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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Though there are many nonprofit organizations that have multiple sites, there has been limited work exploring this type of agency (Young & Faulk, 2010). There have been studies that have looked at International Nongovernmental Organizations (INGOs), one type of Multisite Nonprofit Organization (MNO), but there has been significantly less research exploring national MNOs. To better understand national MNOs, this study examines what makes these nonprofits unique, what conflicts exist within MNOs, and the relationships between those in the affiliate office and those in the central office.

Dual organizational identification (Vora & Kostova, 2007), which looks at identification with multiple levels of an organization and cooperation theory (Deutsch, 1949a, b), which explores what leads to cooperation and competition within an organization, are used as theoretical frameworks in understanding MNOs. This study looks at 9 disease-specific US-based MNOs, using a mixed-methods approach. To start, a survey was sent out to those in the affiliate and the central office, asking about organizational identification at multiple levels, cooperation, distance, and perceived organizational support (POS). One hundred and three people took part in this survey, including 82 people from the affiliate. Furthermore, 26 people took part in interviews following this survey. During these interviews, organizational structure and intraorganizational relationships were discussed.

This study finds that there are several conflicts that occur specifically in MNOs between those in the central office and those in the affiliate office. This includes
centralization versus decentralization, the perception of the central office, the requirements of the affiliates, fees and fee structures, the direction of the organization, and personality/individual issues. The lack of trust acted as a mediator to those conflicts. Lastly, outcomes of these conflicts include the affiliate leaving the organization, individuals in the affiliate leadership leaving the organization, no changes at all, or changes in the central office.

The structure and the lifecycle of the affiliate are aspects of MNOs that differentiate them from organizations with single sites. Within MNOs, some organizations have their affiliates obtain their own 501(c)(3) status, while others do not. Organizations sometimes also use a mixed structure, where some of the affiliates operate under their own 501(c)(3) status while other affiliates within the same agency are under the central office’s 501(c)(3) certification. Furthermore, some organizations have their affiliates as staff-run, some are volunteer-run, and some organizations are mixed. A 3x3 table exploring these two variables presents one way to better understand MNO structure. MNOs are not monolithic organizations; rather, they are diverse in the ways affiliates are structured and managed. Furthermore, the affiliate lifecycle is examined, which includes affiliate birth, and growth, stasis, and decline. Affiliates can go through these three stages circularly or linearly, possibly leading to the death of an affiliate. Affiliate death can happen due to loss of interest, financial reasons, loss of leadership, or conflicts. An affiliate may be reborn at a later time.

Lastly, this study looks at organizational identification toward the central office. Using fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), this study provides a better understanding of the intraorganizational relationships which exist within MNOs.
Specifically, to have organizational identification toward the central office, one must first have organizational identification toward the affiliate office. Being physically closer to the central office, lack of conflict, and a high level of POS also help build organizational identification toward the central office. Based on this study, recommendations for MNOs are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background and Motivation

Though there is growing interest in the study of nonprofit organizations (Shier & Handy, 2014), limited research has explored multisite nonprofit organizations (MNOs) which are organizations with multiple physical locations (Cornforth, 2012; Young & Faulk, 2010). There is a lack of understanding around the unique issues MNOs must manage (Grossman & Rangan, 2001). For example, one question that remains unexplored is how the central office, or headquarters, of an MNO creates and maintains a positive relationship with their affiliate.¹ While research into the United Way has shown that there are differences in local and regional practices which an affiliate may have (Paarlberg & Meinhold, 2012), there has not been an exploration into how these regional differences affects the MNO as a single unit. There are, though, many nonprofit organizations that operate over multiple sites. For example, in Australia, 13% of charities reported operating in more than one province and 17% reported operating overseas (Australia Charities and Not-for-Profits Commission, 2014). According to data retrieved from the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) dataset, 12,319 U.S. nonprofit organizations which filled out 990s in 2012-2013 reported having affiliates (The Urban Institute, 2013).

Research has explored the complexities of International Nongovernmental Organizations (INGOs), one type of MNO (Bloodgood & Schmitz, 2012; DeMars &

¹ For this research, the headquarters, or main, office will be known as the central office. Affiliate offices will be used to describe additional offices which do not include the central organizational staff, such as the CEO of the organization. Young & Faulk (2010) identified nine structural variations for affiliate offices, each with a unique title. For the purposes of this research, these types of offices will be lumped into one designation.
Dijkzeul, 2015), and Multinational Enterprises\(^2\) (MNEs) (Blazejewski & Becker-Ritterspach, 2011; Kostova, Marano, & Tallman, 2016; Kostova, Roth, and Dacin, 2008). Limited research, though, has applied this work to MNOs which operate on a national scale. This study will explore intraorganizational dynamics in MNOs through the lens of dual organizational identification, perceived organizational support (POS), and cooperation theory.

**Statement of Research Problem**

There has been limited research that has focused specifically on MNOs. Of this work, the majority has examined the structure of MNOs (Cornforth, 2012; Grossman & Rangan, 2001; Young & Faulk, 2010). There has not been much of an examination of the internal relationships that arise within this type of organization. This is a hole in the nonprofit management literature. In comparison, research into MNEs has shown that subsidiaries take part in activities independent of their headquarters, such as knowledge creation (Scott-Kennel & Giroud, 2015), inter- and intra-organizational networking (Bouquet & Birkinshaw, 2008b; Forsgren, Holm, & Johanson, 2005; Scott-Kennel & Giroud, 2015), creating new programs (Schmid, Dzedek, & Lehrer, 2014), and exploring ways to increase their power within the organizational structure (Bouquet & Birkinshaw, 2008a; Ciabushi, Holm, & Martin, 2014; Fosgren, Pedersen, & Foss, 1999). Subsidiaries in MNEs are expected to implement programs that have been created and distributed by the central office, though they may personalize them to fit local needs (Klimekeit &

---

\(^2\) In the management literature, the terms Multinational Enterprise (MNE) and Multinational Corporation (MNC) are used interchangeably. Unless quoted otherwise, for the purposes of this paper, the term MNE will be used.
Reihlen, 2016). It is unknown if the organizational behavior of MNOs mirrors that of MNEs.

This research, therefore, will examine the relationships which exist within MNOs with a specific focus on the professionals working in the central office and the professionals and volunteers managing affiliate and regional offices. It will also explore the organizational structure of MNOs. Specifically, this study looks at three research questions:

*Research Question 1*: What, if anything, makes MNOs a unique type of organizational structure?

*Research Question 2*: In what way, if any, do affiliate organizations manage to integrate into their local community while staying connected to their larger agency?

*Research Question 3*: What type of conflicts, if any, exist between the affiliate and the central organization?

**Purpose of the Research and Outline of Dissertation**

The purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of the internal relationships which exist within MNOs. This dissertation starts with a review of the pertinent literature, including studies looking at MNOs, INGOs, and MNEs. Furthermore, it examines at the literature around organizational identification and cooperation and conflict theories to build hypotheses for this study. Next, this study explains the methodologies used, including outreach, qualitative, and quantitative measures. Chapter 4 looks at Research Question 3, exploring the conflicts which exist within MNOs. Chapter 5 focuses on Research Question 1 and examines the unique organizational structure of
MNOs as well as the lifecycle of affiliate organizations. Chapter 6 examines Research Question 2, using fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis methods to better understand organizational identification within MNOs. Lastly, Chapter 7 provides a summary, as well as implications and limitations of this study.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature begins with an examination of the nonprofit literature concerning MNOs. I also consider the concept of fiscal sponsorship, a unique arrangement between nonprofit organizations which has certain similarities with MNOs. Lastly, I apply research performed around two other types of organizations to understand MNOs: INGOs and MNEs. Using this information, I present a definition of an MNO which is used for this research.

I then examine MNOs through the lens of organizational identification and conflict. Specifically, by looking at organizational identification, conflict, and POS, I propose hypotheses regarding organizational identification and how it affects MNOs. I utilize dual organizational identification theory and cooperation theory to better understand the ways that employees relate to both their affiliate office and with their organization at large.

Multisite Nonprofit Organizations

Research Question 1: What, if anything, makes MNOs a unique type of organizational structure?

Examples of MNOs

The world is filled with many different MNOs. The relationships that central offices have with affiliate offices are different for each organization (Young & Faulk, 2010). Below are a few examples of MNOs.
• The Huntington’s Disease Society of America, an American national disease-specific nonprofit organization based out of New York City, is set up with a national office, regional office, and chapter and affiliate offices. While the first two of these locations are managed by professionals, the chapter offices are often volunteer-run, though some do have paid staff in the form of Social Workers or professional fundraisers. Though the local chapters have some independence in their fundraising, the bulk of the directives concerning fundraising and programming comes from the national office via the regional offices. All the money raised by the local affiliates stays in the local area.

• The Pajama Project is a national agency based in New York City with local chapters across the United States. The chapters are managed by volunteers and take donations independent from the national office. All the donations are distributed locally. While the national agency provides support and guidance to the local chapters, due to the limited nature of the organization (they only take donations of books and pajamas), there is a finite amount of need for support. The bulk of the guidance from the headquarters comes by helping local chapters determine which organizations to work with locally and how to distribute donated goods.

• Partners in Health is an INGO based in Boston. While originally focused on providing services in Haiti, they are now stationed in 10 countries across the world, providing medical services through specialized clinics and providing medical training to members of the community. They start programs in countries when they are invited by the government and work with that government on a
national and local level to provide localized services. Employees are sometimes stationed in more than one country during their tenure with the organization. On the ground, a high proportion of the staff is from the local community.

**Definition of Multisite Nonprofit Organizations**

Part of the process of understanding MNOs is establishing a definition. Though there have been aspects of MNOs which have been examined and categorized (Grossman & Rangan, 2001; Young & Faulk, 2010), with the literature taking a specific interest in INGOs (e.g. Brown, Ebrahim, & Batliwala, 2012), there has not been a comprehensive definition of MNOs.

In the United States, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) provides some guidance concerning the definition of an MNO. In the Form 990, Part VI, Section A, Question 10 asks if the organization has local chapters, branches, or affiliates and if the organization has written policies and procedures related to this. Specifically, the IRS is asking if the organization has

… any local chapters, local branches, local lodges, or other similar local units or affiliates over which the organization had the legal authority to exercise direct or indirect supervision and control… and local units that are not separate legal entities under state law over which the organization had such authority. (Internal Revenue Service, 2015, 22)

The IRS also provides the option for MNOs to file a group return, which allows affiliate organizations the option to file with their central organization. In 2010, approximately 2,500 501(c)(3)s applied for group exemptions (Advisory Committee on Tax Exempt and Government Agencies [ACT], 2011). Affiliates may file their own 990s if they so choose.

Australia is another country which, in their nonprofit reporting, identify MNOs. In Australia, though, each affiliate does not fill out their own reporting; reporting is the responsibility of the headquarters. Thirteen percent of the nonprofits in Australia, though,
reported having operations in multiple provinces (Australia Charities and Not-for-Profits Commission, 2014).

Most of the literature assumes that MNOs will have physical locations across different geographic areas. In some agencies, this may be established offices while for other agencies, the affiliate offices are based out of an employee’s or volunteer’s home. There is much discussion on how an organization makes the decision to expand and to where they should expand (Barry et al., 2015; Krause, 2014). However, the literature does not discuss the distance between the main office and the affiliates as a variable that affects nonprofit organizations. Based on the literature and case examples, MNOs are organizations that have multiple physical locations across a certain geographic area (geographic diversity). That area can be a county, a state, a country, or across multiple continents.

Importantly, not every organization that considers itself “national” would be considered an MNO. For example, an organization which is based in one location but provides services, either through the internet or similar mediums, across a geographically diverse location would not be considered an MNO. Although they would be providing services to a geographically diverse audience, they are running programming from a singular office. Instead, the focus here is on organizations that have distinct offices and locations that are geographically dispersed, even if over a small distance, so as to raise funds and/or provide services.

This leads to the question of what the difference is between an MNO and an umbrella organization composed of individual organizations sharing the same goal. For example, a franchise organization such as Planned Parenthood has many offices around
the United States. Each has their own 501(c)(3) status, their own executive director, and their own board. Every office oversees their own fundraising and provides a percentage of those funds to the national office as a part of their franchise agreement. The national office, however, oversees issues such as branding. In fact, to be a part of the Planned Parenthood grouping of organizations, there are certain rules and precedents that these affiliates are required to follow. Therefore, though the affiliates have a certain amount of independence, they are still limited by being a part of the Planned Parenthood brand, as opposed to being a completely independent organization (Oster, 1996). By being an affiliate to this organization, affiliates have certain guidelines and limitations that they must adhere to that they would not have if they were a completely independent organization. In return, affiliates receive support from a larger organization and get to be associated with the MNO brand.

In summary, MNOs are a diverse grouping of offices held together into a singular entity. Each central office provides a different level of independence for their affiliates. Due to the nature of this type of organization, an office may sometimes only include one employee or volunteer working out of their home. The important aspect is that these employees and/or volunteers are permanently based in a location that is different from the central office or headquarters. Based on the literature, for a location to be considered an affiliate of a multisite nonprofit organization, it should share the name of the organization’s headquarters, receive directives from the central headquarters concerning the direction of programming and branding, and identify, to some degree, with the national headquarters.

*The Structure of MNOs*
Research, though, has examined several organizational structures that are utilized by MNOs, such as franchises, (Oster 1992; 1996; Young, 1986; Young & Faulk, 2010), federations (Brody, 2015; Foreman, 1999; Hudson & Bielfeld, 1997; O’Flanagan & Taliente, 2004; Young & Faulk, 2010), bureaucracies (Rost & Graetzer, 2014), and umbrella organizations (Hudson & Bielfeld, 1997; Wittberg, 2013; Young, 2001).

**Franchises and Federations**

One type of MNO structure that has been explored in the literature is the franchise structure (Oster 1992; 1996; Young, 1986; Young & Faulk, 2010). In a franchise relationship, the local affiliate pays a fee for the privilege of using the organization’s logo and name. Furthermore, they receive some sort of support from the headquarters. The local affiliate pays either a flat fee or a percentage of their fundraising (or membership fees) to the central office (Oster, 1992). Oster (1996) found that, as organizations grow in the number of affiliates, the likelihood of being a franchise organization increases. She theorized that franchising MNOs see franchising as a way to manage a monitoring problem which larger organizations may have. When looking at franchise organizations of restaurants, Bradach (1998) found that this arrangement, due to its decentralization, was particularly suited for local responsiveness while still maintaining uniformity. An issue that exists in franchises is, since each affiliate is a separate organization, affiliates compete against each other as well as the central office for funds from the same donors, creating confusion among donors who may not perceive the affiliate and the central offices as separate organizations (Oster, 1992). While certain organizations may find the franchise structure an appealing way to manage a large organization, it is not the only option.
Federations are another organizational structure utilized by MNOs (Brody, 2015; Brown, Ebrahim, & Batliwala, 2012; Foreman, 1999; Hudson & Bielfeld, 1997; O’Flanagan & Taliento, 2004; Young & Faulk, 2010). Hudson and Bielfeld define a federation as “… one in which the central body is controlled by the units, which enter voluntarily into the larger association” (35). For MNOs, a federation system gives a large amount of autonomy to its local members, though this may mean that affiliates compete with each other for resources. Within this structure, the role of the national office is focused on branding and communication. In her research, Foreman (1999) specifically identifies what she calls a global bumblebee model. In this arrangement, “… membership on the international board is not based on a member’s capacity to raise resources, but rather a member’s geographic region or some other nonresource acquisition-based criteria” (Foreman, 1999, 181). O’Flannigan and Taliente (2004) identified the federation model as useful for expanding organizations. While a federation and franchise structure are both decentralized, a franchise represents a more decentralized structure than a federation. Provan (1983) questioned what makes a federated structure useful for the affiliates. In his work, Provan theorized that, by giving over control to the central organization, “… the affiliate organizations expect the federation’s management to minimize the complexity of the linkage network and reduce environmental uncertainty” (79-80). This reduction of uncertainty and large federated network provide the affiliate more than if they had been working on their own.

Umbrella Organizations & Bureaucracies

---

3 There is disagreement between Oster (1996) and O’Flannigan and Taliente (2004) about whether larger organizations are more likely to be federations or franchises. It might be that O’Flannigan and Taliente include franchises as a type of federation.
Another structure that is utilized by MNOs is the umbrella structure (Brown, Ebrahim, & Batliwala, 2012; Wittberg, 2013; Young, 2001). This type of organization includes “… nonprofit member organizations whose members themselves are nonprofits” (Young, 2001, 290). These organizations vary in how loosely or strongly centralized they are. Specifically, Young categorized three structures that umbrella organizations may exhibit: goal-seeking, economies, or polities. In a goal-seeking structure, there is coordination between the central office and affiliates, with the central office guiding the agency. In economies, local organizations band together into umbrella organizations for economic efficiency, but each local organization has a high level of autonomy. Lastly, polities represent organizations are diverse types of organizations which work together to deal with a common problem or collaboration around specific issues. (Young, 2001).

Brown et al. (2012) identified umbrella organizations in their study of INGOS structures, but referred to them as networks. The umbrella structure represents many different relationships. While some of these organizations may be considered MNOs, others may be more similar to membership organizations with independent organizations working together towards a common goal. Though umbrella organizations usually are membership programs, they sometimes take control of certain aspects of the participating organizations, such as fundraising (Wittberg, 2013).

Another approach recently explored in the literature is looking at MNOs as bureaucracies (Rost & Graetzer, 2014) or unity organizations (Brown et al., 2012). Specifically, the research of Rost and Graetzer examined the Catholic Church as a rule-following bureaucracy. A bureaucracy is an organization in which there are, amongst other things, specific written rules related to conduct and a clear hierarchy (Weber, 1978).
Based on this analysis, Rost and Graetzer determined that bureaucracy is a strong governance model for MNOs, though this model is not considered effective for managing “… subunits located in institutional distant environments” (Rost & Graetzer, 2014, 306). In other words, bureaucracies may be more efficient for an organization that is less geographically dispersed.

Other Structures

In their study of INGOs, Brown and colleagues (2012) identified five different organizational structures that are utilized. For these organizations, “… architectures include shared values, norms and expectations, formal structures and systems, and human resources required to carry out the tasks defined by their strategies” (1102). These different classification systems provide insight into different aspects of the organization’s culture and perspective. Importantly, the internal architecture and structure of an organization is there to support its focus and mission. Other research has looked at how the structure of an MNO can affect or be affected by different aspects of the organization. For example, Taylor and Lansley (2000) use two aspects of MNOs, centralization and standardization, to differentiate structural models. In comparison, Hudson and Bielfeld (1997) look at environmental variation, or the differences in environment between clients and donors, and local resource density, or how close the recipient of services is from the resources they are receiving, to examine differences in organizational structure.

Understanding the structure and administration of an organization is important but only gives a limited view of the organization (Simon, 1997). Past research has not examined the intraorganizational relationships and behaviors of MNOs (Cornforth, 2012).

