

Kristin Jackson  
 FYC 6423  
 30 June 2009

Annotated Bibliography – Representation and Legitimacy

**Beckfield, J. (2003). *Inequality in the World Polity: The Structure of International Organization. *American Sociological Review*. 68(3):401-424.***

The *American Sociological Review* is a peer reviewed journal published by the American Sociological Association (ASA). The journal is focuses on publishing new/cutting edge material on theoretical developments, the social process, and methodological innovations. Jason Beckfield is an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Director of Undergraduate Studies for Harvard University. One area which Beckfield's interest lie is in studies of global inequality and social policy. In *Inequality in the World Polity: The Structure of International Organization* Beckfield looks at differences in equality between INGs or INGOs. Beckfield uses the Yearbook of International Organizations to obtain data on various INGs and INGOs. Beckfield found that westerns societies have increased their relationships with INGOs and INGs more than other societies. Beckman identified three explanations for his findings: the IGO field is more mature, IGOs are used to counter INGOs, and the fact that, "states may resemble one another more than societies," (p 418). This study suggests that participation in world polity is being more even distributed through IGO activism. Beckfield suggest a good direction for future research would be, "to integrate the vision of policy script diffusion from world polity theory with the conflict model of the world polity derived from world-systems theory and the world civilization approach," (419). While empirical data was collected and analyzed it was from secondary source. Future research could contribute to the body of knowledge on conflict theory and world policy by cross checking reliability and validity of Beckfield's findings through primary data collection. Beckfield is essential looking at representation and how to determine who is most qualified/what qualifies some to represent another individual or group.

**Brown, L. and Moore, M. (2001). *Accountability, Strategy, and International Nongovernmental Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 30(3):569-587.***

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Brown and Moore are affiliated with the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations. The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations is affiliated with Harvard University and is focused on nonprofit research,

education, and practice. One area of Brown's focus is on change and conflict in organizations and intuitions. Moore's focus rest more on management, leaderships, and civil society. The purpose of Accountability, Strategy, and International Nongovernmental Organizations is to look at developing NGO accountability, addressing accountability as a strategic concept, and looking at the different implications of different strategies. Brown and Moore define accountability as, "when an actor recognizes that it has made a promise to do something and accepted a moral and legal responsibility to do something and accepted a moral and legal responsibility to do its best to fulfill that promise," (p 570). Which stakeholders an organization recognizes it is accountable to can affect is mission, strategies, and operations. To illustrate the accountability relationship Brown and Moore introduce the strategic triangle. Brown and Moore look at the implications of the accountability relationship for different types of organizations and conclude that an organizations success especially on an international level is related to how they organize their accountableness or to prioritize to which group they are accountable. Brown and Moore look at the directionality of accountability. The authors do no suggest any direction for future research, but their claims could be strengthened by primary empirical data on the impact of prioritizing accountability.

**Guo, C. and Musso, J. (2007).Representation in Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations: A Conceptual Framework. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 36(2): 308-326.**

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Gau is an assistant professor at Arizona State University. One are of research that Gau is interested in is non-profit governance. Musso is a professor at the University of Southern California. She also is interested in governance. The purpose of Representation in Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations: A Conceptual Framework is to add to the definition of participant representation and look at how legitimacy and capacity relate to representation. Substantive representation deal with acting on another party's behalf. Symbolic representation deals with acting for another party based on the party's beliefs. How an organization is able to or choose to act on the behalf of another party maybe related to other types of representation such as: formal (leadership selection), descriptive (demographic characteristics of constituents), and participatory (active constituent participation). Guo and Musso look at how two organizations navigate these issues and the implications of the organizations decisions in terms of legitimacy. Guo and Musso found that different organizations maybe more accountable in certain aspects of representation than others depending on the type of organization, thus making it hard to develop or apply a standard for representation. Essentially Guo and Musso are concerned with looking at how and organization represents others, but stays within its stated mission and values compared to actual performance. Future research would focus

on systematic empirical analyses that look at how NPO represent their constituents, examine the dimensions of representation across multiple organizations, and look at how environmental/organizational factors influence representation.

