception of the goals and work that preservation nonprofits and government departments providing preservation services had pursued in the past (Filion, 1991; Hackworth & Smith, 2001; Saito, 2009; Maloutas, 2012). Just as with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) passed in 1966, the civil rights movement was expanding the number of Americans whose stories were considered worth telling and hearing. As a result, the scope of built resources traditionally of concern to historic preservationists (usually monuments and landmarks associated with White culture) and the actions taken to preserve them (often turning them into museums) came into question.

The NTHP was created in 1949 and funded by the federal government as part of the NHPA. According to the NTHP website, the trust became privately funded after 30 years through "mutual agreement." Around the same time, the antagonistic public climate related to gentrification concerns led NTHP to rewrite its mission statement with more community-minded wording to regain public support for its work (Barthel, 1997). In doing so, the NTHP became a participant in promoting changing understanding of the benefits of historic preservation. A new focus on cultural meanings and a concern for future use has shifted the emphasis from physical elements of the built environment, which are preserved to a broader definition of what is worth preserving, and to the symbolic and semiotic meanings of the places being preserved (Matero, 2003; Worthing & Bond, 2008; Wells, 2010).

Historic preservation is increasingly seen as important. This is partly because historic buildings have become a widely acknowledged aspect of material culture. Sax (1982) described the "transformation in the context of property rights" related to historic preservation laws occurring in the early 1980s as a possible result of "social coherence demand[ing] evidence and symbols of common purpose" causing Americans to "turn … to symbols of stability, of links with our past. History is an obvious outlet for such values … as growth and development seem to become less valuable guides for future well-being" (p. 490). The urgency of preserving historic places and buildings as important elements of material culture and place identity has increased with an increase in natural disasters and associated threats (Morgan, Morgan, & Barrett, 2006; Verderber, 2009) and as the economic importance of cultural elements is recognized (Wojno, 1991; Rypkema, Cheong, & Mason, 2011). Meanwhile, government funding for historic preservation has declined, and the recent economic downturn means that many municipalities that traditionally funded an historic preservation staff person no longer can. Historic preservation in the U.S. has therefore increasingly become a concern for the nonprofit sector.

Nested Pressures

Taking an institutionalist view, understanding variation in U.S. historic preservation nonprofits requires studying organizations as a population (e.g., Hinings, Greenwood, Ray, & Suddaby, 2004). Examining the population of NTHP partner organizations provides a good opportunity for doing so, as there are clear pressures at both national and regional levels as well as a shared function among the organizations. Hannan and Freeman (1977) promote studying organizations in populations rather than as single units because variation among organizations reflects not only adaptation but also inertial pressures from within and from the operating environment. These inertial pressures include sunk costs for personnel, organizational norms based on past decisions, and legal and fiscal barriers to market entry and exit. "External legitimacy considerations" assert additional inertial pressures that mean only certain organizations survive selection in a certain environment. Because NTHP partner organizations perform the same function (historic preservation) in the same sector (nonprofits) and all have an affiliation to a larger organization grounded in legislation that formed them (NTHP, formed out of the National Historic Preservation Act, or NHPA), this study considers NTHP partners a comparable field of organizations.

Nonprofits in this field nest within institutional levels, influenced by both the region in which they are located and the national policies that apply to their operations as a nonprofit and as an historic preservation organization. Based on Bronfenbrenner's 1979 ecological model, historic preservation nonprofits can be understood as being nested in multiple institutional environments operating at different levels. From a social constructionist viewpoint, the levels of actors and influence comprising this interrelated system and process of field structuring must be examined in context if the structuring is to be better understood (e.g., Giddens, 1984). Rypkema

et al. (2011) describe the field of historic preservation as "a complex matrix of laws, incentives, policies and advocacy groups at the national, state, and local level" (p. 1). One of the most prevalent ways national pressures can be expected to show is through a professional approach to preservation, in part through mission alignment with NTHP. Regional variation can be expected to show in resources preservation. Each of these levels is discussed in more detail below.

Institutional Theory: National Pressures Lead to National Patterns

Institutional theory is helpful in understanding the pressures faced by individual nonprofit historic preservation organizations because of their affiliation with a larger, national-level organization. Institutional theory addresses the evolution and spread of institutions like rules, norms, cultures, and symbols as well as formal political institutions affecting both individual and collective behavior and decision-making. Neo-institutional theorists treat organizations as populations within organizational fields. These theorists stress that the institutional context comprises vertically and horizontally interlocking organizations and that the pressures and prescriptions within these contexts apply to all relevant classes of organizations (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996).

Beginning in the 1970s, March and Olsen (1984) argued that the best way to understand political behavior (and therefore policymaking) is through a "logic of appropriateness" that individuals acquire through membership in institutions. They contrast this normative logic with the "logic of consequentiality" that is central to rational choice theories, arguing that people in institutions behave according to normative standards rather than desire to maximize individual utilities.

This perspective on institutions is widely adopted in public policy studies in the form of coercive, normative, and mimetic isomorphic pressures delineated in DiMaggio and Powell (1983). Isomorphic pressures, such as a perceived need to conform to peer practices or professional standards, cause similarities in structure and related behavior among organizations that organizations face once they become part of a network of organizations (in this case, the NTHP network) and expectations become institutionalized. In this context, these professional standards are communicated largely through the NTHP's mission. Institutional theory explains the "emergence of distinctive forms, processes, strategies, outlooks, and competences" that come about "from patterns of organizational interaction and adaption" (Selznick, 1996, p. 271). Selznick asserts that these patterns and responses should be understood as responses to internal and external stimuli.

Regionalism: Differing Regional Climates Lead to Regional Variation

While most institutional theorists focus on institutional pressures at the national level, a competing body of literature argues that institutional pressures may operate nested at multiple levels. This matters to NTHP partner nonprofits not least because other elements of nonprofit practice differ regionally and because NTHP itself divides the U.S. into six regions, providing information and support for each region through separate field offices. Recent research by Quirke (2013) on 60 "rogue" private schools in Toronto, Canada, suggests that in organizational fields that are "patchy and uneven," more marginal organizations can avoid pressures for conformity from the larger field, but that homogenous patches can be found even within seemingly heterogeneous fields. Quirke defines an organizational field as "organizations [that] face the same regulations and environmental conditions" (p. 1676). She notes work by others, including Lune and Martinez (1999) demonstrating that organizational fields segment to preserve identities within larger institutional environments and that this may occur as fields

mature (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2002; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008 in Quirke, 2013). Patchy organizational fields are characterized by "weak regulation and sparse infrastructure" combined with a pluralism that allows for multiple logics in approaching work within the field and shifts in technical demands and stakeholder expectations "which encourage varied organizational responses across the field" (p. 1684). Quirke notes that, in education, participation in voluntary accrediting leads to more prevalent conformity to organizational norms. "Rogue" private schools "can be expected to conform to traditional school models along a number of dimensions: governance structure [as nonprofits], physical structure [traditional school buildings and facilities], professional model of teaching [credentialed staff with dense networks], and curriculum [generalist]" but "fail to conform on any of these dimensions" because of the patchiness of the field within which they operate (p. 1688).

