

The Impacts of NGOs

Bell, D.A. & Carens, J.H. (2004) The ethical dilemmas of international human rights and humanitarian NGOs: Reflections on a dialogue between practitioners and theorists. *Human Rights Quarterly* 26 (2), 300-329.

Human Rights Quarterly is an academic journal that has been in print for 30 years and is recognized as a leading journal on human rights. It is widely utilized by academics, policymakers, governments and NGOs. Daniel Bell is an Associate Professor at the City University of Hong Kong. Joseph Carens is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto. The authors seek to point out typical dilemmas that NGOs encounter in their work and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of resolving them. Four ethical dilemmas are identified: 1. Conflicts between human rights principles and local cultural norms; 2. Tension regarding expanding or restricting an organization's mandate; 3. How and whether to collaborate with less-than-democratic governments; 4. Ethical limits in terms of fund-raising. One possible weakness is that these concerns were the result of a two-day workshop session between human rights NGOs and academics which may have inadvertently not represented other important stakeholders and may not have given rise to other issues or concerns due to the length of time. Further, this article merely focuses on the dilemmas and not on resolutions to them. What appears to be exciting about this article is the mere dialogue across disciplines and professions which may assist in bridging understanding and positive results that create solutions to these 4 conflicts. This is a potential starting point.

Boli, J. & Thomas, G.M. (1999). INGOs and the organization of world culture. In J. Boli & G.M. Thomas (Eds.), *Constructing world culture: International nongovernmental organizations since 1875*, (pp. 13-49). Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

John Boil is a professor of Sociology and the Director of Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Center at Emory University. He has a strong background and focus in theory which is represented in the course work he currently teaches. He's written numerous books and journal articles (CV is 19 pages!). George Thomas is a professor of Sociology at Arizona State University and the author of several books and journal articles. This chapter explores the world as a world polity or single "international society" and seeks to explain further this perspective through analyzing the history, structure, and operations of INGOs. The chapter discusses INGOs as embodiments of universalism, individualism, rational voluntaristic authority, progress and world citizenship and the culture of INGOs is oriented to intellectual, technical, and economic rationalization. The article determines 4 issues that are interrelated. They discuss the need to map the organizational dimensions of the world polity in more detail—within world-cultural sectors as well as across nation-states and regions. They determine that more can be learned by investigating the world-cultural principles and models that predominate in sectors and focus on their evolution over time and their interrelations across sectors. The authors discuss the need for more study of the "penetrative capacity of global processes"—how global structures affect national and subnational institutions and actors. And finally, they urge the need to better

understand the tensions and conflicts that are between global cultural structures and actors. This chapter was a difficult read for anyone not versed in theory or find theory difficult to comprehend. Perhaps its weakness is in the presentation of the arguments for all to understand.

Chambers, S. & Kopstein, J. (2001). Bad civil society. *Political Theory* 29 (6), 837-865.

Simone Chambers is a professor in Political Science at the University of Toronto. She's has interest in political theory, theories of justice, democracy, discourse and political participation. Jeffrey Kopstein is also a professor in Political Science at the University of Toronto and the director for the Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies. He has been awarded a number of fellowships and has many articles and books published. This article discusses the necessary tools of building liberal democracies. They argue that rights, civic education, promotion of good associations, and an expanded public sphere are not enough. They discuss this through the context of bad civil society. They suggest that the rights arguments are the laissez passer view of the issue and only work if rights are viewed as violated. The civic education argument, they argue, is weak because there is little evidence that it can work in scarcity situations. With the public sphere argument, they argue that the efficacy that assumes a level of social justice doesn't always exist. The article grounds itself in theory back to Tocqueville, Aristotle and Rousseau. The authors suggest addressing bad civil society issues means returning to issues of social justice. Again, as with any theoretical article, this may be difficult to tease if one struggles with theory in the first place. I also question some of their examples for bad civil society, though they do a decent job of counterpointing the good that these organizations bring to the table for members.

Gourville, J.T. & Rangan, V.K. (2004). Valuing the cause, marketing the relationship. *California Management Review* 47 (1), 38-57.