**Hudson, A. (2000). Making the Connection: Legitimacy Claims, Legitimacy Chains and Northern NGOs' International Advocacy. In D. Lewis & T. Wallace (Eds.), *New roles and relevance: Development NGOs and the challenge of change* (pp. 89 - 97). Kumarian Press, Bloomfield, CT.**

*New Roles and Relevance: Development NGOs and the Challenge of Change* is written by a combination of researchers and practitioners. The book advocates for improvements in theory and practice challenging NGOs to improve in the following areas: relevance, accountability, and performance. Allen Hudson is a political economist and is expert in the areas of governance and accountability, among other areas. He is also member of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). ODI is a British organization that focuses on international development and humanitarian issues. *Making the Connection: Legitimacy Claims, Legitimacy Chains and Northern NGO's international Advocacy* attempts to address how can south and north work together in organizing legitimate and effective international advocacy. Hudson addresses his former question by looking at how the north establishes legitimacy and legitimacy chains in the south. Hudson briefly touches on the fact that downward accountability is often limited. Hudson concludes in order to increase legitimacy when dealing with multiple accountabilities it must be done through governance and the institutionalization of values. This chapter was more of a think piece and would benefit from empirical support.

**Strickland, R.A. & Vaughan, S.K. (2008). The Hierarchy of Ethical Values in Nonprofit Organizations. *Public Integrity* 10(3), 233-251.**

The journal *Public Integrity* is focused on ethics in government. The journal is peer reviewed and targets practitioners and scholars. *Public Integrity* is published by the American Society for Public Administration. American Society for Public Administration is a non-profit focused on public/non-profit administration, elevating the public service profession, networking with in the field, and achieving solutions to governance challenges. Strickland and Vaughan are both professors at Appalachian State University with at least one area of their research focus being on ethics in nonprofit management. In the hierarchy of ethical values in nonprofit organizations Strickland and Vaughan discuss the levels of ethical behavior (financial competence, accountability, reciprocity, respect, and integrity) and the need for organizations to internalize the levels in order to truly be accountable. Through eternalizing values NPOs engage in stewardship and are able to regulate themselves. Further Strickland and Vaughan imply that ethics and accountability can only be regulated to a certain level, hence the need for

organizational internalization or commitment. Strickland and Vaughan also give potential ways to increase accountability at each level. Strickland and Vaughan conclude, “Simply following the letter of the law does not mean that organizations are ethical,” hence the need for integrity or stewardship (p 247). Strickland and Vaughan recognize despite potential difficulties empirical testing is necessary.

**Dees, J. and Anderson, B. (2003). Sector-Bending: Blurring Lines Between Nonprofit and For-Profit. *Society*. 40(4) 16-27.**

The journal *Society* focuses on research findings from all social science disciplines. The journal’s primary audience is decision makers and others concerned with societal trends. Dees and Anderson are both affiliated with Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business. Anderson is also involved with Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). *Sector-Bending: Blurring Lines between Nonprofit and For-Profit* addresses nonprofits implementing business methods and structures. “Sector –bending refers to a wide variety of approaches, activities, and relationships that are blurring the distinctions between non-profit and for-profit organizations,” (p 16). Dees and Anderson use the term Hybrid organizations to describe organizations involved in both for-profit and non-profit activities. This is different from the traditional definition of hybrid organizations that engage in advocacy and service. Dees and Anderson address the benefits of sector blending as well as the risk or concerns of NPOs entering the for-profit sector. Dees and Anderson said when trying to assess the cost/benefit of this transition one must consider how does the transition benefit or hurt society not the organization it self. Dees and Anderson primarily wrote a think piece on sector blending future empirical research in the areas of social impact of transitions and implications on the sectors. Additionally Dees and Anderson question should NPOs that switch to for-profits have to repay benefits received from being a nonprofit. Dees and Anderson concluded at this time there is not enough evidence to show that sector blending hurts society, but they appear confident that it can influence accountability relationships.