---

4 In their work, Brown et al (2012) used the term architectures to describe organizational structures.
Summary

In summary, the literature has identified a number of organizational structures which exist within MNOs. There are still many holes in this area of research, though. For example, no one, to my knowledge, has explored what decisions lead to specific types of organizational structures in MNOs or what would make one structure better than another for different types of MNOs. Furthermore, while the structure of the organization provides a certain amount of insight into an MNO, there are still many questions which can be asked concerning how MNOs provide services across a geographically diverse area and how affiliates work with the central office (and each other) to create services and interact with donors. A summary of the work which has explored MNOs can be found in Table 1.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of MNO Structure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchises</td>
<td>The local office pays a fee to be a part of the larger organization.</td>
<td>Oster 1992, 1996; Young, 1986; Young &amp; Faulk, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>Affiliates control the central body of the organization</td>
<td>Brody, 2015; Brown, Ebrahim, &amp; Batliwala, 2012; Foreman, 1999; Hudson &amp; Bielfeld, 1997; O’Flanagan &amp; Taliento, 2004; Young &amp; Faulk, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella</td>
<td>A grouping of nonprofit organizations which come together.</td>
<td>Brown, Ebrahim, &amp; Batliwala, 2012 (as Networks); Wittberg, 2013; Young, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy/Unitary</td>
<td>Clear hierarchy and centralization.</td>
<td>Brown, Ebrahim, &amp; Batliwala, 2012 (as unities); Rost &amp; Graetzer, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflicts in Multisite Nonprofit Organizations**

There are unique tensions associated with being an MNO. For example, conflict between the central office and the affiliate offices may center around fundraising. Specifically, the central offices and affiliate offices may have conflicts around which funds raised should go to the central office and which donations should go directly to the local office. Furthermore, disagreements can exist between the central office and affiliate regarding who will reach out to local donors (Grossman & Rangan, 2001; O’Flannigan & Taliente, 2004). Central offices and affiliate offices also have conflicts regarding the delivery of programs, the governance structure of the organization, the direction of the
organization, and the question of centralization versus decentralization of the organization (Grossman & Rangan, 2001). These tensions arise partly due to the fact that affiliates of MNOs “… must satisfy local constituencies while aligning individual missions, structures, governance practices, and programs with parent organizations” (Siddiki & Lupton, 2016, 157S). Furthermore, what is best for the local affiliate may not always be what is best for the central office (Harris, 2011).

Conflicts can also be exacerbated due to cultural differences between the central offices and affiliate offices. What is seen as an appropriate use of funds by a local office may differ from what a headquarters may view as appropriate (Smith, 2003). In the case study of an environmental nonprofit, Balser and Carmine (2009) explored how changes in leadership led to conflicts between two offices, San Francisco, where the headquarters used to be, and Washington, D.C., where the headquarters was moved. This move represented a change in strategy for the organization from outreach to politics. Research into local practices by the United Way displayed that local perceptions affected the adaptation of national system changes (Paarlberg & Meinhold, 2012). Local United Way chapters adapted national directives in a way that was best for their local community.

Fiscal Sponsorship

Some organizations act as sponsors for smaller organizations, programs, and projects to provide what is called fiscal sponsorship. In this type of arrangement, a project or organization receives the support of a sponsor agency so as to utilize the sponsor’s tax-exempt status and other administrative support that may be needed. The sponsor agency may get a fee, a percentage of the funds raised, or have some other motive for taking part in this arrangement (Takagi & Chan, 2009). Colvin (1993) presents six models of fiscal
sponsorship, with varying levels of control by the sponsor organization and the sponsored program over employment, budgets, and administrative expectations. There is very little academic research in the nonprofit sector concerning this arrangement (for notable exceptions, see Kinney & Carver, 2007 and Lewis et al., 2016). Most of the literature, though, views this relationship as a partnership of two different organizations coming together, as opposed to one organization creating a new office or project in a different location (Sattely, n.d.; Takagi & Chan, 2009).

Contracts concerning fiscal sponsorship usually provide an exit clause, or the ability for a program to leave the agreement (Sattely, n.d.). While these relationships are an important aspect of the nonprofit community, they are distinct from MNOs. In the relationship, the project is dependent on one sponsor that is seen as an incubator or an umbrella organization to several projects (Colvin, 1993). An expectation is that the project will eventually become its own organization or will only exist for a finite period. In an MNO, there is no expectation that there will be an eventual separation. Though different models of MNOs provide different levels of independence for affiliates (such as federations as compared to bureaucracies), there is still the understanding that affiliates are a part of one unitary MNO.

*Research on International Nongovernmental Organizations*

There has been one type of MNO which has received attention in the literature: INGOs. While it is impossible to know the exact number of INGOs around the world (Lewis, 2010), these organizations are both influential and numerous. Intergovernmental organizations and governments have increasingly become reliant on INGOs for a variety of services and support (Mathews, 1997). Though INGOs have existed, in some form, for
many years (there is evidence of a 14th century Chinese-based humanitarian INGO-type organizations), there has been a recent rise in the number of INGOs (Davies, 2014). In 2014, almost $8 billion was distributed to humanitarian INGOs alone, with funds originating from both government and individual donors (Global Humanitarian Assistance, 2015).

Research has looked at INGOs from several perspectives. Some of this work is applicable to MNOs in general. For example, Barry and colleagues (2015) examined how Human Rights INGOs decide where to place new offices. Specifically, they identified two types of offices: membership offices, created through bottom-up pressures, and secretariat offices, created through top-down processes. Local offices are created either through local initiatives or the encouragement of the central office. These two types of offices may have different relationships with the headquarters and the organization in general.

Some work has been done concerning how an organization’s founding may affect the organizational culture. In particular, Stroup (2012) found that, though many organizations are expanding globally, they are still bound by their local structures and resources in their country of origin. Stroup stated that "[n]ational origin plays a critical role in determining how INGOs raise funds, embrace professionalism, engage in advocacy, relate to governments, and choose issues" (189). In other words, the culture of the country in which the organization is created influences the organizational culture of not only the headquarters but the affiliate offices as well. This connects to social origin theory, first proposed by Salamon and Anheier (1998), which looks at a nonprofit “… not as an isolated phenomenon floating freely in social space but as an integral part of a
social system whose role and scale are a by-product of a complex set of historical forces” (245).

One can imagine how tensions may arise when an organization needs to balance its organizational culture influenced by its location of origin with the local culture of the affiliate. For example, in one study, Smith (2003) examined how conflicts arise between INGOs and the local constituency. Specifically, Smith reported the act of giving money, considered a tradition locally, was seen as corruption by the INGO. Anderson, Brown, and Jean (2012) found that Humanitarian INGOs sometimes provide aid without consulting with those on the ground (neither the local community nor local professionals) to find out what is needed. Instead, the focus is on what the central office identifies as a need. Executive directors in local organizations have a responsibility to their locality which can sometimes conflict with their larger organization (Harris, 2011).

Research into Multinational Enterprises

Another way to explore MNOs is through the research that has been done examining MNEs in the management literature. This is an area of research in management which has been growing and diversifying over the past fifty years (Kostova, Marano, & Tallman, 2016). Similar to MNOs, people working in affiliates, also known as the franchise offices or subsidiaries, of MNEs have a unique challenge “… not to pick either company or franchise units but instead use both and ensure that processes exist that leverage the strengths and ameliorate the weaknesses of each one” (Bradach, 1989, 2). Some of the work around MNEs can provide insight into MNOs and a direction for research.
Research has examined the relationships that affiliates have with their headquarters. Bouquet and Birkinshaw (2008a) found that, though subsidiaries are dependent on their headquarters, they are willing to explore ways to gain and use power within their organization. Subsidiaries use their influence and power to create innovation, to change, and to grow within their network. Dörrenbächer and Gammelgaard (2011) explained that there are different types of power that subsidiaries may utilize in their relationship with their headquarters. Furthermore, each of these types of power lead to a different relationship between the subsidiary and the central office. Subsidiaries in a MNE have many different options to express power within their organizational relationship (Dörrenbächer & Gammelgaard, 2011; Forsgren, Pedersen, & Foss, 1999).

Importantly, MNEs have to balance local responsiveness with strategic coordination to create a situation that will work best for both the agency as a whole and the local affiliate (Prahalad & Doz, 1987). The subsidiary often has tensions between what is expected of it from its local network and what the headquarters wants it to focus on. This tension plays out in meeting the needs of the local clients as well as the interests of the central organization (Forsgren, Holm, & Johanson, 2005).

Another area that has been researched extensively is subsidiary entrepreneurship (Schmid, Dzedek, & Lehrer, 2014). These are initiatives which are “… proactive, autonomous and risk-taking activities” (Schmid, Dzedek, & Lehrer, 2014, 201) and are established through the subsidiaries. Importantly, though, this type of entrepreneurship can bring power and attention to the local affiliate (Bouquet & Birkinshaw, 2008a).

Interdependence of the subsidiary with the central office is another way to understand MNCs (Nohria & Ghoshal, 1997; O’Donnell, 2000). For example, O’Donnell
(2000) found that interdependence and vertical integration mechanisms used by headquarters and subsidiaries have a positive impact on organizational identification and cooperative behavior. Presented as a differentiated network, Nohria and Ghoshal (1997) suggest some level of independence for affiliates can help manage issues unique to their locality.

Studies looking at the ways in which local subsidiaries respond to headquarter initiatives provide some guidance for research into MNOs. For example, Klimkeit and Reihlen (2016) identified three factors that influence the enthusiasm that local subsidiaries have in response to pressures towards global conformity, or pressures from the headquarters for affiliates to act in a uniform way. First, there is the idea of local fit, or how strongly the programs being pushed through the headquarters relate to the needs of the local clients. Linking practice, the second factor, is the way that the headquarters helps to coordinate the roll out of the new program. The last factor, subsidiary resources, refers to the amount of resources that can be used to respond to any pressures to conform. These factors can lead to a varying level of compliance from the local affiliates, from full compliance to outright resistance (Klimkeit & Reihlen, 2016).

One of the seminal pieces concerning MNEs is by Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989). In their book, they outline four types of MNEs based on organizational administration: multinational, international, global, and transnational. From this framework, a multinational organization is decentralized, with a focus on the national subsidiaries as unique organizations. An international organization is similar to a multinational organization, but the subsidiaries are more dependent on the central headquarters and there are more formal controls concerning the headquarters/subsidiary relationship. A
global organization has a centralized configuration “… and a management mentality that sees] the world as a single economic entity…” (Bartlett & Goshal, 1989, 52). Lastly, a transnational organization is a plastic organization due to its understanding of local responsiveness. Specifically, this type of organization is the most flexible of the four as it learns globally from local initiative. In all of these administrative structures, the subsidiary is in charge of the local environment while the headquarters oversees the global operation. These different structures may be useful in understanding not only INGOs, but MNOs in general.

**Summary**

This study will fill holes in the literature by exploring the organizational behavior of MNOs. Using organizational identification, organizational structure, and intraorganizational conflicts, this study aims to better understand how headquarters of MNOs relate to their affiliate offices and vice-versa. Furthermore, this study will focus on national MNOs, of which there have been a limited number of studies. Lastly, by using a mixed methods approach, this study will be able to explore MNOs through quantitative measures while still using qualitative methods to gain insight into the intraorganizational relationships of MNOs.

**Organizational Identification**

*Research Question 2: In what way, if any, do affiliate organizations manage to integrate into their local community while staying connected to their larger agency?*

One way of understanding MNOs is through organizational identification. Due to the geographic diversity of the affiliates, organizational identification can provide insight
into the intraorganizational relations of MNOs. Though there is much written about organizational identification, there is still some debate about its meaning (Cole & Bruch, 2006). Mael and Ashforth (1992), for example, express that “… [organizational identification] refers to the extent to which the individual defines him or herself in terms of an organization…” (106). Some have argued that organizational identification is focused on the cognition connecting with the organization (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008). Others have stated that organizational identification has both a cognitive and affective aspect (Edwards, 2005). Van Dick (2001) proposed that affective identification, as opposed to cognitive identification, was central to his model of organizational identification. Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) conceptualize organizational identification as connecting one’s attributes with the organization’s attributes. Cheney (1983) explored identification from the perspective of rhetoric. For him, identification is about being able to say, “I am like you” to other in-group members. Foreman and Whetten (2002) suggest that organizational identification is a comparison between the expectations of and the reality of organizational identity. In other words, “… identification is the level of congruence between members’ identity perceptions and identity expectations” (Foreman & Whetten, 2002, 620). Bevort and Suddaby (2016) found that new logics within an organization are understood through a lens of organizational identification. Organizational identification has been found to have positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes for organizations (Lee, Park, & Koo, 2015).

In summary, organizational identification is focused on how an employee connects with the organization in a cognitive and affective manner.

Organizational Identification and Other Measures
Organizational identification is correlated with organizational commitment (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Cole & Bruch, 2006; Mael & Tetrick, 1992; Riketta, 2005; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). They are generally seen as separate constructs, though not always (Postmes, Tanis, & de Wit, 2001). For example, van Knippenberg and Sleebos (2006) separate identification and commitment by pointing out that while “… (i)dentification reflects psychological oneness, commitment reflects a relationship between separate psychological entities” (971). Edwards (2005) defined organizational commitment as a “sister” to organizational identification. This is a related but distinct concept. Specifically, Edwards operationalized organizational identification as one aspect of organizational commitment. For the purposes of this research, identification and commitment will be utilized as distinct constructs (van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006).

Another construct that is related to identification is organizational identity. As proposed by Albert and Whetton (1985), identity is something that is distinctive, essential, and enduring. Similar to organizational identification and organizational commitment, there is a relationship between organizational identification and organizational identity. Ashforth, Harrison, and Corley (2008) suggested that, to define organizational identification, one must first look at organizational identity. Indeed, it has been proposed that “(s)trong identification with an organization is also apparent when the social identity of an organization is more available and salient than other social identities” (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, 256). Both, though, are considered a root construct because “… every entity needs to have an idea of who or what it is, who or what other entities are, and how the entities are associated” (Ashforth, Harrison, &
Corley, 2008, 326). Sluss and Ashforth (2008) differentiate identity and identification by defining identity as what is and identification as the connection that one has to that identity. In other words, identity and identification are important because they help the employee and the organization understand who they are, who they are not, and who the “other” is.

Organizational Identification in the Workplace

As a concept, organizational identification has been shown to be an important aspect of organizational life and, therefore, has been studied from a variety of angles. Reviews of the literature (He & Brown, 2013; Ramarjan, 2014) and meta-analyses (Lee, Park, & Koo, 2015; Riketta, 2005) have explored the variety of ways that organizational identification impacts organizations and employees. Organizational identification has been shown to be a complicated measure. For example, Edwards and Peccei (2007) identified three sub-components of organizational identification: belonging and membership, sharing of goals and values, and self-categorizing as a part of the organization. Sluss and Ashforth (2007) stated that an interpersonal level is necessary to building up organizational identification. For Sluss and Ashforth, interpersonal relations help create stronger identification within the organization.

Organizational identification has been utilized to better understand nonprofit organizations. For example, Newton and Teo (2010) found that identification was connected to job satisfaction and organizational commitment in employees of nonprofit organizations. In looking at the identification of volunteers, Tidwell (2005) reported that organizational identification led to a higher level of financial contributions, satisfaction,
and commitment to the organization. Identification is also positively related with charitable giving and volunteerism (Hou, Eason, & Zhang, 2014). Organizational identification has a positive effect on nonprofit employee’s absenteeism and extra-role behavior (work done beyond one’s job description) (Rho, Yun, & Lee, 2015). In their analysis of a philharmonic, Golden-Biddle & Rao (1997) examined how different identifications within an organization, in this case a board member or a musician, shape the way one sees the organization. Diverse identities within an organization can lead to different perspectives on the organizational identification. Identification with a nonprofit organization is also important to donors. A higher level of organizational identification by donors leads to larger donations (Hou, Eason, & Zhang, 2014; Ko, Gibson, & Kim, 2011). Looking at social workers who work off-site, Milton, Sinclair, and Vakalahi (2016) found that aspects of telecommuting, such as isolation and lower supervision, can have a negative effect on organizational identification. In comparison, a higher level of face-to-face interaction and supervision has a positive effect on organizational identification.

Organizational identification is important for an organization. Research in the management literature has shown that there are many benefits for the organization when employees exhibit a higher organizational identification (e.g. He & Brown, 2013; Ramarjan, 2014; Riketta, 2005). Identification grows when employees interpret their administration as respectful of their needs (Ullrich et al., 2007). Others have found organizational identification as a good indicator of turnover intentions (Cole & Bruch, 2006; van Knippenberg, van Dick, & Tavares, 2007). Positive organizational identification leads to growth in organizational financial performance due to its impact on
customer satisfaction (Homburg, Wieseke, & Hoyer, 2009) and employee’s sales performance (Homburg, Wieseke, & Hoyer, 2009; Wieseke, Ahearne, Lam, & van Dick, 2009). Job performance is positively correlated with organizational identification (Weiseke, Ahearne, Lam, & Von Dick, 2009). Identification was also found to be negatively associated with turnover intention, but not for all employees (Cole & Bruch, 2006). In summary, organizational identification is an important measure for understanding an employee’s and customer’s relationship with the organization.

**Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory**

There are two main theoretical frameworks often used when studying organizational identification: Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory. Social Identity Theory (SIT), as an aspect of organizational identification, finds that “… in-group favoritism tends to occur even in the absence of strong leadership or member interdependence, interaction, or cohesion” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, 24, italics in original). Organizational identification, or in-group favoritism, can happen even in environments where the employees does not seem to feel a substantial amount of support internally. Three aspects that help improve organizational identification, according to SIT are the distinctiveness of the group, the prestige of the group, and awareness of an out-group. Furthermore, SIT can help create a phenomenon of depersonalization, where the person becomes a larger part of the organization (Hogg & Terry, 2000). SIT has been used in several studies to better understand identity and identification in nonprofit organizations (Balser & Carmine, 2009; Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997; Newton & Teo, 2010; Rho, Yun, & Lee, 2015; Tidwell, 2005). Tidwell (2005) used SIT, for example, to create a model of prosocial behavior in nonprofit organizations.
Associated with SIT is Social Categorization Theory (SCT). This theory finds that people tend to connect with others to share social behaviors, mutual attraction, and collective biases against those not part of their group (Turner, 1985, 1987). Research has shown that people make decisions that favor the in-group members at the expense of the out-group. They will even make decisions which favor in-group members instead of decisions which help everyone (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). Indeed, “… the essential criteria for group membership, as they apply to large-scale social categories, are that the individuals concerned define themselves and are defined by others as members of a group” (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, 15), even if that group is randomly created (Tajfel et al., 1971).