The degree of patchiness in the field of historic preservation nonprofit organizations is arguable. While there are potentially multiple logics in American preservation, *and* there are some very clear regulations such as requirements for National Register status and tax exemptions at the federal and state levels, there is both variability and changeability in regulations at the local level, and there is little government-related infrastructure dedicated to preservation at any level. There are seldom substantial shifts in technology concerning materials preservation, but there are relatively rapid shifts in technology regarding public information and outreach, in which these organizations must excel to succeed. This uneven patchiness presumably means this population of organizations may be expected to conform to isomorphic pressures along some dimensions but not others. Because the NTHP is a national-level organization with resources and recommendations to which all NTHP partners have access, national pressures presumably lead to similarities in most indicators of governance structure and to professional approaches to preservation. However, because environmental conditions affecting this organizational field vary relative to infrastructure and regulation as well as regional histories and cultures of support for preservation, this may mean some dimensions of scope and capacity vary by region, especially if indicators of local organizational context vary regionally.

In addition to regional variation resulting from patchiness within the field, there are other arguments for regional variation in historic preservation nonprofit organizations ideas borrowed from cultural regions (Elazar, 1984) and critical regionalism (Tzonis & Lefaivre, 1981; Powell, 2007). These literatures suggest that at least some characteristics of these organizations may vary according to regional cultural and political climates in which organizations are located. According to Elazar (1984), American regional subcultures affect political behavior, political processes, institutional structures, and state and local policy and programming. He classified the U.S. geopolitically, using individualistic, moralistic, and traditional labels delineating nine possible subcultures based on observations and outside research. While there has been criticism of Elazar's assertions about regional differences in the four decades since the publication of *American Federalism* (Nardulli, 1990; Lieske, 1993; Hero & Tolbert, 1996), and the composition of U.S. regional populations has certainly changed since described centralized control in the Midwest and traditionalist culture in the South, his ideas still hold. There are unarguably still distinct regional differences in culture; therefore, policies and policy adoption still exist (Lall & Yilmaz, 2001; Barnett & Coble, 2011; Thorlton, McElmurry, Park, & Hughes, 2012) that can therefore be expected to influence historic preservation. Elazar's theory has been applied to explaining regional philanthropy in the U.S. as well (Schneider, 1996), and other scholars have found differences in corporate disaster philanthropy between global regions (Muller & Whiteman, 2009).

Elazar describes states in the South and Midwest as tending toward central control. For example, Southern states have a tradition of historic preservation and a resource base

traditionally willing to support preservation. This suggests Southern organizations may be more likely to make programming decisions based on tradition than those in other regions. They may be less likely to exhibit conformity to overarching national trends in historic preservation than states in other regions because they are not compelled to align themselves with NTHP to secure grants as other organizations may be. The Midwest has a greater percentage of states with historic preservation tax credits than does other regions, suggesting the Midwest may show a greater focus on programming around advocacy or education. Because the Western region has more pre-European history but was urbanized much more recently than other regions, characteristics of Western historic preservation nonprofits may differ. Likewise, the earlier industrialization and urbanization of the Northeast region may mean preservation organizations in that region show different scopes and resource foci.

Critical regionalism was originally an architectural approach aimed at rooting design in geographic and cultural contexts (Tzonis & Lefaivre, 1981; Frampton, 1983; Tzonis & Lefaivre, 1990; Lefaivre & Tzonis, 2003) that came about as a response to the generic globalized approach of modernism. The idea transferred from design to include cultural and political studies, where regions are conceived not as places with stable boundaries and autonomy, separated from other regions and "not so much as places themselves but ways of describing relationships between places" (Powell, 2007, p. 10). This conception of regions as relationships rather than separations reinforces the need to understand both national and regional patterns in preservation practices. However, Powell makes the point that "often when a region is evoked, described, or defined, it is for some specific purpose: to achieve certain changes in the physical or cultural landscape, often changing one by changing the other" (p. 5).

Woods et al. (2013) examine displays on Willa Cather and Brandon Teena in the Nebraska state history museum using critical regionalism to understand and question the heteronormative viewpoint. This reflects Powell's assertion that dominant narratives and identifiers of region are often re-affirmed when regional lines are drawn as a purposeful demarcation on a map, often "unreflectively, reaffirming conventional wisdom about the place" (Powell, 2007, p. 5). All this suggests regional variation be examined here, and address one of the central questions of critical regionalism: "What do people actually do in region?" (Rice, 2012, p. 203) in relation to historic preservation activities, as this is missing from the current literature on the field. In part, this study aims to address this gap.

In the United States, regional designations are employed to better understand differences in policies and actions of government and nonprofit organizations (Schneider, 1996; Clerkin, Paarlberg, Christensen, Nesbit, & Tschirhart, 2013). Carlson (1980) analyzes historic preservation by region using National Register data coded into 10 different building types and finds that eastern states have a higher concentration of sites on the register than Western states. This may not be surprising given the timeline of U.S. history but provides reason to expect regional differences in preservation organizations in America. Borden, Schmidtlein, Emrich, Peigorsch, and Cutter (2007) examine variations in vulnerability to environmental hazards (natural disasters) against available federal funding using social, built environment, and hazard impact vulnerability indices and find vulnerability is a "place-based regional phenomenon." Further, NTHP partners within the same region have more opportunities for interaction because of geographic proximity and the likelihood of attending more locally focused conferences.

The NTHP has designated six regions for their partner organizations (see Table 6), providing technical assistance and leadership to each through a regional field office. Using Powell's (2007) reasoning that the lines drawn around regions may work to reinforce or change physical or cultural landscapes, this suggests that the values promoted and services provided within a

region may be different from other regions. This will likely cause organizations within an NTHP region to be more similar to one another and less like those in other regions. Therefore, organizations will likely differ by region in both scope, as indicated by professional approach to preservation, and in capacity, as shown in governance structure and organizational structure.

Methodology

Comparative Mixed Methods Design

This research uses a transformative mixed methods design (e.g., Driscoll, Appiah-Yeboah, Salib, & Rupert, 2007). Mixed methods research is, "generally speaking, an approach to knowledge (theory and practice) that attempts to consider multiple viewpoints, perspectives, positions, and standpoints (always including the standpoints of qualitative and quantitative research)" (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007, p. 113). These authors note "the dividing lines [between methods] are *much* fuzzier than typically suggested and antagonism between the paradigms is unproductive" (p. 122). Additionally, mixed methods researchers have varied opinions on "where or when in the design mixing" takes place, with some reporting it must take place during data collection, some during data collection and analysis, and most that it "can occur at all stages of research" (p. 122). Here, population-level data ensures diverse perspectives, and both data collection and analysis involved quantitative and qualitative components.

I collected data using a concurrent mixed method strategy, following expectations that "the same individuals provide both qualitative and quantitative data so the data can be more easily compared" (Driscoll et al. 2007, p. 20). Data are from 168 semistructured telephone interviews with representatives from 96 historic preservation nonprofit organizations in 44 states in the six regions defined by NTHP. Two phases of data collection preceded two phases of analysis. The sample, data collection, and two phases of analysis are described in detail below.

Sample Population

This study uses NTHP's 2010 list of state and local partner organizations. This provides a basis for comparison of a population of similar organizations representing a nonprofit subsector. Organizations range from the oldest preservation organizations in the nation to some of the newest organizations. Geographic focus areas for these organizations range from the city to the state level. This study focuses on these types of organizations because they are often the primary geographic representative in their area and are likely have the largest impact on the area's approach to historic preservation.