John Gourville is a professor of Business Administration at the Harvard Business School. He focuses on consumer decision-making, particularly pricing and the adoption of innovations. V. Rangan is also a professor at Harvard Business School in marketing and is the co-chairman of the Social Enterprise Initiative. He has interests in studying the role of marketing in nonprofit organizations and this influences the adoption of social products and ideas. This is no wonder that this article has a sharp business perspective for nonprofits and the relationship with for-profit entities for cause marketing. This article discusses how nonprofits enter into cause marketing relationships with for-profit companies. They discuss the needs on both sides of the table which bring them to this potential relationship. The authors also explain how cause marketing works as well as the variation within the framework. Both nonprofits and for-profits have to determine a "fit" in order to figure out potential outcomes of the relationships. The authors give a mock example to better explain this. Depending on the outcomes determines which side benefited (or both) which brings into question the definition of success. The authors seem to skirt around defining success for each. For the sake of this class, we would focus more on the determinants of success for a nonprofit if utilizing this framework. This article is fully embedded into a business framework which they admittedly determine that the issues of cause marketing can't be adequately answered with this framework alone though it does allow one to approach these relationships as a business opportunity. In the terms of nonprofits, we have been discussing the need for NGOs to be more professional and is it right to view them as businesses. If one is to

determine that they are not businesses nor should be run on the business model, should one utilize this framework?

Kendall, J. & Knapp, M. (2000) Measuring the performance of voluntary organizations. *Public Management 2 (1)*, 105-132.

Jeremy Kendall is a part of the London School of Economics and is a senior lecturer at the University of Kent. His interests include social and political impacts of the third world, voluntary or nonprofit sector in the UK, international comparisons of the third sector, and voluntary sector and the policy process. Martin Knapp is an economist and policy analyst whose interests are in health and social care. He is the Director of the Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU) at the London School of Economics. This article focuses on the need for indicators which can determine the success of the voluntary sector, or nonprofit. The aim is to develop some criteria for measuring performance. The authors seek to intertwine international theories about roles and contributions with the production of welfare (POW) approach. The POW approach has success in evaluating the effectiveness of human services. The authors identify 8 domains of performance: economy, effectiveness, efficiency, choice/pluralism, equity, participation, innovation, and advocacy. While it's strongly argued that there needs to be some measures to determine success, it's possible that many of these domains may not apply or conflict depending on which theory one uses to ground their nonprofit in: services, advocacy, or political. It begs the question of should this model be modified based on the grounded theory of the nonprofit? Regardless, when looking at our own NGOs for research, we should consider these domains carefully within the context of the realm our NGO claims it works.

Mallaby, S. (2004) NGOs: Fighting poverty, hurting the poor? *Foreign Policy Sep/Oct (144)*, 47-58

Sebastian Mallaby is the Director of the Maurice R. Greenberg Center for Geoeconomics Studies and the Paul A. Vockler Senior Fellow for International Economics Deputy Director of Studies. He's been working with the Washington Post since 1999 as a columnist and has expertise in globalization, trade, foreign assistance and hedge funds. This article discusses the conflicting "good" between the World Bank and Western activists. The article highlights World Bank projects that have been diluted or dissolved due to activists. This article is critical of how activists, particularly nonprofits, work to prevent projects from happening—particularly when there are limited facts. This article brings into question the topic of success. Is a nonprofit successful for preventing a project from occurring at the expense of local peoples? Is it appropriate to advocate on behalf of others without clear consensus of what they want? It seems that with all good intention, some nonprofits' own moral values override those who are directly impacted by the decisions. This article, while I perceive, as possibly biased on behalf of the author, does bring to light how the ideals of the North can be imposed on the South and may have strong negative consequences.

Holland, T.P. (2002). Board accountability: lessons from the field. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership 12 (4)*, 409-528.

Thomas Holland is a professor and the codirector of the Institute for Nonprofit Organizations at the University of Georgia. His interests include management and governance of nonprofit organizations. This article focuses on accountability which is considered to be a major issue for nonprofits. He defines accountability as being composed of practices of clarifying expectations, agreeing on goals and criteria for assessing progress, and finally providing information by which to assess performance. This article states determines that there are 6 sets of practices that promote board accountability—research is qualitative analysis through interviews, consultations, and meeting observations of board members. The sets of practices are: setting clear expectations and standards for group and members, utilizing policies regarding conflicts of interests, identifying/staying focused on priorities, maintaining two-way communication with constituency groups, performing assessments of meetings and board performance, and experimenting intentionally with new approaches. Possible concerns with this article: the sample is considered to be small and is nonrandom which can skew the results and may not give the full picture. The author also notes that more research is needed on antecedents and consequences when strengthening board accountability. Yet, this article still points out that many boards are not living up to their accountability plans. Not implementing accountability by boards gives rise to conflicts, abuses, and mistrust.