SIT and SCT are often used to understand organizational identification. For example, Mael and Tetrick (1992) used SIT to help guide their influential measure of organizational identification. Sluss and Ashforth (2007) identified SIT as a theoretical framework in understanding the interpersonal roles of organizational identification. Importantly, SIT and SCT find an in-group favoritism and collective aspect of organizational identification that is important for understanding intraorganizational relationships.

_Philosophy of Science_

Research has shown that organizational identification can have multiple foci (Ashforth & Mael, 1992). Specifically, identification can be focused on a variety of different levels within an organization (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Ashforth, Rogers, & Corley, 2010; Brooks, Garcia, & Fleming, 2008; Cooper & Thatcher, 2010; Edwards & Peccei, 2015; Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006;
Meyer, Becker, & van Dick, 2006; Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Ramarajan, 2014; Scott, 1997; Scott & Stephens, 2009; van Dick, 2001; van Dick, Wagner, & Lemmer, 2004; van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000; Vora & Kostova, 2007; Vora, Kostova, & Roth, 2007). Very little research, though, has explored multiple foci of organizational identification within MNOs (Young [2001] looked at multiple identities from the perspective of umbrella organizations). In one exception, Harris (2011) found that larger nonprofit organizations use common branding to create a common identity among diverse professionals.

There has been a sizable amount of research looking at multiple identification in the management literature, especially how people manage having multiple identifications in the workplace (Ramarajan, 2014). For example, George and Chattopadhyay (2005) explored how contractors managed their identification with the main organization as well as identification with their client organizations. This research found that different factors impact a contractor’s identification with the employer versus the client. For example, variables such as congruence of values and distinctiveness of the organization led to a stronger identification with the employer. In comparison, spending more time with the client led contractors to have a higher identification with the client, but the same variable did not affect identification with the employer. George and Chattopadhyay’s (2005) research showed that contract workers could identify with both the organization and the clients if they feel similarly about both foci. That said, the contract worker may find identification with one of these sides appealing at the expense of identification with the other. Indeed, Alvesson, Ashcraft, and Thomas (2008) found that there are “… multiple,
shifting, and competing identities” (6), which affect people’s identification with their organization. These identifications are ordered differently in particular situations.

Research has mostly examined the foci of identification within a singular organization. Organizational identification may be focused on different levels of one organization (Cooper & Thatcher, 2008; Van Dick, 2001; Van Dick et al., 2004). Van Dick (2001) identified on four levels of foci that a person may identify with, “… (1) identification with the own career, (2) identification with one’s working unit or group, (3) identification with the organization as a whole, and (4) identification with the occupation or occupational group” (Van Dick, 2001, 273). Some studies have started to examine how these different foci may affect identification. For example, van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) argued that employees would have a stronger identification with their work-group than with the organization as a whole. During their day-to-day work, most people will probably focus more on their work-group and, therefore, their identification with these smaller groups may affect attitudes towards the organization. Van Dick and colleagues (2004) found different levels of identification with various foci within an organization. Instead of one or the other, research has shown that people could identify with multiple levels of an organization simultaneously (Edwards & Pecci, 2010) or that identification between different levels of an organization can fluctuate during the course of the workday (Scott & Stephens, 2009). Furthermore, respondents were aware of the identification with both levels. For the most part, though, respondents in Edwards and Pecci’s (2010) study identified more with the larger organization than the local office. Scott (1997) found that, looking at public workers in a geographically dispersed organization, most employees tend to have a stronger identification with their local
agency than the organization as a whole. Furthermore, some identities were compatible with each other, instead of creating conflict.

Other work has shown, similar to Edwards and Pecci (2010), that people can identify with multiple layers of organizations. Richter et al. (2006) examined those who interact highly with out-group members, also known as boundary spanners. While many in the study exhibited dual organizational identification, those considered boundary spanners were more likely to identify both with the organization and their subgroup than those who were not considered boundary spanners. Ashforth, Harrison, and Corley (2008), looking at the literature, suggested that people are more likely to identify with their localized group as opposed to the larger organization. Furthermore, they suggest that these different levels of identification may converge rather than conflict. Cheney (1991) found that multiple identities can exist harmoniously or can create conflict. Specifically, when looking at MNEs, Cheney expressed that “… the management of multiple identities is especially difficult: cultural, ethnic, and national identities must be balanced with the identity of the entire organization” (Cheney, 1991, 176, italics in the original). For employees in organizations similar to MNOs, managing multiple identifications is difficult due to the complexity of handling culturally differences and distance between the central office and the affiliate. Cooper and Thatcher (2010) theorized that cultural differences affect various foci of identification. Cultural backgrounds can lead to differences in identifying with the organization at large versus a more individual identification.

Pratt and Foreman (2000) created a classification scheme based on two aspects of multiple identities: Identity Synergy (how well the identities work together) and Identity
Plurality (how many there are). Indeed, Pratt and Foreman suggest that having an optimal number of identities and identifications (with this number being different for every person) can lead a person to be able to respond across various settings. Furthermore, one wants the identities to have an optimal level of synergy so as to be able to respond effectively to all of them without being overwhelmed by their diversity. Having multiple identities can have either a positive or a negative effect for an employee depending on how important the identities are and how much they conflict or work together (Brooks, Garcia, & Fleming, 2008; Cheney, 1991; Pratt & Foreman, 2000).

**Summary**

Though a significant portion of research in organizational identification has looked at for-profit organizations, there has been limited research examining organizational identification in nonprofit organizations. Organizational identification of employees and volunteers provides many benefits to the organization, including higher employee satisfaction, a higher level of volunteerism, and higher levels of donation. Additional research into organizational identification has shown that professionals will identify with multiple levels of an organization, though limited research has examined multiple identifications within a nonprofit organization. Furthermore, multiple identifications within an organization with multiple sites might be more complicated than those within one site. This study fills this hole by building on the literature on organizational identification in nonprofit organizations. Not only does it explore how identification plays out for employees of a nonprofit, but it also examines how being part of a multisite agency affects organizational identification. Specifically, this study begins
to examine how an employee in an affiliate office manages identifications for both their local organization as well as the organization at large.

Theoretical Focus and Hypotheses

This study uses organizational identification as the central theoretical framework for understanding MNOs. POS and Cooperation theory are also used to supplement organizational identification. These two theoretical frameworks can provide insight into organizational identification and the internal relationships within an MNO.

Organizational Identification

To understand organizational identification in MNOs, I am using the framework developed by Vora and Kostova (2007). This theoretical framework, looking specifically at MNEs, proposes that, instead of separating identifications, “… there is the question of how managers can relate to both the MNE and subsidiary and be effective despite the potential conflicts” (Vora & Kostova, 2007, 328). Vora and Kostova propose that one can have identifications with multiple levels of a MNE organization, also known as dual organizational identification. Instead of compartmentalizing identifications, one might be able to merge them (Sluss & Ashforth, 2008). This can lead to individuals either identifying with one part of the organization over the other (disparate levels of identification) or with both parts equally (comparable levels of identification) (Vora, Kostova, & Roth, 2007). To understand how an employee identifies with each foci, Vora and Kostova recommend looking at the strength of each identification (relative magnitude) and whether the identifications overlap (form). By understanding these not as
different identifications but as synergistic, researchers can better understand how an employee works in both the larger organization as well as the local area.

Therefore, to understand the relative magnitude of identification:

*Hypothesis 1: Employees in the affiliate office will have a lower organizational identification with the central organization than with the affiliate office.*

Very little is known about what might influence organizational identification among affiliate offices. Studies have shown that volunteers and paid staff have a different perspective on identification (Kreutzer & Jager, 2010). Kostova and Roth (2007) have theorized that the “institutional distance” between the subsidiary and central office in an MNE would affect organizational identification. In other research, cultural distance was found to have a marginal effect on dual organizational identification (Vora, Kostova, & Roth, 2007). This research, though, does not take into account the effect of technology on organizational identification. In this study, distance is used as a moderator. Specifically, distance growth may moderate the strength of an employee’s identification with their affiliate office and lower the employee’s identification with their central office.

Therefore:

*Hypothesis 2: As distance grows between an affiliate office and a central office, organizational identification with the central office for employees in the affiliate office will decline.*

*Perceived Organizational Support*

One measure, POS, has been shown to be strongly correlated with organizational identification (Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Marique, Singlhamber, Desmette, Caesens, & De Zanet, 2012; Ng, 2015; Zagenczyk, Gibney, Few, & Scott, 2011). As first envisioned
by Eisenberger and colleagues (1986), POS refers to the employee’s perception of the organization’s commitment toward them. According to Eisenberger and colleagues, “… employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (501). This measure has been useful in understanding how employees perceive the support available to them from their parent organization to perform their job effectively and has been correlated with organizational commitment (Rhodes & Eisenberger, 2002). POS has been found to be important to volunteers and employees of nonprofit organizations. It has been connected with nonprofit organizational commitment (Nguyen & Jepsen, 2015; Salim, Sadruddin, & Zakus, 2012), lowered intentions of employees to quit, and higher job satisfaction (Salim, Sadruddin, & Zakus, 2012). Furthermore, POS has been found to be connected to a greater volunteer experience (Boezman & Ellemers, 2008).

There have been a number of studies that have found a connection between POS and organizational identification. For example, Zagenczyk and colleagues (2011) found that POS acted as a mediator between psychological contract breach and organizational identification. Ng (2015) found that organizational identification was influenced by perceived organizational support. Furthermore, using Structural Equation Modelling, Edwards and Peccei (2010) reported that POS had a positive effect on organizational identification. Therefore:

**Hypothesis 3:** As Perceived Organizational Support from a central office goes up, identification with the central office goes up.

*Cooperation theory*
Research Question 3: What type of conflicts, if any, exist between the affiliate and the central organization?

A question that has been presented concerning MNOs is how they manage the tensions between the affiliate and central organizations. Studies have shown that there are conflicts between the central and affiliate office which may lead to competition for resources (Grossman & Rangan, 2001). Furthermore, studies have shown a link between identification and higher levels of cooperation (Kramer, 1993). As presented by Deutsch (1949a, b), Cooperation theory suggests that, if people see that their goals are aligned, they will cooperate. If they do not, they will compete. In addition, some professionals may act independently of each other, instead of cooperating or competing (Tjosvold, 1984). A sizable amount of research has explored cooperation and its effects on organizational behavior (Deutsch, 1980; Deutsch, 1990; Tjosvold, 1984).

From an organizational standpoint, cooperation has been linked to many positive aspects of organizational behavior. For example, Alper, Tjosvold, and Law (1998) found that cooperation was connected to open and constructive conversations between teams. In comparison, the perception of competitive goals between groups interfered with discussions. Fitzsimmons and Stamper (2014) theorized that friction will occur with an employee’s organizational relationship when the employee’s expectations conflict with the organization’s goals. Smith and colleagues (2011) associated cooperation with employee coordination and, therefore, higher organizational performance. This was seen in both interorganizational groups and intraorganizational groups. Kramer (1993) found that cooperation within an organization can be dependent on the identification an employee has with the organization and with those working in the organization. From a
network perspective, Joshi, Labianca, and Caliguri (2002) found that the more central a subsidiary is in a network, the more other nodes express disliking them. These feelings can lead to conflict and inhibit cooperation within an agency.

According to SCT, being a part of a group can lead to conflict with out-group members. Just being a part of a group can lead to out-group conflict. Conflict comes solely from the awareness of an out-group (Turner & Tajfel, 1986). For an MNO, this leads to the question of whether the employees of an affiliate see the central organization as a part of the in-group or as an out-group. Luo, Slotegraaf, and Pan (2006) found that “… although a firm’s functional areas may experience competition for resources and strategic emphasis, cooperative forces are necessary to shape not only its market learning but also its customer and financial performance.” (76). Instead of being competing forces, competition and cooperation are synergistic parts of an organization. Therefore:

**Hypothesis 4:** A perceived lower level of competition with the central office by affiliate employees will be connected to a higher level of organizational identification with the national office.

**Hypothesis 5:** A perceived higher level of competition with the central office by affiliate employees leads to a higher level of organizational identification with an affiliate office.

The theoretical framework is illustrated in Figure 2.1, below:
Figure 2.1: Theoretical Framework
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This study used a mixed-methods approach to better understand the relationships between affiliates and central offices. Specifically, this study used a survey of MNOs, focusing on disease-specific organizations, as well as interviews with professionals and volunteer leadership in both the affiliates and the headquarters. The survey provided the basic information on how organizational identification affects the relationship between employees in affiliate offices and employees in central offices. The interviews provided insight into the information retrieved from the survey. Put differently, the interviews dug deeper into both how employees in the affiliate office relate to their central office as well as their local constituency, and also how the central office manages to maintain relationships with affiliate offices. Discussions also explored the organizational structures and affiliate lifecycle.

Outreach

This study focused on disease-specific MNOs. These are organizations which provide support, services, and research around one specific disease, such as Huntington’s disease or Fragile X Syndrome, often on a national or international scale. These organizations work with people dealing with these diseases by providing services such as support groups, social workers, education, referrals to professionals, and opportunities to take part in clinical studies. Often, disease-specific nonprofit organizations offer supports both to people suffering from the disease as well as their family members. The focus of this dissertation is employees and volunteers in disease-specific organizations with multiple affiliates around the United States. This includes offices managed by paid staff and those managed by volunteers (some affiliates are volunteer-run, some affiliates are
run by professionals, and some affiliates are managed by a mixture of professionals and volunteers). This particular type of MNO was chosen because of the diversity within this grouping regarding the number of affiliates.

Little research has explored disease-specific nonprofit organizations. The limited literature around this type of nonprofit has focused on disease-specific organizations as advocacy groups or groups which support research (Terry, Terry, Rauen, Uitto, & Bercovitch, 2007). Disease-specific organizations play an important role in supporting research and providing resources for people with specific diseases (Snowden, 2008). These organizations were chosen due to ease of access (I was previously employed by one and, therefore, have a knowledge of these organizations) as well as the generalizability from findings from these organizations.

Outreach was done through both a snowball sampling procedure as well as outreach to specific nonprofit organizations (Berg & Lune, 2012). To start, I reached out to agencies with whom I have a personal relationship. Along with their participation in the study, I asked for assistance in connecting me to other disease-specific organizations which may be willing to take part in my research. Furthermore, I reached out to the National Organization for Rare Disorders and the Genetic Alliance to ask for support in contacting MNOs which focus on a single disease. These organizations are umbrella organizations, many of whose members are disease-specific organizations. Lasty, using the NTEE code of G (Disease, Disorders, and Medical Disciplines), I searched Guidestar.org for participants. Though the results were approximately 24,500 501(c)(3) organizations, only approximately 300 were disease-specific organizations with a national focus. The rest were either affiliates of national agencies, local focus, or not an
MNO. I looked at the website of the agency to for information on either the CEO or the contact person for affiliate relations. An e-mail was sent out to the appropriate person, along with a follow-up call.

Once an organization expressed interest or agreed to be part of this study, I scheduled an interview with either the CEO or a senior manager in the MNO. This interview examined the history of the nonprofit and the relationship that the central office has with the affiliate offices. The central office then sent out the survey to those in the central office as well as affiliate leadership. The responses were confidential and the central office did not have access to specific information about their affiliates.

At the beginning of the survey, respondents had the opportunity to provide their name and e-mail to take part in an interview which went into more depth concerning their experiences in being a part of an MNO. IRB approval was granted on March 7, 2017.

Nine nonprofit organizations took part in this study. Table 3.1 provides information on the number of affiliates within the nonprofit organization. As can be seen, there is diversity in the size of the organizations, with the smallest having 7 affiliates and the largest having approximately 200 affiliates. The affiliates were scattered across the US. There is also some diversity in revenue, with organizations representing between $1.8 million and $8.5 million in revenue, as based on the 2016 Form 990 (Part 1, Question 12, under revenue). The number of staff was self-reported during the interviews. The MNOs all had affiliates within the United States and none were international. The survey was sent out to 1,494 people via e-mail. Organizations also mentioned it in private Facebook groups and newsletters. 142 people took part in the
survey, providing a 10.5% response rate, of which 103 completed the survey. 82 of those were from the affiliate offices.

The response rate is a limitation of this study, as there might be a response bias regarding who decided to take part in the survey and the interviews, leading to a difference between those who responded and those who did not. Specifically, those who have a better relationship with the central office may be more likely respond to the survey. Respondents might have a higher organizational identification or may perceive a higher POS than those who did not respond to the survey. This response bias may have led to a lower response rate. Furthermore, response might be low due to the length of the survey. Future surveys can offer an incentive for those who take part in the study, including a drawing for a gift card, to encourage a higher response rate.

The organizations were mostly based on the east coast, with the exception of Organization 5, which is based out of Chicago. All of the organizations are based out of major cities, which may be due to the availability of funds. Furthermore, it might be easier to set up a national office in a city where one can easily get affiliates to the central office and to get those in the central office to the affiliates.

Table 3.1: Participating Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Affiliates</th>
<th>Headquarters Location</th>
<th>Total Revenue (2016)</th>
<th>Staff in the Central Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>$8,578,920</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$4,338,344</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$5,207,559</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$2,365,433</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey

For this study, I used three measures, one looking at organizational identification (Mael & Tetrick, 1992), one looking at POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) and one looking at cooperation and competition (Luo, Slotegraaf, and Pan, 2006). Furthermore, control variables were used to better understand how different factors of the affiliate office may affect this relationship. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A.

Dependent Variable

The most commonly used measure to understand organizational identification is a six-question survey created by Mael and Tetrick (1992) (Riketta, 2005). This survey, a five-point Likert scale, asks about different aspects of organizational identification. This was asked for those in the affiliate office as well as those in the central office. For OIDC, the α = .80.

Independent Variables

To better understand OIDC, those taking the survey were asked about organizational identification towards their affiliate (OIDA), using the same survey as used to explore OIDC. This question was only asked to those in the affiliate offices. One concern with using the same measure for both the dependent variable and independent
variable is common source bias. This is a concern when the same measure is used for multiple variables. This bias can either inflate or deflate the relationships which are being examined (Meier & O’Toole, 2012). It is difficult to identify the impact of common source bias. Though there are strategies which can be used to control for common source bias within regression models, Favero and Bullock (2014) suggested that these methods may not fully remedy the issues associated with this bias. Though this is a concern, the method of using the same scale to measure OIDC and OIDA is used in the management literature to understand multiple foci of identification (Edwards & Peccei, 2011).

POS is studied using a measure created by Eisenberger et al. (1986). This measure has been used by several other studies examining organizational identification (e.g. Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Zagenczyk et al., 2011). This survey asks 10 questions concerning different aspects of POS and is on a 7-point Likert scale. The focus of this measure will be how the affiliate employees and employees in the central office perceived POS from the central office. Therefore, the survey has been slightly modified to clarify which relationship is being examined. For POS in this study, the \( \alpha = .91 \).