Because the data are near population level, descriptive analyses are representative of the population. The six regions defined by the National Trust form the basis for regional comparisons in this study.

Data Collection

I chose telephone interviews for data collection because a semistructured protocol with open-ended questions facilitates interrogation of a broad range of information about current organizational behaviors. As they were likely to know the most about the mission alignment and organizational structure, I chose executive directors as representatives of the organizations. In

two cases, board members acted as informants when organizations had executive director vacancies.

I conducted two phases of interviews: between October 2010 and October 2011 and between June 2014 and March 2015. In all, 77% of the organizations on the 2010 partners list participated in the first phase of data collection.[1] In the first phase of data collection, I spoke with leaders at 95 historic preservation nonprofit organizations in 43 of the 48 states with active NTHP partners.[2] The second phase of semistructured interviews took place with the same organizations between June 2014 and March 2015 as part of a larger study focused on organizational activities around disaster planning, still aimed at understanding the scope and capacity of U.S. historic preservation nonprofits. Wyoming was included in the second phase of the study, bringing the total number of preservation organizations represented to 96 organizations in 44 states.[3]

I asked organizational representatives open-ended questions about the scope of the field in relation to professional approaches to preservation, including organizational mission, targets of preservation, and programming priorities. I asked for categorical responses about leader opinions on the importance of adaptive use and disaster planning activities. Respondents were also asked open-ended questions pertaining to indicators of capacity around governance structure in relation to organizational basis for programming decisions. I solicited categorical responses to indicate conformity to the Department of the Interior's "50-year rule" and solicitation of public input.[4] Organizational representatives were asked additional questions about organizational capacity around organizational structure, including organizational age, numbers of employees, membership status, number of members, and board size.

Analysis

Because no known previous studies have broadly documented activities of U.S. historic preservation nonprofits, no existing framework for assessing organizational scope and capacity is available. To address this, I developed typologies for understanding the scope of activities undertaken by this field of organizations and organizational capacities. Four typologies relate to scope, representing facets of professional approaches to preservation. Typologies around professional approaches to preservation describe: 1) strategic aim, 2) mission intent, 3) targets of preservation (resources being preserved), and 4) programming priorities. Strategic aim and mission intent are based on organizational mission statements. Two additional facets of scope derived from quantitative data are nonprofit leader opinions on importance of adaptive use and disaster planning activities, as described in quantitative operationalization.

I developed three additional typologies for assessing organizational capacity: 1) programmatic decision-making, 2) solicitation of public input (both related to governance structure), and 3) geographic focus. Other elements of capacity described in quantitative operationalization below include decision-making basis related to adherence to the Department of the Interior's "50-year rule" and additional elements of organizational structure.

Below, I describe the coding and development of each of these typologies and of descriptive measures of participating organizations. Patterns of homogeneity and variation in each characteristic are described and discussed separately in the findings section.

Qualitative Analysis

The four typologies related to scope and three typologies related to capacity described below derive from qualitative inductive coding of semistructured interview data. As with all qualitative coding described here, I analyzed survey data and then grouped them into similar themes. At each stage of data analysis, a peer researcher reviewed categories and groupings to ensure reliability; agreement was over 95%.[5]

Organizational scope describes professional approaches to preservation practiced in these organizations. The scope includes strategic aim and mission intent of these organizations as indicated by mission statement wording. Targets of preservation and programming priorities are included. Each facet of professional approach to preservation is described below.
Mission statements are indicators of the goals and activities of nonprofit organizations. In this population of nonprofits, mission statements reveal both the organizational aim and intent of the activities undertaken.

Strategic aim indicates what an organization is trying to preserve at a broad level and varies depending on whether organizations report focusing on specific sites, on cultural practices, or on the local economy. Based on inductive coding, I identified three distinct descriptive categories of strategic aim: 1) preservation of place, 2) preservation of culture, and 3) promotion of economic growth. Preservation of place comprises historic places and resources, architecture and built heritage, landscapes and environmental heritage, neighborhoods, districts, and getting historic designation. Preservation of culture includes cultural heritage and resources, encouraging improved quality of life and sense of community, unspecified heritage, object and artifacts, archaeological and prehistoric resources, and maritime heritage. Promotion of economic growth comprises encouraging economic growth and vitality and re-use or continued use of structures. These categories are not mutually exclusive; missions reflect one or more of these aims.

Additionally, the intent of these organizations' mission statements is indicative of their understanding of the appropriate scope of work in the field. Intent of mission statements differs from strategic aim because it indicates their stance toward preservation in relation to intended actions toward preservation foci. Mission statements among this group of nonprofits generally follow a parallel structure, with a certain intent involving an intended action toward a certain scope of resources through a particular type of outreach. Some elements of mission intent overlap, but two distinct categories emerged. Some organizations' missions aim only to protect, preserve, or promote awareness of resources; others sought to enhance the state of the resources as well as to protect, preserve, or promote awareness (see Table 1).

As another way to understand organizational focus, I asked each organizational representative an open-ended question about the types of resources that his or her organization was targeting for preservation at the time of the interviews. Resource types listed by two or more organizations comprise 33 categories and include both commonly preserved individual resources such as bridges and residences and occasionally preserved individual resources such as murals or historic neon as well as commonly preserved sociocultural history captured in cultural landscapes or the built environment or occasionally preserved heritage lifeways (see Table 2).

In addition to examining broad strategic aims through mission statements and questions around organizational targets of preservation, I asked respondents about the top-three programs run by their organizations to better understand how they are trying to achieve their aims. From interview data, I coded five focus areas: 1) advocacy, 2) development activities, 3)

Table 1. Mission Intent of Historic Preservation Organizations in the U.S.

	Mission Intent	Number of Missions Containing this Intent	% of Organizations with this Mission Intent
Protect, preserve, promote	Preserve or protect only	52	54
	Preserve & promote or Preserve & protect or Promote & protect	20	21
	Preserve, promote & protect	8	8
Protect or preserve & enhance	Preserve or protect & enhance	9	9
	Preserve, protect & enhance	8	8
	Total	97	100

administration and management, 4) physical interventions, and 5) conferences. Advocacy-focused activities include preservation awards, technical assistance, and publication of endangered properties lists. These activities all focus on developing awareness and support for preservation activities among individuals and institutions, whether by acknowledging their contributions, providing them tools to undertake preservation activities themselves, or drawing public attention to certain properties to increase support for individual sites. Development activities comprise fundraising, museum programs, and educational programming, all of which increase the profile of and support for the nonprofit organization itself, often while providing educational opportunities. Administration and management involves activities related to managing visitors' centers and to loan administrations. Programming focused on physical interventions includes both active restoration undertaken by the organization itself as well as revolving funds. Conferences are self-explanatory and are usually held annually.

Understanding a nonprofit subfield requires not only an examination of the scope of work undertaken by the field but an understanding of capacity within the organizational field related to governance structure. Governance structure is represented in part by how programming decisions are made in this nonprofit subfield. Governance structures related to decision-making includes the basis for decision-making about programming, whether and how organizations solicit public input, and the geographic area covered by the organization. I coded a programming decision basis, in which respondents reported into six categories, including funding, board and staff input, strategic plan, mission statement, tradition, and other (mostly local need). Each organization may use one or several basis for making programming decisions.