**Hale, T. (2008). Transparency, Accountability, and Global Governance. *Global Governance*. 14:73-94.**

*Global Governance Journal* address topics on economic development, peace and security, human rights, and the preservation of the environment. *Global Governance*’s target audience is academics and practitioners. *Global Governance* is a publication of The Academic Council of the United Nations System (ACUNS). ACUNS is a professional association devoted to the study of multilateral relations, global governance, and international cooperation. The purpose of *Transparency, Accountability, and Global Governance* is look at whether and how transparency affects global actors and how the prior finds

impact global governance. “Accountability is the synthesis of two concepts: answerability ...and enforcement,” (p 75). Transparency promotes answerability. The question remains, in the absence of enforcement can transparency still promote accountability? Hale address the pro and cons of three informal tools that can be used to hold global institutions of accountable: market pressure, internal norms of the targeted group, and discourse. Hale concludes through, “strengthening the role of accountability actors primarily NGOs and ensuring that Transparency mechanisms achieve maximum disclosure can...make global governance more democratic,” (p 91). Although Hale does not directly answer the former question based on his findings and the call for the use of informal tools it can be reasoned that accountability requires enforcements. According to Hale future research will focus on distinguishing actual attempts at accountability from public relations stunts and identifying areas where transparency alone is not adequate. The Hale article is more of a literature review or synthesis of current perspectives on transparency, accountability, and governance. Future research would attempt to add empirical merit to Hales conclusions or test the application of the theories presented.

**James, E. (2003). Commercialism and the Mission of Nonprofits. *Society*. 40(4): 29-35.**

The journal *Society* focuses of research findings from all social science disciplines. The journal’s primary audience is decision makers and others concerned with societal trends. Estelle James is a consultant at the World Bank and a fellow at the Urban Institute. World Bank provides financial and technical assistance to developing countries. The Urban Institute is also focused on international assistance, but also gathers data, educates Americans, conducts research, and evaluates programs. James in *Commercialism and the Mission of Nonprofits* attempts to weight the pros and cons of NPOs reaming non-profit or switching to for-profits. James points out that NPOs do no have access to equity capital and financial markets, so they may seem trustworthy because they do no have to focus on revenue generation. However, as for-profits use nonprofit measures to demonstrate their own accountability their may not be the previously presumed differences. Worst case scenario while for-profits become more “trustworthy” NPO values may shift as they try to prove additional form of accountability. James suggests that additional research should focus on weather special tax privileges should extend to mixed industries and if so what does society gain? Additionally who should be permitted to acquire the assets of converted NPOs and how would society benefit for the new arrangement? Future research could also expand on James conclusions by looking at the cost/benefits to society James address from an empirical standpoint.

**Lister, S. (2003). NGO Legitimacy: Technical Issue or Social Construct? *Critique of Anthropology*. 23(2): 175-191**

*Critique of Anthropology* subjects social reality to critical analysis. The journal is internationally peer reviewed. Sarah Lister is an advisor for the Oslo Governance Centre. The Oslo Governance Centre was established in 2002 as part of the United Nations Development Program in hopes of promoting democratic governance. Lister's recent works focus on topics such as civil society in policy process and the political representation of marginalized groups. *NGO Legitimacy: Technical Issue or Social Construct* focuses on understanding of legitimacy as a social construct. Lister reviews several definitions of legitimacy and reviews the concept of legitimacy from within institutional theory. Lister attempts to expand

current research from an institutional theory perspective by looking at the legitimizing environment, the dimensions of legitimacy, and the enhancement of legitimacy through symbols. Lister concludes that an organization's legitimacy is related to conformity with dominant discourses. Lister suggests that future research focus on how symbols are created and gain legitimacy.

**Chesterman, S. (2008). Globalization Rules: Accountability, Power, and the Prospects for Global Administrative Law. *Global Governance*. 14:39-52.**

*Global Governance Journal* address topics on economic development, peace and security, human rights, and the preservation of the environment. *Global Governance's* target audience is academics and practitioners. *Global Governance* is a publication of The Academic Council of the United Nations System (ACUNS). ACUNS is a professional association devoted to the study of multilateral relations, global governance, and international cooperation. Simon Chesterman is currently the Executive Director for New York School of Law and is over the Institute for International Law and Justice. Prior Chesterman served as Senior Associate at the International Peace Academy and Director of UN relations at the International Crisis Group. The purpose of *Globalization Rules: Accountability, Power, and the Prospects for Global Administrative Law* is to describe the current state of global accountability and demonstrate how transparency, participation and review will improve decision making and protect INGOs legitimate interest. Global governance is currently primarily regulatory in nature and tends to be responsive and ad hoc in structure. Chesterman identifies two primary forms of accountability (legal and political). Legal accountability focus on compliance with rules. Political accountability can be arbitrary because it focuses on the relationship between parties. Between either concepts of accountability in detail there is a spectrum of other forms of accountability. Chesterman concludes that accountability does not just rest on the relationship between parties involved, but on the stability of the relationship. The implementation of standards used to hold organizations is not useful if the standards are not legitimate; however, the term legitimacy is so broad people prefer to use accountability. This study is more of a synthesis of current knowledge and ideas regarding globalization rules. Chesterman does bring in a case study pertaining to animal rights, but ultimately future research would look