To understand cooperation and competition, 9 questions about competition are used from the survey created by Luo and colleagues (2006). Specifically, I used a cross-functional competition scale. This 7-point Likert scale was only asked for the affiliates to better understand their relationship with the central organization. This provides an idea of how much competition the affiliate feels when examining their relationship between the affiliate and the organization. For this scale, the \( \alpha = .88 \).

**Control Variables**
Along with these measures, there were also control variables used in this survey to better understand how different aspects of an organization and an employee affect the organizational identification of an MNO. First, research has shown that employees and volunteers understand their organizational identification differently (Kreuter & Jager, 2010). Though organizational identification is often thought of in terms of employees, some organizations have their affiliates managed, to some degree, by volunteers. Those who volunteer for the organization at such a high level may have a different relationship with their central organization as compared to an employee.

When looking at the Catholic Church, Rost and Graetzer (2014) found that geographic distance affected the relationship which affiliate offices had with the bureaucracy. While being solely in a separate office may lead to difference in organizational identification, it is possible that distance may encourage a stronger connection with the local affiliate as compared to the larger organization. Therefore, this survey asked about how far their affiliate office is, in miles, from the central office.

The size of the organization and the size of the affiliate are two other questions that may affect how an affiliate relates to the organization. Research into franchise MNEs has found that size affects an affiliate’s relationship with a central office (Fable, Dandridge, & Kumar, 1998). For an MNO, a bigger organization may lead to more name recognition and organizational pride, or it may lead those in affiliates to focus their identification on their smaller in-group. Furthermore, a bigger affiliate may be more independent and, therefore, affiliate employees may have a stronger identification with their local affiliate as opposed to the larger organization. Though organizational size can be difficult to measure, for this study, both affiliate size and central organization size
were measured by operating budget. Specifically, the breakdown used for this survey mimics the breakdown used for the annual Nonprofit Organizational Salary and Benefits Survey (Hrywna, 2015). Finally, organizational identification has been connected to length of tenure (Riketta, 2005). Therefore, the length of time a person has been with the organization is also asked. The question of tenure was changed into a continuous variable, based on the question. Specifically, the first option (Less than 1 year) was changed to .5, the second option (1-3 years) was changed to 2, the third option (3-5 years) was changed to 4, the fourth option (5-10 years) was changed to 7.5, and the last option (10+ years) was changed to 12. Gender was asked as a dummy variable (0=Male, 1=Female). Lastly, the survey asked about education level, going from Some High School, no diploma to Doctoral degree. This option was changed into a dummy variable, with those who have a Bachelor’s degree or less being 0 and those with a Master’s degree or higher being a 1.

**Interviews**

At the beginning of the survey, there was a question asking if the person would be willing to take part in a 30-60 minute phone or Skype interview. The purpose of this interview was to discuss the organization for which they work and find out their views on how the organization does or does not build up a sense of organizational identification. The interview also discussed how competition and tensions between the affiliate and the central organization play out. Furthermore, I interviewed people in the central office of every organization which was surveyed to get a better idea of the structure and organization of the nonprofit institution. By interviewing people at both the central office as well as at the affiliate office, I was able to get different perspectives on the relationship
between the central office and the affiliate office, the structure of these organizations and the lifecycle of affiliates.

During this study, I interviewed 26 people from 9 organizations. Except for one group interview with three people, all the interviews were individual interviews. This included 14 people from the central office and 12 people from the affiliate offices. In this study, those who were interviewed from the central office are identified with a C and then a number. Those who were interviewed from the affiliate were identified with an A and then a number. The number indicates the order in which they were interviewed. The interviews took place between April 2017 and September 2017. There were 988 minutes of interviews, totaling 213 single-spaced pages of transcripts. An interview protocol can be found in Appendix B.

**Analysis**

**Survey Analysis**

To begin the analysis of the survey, regression models were used. The first five models (Models 1-5) use the dependent variable of OIDC. Models 1 and 2 look at all the respondents while Models 3 and 4 specifically focus on those who are in the affiliate office. Models 1-5 use variations on the Equation 1:

5 The qualitative and quantitative analysis was done at the same time. The qualitative analysis did not influence the survey questions. The analysis of the interviews, though, was completed before the quantitative analysis, and influenced the interpretation of the survey results.
(1) $\hat{Y} = b_0 + b_A X_A + b_{POS} X_{POS} + b_T X_T + b_E X_E + b_V X_V + b_G X_G + b_D X_D + b_{OIDA} X_{OIDA} + \varepsilon$

The dependent variable (Y-hat) is organizational identification towards the central office. For this equation, A is Affiliate Office (dummy variable), POS is Perceived Organizational Support, T is length of tenure, E is education (dummy variable), V is Volunteer (dummy variable), G is gender (dummy variable), D is distance from the central office in miles, and OIDA is the organizational identification with the affiliate office. The error is represented in the $\varepsilon$ value.

Two other regression models (Models 5 and 6) look specifically at organizational identification towards the affiliate office (H5). These models use the following equation:

(2) $\hat{Y} = b_0 + b_D X_D + b_{POS} X_{POS} + b_C X_C + \varepsilon$

In this equation, the dependent variable (Y-hat) is organizational identification towards the affiliate office, D is distance in miles from the central office, POS is Perceived Organizational Support, and C is Competition with the central office.

One issue is that the three main measures (organizational identification, POS, and cooperation) all use different Likert scales. Specifically, OID uses a 5-point scale while POS and Cooperation use a 7-point scale. Therefore, the regression models were standardized. Though it comes with some uncertainty (Baguley, 2009), standardization is still the best way to deal with the differences in these scales.

To gain a better understanding of the complexity of organizational identification, I used a fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) (Fiss, 2011; Ragin, 2000).
Instead of looking at linear relationships and correlations, QCA looks at relationships based on Boolean logic and membership. What makes QCA unique is that “[i]t rests on the assumptions… that the interplay between conditions explains an outcome” (Schneider & Wagemann, 2010, 411, italics in original). It is not just looking at one solution but, instead, different memberships within cross-case configuration constructions to explore necessary and sufficient conditions for the outcome variable which is being studied. Specifically, QCA looks at the casual conditions which lead to a specific outcome (Fiss, 2011). In this case, the outcome is OIDC.

To perform a QCA analysis, the variables, or conditions and outcomes, first need to be fuzzified (Ragin, 2000). All the conditions and outcomes were translated on a scale of 0-1, with 1 representing full in-membership and 0 representing full out-membership. For example, a 1 in OIDA represented a complete identification with the affiliate, while a 0 in OIDA represents no identification at all with the affiliate. This was done for the conditions of OIDA, Competition, and POS, and the outcome of OIDC. The condition distance was broken up into four break-points (Ragin, 2000) with the closest 25% of affiliates as 1, 25%-50% of variables as .66, 50%-75% as .33, and 75% and higher as 0. This represents the membership of being close to the central office. Though in a limited way, QCA has been used in studying aspects of nonprofit management, such as performance (Winand, Rihoux, Robinson, & Zintz, 2012) and structure and contract performance (Carboni, 2016). It has been used in the management literature, with some calling for more research using QCA methods (Cambpell, Sirmon, & Schijven, 2016; Fortwengel, 2017).
The benefit of using QCA is it can show how multiple combinations of variables may affect the outcome. Instead of looking at linear models, QCA “… leads researchers to view cases as combinations of attributes and to identify attribute combinations that are consistently linked to outcomes.” (Misangyi et al., 2017, 261). These “recipes” (Ragin, 2008) are created using a truth table, which show different relationships that the independent variables have with the outcome variable.

**Qualitative Analysis**

The interviews were analyzed using NVivo 11. To begin, a conventional content analysis (Hseih & Shannon, 2005) was done to identify the main themes of the study. These nodes included Affiliate-Central Office Relationships, Affiliates, Branding and Communication, Conflicts, Fundraising, Identification, Improvements, Localization, Organizational Expansion, Organizational Shrinking, Standardization, and Structure. Most of these themes were based on the interview protocol. Some nodes were added as interviews went on to identify themes which came up. Previous interviews were recoded with themes which were added later.

Following this, the Gioia Methodology was used to code the different nodes (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013). This is a two-order coding method. The first order looks at the main concepts in the interviews while the second order examines the specific themes. The Gioia Methodology uses an *in vivo* coding method. To start, I coded within each section the central ideas of each quote. Following that, the codes were translated into main themes using a chart. The chart orders the codes into similar themes (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Using the Gioia Methodology provides
the author with an organizational chart which helps organize the main themes and quotes in this study. Three charts were created: Conflict, Organizational Structure, and Affiliate Lifecycle.
CHAPTER 4: CONFLICTS

Introduction

Intraorganizational conflicts exist between central offices and their affiliates. Based on interviews with staff and volunteers in the central and affiliate offices, this chapter explores specific conflicts which exist and the ways in which the conflicts affect MNOs. There were several ways in which conflicts played out in organizations, based on the interviews. Specifically, those in the central and affiliate offices reported conflicts connected to centralization versus decentralization, the perceptions of national, the requirements of the affiliate, the fees and fee structures, the direction of the organization, and personality/individual issues. Understanding these conflicts is important for understanding organizational behavior in MNOs. By identifying the conflicts which exist, researchers can start exploring the ways in which nonprofit organizations manage these conflicts.

This chapter will look at each of the conflicts individually presented in the interviews. It will then explore how these conflicts fit into the literature. Finally, it will end with concluding remarks, including thoughts on future research.

Conflicts in Multisite Nonprofit Organizations

Centralization of the Organization

One of the themes presented during the interviews regarding conflicts revolved around the centralization of the organizational structure and decisions. The organizations which were a part of this study were moving toward a more centralized affiliate structure. Though this was acted upon differently by each organization, most of the organizations
were aiming to have all the new affiliates under the central office’s 501(c)(3) status. Some have taken steps to centralize and standardize things such as bank accounts. This recent push for centralization has led to a mixed structure, where some of the affiliates were under their own 501(c)(3) status and others were under that of the central office. This question lead to an issue presented by A10 regarding how much autonomy the local offices should have in creating their own affiliate structures versus being given affiliate “templates” from the central office. A10 questioned the flexibility which affiliates have in their structure, fundraising, and programming. A4 explained that, in her experience, affiliates seem to want to be a part of a central organization and use that standard brand when it is beneficial, but still want to have their independence and the ability to localize their brand and services when possible. Tensions arose regularly around how much independence each affiliate wanted versus how much the central office felt was appropriate.

As a part of centralization, the question of standardization versus localization was of concern. In other words, those interviewed discussed the conflict of having standardized organizational programming and fundraising while still allowing for local individualization based on need and local knowledge. This was not only regarding the structure of the affiliate organization, but also the use of branding materials, such as the logo or the organizational website. A4, for example, discussed the need for standardization amongst affiliates, especially regarding quality and branding. This connects to the reason why many of volunteers chose to be affiliate members of a national organization (as opposed to being an independent nonprofit), according to multiple respondents. Respondents felt that being a part of the larger agency enabled
affiliates to be associated with a well-known, well respected organization. Keeping the branding consistent across affiliates helped maintain that image. C8 expressed that getting volunteers to use the right website templates and logos was a slow process, with lots of handholding and explaining. One conflict around standardization, which C4 and C8 experienced, was that affiliates sometimes preferred to use their own logos instead of the logo of the central office. As part of the affiliate agreements which are drafted by the central office, many of the organizations include standardized branding guidelines, as well as having a communications manager on staff to support the affiliates. During interviews, some people associated with affiliate offices complained that these guidelines were confusing.

Another theme presented during the interviews was how much the central office should invest in the affiliates, both in time and money. For example, affiliates complained that, while they are spending money on fees, they do not feel they are getting adequate support from the central office in goods and services. One concern, specifically, was whether the central office should be giving money to the local affiliates to manage programming and encourage growth. Instead of fees going from the affiliate office to the national office, some affiliate personnel interviewed expressed that they would like the national office to pay for certain things, especially those facets which might support affiliate growth. This leads to an interesting question for MNOs: Should money flow from the affiliate office to the national or vice-versa? Is the flow of money between the affiliate office a one-way or two-way street? The conflicts around fees, which were brought up by several people in the affiliate and central offices, will also be discussed later in this chapter.
**Direction of the Organization**

The direction of the central organization was also identified during interviews as a factor leading to conflicts. This conflict focuses on the decisions the central office makes in terms of advocacy, programming, and growth. C4 found that one of the central conflicts affiliate deal with is the question of “… is it my job to help people across the country?” Is the affiliate responsible for the organization as it provides services across the country, or should the affiliate be thinking of the needs locally and pushing the organization toward those local needs?

A4 reported that some of the conflict surrounding the direction of the organization is influenced by how much say the affiliate has in the national decision-making process. When discussing the history of her organization, she presented an example of how contentious this question can be. Several years ago, her organization’s direction was influenced by a board of affiliate representatives, not by the national board. A4’s central organization changed, taking organizational decision-making away from the affiliates and giving it to the national board. This led to a complaint from those associated with the affiliates, as well as soul-searching within the organization regarding who is responsible for influencing the organization and its direction. Specifically, where should the power and decision making be located: in the central office and the national board or through a coalition of affiliate offices? Furthermore, is the organization beholden to its national board and its national presence, or should it be focused more on local growth and the strength of the local offices?

A5 also expressed that affiliates within her organization have disagreements with the central office regarding the direction of the organization. This difference in priorities
can make the affiliates feel as though they are not being heard. She expressed that when the central office makes decisions which are not what the affiliates would like, “… that doesn't mean they're not addressing [affiliate priorities], it just means that they're not what [central] feel is a priority for all the chapters at this time.” A5 reported, though, that not all affiliates feel this way. It is not very likely that the central office will be able to meet the priorities of all of the affiliates. Even if the central office does not follow the priorities of the affiliate offices, A5 still felt that the central office was listening to her most of the time.

One issue connected to the direction of the organization is the scale of the organization. A1 discussed how the conflicts regarding the direction of the organization is due to the difference of the scale of the national office as compared to the scale of her affiliate. Though her affiliate is only focusing on one particular area of one state, the national office is charged with looking at the needs of the constituency at both a national and international level. This difference in perspective leads to a different view regarding not only the direction of the organization, but the stance that the organization may take on issues of advocacy.

Perceptions of the Central Office

How the central office is perceived by those active with the affiliate offices was discussed by those interviewed as a locus for conflict. For example, C5 complained that there is a disconnect between the resources available to national and the resources and staff affiliates think the central office has available to them. When discussing her interactions, she found:

I think that our chapters sometimes see us as a different organization just because we know that we're small and we don't have a lot of staff here, but they might not necessarily know that. They might see us as a big organization with a bunch of employees and a bunch of volunteers and really when people see national and
they're... they're talking about chapters, they mean me because I'm national to them whereas they might consider national as... as more people than me and not as willing to help them if that makes sense, even though really, it's difficult because there's only one of me and so many of them. (C5)

There is sometimes a perception by affiliates that the national office is bigger than it really is and has more staff and resources available than it actually does. This can lead, as it did during the interviews, to affiliates complaining about the amount of work being done by the central office to support affiliates. Because affiliates believe the central office has more capability then it really does, affiliates are unhappy about the amount of contact and support that they receive.

C11, when discussing the affiliates in her organization, found that, because she was based out of New York City, the affiliates assumed that she had access to donors and supporters which she did not. She reported that:

I think there's also a perception problem. I mean we're... we are now six people. When I started we were five. Of how much leverage New York actually has. And this is... This is happened with other organizations, because you're in New York City people assume that we can just call a Broadway star and have them perform at an event or that we have access to a five-night stay at the Regis or something. We are a slim, lean, mean organization, and we only have so many assets so, you know, if we get a hotel stay for someone's auction package, it may not be a five-star hotel or thinking that we somehow have access to celebrities or bigger sponsors.

In this example, affiliates believe that national has access to more resources than it does solely due to its location. To combat this misconception, C11 encouraged board members and affiliate staff to come visit their central office when in New York City. This helped to show how small the office is and the realities of the resources that are available to the national office.

Requirements of the Affiliates

The requirements to be a part of the larger organization was presented as a contentious issue. A4 found that overly complicated reporting requirements were a strain
on affiliate offices. In her relationship with the central office before a major overhaul, she said:

We were to report numbers to them. We were to provide, you know, finances... money to them. We were to provide a number of other things. They were to give us the things in exchange. And it's been long enough now that I can't remember exactly what that was, but it was a very long, very complicated agreement, and it was hard, you know, to sort of everybody keep up with. And there were no... there were no sort of penalties if states didn't.

During this time, there were a high amount of reporting requirements from the central office which were difficult for the affiliate offices to meet, especially smaller ones. This led to being overwhelmed by requirements. Furthermore, affiliates in A4’s organization were unsure about how, or even if, their completed paperwork was used. C9 also found that people were grumbling about the amount that needed to be reported to the central office. Especially for volunteers, who only spend a limited amount of time managing an affiliate during their free time, the high amount of reporting strained relationships between central and affiliate offices.

*Fees and Fee Structures*

Conflicts around fees and fee structures were brought up multiple times over the course of the interviews. C11 expressed an interest in changing the fee structure of her organization. She specifically wanted her central office to be more transparent in what is provided to the affiliate offices in exchange for the fee to limit this type of conflict. C11 discussed how, over the years, the fee structure has been a contentious issue between the central office and affiliates. The amount which affiliates give the central office varies, with some affiliates paying 2% and others paying up to 30% of their income. Each organization has a different method for calculating fees.

C4 discussed a specific dispute regarding fees. When one affiliate had financial issues, the organization decided to allow them to forgo the fee until they were able to get
back on their feet. Once they were on better footing and were therefore expected to pay
the fee again, the affiliate balked and started to discuss leaving the organization over fee
payments. C4 reported that “… they want a meeting, a special meeting, because they did
not think there's value in the affiliation fee.” Though the affiliates wanted support from
the central office, whether there should have been a cost for this support was a catalyst
for intraorganizational conflict. A4 discussed how one of the reasons affiliates left their
organization was due to finding it difficult to pay the affiliation fee.

Some conflict existed not because of fees per se, but because affiliates felt that the
support received from the central office was insufficient. For example, A2, when
discussing the stagnation in his affiliate’s growth, wished there would be more support
from the national office concerning growth. He would have liked the central office to
invest more in his affiliate so that they could expand. Furthermore, he found that one of
the issues with growth was that since the fee is based on a percentage:

… we end up giving more to the national organization, which takes it out of our coffers, puts it into theirs. Not that it's all financially related, but certainly from some level, I think there needs to be more support from the national office for the organic growth of an organization that there currently isn't, if you will.

A2 expressed feeling as though, even though more growth would mean more money for
the central office, they were not doing enough to support his affiliate in growing and
gaining new funders. Instead, A2 would have liked to see more money and support from
the central office to encourage growth locally, which would translate to the central office
receiving less money in fees as affiliates grow.