My coding of interview data shows public input used in decision-making as actively solicited or passively acquired. Organizational representatives were asked whether they solicit public input and, if so, how. A range of answers emerged across interviews. Actively solicited public input comes from holding public meetings, conducting surveys, soliciting endangered list nominations, and sending staff into the field to gauge local concerns. A number of organizational representatives also reported their organizations obtain public input "passively," without direct solicitation. Passive solicitation of public input includes information organizations obtain through emails, letters, or telephone calls they receive, responses to information they publish in newsletters or online, or members of the public dropping by their

Table 2. Resources Most Commonly Preserved by U.S. Historic Preservation Nonprofits

Resource Category	Number Reporting (of N= 94)	Percent Reporting
Bridges	44	47
Cultural landscapes or the built environment	43	46
Residential	42	45
Mid-Century Modern or recent past	40	43
Landmarks or historic sites	39	41
Commercial	38	40
Religious structures	36	38
Landscaped open space or parks	36	38
Industrial Buildings	32	34
Historic districts or neighborhoods	29	31
Open or rural un-landscaped space	25	27
Civic or institutional buildings	21	22
Farming or ranching resources	17	18
Schools	16	17
National Register eligible (50 years or older)	16	17
Barns	14	15
Archaeological resources	12	13
Theaters	9	10
Antiques, details, and objects	9	10
Cemeteries	8	9
Maritime resources	6	6
Military resources	6	6
Geographic features	4	4
Water towers or hydrology related	4	4
Historic university	4	4
Railway or transportation related	4	4
Libraries	4	4
Museums	3	3
Murals	3	3
Mining resources	3	3
Racetracks	2	2
Heritage lifeways	2	2
Historic neon	2	2

offices to ask questions or share information. Organizations may take either one or both approaches to obtaining public input.

These historic preservation organizations provide programming and other services to differing geographic areas. Data for this descriptor come from mission statements and from descriptions on organizational websites. The four different geographic coverage areas that emerged from categorizing these data include city, county, multicounty, and state.

Operationalization of Quantitative Data

I collected several measures of both scope and capacity (described below) as categorical responses and therefore did not require qualitative interpretation. To assess scope related to a professional approach to preservation, I asked nonprofit leaders to assess whether adaptive use or more traditional, stricter approaches to preservation and restoration are more important to the field of nonprofit historic preservation today and which will be more important to the future sustainability of the field.[6] I also asked organizational representatives whether their organizations participated in local- or state-level disaster planning efforts, had done in-house disaster planning, or were part of local or state efforts to plan for disaster clean-up and recovery. Related to capacity and governance structure, I asked respondents whether their organization adheres strictly to the National Park Service's National Register eligibility "50-year rule" in making preservation and programming decisions. Responses comprise a three-category variable, indicating whether adherence to the rule is strict, usual but not strict, or not a consideration in decision-making.

Also, related to capacity, I asked respondents about a number of organizational structure characteristics, including founding year, how many full- and part-time staff the organization, and board size. I also asked whether the organization is a membership nonprofit and, if so, the number of members. To describe local organizational context, I directly asked respondents to categorize the importance of built economic resources to the area covered by their organization and to rank the local influence level of historic preservation advocacy groups.

In this study, some qualitative data are descriptive, but some are numericized to allow for quantitative comparisons. "Quantitizing" is a process specific to mixed methods studies by which qualitative data are categorized numerically for the purposes of quantitative analysis (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003). The strategy outlined by Driscoll et al. (2007) was followed here to reflect "whether or not qualitative responses contain certain codes" (p. 22). I linked databases of the qualitative codes described above and the quantitative data using respondent identification numbers; then I quantified coded data into numeric categorical variables (as in top programming areas) or into binary variables, indicating presence or absence of a certain category of response. Relationships were analyzed using IBM SPSS statistics software. Through this process, I created a number of variables with which to describe patterns and make statistical comparisons (see Table 3).

Quantitative Comparisons

Regional and national patterns were explored using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test for significant differences between groups of organizations in different regions for variables representing organizational structure, including age, numbers of employees, whether organizations have members, numbers of members, and numbers of organizations covering different types of geographic areas in different regions. I used ANOVAs to assess percentages of organizations responding affirmatively to binary variables. Because the rest of the measures are categorical rather than numeric, I used cross-tabulation for the remainder of the analyses. National patterns are reflective of characteristics reported by more than two-thirds of organizations.

Findings

Nationally, ages and other organizational characteristics vary quite a bit, showing neither significant regional differences nor strong national patterns. Organizations range from 10 to 140

Table 3. Variables Representing Organizational Scope and Capacity

Organizational Dimension		Variable Name	Variable Structure
Scope	Professional approach to preservation	Strategic aim [typology]	Three category variable
		Mission intent [typology]	Two category variable
		Target Resources [typology]	Binary variables (33)
		Top programs run [typology]	Five category variable
		Adaptive use current opinion	Three category variable
		Adaptive use future opinion	Three category variable
		Disaster planning	Binary variable
Capacity	Governance structure	Programming decision basis [typology]	Six category variable
		Whether solicit public input	Binary variable
		Solicit public input actively [typology]	Binary variable
		Solicit public input passively [typology]	Binary variable
		Conformity to "50-year rule"	Three category variable
	Organizational structure	Geographic area covered [typology]	Four category variable
		Full time employees	Numeric
		Part time employees	Numeric
		Board size	Numeric
		If membership organization	Binary variable
		Number of members	Numeric
	Local organizational context	Local economic importance of built historic resources	Five-point scale variable
		Influence of historic preservation groups on local policy making	Five-point scale variable
		Local influence of historic preservation groups on state policy making	Five-point scale variable
		NTHP Region	Six category variable

years old, with a mean age of 37. 29 years.[7] These nonprofits vary in size from zero to 45 full-time staff and zero to 100 part-time staff, with a mean of about five full-time and five part-time staff and a modal value of one. Boards range from six to 82 members, with 22 board members on average. Geographic focus varies, with most organizations covering a city (48%), or a state (42%), with the rest covering a multicounty area (7%) or a single county (3%) (see Table 4).

Similarly, over half the respondents report the historic preservation organizations "somewhat" influence both state (53%) and local-level (56%) policymaking, but there are no clear national patterns or regional variations. When asked about top programs, advocacy programming was mentioned first most frequently (by about 37% of organizations), followed closely by development activities (36%), physical intervention programs (15%), administration and management programs (10%), and then conferences (3%). There are, however, clear national patterns in scope, including most elements of professional approach to preservation. Some indicators of organizational capacity also display national patterns.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for U.S. Preservation Nonprofit Organizations

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	95	10	140	37.29	19.958
FTE	95	0	45	4.93	7.513
PTE	95	0	100	4.86	13.445
Board size	95	6	82	22.24	11.087
Member Units	90	0	5000	683.78	844.615

One of the primary indicators of the scope of preservation relates to mission content commonalities among this population of nonprofits. Analysis shows national patterns relating to most components of professional approaches to preservation. These patterns include strategic aim inferred from mission statements and the mission intent of these nonprofits, which are comparable with that of the National Trust and show strong commonalities as a group.

