

Understanding Collaboration Among Nonprofit Organization: Combining Resource Dependence, Institutional, and Network Perspectives

Chao Guo and Muhittin Acar

2005

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| 1 Theme | 2 |
| 2 Research Questions | 2 |
| 3 Hypotheses | 3 |
| 3.1 Hypothesis 1 | 3 |
| 3.2 Hypothesis 2 | 3 |
| 3.3 Hypothesis 3 | 3 |
| 3.4 Hypothesis 4 | 3 |
| 3.5 Hypothesis 5 | 3 |
| 4 Research Method | 3 |
| 5 Result | 5 |
| 6 Conclusion | 5 |
| 7 Thoughts on this paper | 5 |

Focus on two aspects: 1. Overall structure. 2. Introduction. What to read?

In the first 10 minutes: figure out research question. In the second time: challenging methods center around the research question.

In Introduction,

1. What is discussed in introduction?
2. How is the section structured?
3. What is the significance of study?
4. What is the research question?

two statements must be made: 1. Why this paper is written and its importance and relation with other papers. 2. Research question.

Structure of Introduction: scope of this study → shortcomings of existing literature → My study → Research question → Summarize findings → Contributions → Organization of this paper

1 Theme

can be shorter. Use two or three sentences to summarize This paper aims to find relevant factors that impact formality of collaboration among nonprofit organizations. The authors identify eight types of collaborations and further classify them into two classes: informal ones and formal ones. They propose several factors that might be instrumental in making decisions of collaborations of nonprofit organizations, such that resource dependency, institutional factors and network effects, and corresponding hypotheses. They use survey data to test their hypotheses, and the method is based on logistic regression since the dependence variable is binary. Their result shows that nonprofit organizations are more likely to form a formal collaborations as they are older, have a larger budget size, receives government funding but relies on fewer government funding streams, has more board linkages with other nonprofit organizations, and is not operating in the education and research or social service industry. The result is at odds with their hypothesis that a nonprofit organization with larger budget size tend to form a formal collaboration. Other regression results are consistent with their hypotheses.

2 Research Questions

This paper examines factors that influence the likelihood that nonprofit organizations develop formal types of collaborations versus informal ones. Specifically, they identify three types of factors: resource dependency, institutional and network perspectives.

No literature review here. If necessary, it can be added here

3 Hypotheses

Core part : combine it with 3 IV in the next part.

3.1 Hypothesis 1

An organization with greater resource scarcity (or smaller resource sufficiency) is more likely to develop formal types of collaborative activities.

3.2 Hypothesis 2

The likelihood of developing formal types of collaborative activities is curvilinearly (taking an inverted U shape) related to the number of an organization's government funding sources.

3.3 Hypothesis 3

The likelihood of developing formal types of collaborative activities is associated with an organization's industry of operation.

3.4 Hypothesis 4

The more linkages an organization has with other nonprofits through its board, the more likely it will develop formal types of collaborative activities.

3.5 Hypothesis 5

An older organization is more likely to develop formal types of collaborative activities.

4 Research Method

1. Method: Logistic Regression
2. DV: forms of collaboration
 - (a) 1: formal types of collaborative activities.
 - (b) 2: informal ones.

3. IV and Measures

- (a) Resource sufficiency: $\log(\text{reported annual budget for 2001})$.
 - (b) Diversity of government funding streams: categorical variable
 - i. 0: no any government funding stream.
 - ii. 1: one or two government funding streams.
 - iii. 2: three or more government funding streams.
 - (c) social and legal services industry
 - i. 1: operates in the social and legal services industry.
 - ii. 0: otherwise.
 - (d) Education and research industry.
 - i. 1: operates in the education and research industry.
 - ii. 0: otherwise.
 - (e) Health services industry
 - i. 1: operates in the health services industry.
 - ii. 0: otherwise.
 - (f) Arts and culture industry: similarly defined.
 - (g) Board linkages: # of board members who serve on the boards or top management teams of other nonprofit organizations.
 - (h) Organizational age: $\log(2001 - \text{year when a given organization was founded})$
 - (i) board size: $\log(\text{\#people serving on the board})$.
4. Sample: random drawn of 376 nonprofit organizations in Los Angeles and sending out questionnaires.
- (a) response: 97(25.8%).
5. Operationalization: three models vary in the number of regressors included and they are nested.
- (a) Model 1: age + resource and diversity.
 - (b) Model 2: Model 1 + four industry indicators.
 - (c) Model 3: Model 2 + network effects.
 - (d) Conclusion: Model 3 has the highest model fit, so focus on it.

5 Result

should be more specific Based on model 3:

- (a) Hypothesis 1 (resource): Not supported.
- (b) 2 (diversity): Partially supported.
- (c) 3. Industry:
- (d) 4. Network: Support.
- (e) 5. Age: Support.

6 Conclusion

Contribution:

1. Literature on why nonprofit organizations choose to form collaborations is meager. This study fills this important void.
2. External validity. Reduced form study only focuses on Los Angeles.
 - 1. Data: survey data is not reliable, potentially subject to the problem of measurement error.
 - 2. How those factors are proposed? Is there any theoretical foundations?
 - 3. Regression: endogeneity a problem?

Limitations:

1. Cross-sectional data does not reveal a causal inference.
2. Representative: not many small organizations.

7 Thoughts on this paper

strengths and weakness

1. External validity. Reduced form study only focuses on Los Angeles.
2. Data: survey data is not reliable, potentially subject to the problem of measurement error.

3. How those factors are proposed? Is there any theoretical foundations?
4. Regression: endogeneity a problem?