**Personality/Individual Issues**

Sometimes, issues between the affiliate and the central office are due to
personality conflicts and conflicts between individuals. A9, for example, discussed how
some of the conflicts her affiliate experienced were due to the lack of communication
between volunteers in the affiliate office and those in the central office. Though volunteers where having issues with some of the work being done by the central office, that a lack of reaching out and miscommunications led to the conflict worsening. C8 reported that communication with the affiliate offices was an issue which she had problems managing. Miscommunications and lack of communications led to additional conflicts within the organization, such as around centralization and standardization, as well as the direction of the organization.

Personality conflicts are also a major issue which was discussed. When he came in as executive director of his affiliate, A2 found that tensions between the central and affiliate offices were partially due to personality conflicts between the former executive director and those working in the central office. This led to negative feelings and miscommunication between the two offices. Therefore, one of his first tasks as executive director of his affiliate was to mend these relationships. He found that it was not that one person was in the wrong but, instead, it seemed that personality conflicts led to distrust which worsened over time.

*Trust and Sharing*

Though not a source of conflict on its own, trust and sharing tended to exacerbate conflicts within MNOs. Some of those interviewed from the affiliate offices reported having issues trusting the central office. Sharing can include an exchanging of funds or information, such as information about donors, between the central office and the affiliate. The main reason identified during the interviews for the lack of sharing included a feeling of mistrust between the affiliate and central office. For example, one person expressed that affiliate offices “… are afraid that if they give that membership list to
national or to state associations, their members are going to get started getting flooded with e-mails… for donation requests” (A7). In this instance, the affiliate was concerned that sharing donor information would be bad for the relationship that the affiliate has with the donor. They did not trust the central office to handle these relationships respectfully and, therefore, refused to share information.

Lack of sharing can have a negative effect on fundraising. C3, for example, explained that her organization’s outreach to potential donors is fractured because of the lack of sharing. Without information sharing, both the central office and the affiliates may go after the same donors. To donors, this can be confusing as they may not be aware of the difference in donating to the affiliate versus the central office. The program which C3 discussed would have donations split between the central and affiliate offices. C3, though, found implementation difficult due to the lack of trust between the affiliate and the central offices. Other organizations which discussed trying to do joint fundraising programs also found the implementation difficult due to a lack of intraorganizational trust. A4 found her central office’s program of joint fundraising to be promising, but it broke down due to a lack of trust between the board of the affiliate office and the central office regarding how the money would be split. This program was to be a joint, multiyear event run by both the affiliate and the central office, with the central office receiving 30% of the proceeds in the first year. Though the central office was planning to take a smaller percentage of the proceeds in the subsequent years, there was a lack of trust that this would occur. Due to this lack of trust, talks broke down.

An “us versus them” mentality, which both those in the affiliates and the central offices identified as a cause of conflict, also inhibits trust within the organization. A9
discussed how this attitude stems from the fact that, although the organization that she is affiliated with is based solely in the United States, she still observed regional differences in culture. She talked about how

... I have been in Minnesota for seven years now... And so I've seen this here and I'm starting to see that it's like this in the upper Midwest states where, you know, people think, oh well, you know, they're in New York, they just don't get it (A9).

This respondent, thinking back to a previous job working with affiliate offices based out of Minnesota and North Dakota, found that even within a region of two states, this “us versus them” mentality existed, creating conflict between the affiliate and the central office. C6 hypothesized that “[t]he us/them mentality is when... when folks don't have confidence in what the other part is doing” (C6). This divide leads to lower levels of information sharing and trust in general.

Summary

There are many conflicts which may exist within an MNO. These conflicts will probably look different from organizations based out of a single site. For example, conflicts arose due to the distance between offices, which may lead to cultural differences. Having multiple offices may also lead to more opportunities for ingroup/outgroup relationships and the “us versus them” mentality which can exacerbate conflicts. A3 said that he didn’t feel that his relationship with the affiliate office was affected by distance. He later, though, acknowledged that, by not being around the people in the central office, there were some conflicts still because the central office may not fully understand what is happening in his catchment area.

The conflicts presented here show that there are unique issues facing an MNO. Not all conflicts, though, are unique to MNO. For example, personality conflicts exist in organizations across the spectrum. Furthermore, those within the same office may
experience conflicts regarding the direction of the organization. What makes conflicts between affiliates and the central office unique is that, since those in conflict are not in the same office, distance and differences in focus and perspective may influence the direction of the conflict. Miscommunications and cultural differences may exacerbate the issues.

**Discussion**

Though there has been work exploring conflicts in the field of management, little has focused specifically on nonprofit organizations. Conflicts in MNOs require special attention because of the impact of geographic and cultural distance. Grossman and Rangan (2001) identified several conflicts, some of which are similar to those found here. Their study also discussed the direction of the organization, the centralization of the organization, and funds raised/who will reach out to local donors (trust and sharing). Cultural differences, identified by Smith (2003) and Balser and Carmine (2009), as well as conflict regarding what is best locally versus what is best nationally (Harris, 2011; Siddiki & Lupton, 2016) were also identified in this study. Table 4.1 presents these conflicts, along with the conflicts which have been previously identified in MNOs.
Table 4.1: Conflicts in Multisite Nonprofit Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicts in the literature</th>
<th>Conflicts in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Funds raised locally versus nationally (Grossman &amp; Rangan, 2001)</td>
<td>• Centralization versus Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who will reach out to local donors (Grossman &amp; Rangan, 2001; O’Flannigan &amp; Taliente, 2004)</td>
<td>• Perceptions of National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery of programs (Grossman &amp; Rangan)</td>
<td>• Requirements of the Affiliate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structure of the organization (Grossman &amp; Rangan, 2001)</td>
<td>• Fees &amp; Fee Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direction of the organization (Grossman &amp; Rangan, 2001)</td>
<td>• Direction of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centralization versus decentralization (Grossman &amp; Rangan, 2001)</td>
<td>• Personality/Individual issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is best locally versus nationally (Harris, 2011; Siddiki &amp; Lupton, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural conflicts (Smith, 2003; Balser &amp; Carmine, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of trust and sharing, the perceptions of the central office, the requirements of the affiliates, and fees and fee structures into the discussion of conflicts within nonprofit organizations adds a new perspective on conflicts. These conflicts do not happen in a vacuum. For example, the conflict regarding affiliate fees was influenced by the affiliate’s lack of trust in the central organization to use this money to further the local or the national initiatives. Part of the question regarding requirements was not just the amount that was asked of affiliates but, also, what was done with the paperwork which was filed. A concern expressed was that the work of being a part of an affiliate was being done, but no one was using the information gathered.

Complaints regarding fees also led to conflicts, including affiliates leaving (or considering leaving) the organization. One respondent (C11) felt that the problem was not so much with fees, but that the affiliates did not understand how the fees were used and why they were important. When those affiliates explored becoming a separate
501(c)(3), for example, they realized that it was cheaper to pay the fee to have the central office handle the bookkeeping and other administrative responsibilities. Discussion around fees helps affiliates understand what they get out of fees and the cost of running an MNO. As the fees are being used to support affiliates, the discussion of the support received from the fees can help regarding what affiliates expect from the central office and the costs of that support.

The theme of trust has been discussed sparingly in the nonprofit management literature. For example, Andrews (2017) did find that larger organizations have issues with trust and a lower commitment to organizational goals. This study, did not find that size was a factor in the level of trust. Instead, issues of trust were found in organizations of all sizes. This lack in trust was connected to a lowered commitment to the central organization as a whole (Andrews, 2017).

Trust has also been found to be connected to cooperation and conflict. Trust led to a higher level of cooperation and information sharing (Zand, 1972) while lower levels of trust led to conflict (Simons and Peterson, 2000). Cooperation between teams and within teams can help build up trust within an organization (Costa, Fulmer, & Anderson, 2017). Levels of trust itself can be an indicator of conflict within the organization, with a higher level of trust leading to a lower level of conflict (Hodson, 2004) and higher levels of cooperation (Montes & Irving, 2008; Rosanas, 2008; Stahl et al., 2011).

The “us versus them” mentality present in this study mimics behaviors presented in SCT. Indeed, this theory suggests that people have a certain bias against those who are not part of their in-group (Turner, 1985, 1987). These biases towards out-group members are even present in randomly created groups (Tajfel et. al., 1971). This “us versus them”
mentality can lead to barriers for cooperation and trust. The perspective of the central office as being a part of the out-group can inhibit trust between the office and affiliate and exacerbate conflicts which may exist. As shown in this study, an “us versus them” attitude decreases the trust between offices (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012; Newell, David, & Chand, 2007).

An area of conflict from this study not found in the literature is the affiliate expectations based on how they perceive national. This misconception may be based on many different factors, such as a feeling from the affiliate that national has access to resources due to its location, or a misconception of the size and scope of the national organization. Affiliates want the central office to do what they feel is a fair share of the work. But, due to this misconception, they are unable to identify what a fair share of support from the central office would look like. Battling this can be difficult for central offices, but can include strategies such as having those associated with the affiliates visit the central office or providing the affiliate offices with information on the state of the organization as a whole. This can help mitigate the differences between how the affiliates see the central office and the availability of resources within the central office.

Decentralization, specifically localization, has been explored in the nonprofit setting. Focused on the conflict between the local and the national, Gibbons and Hazy (2017) find that larger organizations, such as Goodwill, use a model which can help focus on the ability to “… adapt both to changing local market conditions in its business operations and to the evolving mission needs of its local communities” (300). Paarlberg and Meinhold (2012) use the United Way as a case study to show how local influences impact organizational practices at the local level. When looking at the conflict of
decentralization, this presents a picture of organizations that have focused on decentralizing to meet local needs. They still, though, have a certain level of centralization to keep a level of similar services across various markets.

Figure 4.1 provides a visualization of the conflicts presented here and how these conflicts affect the relationships between the affiliate and central office. Some of the topics discussed both in this study and the literature are specific moderators which influence conflicts. These make the conflicts either worse or better but, for the most part, conflicts do not originate from the moderators. Based on the research here and other studies, the main conflicts faced in an MNO is centralization, perceptions of the central office, requirements of the central office, fees, direction, localization, program delivery, organizational structure, cultural conflicts, and individual conflicts. Moderators which impact the direction of the conflict include distance, miscommunication, trust, and identification. Although not mentioned much in this research, studies have shown that identification can help improve cooperation and mitigate conflicts within an organization (Kramer, 1993). Every conflict will be different in organizations.

In this study, conflict led to four outcomes for affiliates. First, the affiliate may leave the organization. During the interviews, there was discussion on how affiliates would either decide to disband altogether or leave to start their own organization (this will be discussed in more depth in the next chapter). Secondly, individuals may exit the organization as well, leaving the affiliate intact (The leader leaving the affiliate, though, may lead to the affiliate closing). Third, there may be no change. Some of the conflicts may either continue to exist or naturally dissipate. Lastly, the conflicts may lead to
organizational change. Changes in programming, such as joint fundraising programs, as well as the affiliate-organization contract, were identified as stemming from conflicts.

Figure 4.1: Conflicts in Multisite Nonprofit Organizations

Conclusions

Conflict is not a new theme in the management literature. Some argue that conflict is good for an organization (e.g. Tjosvold, 2008). It can be used to explore issues within an organization and create a stronger team and structure in the long run. However, conflict is little understood within nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, conflict may not be caused by just one thing but, instead, may be pushed by several forces. This study presents several factors which influence conflict between affiliates and the central office. This study also presents a future path for the study of conflict within nonprofit organizations. Understanding how nonprofits experience conflict and how they mitigate
conflict, can help us better examine the organizational behavior of nonprofit organizations and professionals.
CHAPTER 5: THE STRUCTURE OF MULTISITE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND THE AFFILIATE LIFECYCLE

Introduction

During the interviews, respondents in the central and affiliate offices discussed the structure of their MNO as well as the lifecycle of the affiliates. This chapter will look at the different structures which were used by MNOs. Furthermore, it will explore the lifecycles of the affiliate offices, with a focus on the birth and death of affiliate. Though organizations in this study were interested in growing the number of affiliates across the country, they also reported that there were circumstances which led to affiliate numbers decreasing. This chapter adds to the literature by exploring how the MNO structure and the affiliate lifecycle affect MNOs.

Analysis

Organizational Structure

In this study, multiple organizational structures were present. While some MNOs used a more centralized structure, others focused on allowing their affiliates to be more localized in their program planning and fundraising. One example of this is the 501(c)(3) certification of affiliates. In some organizations, all of the affiliates have their own 501(c)(3) status separate from the central office. In other organizations, the affiliates are under the 501(c)(3) status of the central office. Not uncommon were organizations which had a mixture of 501(c)(3) statuses. In other words, in several organizations, some of the affiliates had their own 501(c)(3) status while others were under the central office’s certification. This came to be through a variety of routes. For example, when
Organizations 4 & 6 were first established, their affiliates were encouraged to obtain an independent 501(c)(3) status. As the organizations grew they started to find that having new affiliates under the central office certification is easier for both the affiliate and the central office. C4 reported that other MNOs are moving towards a more centralized structure regarding 501(c)(3) certification.

There were several motivations behind the move toward a centralized structure. For example, Organizations 2 & 9 found that the centralized structure protected the organizational brand. With a centralized structure, the central office has more oversight of the fundraising and services provided by the affiliates. While control is one of the reasons why some MNOs may use a centralized structure, for others, this structure is simpler for affiliates. C11, for example, reported that it was easier for affiliates to be under the central office’s 501(c)(3) rather than their own. Those affiliates from her organization which explored getting their own 501(c)(3) designation found that the amount of work required to maintain this independence was cost-prohibitive. The affiliates preferred to pay a fee to the central office, allowing the central office to manage the bookkeeping and accounting required to maintain the 501(c)(3) status.

Along with the 501(c)(3) status, another aspect of MNOs discussed is whether the affiliates are run by staff or volunteers. While some MNOs have their affiliates fully managed by volunteers, others are led by paid staff. Lastly, some MNOs have a mixed leadership structure. When the organization used a mixed approach, the affiliates in this study obtained staff by raising enough funds to support staff. Often, it is not the central office which decides which affiliate will employ staff members. It is the decision of the affiliate office. An exception to this is found in Organization 6, where all of the affiliates
are staff-run. Furthermore, two new affiliates in Organization 6 were created from a top-down approach, both of which were staffed.

Two organizations in this study (Organization 1 and Organization 6) had an additional layer of hierarchy between the central and affiliate offices. For Organization 6, the middle layer consisted of a volunteer or group of volunteers who managed a state association in specific states (based on need and availability of volunteers). Similar to the affiliates, these state associations can either obtain an independent 501(c)(3) or be under their central office’s designation. While those in the central office of Organization 6 found this structure to be effective, those in the affiliate offices were not always pleased with this. Organization 1 had staff across the country who worked with certain states, with each state having a staff member who provided support and a link to the central office. Affiliates and those working in the middle level of the hierarchy found this to be effective for exchanging information between affiliates and the central office and providing affiliates with professional attention and support. These two organizations have two differences in their middle level. First is the consistency of the middle level across the country. In Organization 1, every state is under some field staff member, while not every affiliate in Organization 6 has a state association affiliated with it. Secondly, in Organization 1, the field staff are hired by the central office while in Organization 6, the state associations are affiliates which are separate from the central and affiliate offices. Some of the state associations have their own 501(c)(3) certification.

Of the 9 organizations in this study, 7 have affiliate agreements which were reauthorized yearly. One has an affiliate agreement which is only signed when an affiliate is started, while one had no written agreement. Within this agreement is an outline of the
affiliate structures and expectations. Most of the organizations require 3 or 4 volunteers on their board to maintain affiliation, though Organization 1 required 8 board members. One of the central concerns expressed through this agreement is that all of the work does not fall on one person. Each organization has different expectations regarding what the work of the affiliate office should be. For example, while Organization 8 has the affiliates focusing on fundraising for the central office, others have the affiliates take part in program planning and development. The expectations vary based on the needs locally and nationally.

Affiliate Growth

Most of the affiliates in this study were established through a bottom-up process. This is initiated when someone from the community approaches the central organization. Though staff in the central office, such as C9, mentioned an interest in being proactive in building up affiliates in areas of need, most central offices wait until a local advocate approaches them to start an affiliate. When C4 decided to start an affiliate using a top-down process, she found it difficult to keep the affiliate running due to a lack of local engagement. C8 reported that, though her organization started affiliates based on local interest, they would like to be able to be more proactive in planning the placement of affiliates. In other words, C8 would like the central office to be able to think systemically about where they would like to expand, as opposed to deciding to expand based on local interest.

One concern which was brought up by C9 was the growth of affiliates without thoughts regarding “the costs or consequences.” In other words, there are times when the central office encourages the growth of the affiliate without considering local capacity.
Instead of piecemeal growth, C9 suggested that agencies should think strategically about which locations would be able to support an affiliate and where the affiliates would be able to do the most good. One of his concerns with affiliate building in his organization was that he found they were “… a little bit too laissez faire on granting new affiliate status… I’m not necessarily sure all the time that new affiliates should be new affiliates” (C9). His concern was that those who are starting affiliates may not be aware of the commitment required. Furthermore, C9’s central office was more interested in the quantity of affiliates rather than the quality of the affiliates. To help make sure that the affiliates were able to succeed once established, respondents discussed either having a walk, support group, or other event before officially starting the affiliate. This event was then used to build up support for an affiliate locally (C1 & C9). C10 talked about working slowly with new volunteers when starting up affiliates. This helped the local volunteers understand not only the complexities of running an affiliate but also how the other factors in their lives, such as caring for a sick relative, may be impacted by the time it takes to manage an affiliate.

In this study, volunteers who started affiliates tended to be people who were affected by the disease which the organization represents. Due to this limitation, there were few people who were interested in building up the affiliate office. Those in the central office reported difficulty reaching out to the larger community. This led to struggles in building affiliates in rural areas, where there are fewer people (C9).

One concern which was expressed with regards to building a new affiliate was the relationship between the central organization and the affiliate volunteers. C8 reported that “… one of the things that was important to us was protecting the volunteers who are
starting, you know, incorporation, and because we don’t have direct oversight of those volunteers. Also building in protection for the national organization.” For her, the concern was how to protect the central organizational name and image when there is no direct oversight of the affiliate. As her organization expands into the first new affiliate in several years, C11 has been exploring, from a legal standpoint, what is best when starting a new affiliate. From her perspective:

… it’s also about making sure we do our due diligence, that we’re protecting the organization, if [the affiliate is] going to do fundraising events, it’s a cash positive. We’re not in a position to lose thousands of dollars in a first year, and I wouldn’t want anyone to go out and have a negative experience. So, it’s really protecting both sides.

In other words, C11 was concerned about the volunteers organizing successful events and, as a result, having a good experience as members of the organization at large. She was also worried about the central office looking respectable to its stakeholders who would not like learning about an event which lost money. C11 wanted to ensure she protected her new affiliates from failure while preserving the reputation of the central organization. This is connected to an issue A7 reported: people sometimes have difficulty differentiating between the affiliate and the larger organization. In her experience, she has found that people do not always understand how the affiliate and central organization are different. Therefore, people will sometimes assume that the affiliate office and the central office are one organization, with the local representing the central and vice-versa. This also leads to donors questioning why they should donate to one part of the organization when they have already donated to a different section of the organization.