Pless, N. & Maak, T. (2009). Responsible leaders as agents of world benefit: learnings from "Project Ulysses." *Journal of Business Ethics* 85 (1), 59-71

Nicola Pless is Research Director in Responsible Leadership at the University of St. Gallen. She focuses on international management, diversity management, corporate responsibility, responsible leadership, and leadership development. Thomas Maak is Research Director at the Institute for Business Ethics and Reader in Corporate Responsibility at the University of St. Gallen. He focuses on business ethics, corporate citizenship, integrity management, and responsible leadership. This article discusses PricewaterhouseCoopers' leadership development program – "Project Ulysses". Project Ulysses is a development program focusing on a global firm-wide citizenship and leadership development that seeks to develop the next generation of global and responsible leaders within the firm as well as to foster business in civil society partnerships by strengthening the personal involvement of PwC in local communities and building effective global networks with external stakeholders. This article discusses the role of business leaders in regards to fighting social ills and creates arguments as to whether or not they should address these issues. The authors suggest that based on the project, the following should be considered: providing ethical inputs during program foundation (moral thinking, responsible leadership frameworks, etc); utilizing coaches and facilitators with educational backgrounds in philosophy or business ethics to bring about ethical discussions around participants' narratives, and also to support experimentation and action of participants in their home territories.

Brower, H.H. & Shrader, C.B. (2000) Moral reasoning and ethical climate: Not-for-profit vs. for-profit boards of directors. *Journal of Business Ethics* 26 (1), 147-167.

Holly Brower is Associate Professor at Wake Forest University in the Calloway School of Business. Her research interests include leadership, business ethics, trust, decision-making process and governance. Charles Shrader is Departmental Executive Officer of the Department

of Management. His major interest is the relationships of strategy and corporate social responsibility with company performance. The authors examine the differences in moral reasoning and ethical climate between board members in the for-profit and nonprofit corporations by utilizing Rest's moral development and Victor and Cullen's ethical climate surveys. The authors had 6 for-profit and 7 nonprofit corporations participate in which they found each do not necessarily differ in moral reasoning but have different types of ethical climates—for-profit boards utilize higher stages of reasoning than nonprofits. Further, for-profits had climates higher in egoism than nonprofits. Nonprofits seem to have higher benevolence factors. One potential weakness is that this research is considered to be exploratory which gives rise to more questions than answers. One very interesting outcome of the study showed that applied ethical reasoning is high in for-profits than nonprofits. The authors briefly discuss a 1994 Gallup Poll that determined that Americans felt government was the only institution less trustworthy than corporations and *US News and World Report* had an article determined corporations and their leaders were making efforts to adhere to rules and community expectations. The research also found that for-profits had better follow through and may be better trained in how to make decisions, create paper trails, and justify their actions. It suggests that perhaps nonprofit directors don't necessarily have a personal stake in how their decision impacts the organization. This article brings back the issue of whether or not nonprofits should adopt a business model.

Dijkzeul, D. (2003) Healing governance? Four health NGOs in war-torn Eastern Congo. *Journal of International Affairs*, 57 (1), 183-188.

Denis Dijkzeul is a professor in the management of humanitarian crises at the IFHV at Ruhr Universitat Bochum, Germany. He consults for international organizations in Africa, Asia, Central America, Europe and the US. His main interests are the management of international organizations and the participation of local populations in humanitarian action. This article focuses on health NGOs in the eastern part of DRC where there is little influence of government or governance. Research was conducted during the summers of 2001 and 2002 on 4 NGOs: ASRAMES, IRC, MERLIN, and Malteser which are trying to improve health care and bring down mortality and morbidity rates. The article discusses the different ways these NGOs bring in monies: through outside international funds, using local resources through cost sharing or contributions in kind and participation of health committees, and controlling or lowering the costs. The author determines that there is not complete cost-recovery system that is possible and suggests that the key to successful cost sharing is to establish a health management system that provides the right incentive structure for local staff in order to improve the quality of health care. The article also discusses different management approaches of the NGOs and determines that there are 2 poles of continuum: intensive supervision approach and the hands-off contract approach. Both are criticized and left for continual debate. The author also stresses the need for a functioning government so that possible sustainability of NGO activities can be achieved, since it is not wise and has severe potential downfalls for an NGO to take over more governing roles.