Strategic aim is indicated through content of mission statements. Here, I categorized missions according to strategic focus on preservation of place, preservation of culture, economic development, or a combination. Strategic aim in historic preservation nonprofits shows clear national patterns aiming for preservation of place, with 99% of all mission statements reporting a focus on preservation of place. Over half (54%) of this population specifies a focus on preservation of place alone, with no mention of cultural or economic concerns. Strategic aim around preservation of culture varies more, with half or fewer organizations in each region and only 41% of organizations nationally mentioning cultural preservation in mission statements.

Overall, 31% of this population of preservation nonprofit organizations reports a focus on a combination of place and cultural preservation, then a focus on preserving place, culture, and economic development in combination (10%). Remaining organizations focus on preservation of place and economic development (4%) or economic development alone (1%). In total, 15% of mission statements list economic development as integral to preservation, but neither cultural nor economic development foci show significant regional variation. Likewise, the intent of mission statements in this nonprofit subfield is fairly consistent.

Intent of mission statements indicates how organizations intend to accomplish their strategic aims or how they intend to approach preservation. Intent is fairly consistent nationally, with 83% trying to fulfill strategic aims through a focus on preservation, promotion, or protection in some combination. Only 17% of organizations reported an additional intent to enhance historic resources (see Table 1). Indicators of the scope of preservation relate not just to the way in which organizations approach preservation but to specific types of resources preserved.

National Patterns

While there are some regional variations in resource types based on regional history, a number of historic resources appear as consistently as important across regions. Crosstabs show national patterns are found for the following resource types: midcentury modern or recent past, libraries, landscaped open spaces or parks, residential resources, historic neon, hydrology-related resources or water towers, barns, geographic features, archaeological resources, heritage lifeways, military history, theaters, historic neighborhoods or districts, civic or institutional buildings, antiques details and objects, national register eligible structures, museums, murals, railway or transportation related resources, university resources, schools racetracks, cemeteries,

and maritime resources.[8,9] The most commonly preserved resources with no regional concentrations (see Table 5) are residential (a preservation focus at 45% of organizations nationally), midcentury modern or recent past (43%), and landscaped open space or parks (38%).

While concerns for preserving particular types of resources are clear, these concerns do not extend the scope of preservation in this organizational population far enough to support mitigation efforts around preventing resource loss in the case of a natural disaster. Nationally, slightly over two-thirds of this nonprofit subsector report not participating in disaster planning efforts. Only about a third of the 73 organizational representatives participating in this phase of interviews reported disaster-planning engagement. The most frequently reported include developing an in-house protocol for responding to a disaster (34% of organizations) and participating in local or state disaster planning efforts around historic resources (32%). Less than a quarter of organizations (23%) report participating in local or state disaster efforts to ensure historic resources are protected in recovery and clean-up plans. The pattern becomes even clearer when considering total types of disaster-planning engagement. More than half (57%) of organizations are not participating in any type of disaster planning, 16% in only one kind, and 6% in two kinds. Only about one in five organizations (21%) is concentrating on all three areas of disaster planning. But, the vast majority of organizations (84%) report that they feel their organization should ideally engage in disaster planning efforts, showing a clear pattern of concern for this area of planning even among those who are at presently unable to engage in it.

There are also several clear patterns in relation to the capacity of this nonprofit subfield. This group of nonprofits displayed national patterns in governance structure around solicitation of public input, adherence to the National Park's "50-year rule," and programmatic decision-making basis.

Because it relates to organization decision-making, it is important to understand how this subfield seeks input from external and internal stakeholders. The vast majority of these nonprofits reportedly solicit public input both actively and passively. Most (84%) of the organizations reported actively seeking input from the public. Almost as many (82%) report gathering public input passively. Only one organization reported not soliciting public input at all. Similarly, there are strong national patterns in adherence to the National Park's "50-year rule," demonstrating the weight these organizations give to national standards imposed from outside the field when making decisions.[10] In all, 80% of organizations report considering the "50-year rule" in making preservation decisions. Specifically, 29% of organizations report always basing preservation decisions on whether resources are 50 years old, and 51% of organizations report they usually use the rule as a "rule of thumb" but do not adhere to it strictly. Only 20% report not using this rule as a basis for decision-making. Internal stakeholders play an important role in decision-making as well. In addition to soliciting public input, these organizations rely heavily on institutional knowledge, with the majority of organizations reporting the primary decision-making basis for programming as board and staff input.

Regional Patterns

Despite some overarching regional patterns related to the scope of the subfield, there are also notable regional patterns in the scope of preservation, with a few elements of professional approach varying significantly by region as well. There are also distinct regional patterns in organizational capacity, specifically regarding operating environments. I discuss significant regional differences below, followed by regional descriptions that include national patterns as well as statistically and qualitatively different regional patterns.

The scope of preservation as defined by activities within this subfield of nonprofit organizations shows regional variation in several facets of the professional approach to preservation. While strategic aim does not differ statistically by region, opinions on the role of adaptive use in the current and future state of the field of nonprofit preservation do, with adaptive use being widely seen as the more important approach to nonprofit historic preservation both now and in the future. However, cross tabulation shows leaders' opinions on whether adaptive use or a more traditional approach to U.S. preservation is more important to the present and to the future of the field differs significantly by region $x^2(10 \ N=77)=27.02$, $p=0.00$; $x^2(10 \ N=78)=24.91$, $p=0.01$. This variation is further detailed below in regional snapshots.

In addition to differences in professional opinions on adaptive use, there are noticeable regional differences in resource preservation. While some resources preserved appear nationally, cross tabulations support regional differences for some resource foci. Regions differ significantly in organizational focus on preserving: cultural landscapes or built environment $x^2(5 \ N=94)=14.07$, $p=.015$; industrial buildings $x^2(5 \ N=94)=19.26$, $p=0.00$; bridges, $x^2(5 \ N=94) = 23.37$, $p=0.00$; and religious structures $x^2(5 \ N=94)=42.62$, $p=0.00$. There are also regional differences in preserving mining resources $x^2(5 \ N=94)=21.42$, $p=0.00$, farming or ranching resources $x^2(5 \ N=94)=14.61$, $p=0.01$, urban or rural un-landscaped space $x^2(5 \ N=94)=18.08$, $p=0.00$, commercial resources, $x^2(5 \ N=94)=11.52$, $p=0.04$, and landmarks or historic sites, $x^2(5 \ N=94)=11.12$, $p=0.05$. Many of these resources not only differ by region, they are among the most common resources preserved nationally (see Table 5).

There are also a number of regional differences in capacity among this nonprofit subsector. Such differences show up in part though differences in how organizations make decisions. In this nonprofit population, programmatic decisions are most frequently based on board and staff input (52% of organizations), followed by aligning decisions with funders' goals (46%), tradition (38%), strategic plan (31%), mission (28%), and other (21%). A one-way ANOVA between subjects comparing the use of programmatic decision-making basis by region shows a significant effect at the $p<0.05$ level for aligning decisions with funder's goals [$F(5, 89)=2.49$, $p=0.04$], and for programming decisions based on board and staff input [$F(5, 89)=3.81$, $p=0.00$]. Specifically, organizations in the Southern region were significantly less likely to rely on board and staff as a basis for decision-making relative to other regions. Organizations in the Mountain-Plains, Western, and Northeastern regions were significantly more likely to align decisions with funders' goals than the Southern, Midwestern, and Southwestern regions. Programming decisions based on tradition approached regional significance at the $p<0.05$ level [$F(5, 89)=2.72$, $p=0.05$]. There are no regional differences for programming decisions based on tradition, strategic plan, mission, or other (mostly local input). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test show groups differ significantly ($p<0.05$) in some decision areas, for example, that the percentage of organizations relying on board and staff for programming decisions in the Midwestern region (M=0.75, SD=0.45) is significantly different from the Southern region (M=0.25, SD=0.44).[11] Descriptions of variations are below and condensed in Table 6.