Sometimes, an affiliate grows out of another affiliate. C7, for instance, talked about how one group of volunteers broke away from one affiliate to start a new affiliate. This came about when a local subgroup, based out of North Carolina, felt as though their
area was not getting enough attention from the affiliate leadership, which was based out of South Carolina. On the other side of the spectrum, when people want to start a new affiliate, the central office sometimes guides them to join affiliates which already exist. This can sometimes even expand the catchment area which the affiliate covers through the addition of new volunteers.

Instead of a new affiliate, an affiliate may be reborn. As will be discussed later in this chapter, sometimes an affiliate dies. C7 talked about keeping a basic structure in an area where there has been affiliate death, with the hopes that an affiliate can restored. It is possible that an affiliate can be reborn with new leadership after a period of time. Information regarding the structure of the affiliate and the local network would be preserved through the central office.

Though the growth of affiliates is an important aspect of MNOs, the central office will sometimes block the opening of a new affiliate. For example, C11 was approached by a group of people who had been doing fundraisers for her organization regarding starting an affiliate. From her perspective, “… it didn’t make sense for us to expend that much staff time and for them to not make a significant amount of money.” In other words, C11 recognized that there is a lot of work from the central office that goes into starting an affiliate. Therefore, she has to be strategic regarding how these resources are used. In this situation, she did not feel the affiliate would bring in enough money to the central organization as compared with the effort it would take to establish the affiliate.

C8 reported that it was important to have an honest conversation with those who are starting the affiliation process regarding requirements and commitments. Specifically, the central office wants to know if the volunteers starting the affiliate can meet the
requirements. C10 discussed a similar issue, with a concern that those who start an affiliate are affected by the disease which the organization represents and, therefore, may not also have the time, energy, and support to sustain an affiliate office. The basic concern underlying this discussion is while volunteers have enthusiasm, they do not always fully understand what it means to run an affiliate office. In fact, C9 worried that too many people are given the option of having an affiliate status without the central organization considering the volunteers’ ability to manage it.

**Affiliate Death**

Affiliate death is a normal part of the organizational lifecycle. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this can be due to conflicts with the central office. Conflicts, though, are not the only reason an affiliate may close. During the interviews, respondents discussed the many reasons for the affiliate closure. C8 reported that “… if you want chapters to be of a certain caliber then you have to allow the ones that aren’t to leave and that was not something that was an option that I think has to be.” When doing a massive reorganization, C8 felt pressure from the board of the central office to keep the number of affiliates stable. This led to affiliate offices being kept open which C8 felt should have been closed due to lack of capacity.

C6 found that newer affiliates were more likely to close rather than older affiliates. She reported that

… with affiliates, because they’re new and they’re less established, we have found situations where the entire affiliate revolves around one family and then something happens in the family that they’re not able to really commit to being an organized group anymore.

When affiliates are newer, they may not have the time to bring people into leadership positions. This can lead to affiliate death if the current leadership is unable to continue.
C6 also discussed how the affiliate offices grow and die based on the needs of the central office. She found “… that’s important and that’s healthy that we’re going to grow and shrink based on what the real capacity is and not just because, you know, everybody wants an [organization] flag in their counties…” In other words, the growth of the affiliate is based more on the ability of the central office to support affiliates as opposed to just the local community’s interest in having an affiliate. As C11 expressed earlier in this chapter, her central office places a lot of resources into establishing and growing affiliates. The central office needs to perceive the affiliates to be worth the resources which are used.

Another reason reported for the closing of affiliates was financial circumstances. A4, for example, talked about affiliates which have closed because they were unable to pay their dues to the central office. C11 also found that financial instability led to the closing of affiliates in her organization. Specifically, she found that some affiliates were focused on events and other fundraisers which were not able to bring in enough money to sustain the affiliate.

One reason mentioned during multiple interviews was a lack of manpower needed to keep the affiliate running. Both C1 and A8 reported that affiliates had been closing recently because there were not enough people to take on local leadership positions and sustain the affiliates. C5 discussed how affiliates close when either the leadership stays stale or the leadership is unable to continue their work. For her, “[i]t’s just leadership stays pretty stagnant. And then members kind of dissolve and the leadership goes away, and nobody wants to take over the role.” The lack of new blood within leadership positions can lead to affiliate death.
Central organizations will close affiliates when they notice inactivity. Sometimes, according to C1, it is the job of the central office to reach out to the local leadership to see if they are interested in staying an affiliate. As C1 discussed:

So, if they’re a chapter and they don’t… they don’t have any walks planned, they don’t have any patient education events planned, so part of my job is to reach out to the leadership there and say ‘Hey, what’s going on? What can I do to help?’ to invigorate participation.

C1 reaches out to the affiliate leadership when she notices inaction and then, based on how these conversations proceed, she sometimes recommends that the affiliate disband.

As the affiliate leadership may not always consider closing, it can sometimes be the central office’s duty to take the initiative when they observe issues.

A yearly reaffiliation process is a good time to see which affiliates may be inactive, according to C8. In her experience, this is the time in which she sees the largest number of affiliate offices closing. In her organization:

A few chapters every year… come to the realization on their own that they can’t fill the reaffiliation process and so many times you don’t necessarily have to have the conversation with chapters that are struggling because they come to that choice on their own.

While she worked with affiliate leadership to explore what supports the central office could provide, C8 found that affiliates tend to be aware of when they are unable to continue with the work and agree to disband. Sometimes, the affiliate leadership needed a push from the central office to help make the decision.

When affiliates close, central offices are presented with the issue of what happens to the people who may have relied on that affiliate for support and services. C7, for example, expressed that her organization tries to do outreach when they realize that an affiliate’s leadership is not able to sustain the position. She reported that:

Typically, what will happen if an [affiliate] is inactive or a chair stepped down and we don’t have a replacement, we spend time looking for that replacement or just a volunteer who’s willing to host a get-together for the community. So, we try not to discontinue them because the goal is always to provide that support. And so we want people to connect with the organizations that are in that area and know that we’re making sure that that area is supported.
According to the interviews, the central office takes on the responsibility of finding some way to fill the gaps in services locally if the affiliate is no longer able to continue to provide those services.

Discussion

This chapter looked at the structure of MNOs, as well as the growth and death of affiliates within these structures. This discussion will start off by looking at the structure of MNOs. It will then examine the life cycle of an affiliate office, with a focus on the birth and death of an affiliate.

Organizational Structure

Table 5.1 provides a 3 X 3 matrix of how each organization which took part in this study deal with centralization (via 501(c)(3) status of the affiliate offices) and whether or not the affiliate are staff-run or volunteer-run. These are the two factors which were discussed during the interviews. Young and Faulk (2010) also looked at centralization in their work on franchises and federations, focusing on the control that the central office has over affiliates. In their analysis, they compare it to homogeneity of affiliates. Grossman and Rangan (2001) looked at autonomy of affiliates as well as the forces of affiliation or why an organization decides to have affiliates in the first place. Lastly, Taylor and Lindsey (2000) utilized standardization and centralization in their categorization of MNOs.

What makes this study unique is that, along with centralization, it also explores affiliate management. Specifically, this study identifies affiliates as staff-run, volunteer-run, or a mixture. This difference in professionalization has been shown to affect
organizational behavior, such as organizational identification (Kreutzer & Jager, 2010). Research has shown a move toward professionalization as part of nonprofits becoming more business-like (Maier, Meyer, & Steinbereithner, 2016). Ganesh and McAllum (2012) suggest that the trends toward professionalism may lead to a difference between nonprofits which are grassroots and those which are more corporate. Limited research has fully explored the difference between an organization which is staff-run versus one which is managed by volunteers. Though staff may be able to spend more time focusing on program planning, fundraising, and affiliate growth, volunteers may be closer to the communities and the cause. This can lead to a stronger sense of ownership of the affiliate by the volunteers.
As seen in Table 5.1, there is great diversity in the staff structure and centralization of MNOs. The limited work that has explored the organizational structure of MNOs has focused on franchises and federations (Young & Faulk, 2010). These types of organizational structures assume a high level of decentralization for the affiliates. In franchises, the affiliates pay a fee to the central office and get certain services in return (Oster, 1992; 1996). This study does find franchising within the MNOs studied. Some organizations have the affiliates under the central 501(c)(3) status and still pay affiliation fees. Part of that fee, in fact, helps support centralized services such as bookkeeping.

Brown et al. (2012) identified INGOs as having different types of structures which are differentiated by their centralization. The assumption in that study was that the organization will have one centralization structure which will cover all the affiliates. Six of the nine organizations which were a part of this study were mixed in their structure and three organizations had a mixture of staff and volunteers managing their affiliates. As shown in Table 5.1, affiliates in this study are either fully under their own 501(c)(3), fully under their central 501(c)(3), or a mixture. This suggests that MNOs use a mixture of structures based on local and historic needs. Some affiliates have more available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Affiliate Organizational Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliates have their own 501(c)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliates under central 501(c)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer run</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.1, there is great diversity in the staff structure and centralization of MNOs. The limited work that has explored the organizational structure of MNOs has focused on franchises and federations (Young & Faulk, 2010). These types of organizational structures assume a high level of decentralization for the affiliates. In franchises, the affiliates pay a fee to the central office and get certain services in return (Oster, 1992; 1996). This study does find franchising within the MNOs studied. Some organizations have the affiliates under the central 501(c)(3) status and still pay affiliation fees. Part of that fee, in fact, helps support centralized services such as bookkeeping.

Brown et al. (2012) identified INGOs as having different types of structures which are differentiated by their centralization. The assumption in that study was that the organization will have one centralization structure which will cover all the affiliates. Six of the nine organizations which were a part of this study were mixed in their structure and three organizations had a mixture of staff and volunteers managing their affiliates. As shown in Table 5.1, affiliates in this study are either fully under their own 501(c)(3), fully under their central 501(c)(3), or a mixture. This suggests that MNOs use a mixture of structures based on local and historic needs. Some affiliates have more available
resources to organize, establish, and maintain their own 501(c)(3) status than others.

Some organizations in this study which are mixed in structure discussed planning, at one point, on having all their affiliates under individual 501(c)(3). Within the past 10 to 20 years, though, some of these organizations have been moving towards a more centralized structure, having the affiliates under the central office 501(c)(3), allowing the central office to have more control over the affiliates. Therefore, while the older affiliates have their own 501(c)(3) status, newer affiliates are under the central office’s designation.

Part of what may impact the structure of the organization is the purpose of the affiliate. There has been no work, to my knowledge, regarding why an organization would want affiliates and what an affiliate contributes to the organization. In this study, the affiliates played different roles for each organization. For example, in Organization 8, the affiliate existed solely to raise money for the central organization. The focus, therefore, was to build up the central office through local fundraisers. In comparison, for Organization 6, the central office came into existence to provide support for the affiliates. While not fully an umbrella organization, as defined by Hudson and Bielfeld (1997), the central office of Organization 6 was created by a coalition of affiliate offices in the 1980s. Because of how it was established, Organization 6 is focused on building up local affiliates. When looking at affiliates of MNOs, one cannot assume that every organization utilizes them in a similar fashion. Sometimes, even within the same organization, affiliates will act in different capacities. For example, some affiliates may be financial centers. Within the same organization, the central office will build affiliates which lose money so that they can provide services within a specific area or continue to support an
affiliate which can be expanded with future local leadership. This mixture allows for the
MNOs to be flexible in the ways that they use affiliates.

In this study, the structure of MNOs was explored. The limited work around this
topic has looked at specific types of nonprofit structures and used that as a starting point
in studying MNOs. This chapter, instead, looked at 9 MNOs and explored the different
types of structures which they utilize. Along with showing a trend towards centralization,
this study also found that organizations provide different levels of centralization to
different affiliates. This mixed type of structure suggests that, instead of one singular
system, organizations use various structures within their organization so as to meet local
and national needs.

*The Lifecycle of Affiliate Offices*

Respondents in this study discussed the lifecycle of the affiliate office. The
exploration of the birth and death of affiliate offices was an interesting outcome of this
study. The lifecycle of an affiliate was presented as a normal process: Affiliates are born
and often they die or are put on hold due to a lack of leadership or local interest. In the
previous chapter, conflicts were shown to lead to the death of affiliates. But during the
discussions here, other factors were identified as leading to the closing of affiliate offices.

In one of the limited articles exploring the establishment of new affiliates, Barry
et al. (2015) identified two types of affiliate offices which exist in INGOs: top-down and
bottom-up. A top-down office is when the central office starts the affiliate, whereas a
bottom-up office is where the affiliate is started by those in the local area. Though some
of the organizations in this study reported isolated cases of the central office creating
affiliate offices with a top-down approach, the majority of organizations had the affiliates
started by volunteers on the ground who reach out to the central office. The theory behind this for the organization is that affiliates will be stronger if they are initiated by those who have local knowledge and connections. By having the volunteers initiate contact with the central office to start an affiliate, the central office gets local support from the inception. But the central office loses the option of being able to be strategic regarding affiliate placement.

**Figure 5.1: The Lifecycle of the Affiliate**

Based on the interviews, Figure 5.1 provides an overview into the life cycle of the affiliate office. As mentioned above, an affiliate can be started through either a top-down or bottom-up process. Sometimes, though, an affiliate is resurrected from the structure of a defunct affiliate. Based on the interviews, this can happen right after the affiliate disbands or sometime later. One organization discussed keeping a minimal presence in an
area so that affiliates can be reborn. Once established, an affiliate grows through local support and guidance from the central office. The central office seems to provide support for growth through a variety of ways, including providing templates for events and programming and helping affiliates with their yearly budgeting. Each organization has different expectations regarding the growth of the affiliate. For example, while Organization 1 expects an approximately 3% increase in fundraising yearly, Organization 8 tends to be more lenient if the affiliate wants to stay constant.

Most of this study was focused on the birth and the death of the affiliate organization. There was, though, the discussion of affiliates growing, becoming set in their ways (stasis), and decline in both fundraising and service delivery. This part of the lifecycle mirrors the work of Hager, Galaskiewicz, Bielfeld, and Pins (1996) and is followed by most nonprofit organizations. Hager et al. (1996), though, present this lifecycle as a linear process. Based on the interviews, the affiliate lifecycle of birth, growth, stasis, decline, and death may be more circular, with affiliates growing, becoming static, declining, and then growing again, or becoming stable after declining. Based on the interviews, affiliates may go through these stages over many years. This study did not delve into what leads to the growth or decline of an affiliate, but did find that organizations put different amounts of pressure on the affiliates. While some affiliates have pressures from their central office, others receive none and are content with stasis. Lester, Parnell, and Carraher (2003) identified five stages of the organizational life cycle: existence, survival, success, renewal, and decline. Most studies in the nonprofit literature have looked at certain stages, such as the organizational birth
(Bess, 1998; Andersson, 2016) and organizational death (Fernandez, 2008; Hager et al., 1996).

One interesting part of this organizational lifecycle is stasis. When exploring the organizations in this study, affiliates stayed in stasis for multiple reasons. For example, Organization 7 did not necessarily encourage growth in their affiliates but were fine with stasis if that was what the volunteer leadership wanted. During the interview, the CEO of Organization 7 talked about not putting too much pressure on the volunteers for growth, instead focusing on their involvement. As many of the organizations are run by volunteers, it is possible that the lack of new leadership or a lack of knowledge around fundraising and growth can contribute to stasis. The CEO of Organization 1 discussed how she encourages 3% growth in her affiliates yearly, though understood that this can be difficult for the volunteer leadership.

As shown in this study, sometimes affiliates break off from existing affiliate organizations. In the interviews in this study, this was instigated by organized groups within affiliates who were physically distant from their affiliate leadership and felt that their area was not receiving enough services. This was described as an amicable breakup, though it is not hard to imagine how this process could become contentious, especially when dividing up funds and donors. This division, though, may be a relatively simple process, providing the original affiliate the ability to focus on a smaller geographic area and the new affiliate the ability to build up local supports and services. Leadership in the new affiliate may have a stronger understanding of running an affiliate based on being a part of a larger affiliate, as compared to those who start a new affiliate from scratch. For the central organization, this allows them to expand their affiliate numbers.
An interesting finding in this study focuses on the death of an affiliate, which has not been discussed in the nonprofit literature. The closing of an affiliate is not an easy decision for either the central office or the affiliate. C8 reported pressure from the board to keep affiliate numbers up during the reaffiliation process, leading to affiliates which were not fully operational remaining open. Despite pressure from their boards, respondents found that there were many times when closing an affiliate was necessary. Indeed, the death of an affiliate was labeled as normal during the conversations.

In the previous chapter, one of the themes explored was that conflicts can lead to the closing of an affiliate. Another cause of affiliate death can be related to a lack of leadership. Based on the conversations in this study, this seemed to be the main cause of death among affiliate offices. When the leadership of an affiliate is not able to make the decision to close on its own, those in the central office are able to help them figure out how to proceed. Financial issues also led to the closing of affiliates. When affiliates were unable to raise enough money to sustain themselves, they were in danger of closing. It was also reported that newer affiliates were more likely to close, as opposed to those that had been open for a longer period of time. This suggests that, although they are still part of a larger organization, affiliates may still exhibit a liability of newness (Hager, Galaskiewicz, & Larson, 2004; Stinchcombe, 1965). Lastly, sometimes there is a loss of interest locally in the affiliate. This loss of interest may also lead to the death of affiliates. That does not mean that these affiliates are closed for good. Local structures may be kept in place so that later on, a rebirth of the affiliate may happen.

Helmig, Ingerfurth, and Pinz (2013) suggest that more studies should be looking at organizational death within the nonprofit field. Due to the support of a central office,
the closing of an affiliate may look different from the closing of a nonprofit organization. For example, the central office may keep files once the affiliate closes to preserve the institutional memory for future volunteers in the area. Organization 3 discussed keeping, at points, a skeleton crew in an area where an affiliate dies so that there is no loss of resources for those who in the community who rely on the affiliate. This takes resources, though, which could be used to help maintain other affiliates or help build affiliates in other underserved areas. One major question which can be asked regarding the death of an affiliate is what happens to those who used the services. In other words, those who used the affiliate for support groups, education, or local resources will not have access to those services once the affiliate closes. Therefore, the organization needs to decide how to mitigate the loss of resources for the local population while still allowing underperforming affiliates to die.