at what makes organizations legitimate or accountable from an empirical perspective.

**Minkoff, D. (2002). The Emergence of Hybrid Organizational Forms: Combining Identity-Base Service Provision and Political Action. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 31(3):377-401**

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Minkoff is a professor of sociology at the University of Washington. One of her research focuses is on the dynamics of American social movements. The purpose of *The Emergence of Hybrid Organizational Forms: Combining Identity-Base Service Provision and Political Action* are to determine what extent is the development of hybrid organizations reliant on other organizations and are hybrid organization more or less vulnerable to political turbulence and resource uncertainties. During the civil rights era service organizations were more prominent than advocacy organizations. Around the 1970s advocacy organizations began to replace service organizations. Organization form is important in terms of social movement strategy because it shapes an organization's ability to mobilize support. "Hybrid forms of organizations develop as an effort to manage environmental uncertainty and episodic change. However, hybrid organizations face challenges similar to other organizations such as: funding organizations may not want to support a group involved in any type of advocacy, a continual need for negotiating service versus advocacy, and additional needs for monitors. The advantage of hybrid organizations is that they can still perform the traditional service role as well as meet evolving demands for advocacy. Minkoff obtained secondary data from the Encyclopedia of Associations on organizations national in scope that focus on equality. Minkoff found that while hybrid organizations are open to future resource expansion, but make organizational survival more difficult especially as government commitment diminishes.

**Morrison, J. and Salipante, P. (2007). Governance for Broadened Accountability: Blending Deliberate and Emergent Strategizing. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 36(2):195-217.**

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Morrison and Salipante are professors at Assumption College in Worcester. Morrison's focus is on achieving accountability and legitimacy in nonprofit organizations. Salipante has focused on examining the role of self-governance in voluntary organizations. The purpose of *Governance for Broadened Accountability: Blending Deliberate and Emergent Strategizing* to synthesize concepts of accountability, develop concepts concerning the practice of nonprofit governance, and look at the relationship between strategy and accountability. "Traditional definitions of accountability are...limited to process

concerns such as finances, international controls, and regulatory compliance," (p 197). Broaden definitions of accountability focus not just on how work gets done, but what work gets done or performance accountability. Morrison and Salipante's study is a case study from which the researchers obtained mostly nominal data. Emergent Strategy is reactive. Deliberate strategizing is proactive. A blended mode includes both proactive and reactive strategizing, thus requiring open dialogue. Morrison and Salipante's results finding are suggestive of future strategy, but incomplete because they only look at one organization. Future research, would examine multiple organizations in a more quantifiable manner.

**Ospina, S., Diaz, W., and O'Sullivan, J. (2002), *Negotiating Accountability: Managerial Lessons from Identity-Based Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31(5): 5-31.***

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Ospina, Diaz, and Sullivan are practitioners and or researchers in the field of public service administration. *Negotiating Accountability: Managerial Lessons from Identity-Based Nonprofit Organizations* addresses how NGO leaders prioritize how much attention they pay to different stakeholders and the problems with implementing a broad approach to accountability. Ospina et al. compare the traditional definitions of accountability: financial health, internal controls, and regulatory compliance to negotiate accountability. Negotiated accountability deals with upward and downward pulls. Ospina et al found that "leaders tied the mission of the organization directly to the needs of the community,...the relationship with the community is a negotiated one,...negotiations with other stakeholders of the accountability environment are often passed through the filter of this core relationship," (p 28). These findings are significant because they illustrate the fact that nonprofits choose which relationships to satisfy and to what degree. This study was a case study future research could expand on Ospina et al's findings by using random sampling and collecting data appropriate for detailed statistical analysis.