Apart from regional differences in organizational characteristics and decision-making, regional differences in organizational context are an important consideration in understanding this organizational population. A one-way ANOVA between subjects comparing reported local economic importance of built historic resources by region shows a significant effect at the $p<0.05$ level [$F(5, 67)=4.59$, $p=0.00$]. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test show ($p<0.05$) that the mean score for local importance of built historic resources for the Western region (M=3.67, SD=1.12) is significantly lower from the Southern region (M=4.76, SD=0.63) and from the Northeast (M=5.00, SD=0.00). Despite these differences, the importance of built historic resources to local economic development does not seem to explain the presence or absence of organizations with missions focused on economic growth. The southwest and

Western regions report the lowest economic reliance on built historic resources, but these regions are among those where mission statements show a concentration on economic development related to historic preservation.

In addition to statistically significant differences between regions, there are some distinct qualitative differences in preservation foci and decision-making basis. For example, the resource type most commonly preserved in each region differs for all but two regions (see Table 5). Qualitative regional differences in this near population-level study underscore the need to look at the field in regional subpopulations. The following section describes some of these regional differences in more detail.

Historic Preservation Nonprofits by Region

Historic preservation nonprofits in each of the six NTHP regions vary qualitatively in both scope and capacity. Scope of work varies regionally according to strategic aim, targets of preservation, and leader opinions on adaptive use. Capacity varies regionally according to most common decision-making bases. Regional descriptions around states comprising regions, most common strategic aims, opinions on adaptive use, decision bases, and resource targets are condensed in Table 6 to provide a visual comparison of findings.

Four of the six NTHP regions (Midwest, Southwest, Western, and Northeast) comprise groups of organizations with mission statements focused on preservation of place and of culture, as well as on economic growth, while organizations in the Southern and Mountain-Plains regions focus not on economic growth but only on preservation of place and culture. When it comes to opinions on adaptive use, the majority of respondents in all regions agree that adaptive use is currently more important to the sustainability of the field than traditional preservation. Again, the Southern and Mountain-Plains regions look similar to one another and different to other regions based on opinions of the importance of adaptive use to the future sustainability of the field. In the Western and Southwestern regions, an equal proportion of organizational respondents agreed that adaptive use is as important to the future sustainability of the field as it is to the field at present. Meanwhile, a large majority of organizations in the Midwest and Northeast reported that adaptive use is even more important to the future sustainability of the field than it is currently. Organizations in the Southern and Mountain-Plains regions differed from those in other regions in that fewer respondents report adaptive use is important to the future sustainability of the field than report it is now. The Southern region is unique in that only about a fifth of respondents reported that adaptive use is important to the future of nonprofit historic preservation, despite three-fourths reporting it is currently important to the field.

Regional patterns of most common resource preservation differ quite a bit from national patterns and from each other. The Southern and Mountain-Plains regions share commonality in that the most commonly preserved resources in are residential resources. In the Midwest, the most commonly preserved resources are bridges, reflecting overall national patterns, with midcentury resources most commonly preserved in the Western region, and religious resources most commonly preserved in the Northeast and second most commonly preserved in the Mountain-Plains region. The Northeast is also different in that industrial resources are second-most commonly preserved in this region and do not show up among the top-two types of resources preserved in other regions. In the Southwest. cultural landscapes and the built environment are most commonly preserved and are also commonly preserved in other regions—they show up as the second-most commonly preserved resource category in the Southern, Midwest, and Western regions as well as making the top-two most commonly preserved resources nationally.

Table 5. Most Commonly Preserved Resources Regionally and Nationally

	Southern N= 31	Midwest N=16	Southwest N=12	Mountain Plains N=6	Western N=11	Northeast N=18	National N=94
Most commonly preserved resources (% of organizations reporting as a focus)	Residential (45%) *Cultural landscapes/ built environment (39%) Mid-Century/ recent past (35%)	*Bridges (81%) *Cultural landscapes/ built environment (69%) Landmarks/ historic sites (56%) Landscape open or rural/ parks (50%)	*Cultural landscapes/ built environment (67%) *Landmarks or historic sites (67%) *Commercial (50%) Historic neighborhoo d/ districts (33%)	Residential (83%) *Religious structures (67%) *Open or rural un-landscaped space (67%) *Bridges (67%) *Industrial (50%) Landscape open or rural/ parks (50%) Mid-century/ recent past (50%)	Mid-century/ recent past (82%) *Cultural landscapes/ built environment (64%) *Urban or rural un-landscaped space (55%) *Bridges (55%) *Commercial (45%) *Industrial (45%) Residential (45%)	*Religious (100%) *Industrial (72%) *Bridges (67%) *Commercial (67%) Landscaped open space/ parks (56%) Residential (56%)	*Bridges (47%) *Cultural landscapes/ built environment (46%) Residential (45%) Mid-century/ recent past (43%) *Landmarks/ historic sites (41%) *Commercial (40%) *Religious (38%) Landscaped open space/ parks (38%)

Note. <0.05 significant relationship between region & this resource type

Discussion

This study makes a salient contribution to the nonprofit studies literature in addressing differing behavioral and structural patterns in a varied nonprofit subsector based on layered pressures at the national and regional levels. I found evidence that both national institutional pressures and regional pressures are shaping the population of U.S. historic preservation nonprofit organizations. These patterns are notable because, even in a highly institutionalized context—like this nonprofit subsector with ties to a larger institution—federal-level legislation shaping the environment, and similar organizational strategic aim and mission intents, there is limited homogenization. Given the limited size of the field and association with a well-respected national institution, these national influences are not as strong as may be expected, and the amount of regional variation found is noteworthy. Findings indicate that, in this population of organizations, institutional pressures are largely responsible for shaping the scope of work conducted. Professional approaches to preservation, including strategic aim, mission intent, some preservation targets, and disaster planning all show national patterns. Two indicators of organizational capacity, solicitation of public input and adherence to the Department of the Interior's "50-year rule," also show national patterns. Despite the influence of national pressures on many indicators of the professional approach to preservation, nonprofit leader opinions on adaptive use and some preservation targets are clearly shaped by regional pressures.

The capacity of these organizations varies regionally, with clear differences in governance structure around some basis for programmatic decision-making. These findings of regional variations as well as national patterns highlight the importance of studying fields of nonprofit organizations within nested institutional and cultural contexts, as sector-wide uniformity cannot be assumed. This may be particularly true in nonprofit fields that undertake work, e.g., historic preservation, which was once considered a primary responsibility of the government. This matters not only to nonprofit studies but also in relation to public and environmental resource management literature, as public managers are, in part, responsible to future generations in relation to cultural and historical legacies (Lewis, 2006). Government managers are increasingly reliant on cooperation with nonprofit organizations and private landowners to manage public resources, and recent social changes can create obstacles in establishing new relationships (e.g., Bergmann & Bliss, 2004). As such, it is important for public managers to understand variability in nonprofit subsectors working to help manage and preserve cultural environmental resources and other public goods, to both inform relationships with organizations working in the same resource area, and best manage these goods.