There is a hole in the literature regarding the life cycle of nonprofit affiliates. Instead of seeing an affiliate as an ever-growing part of an MNO, it should be presented as an organization which grows and dies based on the availability of affiliate and central office resources and support. Though some organizations try to keep affiliates alive when there is a lack of leadership or local support, most MNOs in this study allowed affiliates to close when they were unable to continue to support themselves. This leads to a complex ethical issue for MNOs. By closing an affiliate, local families might lose access to services and support. By keeping the affiliate open, the central office may be utilizing limited resources to support specific areas over other, more organized areas.
CHAPTER 6: DUAL ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION IN MULTISITE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter analyzes survey data to better understand the identification of those associated with MNOs and the relationship between the affiliates and the central office. Using regression models and fuzzy set QCA, this chapter contributes to the understanding of intraorganizational relationships in MNOs.

Summary Statistics

Table 6.1 provides the summary statistics of the variables used in this study and their correlations.
Table 6.1: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIDC (1)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS (2)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIDA (3)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition (4)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time (5)</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (6)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (7)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (8)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (9)</td>
<td>1254.55</td>
<td>982.93</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, there is a negative relationship between POS and Competition (-.62) and a positive relationship between Organizational Identification toward the Central Office (OIDC) and Organizational Identification toward the Affiliate Office (OIDA) (.62).

These relationships can be seen in greater detail in Figure 6.1

---

6 These results are similar to other studies of organizational identification. For example, Cole and Bruch (2006) had a mean of 4.26, 3.97, and 4.02 for different levels of organizational identification. van Knippenberg, van Dick, and Tavares (2007) reported a mean of 4.60 of organizational identification. In looking at POS in nonprofit organizations, Nguyen & Jepsen (2015) found the mean of the measure for POS was 4.27.
Figure 6.1: Correlations

**Figure 6.1a: Organizational Identification towards the Central and Affiliate Offices**

**Figure 6.1b: Perceived Organizational Support and Competition**
Figure 6.1 illustrates the two correlations which were significant. In Figure 6.1a, as OIDC goes up, so does OIDA. A t-test (not shown) showed that there was little difference in the OIDC for those in the affiliate and those in the central office. Based on the t-test and the correlation present, two aspects of OIDC can be observed. First, for those in the affiliate, OIDC seems to be correlated with OIDA. Second, being a part of the affiliate does not lead to a significant difference in OIDC as compared to being a part of the central office. As shown in the correlation table, POS is negatively correlated with competition (Figure 6.1b).

Organizational Identification Toward the Central Office

This section uses a regression model to look at how OIDC was experienced by participants in both the central office and the affiliate office. Four models were used. Due to collinearity, Affiliate and POS were not used in the same models. Model 1 looks at POS, Length of Time, Education, Staff, and Gender. Model 2 looks at Affiliate, Length of Time, Education, Staff, and Gender. Model 3 focuses on OIDA and Distance. Lastly, Model 4 looks at POS, Length of Time, Education, Gender, OIDA, and Distance. None of the models were shown to have a VIF over 1.5, suggesting that collinearity is not an issue (Acock, 2014). Due to the use of different scales, these four models are standardized. The models can be found in Table 6.2.
Table 6.2: Regression Models for Organizational Identification Toward Central Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 Beta (p-value)</th>
<th>Model 2 Beta (p-value)</th>
<th>Model 3 Beta (p-value)</th>
<th>Model 4 Beta (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate</td>
<td>-.010 (.935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.165 (.160)</td>
<td>.111 (.290)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.188 (.112)</td>
<td>.116 (.268)</td>
<td>-.050 (.659)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.100 (.387)</td>
<td>-.090 (.387)</td>
<td>.083 (.436)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.015 (.898)</td>
<td>-.027 (.833)</td>
<td>.048 (.652)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.136 (.241)</td>
<td>-.038 (.713)</td>
<td>.134 (.191)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.570* (.000)</td>
<td>.652* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.023 (.964)</td>
<td>.032 (.716)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.001

In the four models, the only variable which was significant in understanding OIDC was OIDA. Distance was not significant in Models 3 and 4. Therefore, there was no support in this part of the study for Hypothesis 2, which suggests that distance would have a negative effect on OIDC. In Models 3 and 4, the most important aspect of OIDC seemed to be OIDA (.570 and .652 respectively, p<.001). Models 1 and 2 have low R-
squared (.069 and .023 respectively). Models 3 and 4 present a larger R-squared (.330 and .398 respectively).

Table 6.3 looks at regression models regarding organizational identification toward the affiliate office. Model 5 explores only the variable of Distance, while Model 6 adds POS and Competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 5 Beta (p-value)</th>
<th>Model 6 Beta (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>-.129 (.261)</td>
<td>-.110 (.341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.196 (.152)</td>
<td>.103 (.440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.103 (.440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Models 5 and 6, none of the variables were significant. Distance, POS, and competition toward the central office seemed to have little effect on organizational identification toward the affiliate office. Therefore, Hypothesis 5, which suggested that as competition with the central office goes up, identification with the affiliate office goes up, is not supported. Both models had low R-squared (.017 in Model 6 and .040 in Model 7).
Affiliate Identification with the Central Office

QCA was utilized to better understand how those in the affiliate office experience OIDC. In this analysis, the outcome of Organizational Identification with the Central Office (C) was explored using Organizational Identification with the Affiliate Office (A), Perceived Organizational Support (P), Conflict (C), and Distance (D). The fuzzy command in Stata (Longest & Vaisey, 2008) was used to conduct this analysis. First, a truth table was created, using a sufficiency of .800, as is recommended by Ragin (2000). This means that 80% of the outcomes in these cases are explained by the solution. The analysis can be found in Table 6.4, along with the p-value and the number of best fits. In each recipe, an uppercase letter represents membership into the variable, while the lowercase letter represents lack of membership. In other words, an uppercase letter represents the variable being present and a lowercase letter represents the variable being absent.
Table 6.4: QCA Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipe</th>
<th>Y-Consistency</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Best Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apcd</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apcD</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apCd</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apCD</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPcd</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPcD</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPCd</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPCD</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apcd</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApcD</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApCd</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApCD</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APcd</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APcD</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCd</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this, the set was reduced, using the Quine-McClusky algorithm.

Reduction first looks at all of the recipes which have a sufficiency of over .800. It then does a logical reduction. For example, if Apc and APc are both found to be significant, they will be reduced to Ac. The reduction led to the following configuration set, found in Table 6.5:
Table 6.5 Configuration Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIDA</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>⚪</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>0.852</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Solution Coverage</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table uses the notations as proposed by Ragin and Fiss (2008), where ⬤ represents present and ⚪ represents absent. In Table 6.5, three solutions are identified: OIDA and POS, OIDA and distance from the central office, or OIDA and lack of competition. The solution formula is therefore \( A(P+c+D) \rightarrow OIDC \), where \( A \) represents OIDA, \( P \) represents POS, \( c \) represents a lack of competition, and \( D \) represents distance. The outcome is OIDC and + represents the logical OR (Schneider and Wagemann, 2010). The consistencies (the scores which fit the pattern) range from .860 to .881, the unique coverage (the cases which are explained by that recipe alone) from .041 to .106, and the raw coverage (how much the recipe can explain the outcome) from .563 to .614. The overall solution consistency is .852 and the solution coverage is .801.
In the solution formula for this study, those in the affiliate need to have a high level of OIDA to have a high level of OIDC, thus supporting a dual organizational identification model. While Hypothesis 1 suggests that identification with the affiliate office will have a negative effect on identification with the central office, the models above showed that identification with the affiliate is central to identification with the central office. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is not supported. Though distance is one of the ways that one can get to a higher level of identification with the central office, it is not the only way. Hypothesis 2 suggested that distance would have a negative effect on OIDC. Having membership in distance, in this study, is associated with a higher level of OIDC. Specifically, being physically closer to the central office leads to a higher level of OIDC. Therefore, being close to the central office is positively associated with OIDC. This provides support for Hypothesis 2.

The solutions show that both POS and competition influence OIDC. Specifically, two solutions for an outcome of OIDC is OIDA and POS or OIDA and low competition. This provides some support for Hypotheses 3 and 4. Perceived Organizational Support has a positive effect (H3) and conflict has a negative effect (H4) on OIDC.

Discussion

This study looks at the organizational identification of staff and volunteer leadership within MNOs. Through regression models and QCA, this study finds many interesting aspects of the intraorganizational relationships in MNOs. This includes the strong relationship between OIDA and OIDC, whereas competition, distance, and POS
have a noticeably smaller effect. Importantly, though, OIDA is not enough alone to lead to an outcome of OIDC.

The relationship between OIDC and OIDA is an interesting outcome of this study. Those who are associated with the affiliate office tended to have a strong identification with the central office. One reason might be because, in this study, many of these affiliates are started by people approaching the central organization. They make a decision to align themselves with one specific MNO. Therefore, they may already have some identification with the central organization when building these affiliates.

This study provides support for dual organizational identification (Vora & Kostova, 2007) in MNOs. In their work, Vora and Kostova recommended looking at the strength of the identifications and the overlap. By using a QCA analysis, one can look at both the relative magnitude and the form of organizational identification. Vora and Kostova suggest that identifications could be distinct, compound, or nested. It is possible that, in this study, those in the affiliate perceived a compound or nested form of organizational identification. In a compound form, the identifications are related, leading to a dual identification. In a nested form, one identification is a part of the other identification, leading to difficulty in differentiating between the two identifications. The difference would be whether those in the affiliate have their own identification that is separate from the OIDC or if OIDA is a part of identification with the central office. It is possible that some of the identifications are compound and others are nested. But it does not seem as though there were many distinct identifications in this study.

Van Dick (2001) found that there are multiple foci within an organization with which a person can have identification. There has been debate, though, on whether these
identifications can be felt equally between levels (Edwards & Pecci, 2010) or whether one level of identification may be felt stronger than others (von Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000; Van Dick et al., 2004), with Scott and Stephens (2009) suggesting that the identification within organizations can fluctuate during the day. This study supports the research which has found that organizational identification can be felt equally among different layers of an organization. It does seem, as Sluss and Ashforth (2008) found, that identifications within MNOs are not compartmentalized. Instead, it is possible that OIDC and OIDA may be nested into one identification. Another reason why there might be a strong dual organizational identification for those in the affiliate office is that those who do not have a strong identification with the central office may leave. As has been shown in the previous two chapters, affiliate leadership may leave the organization due to conflict. Therefore, those who stay associated with the central organization may have a stronger identification overall.

Distance seemed to have a limited effect on the identification with the central office. This may be a recent phenomenon. Looking at the history of the bureaucracy of the Catholic Church, Rost and Graetzer (2014) found that distance has a negative effect on the relationship between the central office and affiliates. That study only examined the church up to the early 1900s, though. As there are now more ways to communicate than ever before, communication can easily happen without being in the same office. The impact of distance on organizational identification and organizational relationships, in general, may be mitigated by the changes in technology which allow people to communicate freely and to travel cheaply. The number of workers telecommuting and taking part in dispersed teams has been growing in nonprofits (Allen & Vakalahi, 2013).
While this may dilute the effect of distance, it does not get rid of its effects overall. Though not the only pathway toward organizational identification, being closer to the central office can lead to a higher level of organizational identification as opposed to being further away. The effect of distance can be mitigated by having higher levels of POS and low levels of competition, which are intertwined with each other.

Competition does seem to have a limited impact on OIDC. In other words, competition does play a role in organizational identification, but being closer to the central office or having high levels of POS can also help create a high level of OIDC. Competition, similarly, did not seem to have a strong relationship with OIDA. Though low competition is associated with OIDC, it is only one of the route.

Cooperation theory suggests that people will compete if their goals are not aligned and cooperate if they perceive their goals are aligned (Deutsch 1949a, b; Tjosvold, 1984). In this study, competition levels were lower when the respondents reported a higher level of perceived support from the central office. There has been limited work concerning cooperation within nonprofit organizations. Previous work has found that identification is connected to a higher level of cooperation (Kramer, 1993). Cooperation within an organization can lead to higher organizational performance (Smith et al., 2011) and help improve relationships between teams (Alper, Tjosvold, & Law, 1998). This study finds cooperation to be connected to a higher level of organizational identification. Though the affiliate and the central office may be competing for resources such as donors (Grossman & Rangan, 2001), it seems that overall competition is limited based on identification with the central office.
Another route to OIDC is through POS. Though on its own it was not shown to have a strong relationship with OIDC, POS was a part of one of the solutions which led to organizational identification. POS has been found, in other studies as well, to be associated with organizational identification (e.g. Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Ng, 2015; Zagenczyk et al., 2011). If there is a low POS in the organization, distance or conflict can make up the difference. It is possible to see POS, competition, and distance as moderating factors in OIDC.

The negative correlation between POS and competition was also identified in this study. It is not a surprise that as POS goes up, competition between the affiliate office and the central office goes down. This finding provides interesting support to the importance of POS within nonprofit organizations (Boezman & Ellemers, 2008; Nguyen & Jepson, 2015; Salim, Sadruddin, & Zakus, 2012). It is unclear whether low competition creates a higher level of POS or if higher levels of POS leads to lower levels of competition. It appears POS towards the central office has positive implications for both the affiliate office and the organization at large beyond OIDC.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

This study uses a mixed-methods approach to examine the relationship between affiliates and the central offices within Multisite Nonprofit Organizations (MNOs). Interviews with 26 staff and volunteers from the central and affiliate offices, as well as surveys from 108 staff and volunteers from central and affiliate offices, provide insight into intraorganizational relationships and structures. This study builds on the understanding of how MNOs function, which has not been explored in great detail in the literature (Cornforth, 2012; Young & Faulks, 2010).

There are many organizations which would be considered MNOs. Over 12,000 nonprofits report having affiliates on their 990s in the 2012-2013, according to the National Center for Charitable Statistics (The Urban Institute, 2013). This may not include all MNOs, such as group homes for adults with developmental disabilities. Though only providing services within a small catchment area, this type of agency would include workers who are employed in multiple homes outside of the central office. These types of smaller MNOs may not categorize affiliates in their 990s, but may still have the same intraorganizational issues which larger MNOs face.

The concluding chapter of this dissertation will be divided into four parts. To start, there will be a summary and a discussion of the findings of this study. This section explores what it means to be an MNO, why an organization would want an affiliate, and what it means to be an affiliate. It will then present a list of recommendations for MNOs on how to improve their relationships with affiliate offices. Following that, the limitations will be acknowledged, along with thoughts for future research. Lastly, there will be a brief conclusion of this dissertation.
Summary and Discussion

Though other studies have looked at organizations with affiliates (e.g. Barry et al., 2015; Grossman & Ragin, 2001; Harris, 2011; Paarlberg & Meinhold, 2012; Siddiki & Lupton, 2016), there has been limited discussion regarding what affiliation is and why it is important. Organizations have many options for reaching stakeholders without the expense of establishing new offices. What do organizations gain by having an affiliate office on the ground? One perspective is the affiliate would increase fundraising in local areas. Indeed, some organizations have affiliates for the purpose of raising money for the central organization. For other organizations, central offices gain funds from the affiliates through their fee structure. As local affiliates grow, there are more fees being directed to the central office. Though this study builds on the understanding of the affiliate, it may be difficult to expand the results to all nonprofits which have affiliates, as it focuses only on one type of MNO: disease specific nonprofits. Instead, this study provides an exploration into these relationships, which can be utilized by future researchers to explore the organizational behavior in other types of MNOs.

Another use of affiliation is to provide social services to a specific area. It can be hard for a central office to provide services in places which are far away. The establishment of affiliates helps a central office extend its reach. With affiliate offices, even small ones, volunteers and staff are able to connect with local patients, families, and professionals to provide education and support. The central offices of nonprofits in this
study, for the most part, did not decide where to open affiliates and, therefore, how to distribute services nationally. Instead, they waited for volunteers to reach out to the central organization, leading to an inability of the central office to plan or strategize where these services will be. The few MNOs which discussed starting an affiliate using top-down processes expressed difficulty with managing these affiliates and providing support locally. Not every affiliate, though, provides social services. In summary, affiliates are able to provide localized services, but their bottom-up origins lead to difficulty in strategic planning for MNOs.

These two uses of affiliation, fundraising and services, create a stronger understanding of the purpose of MNOs. Affiliation is not just organizational growth, but a relationship between the central office and the local community. Identification, cooperation, conflict, and POS are four aspects of this relationship. Looking at these aspects in particular can help create a greater understanding of MNOS and the way they provide supports and services.

Identification with the central organization is an important aspect of being a part of an MNO. What is interesting, from this study, is that most people who work in affiliates have a strong organizational identification towards the central office. This was not impacted dramatically by distance. Therefore, Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported. This may be due to the bottom-up process by which affiliates are established. Instead of central offices making decisions on where to place these affiliates, volunteers are the ones who determine that they would like to create an affiliate specifically with the organization. This may create a sense of identification with the central office from the start. Conversely, this also creates an issue regarding who wants to start an affiliate. It
limits the pool of leadership to those who are affected by the disease. Although in this study some of the affiliates were staff-led, almost all of the affiliates were created by volunteers and, eventually, raised enough funds so that they were able to hire staff. This led to the affiliate leadership being comprised of people who had other responsibilities, either taking care of themselves or caring for others with the disease. Furthermore, this process also led to the central office’s inability to strategically plan where the affiliates should be placed. Instead, affiliates are created when there are volunteers in the area available to support the initial start-up.

Though POS was not found to be significant for OIDC in the regression models, it was part of the solutions in the QCA model, therefore providing some support for Hypothesis 3. Hypotheses 4 and 5 suggested that competition with the central office will have a negative effect on OIDC and a positive effect on OIDA, respectively. There was no support for Hypothesis 5. Though the regression models did not find support for competition’s impact on OIDC, based on the QCA analysis, a lack of competition is one of the ways in which a person from the affiliate office may experience OIDC, in conjunction with OIDA. Therefore, there is some support for Hypothesis 4, but the impact of competition on the relationship between the affiliate and the central office should be examined in more depth in future research.

The impact of distance in this study is interesting because it is a variable which cannot be changed. Identification, competition, conflict, and POS are variables which may fluctuate based on intraorganizational and interpersonal relationships. One cannot change the distance of an affiliate from the central office. The use of technology can help mitigate the issues connected with distance. Distance is one of the aspects that makes an
MNO a unique type of nonprofit. Though many organizations have multiple layers and teams, an MNO has to deal both of these factors in multiple locations. This leads to efforts by MNOs to maintain identification, minimize conflict and competition, and keep consistent messaging in multiple offices. These efforts will look different from those organizations in a single site.

Cooperation and conflict were connected themes regarding intraorganizational relationships within MNOs. What made conflicts in MNOs unique, as compared to intraorganizational conflicts which may exist within a single site organization, is that they can lead to competition between the affiliate office and the central office. These conflicts and competitions may be unique in an MNO due to the distance between the affiliate and the central office. Furthermore, with many of the affiliate offices doing their own fundraising, the affiliate office may compete for resources with the central office, which would not be seen as often in an organization within a single site. These conflicts are interesting because they show the unique issues which MNOs face. These conflicts come from a variety of sources, such as a misunderstanding from the central office or the affiliate office due to being unaware of the resources available. Being in multiple sites, the conflicts which MNOs face are unique aspects of nonprofit organizational behavior.