**Ossewaarde, R., Nijhof, A., and Heyse, L. (2008). *Dynamics of NGO Legitimacy:***

**How Organizing Betrays Core Missions of INGOs. *Public Administration and Development*. 28:42-53.**

The *Public Administration and Development Journal* is a peer-reviewed journal that looks at the links between public administration practice and management research in both the public and nonprofit sector. Ossewaarde, the first author lectures at the University of Twente on topics related to the field of sociology in the School of Management and Governance. In the Dynamics of NGO Legitimacy: How Organizing Betrays Core Missions of INGOs Ossewaard, Nijhof, and Heyse attempt to develop a framework of legitimacy source for

international nongovernmental organizations. This article looks at the difficulties of grounding legitimacy with in the four established sources: normative, regulatory, cognitive, and output. Ossewaarde et al also examine the threats to the different sources of legitimacy. The authors conclude that future research should be empirical in nature and address the different strategies for INGO legitimacy.

**Wollebaek, D. and Selle, P. (2002) Does Participation in Voluntary Associations Contribute to Social Capital? The Impact of Intensity, Scope, and Type. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 31(1): 32-61.**

The *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* provides research, discussion, and analysis of the impact the nonprofit sector has on society. The journal's target audience is researchers. Wollebaek and Selle are both interested in the study of voluntary Association. Selle is a professor at the University of Bergen and affiliate with the Norwegian Centre for Research in Organizational Management. Wollebaek is a graduate of the University of Bergen and is now affiliate with John Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. The purpose of Does Participation in Voluntary Associations Contribute to Social Capital? The Impact of Intensity, Scope, and Type is to validate the finding/ assumptions of Putnam. Putnam asserted that voluntary association fuel social trust, horizontal social networks, and civic engagement (social capital). Wollebaek and Selle tested Putnam's findings by using data from a nationwide survey carried out by the Norwegian Centre of Research in Organization Management as part of a project by John Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. Wollebaek and Selle's findings did not correspond to Putnam's assumptions, in fact another Norwegian study produce similar findings to Wollebaek and Selle. The role of voluntary association in building social capital is overstated. Passive affiliation may be loosely connected to associations. The exact relationship of voluntary associations to social capital may be more accurately locate if a more institutionalist perspective is employed.

**Synthesis of Literature on Representation and Legitimacy**

**1) What are the areas of agreement or similarity (similar concerns, issues, conclusions or findings) among the authors whose work you reviewed?**

Representation and legitimacy are two terms in the non-profit sector that are inextricably tied together. The discussions of representation and legitimacy begins and ends with the question, what makes nonprofit organizations (NPOs) legitimate representatives of the parties/individuals that they claim to represent? In order to understand the depth of the question posed one must start by understanding how the two key terms, representation and legitimacy are defined.

In the non-profit sector representation is analyzed by looking at one of the following: measures of capacity, substantive representation, or symbolic representation (Guo and Musso, 2007). Representation in terms of capacity is perhaps the easiest dimension to tackle because it deals with concepts that can be easily identified and observed. When discussing representation in terms of capacity one is looking at formal representation (how leadership is selected), descriptive representation (the ability to reflect characteristics of constituents), and participatory representation (constituent participation), (Guo and Musso, 2007).

Substantive and symbolic forms of representation deal with concepts that are normally more abstract. Substantive representation occurs when others, “act in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them,” (Guo and Musso, 2007, p 311). Symbolic representation, “ occurs when constituents believe legitimacy of an organization because of what it is perceived to be, rather than what is actually act in their interests,” (Guo and Musso, 2007, p 313).