Synthesis of the Impacts of NGOs

1. What are the areas of agreement or similarity among the authors whose work you reviewed?

Many of the articles I read had a common theme of how to determine success of an NGO. I read articles that discussed accountability. Other articles discussed ethical and moral dilemmas that NGOs face and what would determine success with that when certain morals are neglected or have to be pushed to the wayside. It seems that much of success will be viewed in how the NGO presents itself in its mission and goals and if their work actually reflects this. We consistently discuss mission drift and are the NGOs successful if they are drifting away from their mission. A few of the articles look at nonprofits through a business lens which made me go back to the argument throughout the semester about should NGOs adopt a business model and the pros and cons of this. There was discussion about the needed ability to measure performance which would determine the success and need of an NGO. Much of what I read ties to previous weeks and the debate about all the complex facets of determining success.

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

For me, there are now more questions than answers. I struggle with how to determine the impacts as successful for an NGO where there is much up for discussion and debate on how to determine success and the appropriate measures. There is even differing opinions on how which best models an NGO. For instance, we have repeatedly seen NGOs in the business context but we face the question of whether or not this is appropriate to compare or measure an NGO to. Can we really hold them to a business model when in fact they weren't originally meant to be that? My tentative conclusion is that this may only get teased out when determining the framework in which the NGO has embedded its mission—services, advocacy, policy. It seems that there isn't a generalized catch-all to make these measures work and even determining how appropriate a measure is can be open to long discussions. Nor is it appropriate for a general measure when there are different frameworks in which NGOs can align with. There is a clear need to hold certain measures as universal—one article pointed out the need for accountability among boards and that for-profits were better at doing this than nonprofits which goes against the public's "trust".

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?

My additional readings reflected this need to adequately measure and determine indicators for measurement of NGOs. There are many discussions about the limitations of the models in which there is an attempt to fit NGOs as well as the indicators. One article highlighted possible indicators but also determined that not all would be useful for each NGO. At this point, can any NGO be adequately compared to others to determine success? Another article pointed out the need to train future global responsible leaders and the need for corporations to be "responsible citizens". If corporations are asked to step up in the moral compass, are NGOs considered successful as this may be argument

that they are not needed? Another article suggested that though NGOs are perceived to be trustworthy, they actually have nothing holding them accountable in terms of performance measure like for-profit corporations or government agencies. Other issues that creep back up is appropriate training and the ability to experiment. The ability to experiment with projects seems to be a logical necessity in determining what works. However, if NGOs are measured by the money they receive, there may not be enough ability to incorporate experimentation when time, money, and accountability is on the line. Other determinants of success are even more difficult to measure.

4. What are your summary conclusions about the topic that emerged from your review of the literature?

There are several points that seem to have come out through our discussions in class and the readings that were assigned for this week. And again, there are also more questions and answers:

- NGOs need to adequate measures to determine success
- Currently, there is no set measures and there is further discourse on which indicators determine success
- At this infant phase of discussion, it is apparent that using an NGO's mission as a basis for determining success, along with theoretical framework it fits into, and the model approach one wishes to you, perhaps indicators will be more apparent as appropriate to measure
- Measurements of success will ultimately vary depending on the selected criteria from the point above. Then it becomes a question of how then is it appropriate to measure NGOs to each other?
- Can following an NGO's mission or practice be counterproductive in terms of morals or ethics—working with not-so-democratic governments, expanding the mission or restricting it, human rights principles vs cultural norms, or ethical limits of fundraising.
- Does bad civil society help us come to a consensus of a set of norms that are appropriate in assisting us in determining successful NGOs?

Ultimately the issues that were brought up in class or through the readings will be useful in critically evaluating our NGOs. I feel like the readings certainly all related to determining success of an NGO though not always direct. This set of readings challenged us, I think, to dive even further into thinking more critically about the consequences of decisions of NGOs and determining potential best practices and measures.