**Recommendations**

This study aims to provide guidance for the ways in which MNOs can improve their relationships with affiliate offices. Below are recommendations for MNOs, based on the study above.
1) **Build organizational support through communication**: Organizational identification toward the central office is based on multiple factors. Although distance can have a negative effect on identification, this can be mitigated. Multiple strategies can be used to build up relationships between the central office and the affiliates. For example, some organizations have specific employees who are responsible for maintaining relationships with the affiliate offices. These employees act as a point person in the central office to whom the affiliates can talk. This person can act as a public face for the organization to the affiliates. They can help the affiliate better understand the policies and procedures from the central office while also helping them achieve their goals. Especially in volunteer-run affiliates, having a nonprofit professional assisting the affiliate can help the affiliate grow. Furthermore, building up communication through a newsletter, regularly scheduled individual or group calls, or educational webinars can help affiliates create a stronger connection with the central office, as well as their peers in other affiliates.

2) **Conflicts and competition can be limited through support from the central office**: It is hard to tell, at this point, if lower competition leads to a higher POS or if a higher POS leads to lower levels of competition. It does seem easier, though, to create a sense of support towards the affiliates so as to help lower the levels of conflict and competition between the central office and affiliate offices. Creating frequent and supportive communication between the central office and the affiliate office, especially through designated employees, can help build up this support. Those in the affiliate expressed, during the interviews, that they would like the central office staff to come to events, though the affiliate representatives understand that this is not always possible due to
limitations of funding and time. An acknowledgement of the events, such as an e-mail or phone call after the fact may help the affiliate office feel recognized by the central office. For bigger organizations, the problem can become that there are too many affiliates and only one person to maintain those relationships. In these situations, it may help to have multiple employees dispersed across the country working with the affiliates. Importantly, the central office should help the affiliates feel as though they are not alone and help build up their identification with the organization as a whole.

3) Creating a sense of community among affiliates: Identification does not only have to come from the central office. Many organizations have found ways to create relationships between the affiliates, including listservs, webinars, and in-person meetings before conferences and/or advocacy days. This may help limit a feeling of isolation among affiliates and help create a sense of community. Assisting the affiliate leadership to connect with other affiliates can also aid in the creation of best-practices for the MNO.

4) Allow affiliates to die: Instead of working toward constantly keeping struggling affiliates afloat, it is sometimes best to allow underperforming affiliates to die. Closing affiliates should be seen as a normal part of the affiliate lifecycle. Furthermore, better information on why affiliates are closing can help organizations be proactive in keeping affiliates open. An exit interview with affiliate leadership, when possible, can provide valuable information for the MNO on their affiliate programming and support. Through an exit interview or survey, an MNO can better gauge how they can support affiliates and what might cause affiliate death in their agency.
5) Work with the affiliates around fees: Fees are both a source of conflict as well as a reason that some affiliates die. Some organizations are exploring providing an itemized list of what fees provide to the affiliate. That way, affiliates can better understand how fees are used by the central office to support affiliates and the organization as a whole. Concern has been expressed from those in the affiliates that, as they grow, they do not see an increase in funds because the amount paid to the central office goes up as well. Working with the affiliates to understand how growth is good as well as the organization as a whole would help limit these concerns.

6) Needs Assessments: One thing which might be of use to MNOs is a needs assessment to better understand the local challenges of affiliates for their specific organizations. For smaller organizations, this can include interviews with each of the volunteer boards or focus groups. For larger groups, a survey might be a better use of time, along with one or two focus groups. These assessments can help guide the organization in building affiliates and improving affiliate relationships. Specific questions can focus on what type of support affiliates would like to receive from the central offices, what challenges they experience in providing localized services and fundraising, and how the affiliates perceive their relationship with the central office.

7) Contracting and Reaffiliation: Most MNOs in this study had a yearly the reaffiliation process. Yearly reaffiliation allows the central office to check in with the affiliate leadership annually to see where they are, what issues they are facing, and which
affiliates are not meeting the needs of the organization or the local constituency. This process also allows for updates to the affiliation contracts, allowing for changes in the requirements for what the affiliates can/should be offering and the expectations of the central office as appropriate. By going through the reaffiliation process regularly, the affiliates and the central office can make sure they are all on the same page regarding what is expected and how the organization should move forward.

Limitations and Future Research

There are many limitations to this study. To start, this study focused on disease-specific organizations in the United States. This may lead to certain biases. For example, due to the fact that they were disease-specific organizations, one issue which was discussed was that there was a limited pool of available volunteer leadership. This might be unique to disease-specific agencies. Furthermore, the organizations which took part in this study all worked in the United States exclusively. Differences may exist in MNOs based out of Europe, Asia, Latin America, or Africa. Difficulties faced by INGOs, due to cultural and physical distance as well as international differences in NGO oversight and legal requirements, might be different than MNOs within one country. Future research can consider organizational identification and conflicts within INGOs and compare that to national or local MNOs. Studies can explore how organizational identification within MNOs may differ in different countries. How MNOs in Japan manage identification may look different than in South Africa or the United States, for example.

This study looked at only nine MNOs. It is possible that organizations which decided to take part in this study were unique in some way. Larger studies of MNOs can
provide different insight into the diversity of this type of organization. Furthermore, there was a low response rate for the survey. This might indicate that those who had a high identification with the organization were more likely to fill out the survey. Response bias may also exist in those who agreed to be interviewed. Other means of surveying and interviewing those in the central office and affiliates could bring about interesting results in understanding intraorganizational behavior within MNOs. Other research, such as a network analysis, may provide additional insight into how affiliates relate to each other as well as the central organization.

Lastly, this study only looks at very specific variables which may affect organizational identification. It is possible that other variables may affect identification with the central and affiliate organization. For example, attachment to the mission of the organization may impact the OIDC for those in the affiliate. Having more data to understand this phenomenon can help organizations expand their services and build better relationships across their network. This study also looks at organizations which tend to have a bottom-up approach to starting affiliates. How a top-down approach affects organizational identification can help MNOs figure out which way is right for them.

Future research can be used to create a better understanding of how these types of conflicts play out in nonprofit organizations. A longitudinal case study of how a nonprofit organization deals or does not deal with conflict can provide insight into the way conflict plays out in nonprofit organizations and its effect on the organization in general. From this study, we can see that conflicts can lead to volunteers and paid staff, or even affiliates, leaving the nonprofit organization. Why some of these conflicts lead to this dissolution while others do not is something that I was unable to ascertain in this study.
Case studies looking at the closure of affiliate offices or surveys of affiliates which have closed can help researchers gain further insight into how affiliates die and the affiliate lifecycle. Furthermore, this line of research can help MNOs identify what may lead to the closing of an affiliate and ways to manage this closure of an affiliate. Affiliate creation and growth are other areas where there are opportunities for future research. Barry et al. (2015) presents one of the few articles exploring how affiliates are established. Understanding the complexities of affiliates, including their genesis and their relationships with the central office, is an area of research which can provide insight into the inner-workings of MNOs.

Further quantitative research can provide interesting exploration into the trust and requirements in a nonprofit organization. There have been many scales of organizational trust established (for more information on this, see Diezt and Den Hartog, 2006).

Understanding both the actual number of requirements, as well as the perceived number of requirements, can help create insight into the interplay between trust and requirements in how affiliates see conflict in MNOs.

**Conclusions**

This study builds on the understanding of MNOs, a unique type of nonprofit organization. In this analysis, several aspects of MNOs are explored. It starts by looking at the definition of an MNO and the research into MNOs which exists in the nonprofit management literature. Furthermore, this study looks at the research which has explored Multinational Enterprises to see how the field of nonprofit management can use this work to better understand MNOs. Lastly, looking at the literature around organizational
behavior, this study uses dual organizational identification and cooperation theory to better understand the intraorganizational relationships between affiliates and central offices.

The next chapter explores the conflicts which exist within an MNO and the outcomes which may happen due to these conflicts. This includes conflicts found both in this study and those which have been identified by previous studies in the nonprofit management literature. It also identifies moderators of conflict, such as distance and trust. These moderators are not causes of conflict themselves, but their existence can either limit the impact of the conflicts or make the conflict worse. The outcomes of conflicts range from no change in the organization to the death of an affiliate office.

It then looks at the structure of MNOs and the lifecycle of affiliate organizations. To better understand the structure of MNOs, this study uses centralization (through the lens of 501(c)(3) status) and whether the affiliate is staff-run or volunteer-run. This 3x3 matrix allows researchers to explore the diversity of MNOs and start to understand how that diversity affects the way central offices interact with their affiliates. Importantly, it also shows how, even within the same organization, there is a diversity of structures.

Furthermore, the affiliate lifecycle is presented. Amending the organizational lifecycle as proposed by Hager and colleagues (1996), instead of a linear process, this study suggests a circular process which can, eventually, lead to the death of the affiliate.

Lastly, this study uses fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis to better understand organizational identification towards the central office. It finds that there are multiple routes to identification towards the central office, but they all utilize identification toward the affiliate office. In other words, even though there are multiple
variables which can create identification toward the central office, identification toward the affiliate is necessary. It furthermore finds that a lack of competition, support from the central office, or being physically close to the central office all help in building organizational identification toward the central office in the affiliate office.
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APPENDIX A: SURVEY

Q1 I am a PhD candidate in the department of Public Affairs and administration at Rutgers University, and I am conducting interviews for my dissertation. I am studying the relationship which affiliate and central offices have in national organizations and best practices which are used.

During this study, you will be asked to answer some questions as to the relationship you have with your organization. This interview was designed to be approximately twenty to thirty minutes in length. However, please feel free to expand on the topic or talk about related ideas. Also, if there are any questions you would rather not answer or that you do not feel comfortable answering, please say so and we will stop the interview or move on to the next question, whichever you prefer.

This research is confidential. Confidential means that the research records will include some information about you and this information will be stored in such a manner that some linkage between your identity and the response in the research exists. Some of the information collected about you includes your gender and tenure with the agency. Please note that we will keep this information confidential by limiting individual's access to the research data and keeping it in a secure location. The data gathered in this study are confidential with respect to your personal identity unless you specify otherwise. The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only parties that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated. All study data will be kept for an indefinite period of time. You are aware that your participation in this interview is voluntary. You understand the intent and purpose of this research. If, for any reason, at any time, you wish to stop the interview, you may do so without having to give an explanation. The risks of participation include: There are no risks to participate in this study.

You have been told that the benefits of taking part in this study may be an executive study with aggregated information on the best practices used across various organizations. However, you may receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study. There are two parts of this study: A survey and an interview. The interviews will be recorded. The recording(s) will be used for analysis by the research team. If you say anything that you believe at a later point may be hurtful and/or damage your reputation, then you can ask the interviewer to rewind the recording and record over such information OR you can ask that certain text be removed from the dataset/transcripts. The recording(s) will be stored on a private laptop in a locked file folder. The recordings will be retained indefinitely. If you have any questions about the study or study procedures, you may contact myself, Seth J. Meyer, at seth.meyer@rutgers.edu or via phone at (516) 996-4733. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Lindsey McDougle, at lindsey.mcdougle@rutgers.edu or via phone at (973) 353 – 5336. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers (which is a committee that reviews research studies in order to protect research participants). Institutional Review Board

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey Liberty Plaza / Suite 3200335 George Street, 3rd Floor New Brunswick, NJ 08901Phone: 732-235-2866
Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

Please contact Seth J Meyer at seth.meyer@rutgers.edu for a copy of this consent form.

Once you have read the above form and, with the understanding that you can withdraw at any time and for whatever reason, you need to let me know your decision to participate in today’s survey and/or interview. If you agree to participate in a future interview, your e-mail address and phone number will be obtained at the beginning of this interview. It will be deleted either once the interview is completed or if you decide to not participate in the interview.

☐ I agree to take part in this survey. (1)

☐ I am interested in taking part in an interview at a future date. (2)

---

Q39 If you are interested in being interviewed to discuss this topic further, please include your name and e-mail address below.

☐ Name (1) ________________________________________________

☐ E-mail address (2) __________________________________________

---

Page Break
Q21 Are you based in the central or affiliate office?

- Central Office (1)
- Affiliate Office (2)

Skip To: Q28 If Are you based in the central or affiliate office? = Central Office

Page Break

Q5 Please answer the questions below concerning the affiliate office for which you work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When someone criticizes the organization, it feels like a personal insult. (1)

I am very interested in what others think about the organization. (2)

When I talk about the organization, I usually say “we” rather than “they.” (3)

The organization’s successes are my successes. (4)

When someone praises the organization, it feels like a personal compliment. (5)

If a story on the media criticized the organization, I would feel embarrassed. (6)
Q4 Please answer the questions below concerning the central office of your organization.

| The organization’s headquarters values my office’s contribution to its well-being (1) |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| (1) (1) | (2) (2) | (3) (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) (7) |

- The organization’s headquarters fails to appreciate any extra effort from my office. (2)
- The organization’s headquarters strongly considers my office’s goals and values. (3)
- The organization’s headquarters would ignore any complaint from my office. (4)
The organization’s headquarters disregards my office’s best interests when it makes decisions. (5)

Help is available from the organization’s headquarters when my office has a problem. (6)

The organization’s headquarters really cares about my office’s well-being. (7)

Even if my office did the best job possible, the organization’s headquarters would fail to notice. (8)

The organization’s headquarters shows very little concern for my office. (9)
The organization’s headquarters cares about my office’s opinions. (10)
Q6 Please answer below about your relationship with the central office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neutral (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We regularly compete for the limited resources with the headquarters. (1)

When the headquarters talks about distribution of resources across offices, tensions frequently run high. (2)

Chapter/affiliate offices regularly compete with each other for more attention and time from the headquarters. (3)

To get more resources for our office, other offices oftentimes have to make sacrifices. (4)

Individual offices here try to obtain more time and attention from the headquarters even at the cost of other functions. (5)
Each office is constantly compared and benchmarked with other offices to improve efficiency in the organization. (6)

Most offices here try to gain more strategic importance and power inside the organization. (7)

Protecting an office’s turf is considered to be a way of life in this organization. (8)

People from different offices feel that the goals of their respective departments are in harmony with the headquarters. (9)
Q25 What is the approximate operating budget of your affiliate

- Less than $250,000 (9)
- $250,000 to $499,999 (1)
- $500,000 to $999,999 (2)
- $1 million to less than $2.5 million (3)
- $2.5 million to less than $5 million (4)
- $5 million to less than $10 million (5)
- $10 million to less than $25 million (6)
- $25 million to less than $50 million (7)
- $50 million + (8)

Q37 How many paid staff members are in your office or affiliate?

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2-5 (3)
- 5+ (4)

Q15 Approximately how many miles away is your office from the central office?

________________________________________________________________
Q35 How close do you feel to the central office (1=not very close, 7=very close)

- 1 (not very) (1)
- 2 (8)
- 3 (2)
- 4 (neutral) (3)
- 5 (4)
- 6 (5)
- 7 (very close) (6)

Q17 Does your office perform its own fundraising independent of the central office?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q18 If yes, approximately how much money do you raise yearly?

________________________________________________________________
Q41 Does your office file tax documents/990 form separately from the central office?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- I don't know (4)
Q28 Please answer the questions below concerning the central office of your organization for which you work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The organization’s values my contribution to its well-being</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1) (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2) (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3) (3)</th>
<th>Neutral (4) (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5) (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6) (6)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7) (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization would ignore any complaint.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions.</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help is available from the organization when I have a problem. (6)

The organization’s headquarters really cares about my well-being. (7)

Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice. (8)

The organization shows very little concern for me. (9)

The organization cares about my opinions. (10)
Q9 Please answer the questions below concerning the central headquarters of your organization for which you work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When someone criticizes the organization, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very interested in what others think about the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I talk about the organization, I usually say “we” rather than “they.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s successes are my successes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone praises this organization, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a story on the media criticized the organization, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27 What is the approximate operating budget of your central office

- Less than $500,000 (1)
- $500,000 to $999,999 (2)
- $1 million to less than $2.5 million (3)
- $2.5 million to less than $5 million (4)
- $5 million to less than $10 million (5)
- $10 million to less than $25 million (6)
- $25 million to less than $50 million (7)
- $50 million + (8)
- Unknown (9)
Q20 For how long have you been associated with the organization?

- Less than 1 year (1)
- 1-3 years (2)
- 3-5 years (3)
- 5-10 years (4)
- 10+ years (5)

Q40 My highest level of education is:

- Some High School, no diploma (1)
- High School graduate, diploma, or equivalent (for example: GED) (2)
- Some college credit, no degree (3)
- Associate degree (4)
- Bachelor's degree (5)
- Master's degree/Professional degree (6)
- Doctoral degree (7)
Q22 When you first started being affiliated with the program you now work, was it the same organization it is now or a part of a different organization?

- Same (1)
- Different (2)

Q26 Are you a volunteer or a paid staff member?

- Volunteer (1)
- Paid Staff Member (2)

Q33 I identify as...

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Other (3)

Q36 What kind of work does your office do?

________________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Default Question Block
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The interviews will be semi-structured interviews conducted in person or via phone, depending on availability of both the interviewer and respondent. The semi-structured aspect will allow for additional questions during the interview that may elicit more information on organizational identification, perceived organizational support, and cooperation within an organization.

1) For how long have you worked with the organization?
2) Approximately how far are you from the central office?
3) Do you feel like you are employed by the central office or the affiliate office?
4) How often do you communicate with people in the central office?
5) Do you ever communicate with other chapters? If so, how often? What do those communications look like?
6) Do you feel more connected to your local office or your central office?
7) Have you ever created a program specifically for your local constituency?
8) Have you ever changed programs or services provided by the central office to fit your needs?
9) Do you feel as though you work for the central office or for your affiliate office?
10) If the central office wants you to do a program or raise funds, do you feel obligated to do it?
11) How often do you visit the central office? How often do you communicate with the staff in the central office?
12) Do you feel that you have a friendly relationship with those in the central office? What about other affiliates?
13) How many employees/volunteers are in your affiliate office?
14) In what ways do you feel other organizations can learn from your organization?
15) In what ways would you like to see your organization improve?
16) Are there any challenges you face due to your size and distance from the main organization?
17) What about your organization are you proud of?
CEO Interview

1) What makes an affiliate or chapter office?

2) How do you decide where to have new affiliate offices?

3) What do you expect from an affiliate? What are their roles and responsibilities?

4) What support do you provide for the affiliates? What employees are expected to work with the affiliates?

5) What support do the affiliates give to you? What do you get from having affiliates and chapters across the country?

6) Have you ever said no to building an affiliate? Why?

7) What recommendations would you give to organizations as they expand?

8) Are there ways that you would like to improve your affiliate/chapter program?

9) Are there ever disagreements between the chapter and central offices? What are they generally about? What ways are they dealt with?