In the United States, NPOs that focus on advocacy morphed out of NPOs that focus on identity-based service provision (Minkoff, 2002). Traditional, NPOs according to Minkoff would have focused more on civic engagement or local participation, thus shortening the chain of legitimacy. For intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and nongovernmental organization (NGOs) the distance between the represented and the representation can be great. Beckfield’s research on the international level supports the idea that representation is easiest achieved by organizations close proximity to the represented because states within nations have closer ties than nations to one another, (2003; Hudson, 2000)

Defining legitimacy, on the other, hand is a much more complex task. Technically, legitimacy derives from the state of being legitimate. The question a hand becomes, how do nonprofits become legitimate? Michael Edwards, the Director of the Ford Foundation’s Governance and Civil Society Unit in New York defines legitimacy as, “having the right to be and do something in society—a sense that an organization is lawful, proper, admissible and justified in doing what it does, and saying what it says, and that it continues to enjoy the support of an identifiable constituency,” (Lister, 2003, p 176). The key to Edward’s definition is the idea that legitimacy rest on the right to act. Other author’s have defined legitimacy in a more subject manner missing the definition and focusing on what gives them the right. According to Ossewaarde, Nijhof, and Heyse the right to legitimacy can be derived from four sources: normative legitimacy (responsibility for victims), regulatory legitimacy (ensuring conformity to international legal systems), cognitive legitimacy (how the sovereign imagines the social needs of people), and output

legitimacy (performance based legitimacy). Organizations are held responsible for achieving and maintaining legitimacy through accountability. NPOs are often accountable to multiple sources. Accountability can be external or internal. Transparency and performance measures pertain to external accountability (Hale, 2008; Chesterman, 2008). Internal accountability leans towards stewardship, (Strickland and Vaughan, 2008). NPOs can manage their accountability relationships through deliberate and emergent strategizing (Morrison and Salipante, 2007). Emergent strategizing is reactive and deliberate strategizing is proactive (Morrison and Salipante, 2007). Morrison and Salipante argue that their must be a blend of both. When NPOs become hybrid organizations it further complicates the accountability relationships as NPOs become accountable to more parties. Hybrid organizations can either be defined as organizations that combine advocacy and service or as organizations that engage in both for-profit and nonprofit activities (Dees and Anderson, 2003; Minkoff, 2002). The problem with hybrid organizations is that as the parties that they are accountable to increase and the demand for external accountability increases. The increase concern for performance measures and the bottom line has the potential to draw NPOs away from their mission or values.

## **2) What are the areas of disagreement and/or tentative conclusions? What remains unclear, unanswered, or in need of further research?**

The articles that I selected were chosen to give me and allow me to demonstrate a broad understanding of representation and legitimacy. I did not find any areas of disagreement only areas in need of additional research.

Representation- Representation focuses on the right to act. The primary literature seemed to focus on the right of the sovereign. What or who gives the sovereign their rights is a question that is on the fore front of international politics today.

Legitimacy- Legitimacy is a complex issue that is most easily construed through the idea of accountability, however, accountability itself is a very broad and under defined construct. Thus the idea of legitimacy is largely socially constructed.

Accountability- Accountability while easier to measure and conceptualize is just as vague as legitimacy. The legitimacy seems to support the idea that a unified standard for accountability would be hard to establish and enforce. Much of the research I review pertaining to accountability was based on secondary data, theory, or reviews of literature. Although it would be hard to obtain more primary data not based on institutional self report would add to the body of literature.

Hybrid Organizations- Hybrid Organizations are organizations that engage in two or more sectors of operation. Currently their does not appear to be enough empirical evidence of the impact of being hybrid has on the organization, society, and or society.

**3) How does the literature you reviewed extend upon and contrast with the major themes, issues, perspectives and/or concepts presented in the required readings?**

The required readings address representation, legitimacy, and accountability. The additional reading I selected elaborate on these areas giving additional definitions and further analyzing the nature of the relationships. I also reviewed articles on hybrid organizations, sector blending, and increasing civic involvement. The articles on hybrid organizations and sector blending address the issue of accountability. The results from the article on civic engagement were most shocking. The article found that participation in voluntary organizations does not necessarily increase social capital. Wolleback and Selle do acknowledge that the results could have been biased because of the model that they used or due to how the data was collected. However, another study conducted within the same geographical region had similar findings.

**4) What are your summary conclusions about the topic that emerged from your review of the literature? This is not a statement of your opinions on the topic, but rather a set of conclusions that you draw based on the literature that you reviewed.**

Representation and legitimacy are broad topics still in need of further definition. Similar to other areas of research interest there are still several theories trying to explain/define these concepts. The body of knowledge would benefit from more empirical testing, more rigid sampling, and longitudinal data. .