In addition to examining institutional and regional pressures in this nonprofit subsector, this study makes an important contribution to the literature on historic preservation by providing an overview of the work and structure of nonprofit historic preservation organizations in the U.S. I found that the majority of preservation organizations have mission statements with a focus on preservation, protection, and promotion of cultural and historic resources, while less than a fifth focus on enhancing the resources they seek to protect. Bridges, cultural landscapes or the built environment, historic residences, midcentury modern or recent past, landmarks and historic sites, and commercial structures are the most commonly preserved resources nationally, with 40% or more of organizations reporting a focus on preserving these resource types. I also found the majority of organizations in this subsector do not engage in disaster planning, either in-house or with outside stakeholders, despite historic preservation having become a widely acknowledged and important aspect of material culture and economic resiliency that is threatened by disasters (Wojno, 1991; Morgan, Morgan, & Barrett, 2006; Verderber, 2009; Rypkema et al., 2011). In providing a national overview of the scope and capacity of historic preservation nonprofits, this study may provide practitioners with a better understanding of the

Table 6. Regional Snapshots of U.S. Historic Preservation Nonprofits

Region	Southern	Midwest	Southwest	Mountain-Plains	Western	Northeast
States in this National Trust region	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, OH, WI	AR, NM, OK, TX	CO, KS, MT, NE, ND, SD, UT, WY	AZ, CA, ID, NV, OR, WA	CT, DE, ME, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
Strategic aim within region	Place, culture	Place, culture, economic	Place, culture, economic	Place, culture	Place, culture, economic	Place, culture, economic
Opinions on adaptive use	Current* (77%) Future* (22%)	Current* (69%) Future* (87%)	Current* (82%) Future* (82%)	Current* (83%) Future* (75%)	Current* (90%) Future* (90%)	Current* (53%) Future* (65%)
Most common decision basis	Tradition (47%)	Board & staff* (75%)	Board & staff* (69%)	Funders* Board & staff* Tradition (83%)	Funders* Board & staff* (50%)	Funders* Board & staff* (56%)
Resources most commonly targeted	Residential (45%)	Bridges* (81%)	Cultural landscapes/ built environment* Landmarks* (67%)	Residential (83%)	Mid-century (82%)	Religious* (100%)

Note. Statistically significant difference by region; p<0.05

behaviors of other organizations, allowing for better information exchange, organizational learning, and impetus for advocacy work around particular resource types.

Findings from this study add to the work by other scholars supporting regional differences in nonprofit organizations and philanthropy (Schneider, 1996; Clerkin, et al., 2013) and in historic preservation (Carlson, 1980). It also supports studies that have found differences in behaviors in nonprofit organizations related to decision-making rationale (Bromley, Hwang, & Powell, 2012).

However, neither programs run by these organizations, nor elements of capacity related to organizational characteristics, geographic cover, or local context show national or regional patterns. This shows that additional research is necessary to better understand additional pressures shaping this nonprofit subsector, and how they shape organizational behavior and structure. For example, an exploration of the relative degree of influence of each of these nested pressures as well how these nested pressures interact could provide valuable information for both public and nonprofit managers seeking to influence practices regarding public resource preservation.

There are many small nonprofit historic preservation organizations in the U.S., but there is no comprehensive list of such organizations—and many are extremely small with a local focus and no paid employees. At least one organization included in this study has closed its doors for good since I interviewed its executive director. This means one limitation of this study is that there may be differences in behavior among these even smaller organizations that are missed in the population included in this study. Additionally, my study provides a cross-section of the patterns of behavior and structure within this subsector, and there may be significant changes over time, especially given recent shifts in regional cultural values and threats to cultural resources. Resource preservation is increasingly the responsibility of nongovernmental organizations in the U.S. Some lawmakers and advocates argue against the continuation of historic preservation districts in urban areas, particularly in regions such as the Midwest, where "the preservation of history and culture is not near to the hearts" of certain political factions (Capps, 2016). This means it becomes increasingly important to understand when and how these organizations will act to preserve cultural resources important to the diverse publics in the area and how they will go about identifying and making programming decisions regarding these resources.

Notes

1. This does not take into account those organizations from which I received no response after several attempts at contact. Taking nonresponse into account, 91% of organizations were included in the first phase of data collection, and 75% of those organizations took place in the second phase as well.
2. Delaware, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and North Dakota were not represented in these phases of the study because organizational representatives did not respond to my requests for interviews, and Alaska and Wyoming did not have an active NTHP partner nonprofit organization at the time the initial interviews were conducted.
3. In addition to Alaska, Delaware, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and North Dakota not being represented in the disaster-specific questions. Pennsylvania was not included because organizational representatives were unable to be contacted or declined to participate.

4. The "50-year rule" refers to National Park Service Criteria for National Register Evaluation, which state that (with some specific exceptions) sites that have "achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible" (Andrus, 2002).
5. Two other people who were PhD students in my doctoral program and members of the research team I worked on at the time of analysis kindly volunteered their weekend to code 10% of the qualitative data each. They coded different parts of the data, so each instance of coding that was checked for reliability was coded by both myself and another person well-trained in qualitative coding. We then sat down and discussed how my coding of each case related to theirs, with the idea that the third person who had not already coded it could weigh in for any cases of disagreement. As we initially agreed in almost all cases (over 95% of data categorizations) and quickly found agreement in cases where we did not initially agree, the coding is clearly reliable.
6. This question was originally designed as binary, but after several respondents shared their opinions that the two approaches are of equal importance, I kept the wording of the question consistent but allowed for a third category if they said they were equal.
7. At the time of data collection in 2010.
8. Resources that differ by region are described in the regional differences section.
9. Some historic and cultural resources that show national patterns in preservation are a part of the current preservation focus in only a small number of organizations, but the focus does not concentrate more heavily in one region than another, so they are listed as national patterns for simplicity.
10. Data for this question are from the 82 responses to this question.
11. Because of unequal group sizes across regions, harmonic means are reported here and for local organizational context, increasing the risk of Type I errors.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure Statement

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest that relate to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

References

Andrus, P.W. (2002). *How to apply the National Register criteria for evaluation bulletin.* U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Retrieved from https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/

Anheier, H. K., & Seibel, W. (Eds.). (1990). *The third sector: Comparative studies of nonprofit organizations* (Vol. 21). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Barnett, B. J., & Coble, K. H. (2011). Understanding regional differences in farm policy preferences. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *94*, 528-534. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aar061

Barthel, D. (1997). The role of "fictions" in the redefinition of mission. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *26*, 399-420. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764097264002

Benson, V. O., & Klein, R. (2008). *Historic preservation for professionals*. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.

Bergmann, S. A., & Bliss, J. C. (2004). Foundations of cross-boundary cooperation: Resource management at the public–private interface. *Society and Natural Resources*, *17*, 377-393. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920490430142

Borden, K. A., Schmidtlein, M. C., Emrich, C. T., Piegorsch, W. W., & Cutter, S. L. (2007). Vulnerability of US cities to environmental hazards. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, *4*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.2202/1547-7355.1279

Boyer, M. C. (1994). *The city of collective memory: Its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bromley, P., Hwang, H., & Powell, W. W. (2012). Decoupling revisited: Common pressures, divergent strategies in the U.S. nonprofit sector. *Management*, *15*, 469-501. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.155.0469

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Capps, K. (2016, Jan 29). Why historic preservation districts should be a thing of the past. The Atlantic, City Lab. Retrieved from http://www.citylab.com/housing/2016/01/why-historic-preservation-districts-should-be-a-thing-of-the-past/431598/

Carlson, A. W. (1980). An analysis of historic preservation in the United States as reflected by the National Register of Historical Places. *Journal of American Culture*, *3*, 245-267. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-734X.1980.0302_245.x

Clerkin, R. M., Paarlberg, L. E., Christensen, R. K., Nesbit, R. A., & Tschirhart, M. (2013). Place, time, and philanthropy: Exploring geographic mobility and philanthropic engagement. *Public Administration Review*, *73*, 97-106. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02616.x

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Driscoll, D. L., Appiah-Yeboah, A., Salib, P., & Rupert, D. J. (2007). Merging qualitative and quantitative data in mixed methods research: How to and why not. *Ecological and Environmental Anthropology*, *3*(1), 19-28.

Elazar, D. (1984). *The American mosaic: the impact of space, time, and culture on American politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Filion, P. (1991). The gentrification-social structure dialectic: A Toronto case study. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *15*, 553-574. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1991.tb00658.x

Frampton, K. (1983). Prospects for a critical regionalism. *Perspecta*, *20*, 147-162.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of management review*, *21*, 1022-1054. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1996.9704071862

Groat, L., & Wang, D. (2002). *Architectural research methods*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hackworth, J., & Smith, N. (2001). The changing state of gentrification. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, *92*, 464-477. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9663.00172

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*, 929-964. https://doi.org/10.1086/226424

Hero, R. E., & Tolbert, C. J. (1996). A racial/ethnic diversity interpretation of politics and policy in the states of the US. *American Journal of Political Science*, *40*, 851-871. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111798

Hinings, C. R., Greenwood, R., Reay, T., & Suddaby, R. (2004). Dynamics of change in organizational fields. In M. S. Poole, & A. H. Van de Ven, (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational change and innovation* (pp. 304-323). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Towards a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*, 112-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Lall, S. V., & Yilmaz, S. (2001). Regional economic convergence: Do policy instruments make a difference? *The Annals of Regional Science*, *35*, 153-166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s001680000035

Lefaivre, L., & Tzonis, A. (2003). *Critical regionalism: Architecture and identity in a globalized world*. Munich, Germany: Prestel Publishing.

Lewis, C. W. (2006). In pursuit of the public interest. *Public Administration Review*, *66*, 694-701. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00634.x

Lieske, J. (1993). Regional subcultures of the United States. *The Journal of Politics*, *55*, 888-913. https://doi.org/10.2307/2131941

Maloutas, T. (2012). Contextual diversity in gentrification research. *Critical Sociology*, *38*, 33-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510380950

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1984). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review 78*, 734-749. https://doi.org/10.2307/1961840

Matero, F. G. (2003). Managing change: The role of documentation and condition survey at Mesa Verde National Park. *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation, 42*, 39-58. https://doi.org/10.1179/019713603806112895

Morgan, D. W., Morgan, N. I., & Barrett, B. (2006). Finding a place for the commonplace: Hurricane Katrina, communities, and preservation law. *American Anthropologist*, *108,* 706-718. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2006.108.4.706

Muller, A., & Whiteman, G. (2009). Exploring the geography of corporate philanthropic disaster response: A study of Fortune Global 500 firms. *Journal of Business Ethics, 84*, 589-603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9710-7

Nardulli, P. F. (1990). Political subcultures in the American states: An empirical examination of Elazar's formulation. *American Politics Quarterly*, *18*, 287-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X9001800303

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Palen, J. J., & London, B. (Eds.). (1984). *Gentrification, displacement and neighborhood revitalization*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Powell, D. (2007). *Critical regionalism: connecting politics and culture in the American landscape*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Quirke, L. (2013). Rogue resistance: Sidestepping isomorphic pressures in a patchy institutional field. *Organizational Studies, 34*, 1675-1699. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613483815

Rice, J. (2012). From architectonic to tectonics: Introducing regional rhetorics. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *42*, 201-213. https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2012.682831

Rypkema, D., Cheong, C., & Mason, R. (2011). *Measuring economic impacts of historic preservation: A report to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation*. Retrieved from http://www.achp.gov/docs/Economic%20Impacts%20v5-FINAL.pdf

Saito, L. T. (2009). From "Blighted" to "Historic": Race, economic development, and historic preservation in San Diego, California. *Urban Affairs Review, 45*, 166-187. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087408327636

Sax, J. L. (1982). Some thoughts on the decline of private property. *Washington Law Review*, *58*, 481-496.

Schneider, J. C. (1996). Philanthropic styles in the United States: Toward a theory of regional differences. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *25*, 190-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764096252004

Schneiberg, M., & Clemens, E. S. (2006). The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. *Sociological Theory*, *24*, 195-227. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2006.00288.x

Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism "old" and "new." *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 270-277. https://doi.org/10.23072393719

Stubbs, John H. (2009). *Time honored: A global view of architectural conservation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Thorlton, J. R., McElmurry, B., Park, C., & Hughes, T. (2012). Adolescent performance enhancing substance use: Regional differences across the US. *Journal of Addictions Nursing, 23*, 97-111. https://doi.org/10.3109/10884602.2012.669419

Tzonis, A., & Lefaivre, L. (1981). The grid and the pathway. *Architecture in Greece*, *15*, 164-178.

Tzonis, A., & Lefaivre, L. (1990). Why critical regionalism today? *Architecture and Urbanism*, *236*, 22-33.

Verderber, S. (2009). The *Un*building of historic neighborhoods in Post-Katrina New Orleans. *Journal of Urban Design, 14*, 257-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/13574800903056465

Wells, J. (2010). Our history is not false: Perspectives from the revitalisation culture. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 16*, 464-485. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2010.505043

Wojno, C. T. (1991). Historic preservation and economic development. *Journal of Planning Literature, 5*, 296-306. https://doi.org/10.1177/088541229100500305

Woods, C. S., Ewalt, J. P., & Baker, S. J. (2013). A matter of regionalism: Remembering Brandon Teena and Willa Cather at the Nebraska History Museum. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 99*, 341-363. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2013.806818

Worthing, D., & Bond, S. (2008). *Managing built heritage: The role of cultural significance*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Author Biography

Anne-Lise K. Velez holds a Ph.D. in public administration and is currently a collegiate assistant professor in architecture and urban studies at Virginia Tech, where she is working on curriculum development for the Calhoun Honors Discovery Program and research on public and nonprofit management. Because of her background in design and her work with nonprofits, Anne-Lise is particularly interested in management decisions and policies that involve the built environment and human interactions with the natural environment, especially as related to community well-being and sustainability.