

Describing the Nature of Collaboration in Nonprofit Organizations that
Serve the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ)
Community in Texas

Leonides Gomez Jr.

Applied Research Project

lg1317@txstate.edu



The rising STAR of Texas

Submitted to the Department of Political Science
Texas State University-San Marcos
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Public Administration

Spring 2017

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to describe who nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, how and why they collaborate. This research uses the literature to develop a conceptual framework that organizes the nature of collaboration into the following five categories: types of collaborators, models of collaboration, acquisition of resources, improvement of program outcomes, and organizational needs.

Data and Methods

Data were collected via a web survey to address the nature of collaboration of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. The survey was distributed to administrators of nonprofit organizations in Texas that serve the LGBTQ community. This survey was sent to 62 administrators, however, 16 of the emails containing the survey bounced. Of the 46 administrators that received the survey, 15 of them completed it. This survey had a response rate of 33%.

Findings

The results of this research revealed that all nonprofit organizations studied collaborated with at least one public, private and nonprofit organization. While the model of collaboration use varied, most nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community reported that they collaborate with other nonprofits via a network. There was overwhelming agreement amongst all administrators that collaboration led to the acquisition of resources and the improvement of program outcomes.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Conceptual Framework.....	5
Chapter Purpose.....	5
Conceptual Framework.....	5
Types of Collaborators.....	5
1.1 Public Organizations.....	6
1.2 Private Organizations.....	7
1.3 Nonprofit Organizations.....	8
Models of Collaboration.....	10
2.1 Networks.....	11
2.2 Partnerships.....	13
2.3 Contractual Agreements.....	14
Acquisition of Resources.....	16
3.1 Financial Resources.....	16
3.2 Enhance Capacities.....	18
3.3 Non-monetary Resources.....	19
Improvement of Program Outcomes.....	21
4.1 Increase in Number of People Served.....	22
4.2 Improve Programs/Services.....	23
Organizational Needs.....	24
5.1 Meeting Mandates and Pressures to Collaborate.....	24
5.2 Institutional Legitimacy.....	26
Summary of Conceptual Framework.....	27
Table 2.1 Conceptual Framework.....	28
Chapter III: Methods.....	30
Chapter Purpose.....	30
Research Participants.....	30
Operationalization of Conceptual Framework.....	30
Survey Instrument.....	31
Research Procedure.....	33
Data Collection.....	34
Human Subject Protection.....	36
Chapter Summary.....	37
Table 3.1 Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework.....	37
Chapter IV: Results.....	40
Chapter Purpose.....	40
Respondent Characteristics.....	40
Analytic Plan.....	43
Findings.....	43
Types of Collaborators.....	43
Models of Collaboration.....	45
Acquisition of Resources.....	47

Improvement of Program Outcomes.....	48
Organizational Needs.....	49
Additional Questions.....	50
Chapter Summary.....	51
Chapter V: Conclusion.....	52
Chapter Purpose.....	52
Research Summary.....	52
Key Findings.....	53
Table 5.1: Key Findings.....	54
Limitations.....	54
Future Research.....	55
References.....	57
Appendix.....	62

Chapter I: Introduction

Bayard Rustin was a civil rights activist who changed the shape of social protest alongside Martin Luther King Jr. in the 1960's (Rustin, Carbado, & Weise, 2003). "At a 1986 gathering of Black and White Men Together, an interracial gay organization, he explained that "[t]wenty-five years ago, if you were to know whether a person was truly for democracy, you asked a simple question, 'What about blacks?' . . . To ask that question now about blacks . . . is no longer the central question. If you want to know whether today people believe in democracy . . . the question to ask is, 'What about people who are gay?' Because that is now the litmus paper by which this democracy is to be judged" (Rustin, et al., 2003, p. xxxix). Although Bayard Rustin spoke these words three decades ago, they unfortunately still resonate in today's society.

While the gay rights movement has seen its fair share of accomplishments in the twenty-first century, with the repeal of the U.S. military's Don't Ask Don't Tell policy and the Supreme Court's ruling on marriage equality, members of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) community still face many economic, social, legal, and health injustices. These types of issues are unique to the LGBTQ community because they all stem from society's prejudice toward their sexual orientation and/or gender identity. Thousands of people within the LGBTQ community do not have the same level of job security as their heterosexual counterparts and the community faces higher rates of depression. According to Mustanski, Andrews, and Puckett (2016), "community-based samples of LGBT

youths have shown that as many as 30% may experience psychological distress at clinically significant levels—including symptoms of somatization, depression, and anxiety” (p. 527). The vital work to address pressing LGBTQ issues such as these must be addressed by means of collaboration between nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community and other entities.

According to Donaldson (2007), “the nonprofit sector makes an enormous contribution to society providing needed services to disadvantaged populations by offering vehicles for charitable and volunteer impulses . . . and serving as a moral compass for responses to social problems” (p. 141). Specifically, organizations serving the LGBTQ community provide them with much needed resources such as mental health services, crisis intervention, suicide prevention services, empowerment programs and events, housing services, and HIV/AIDS care. Many LGBTQ nonprofit organizations, such as the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), focus their attention on securing and protecting LGBTQ rights via political action and education. While some larger organizations such as the HRC have sufficient resources and capacities, others, such as community-level nonprofit organizations, do not. Due to the fact that many LGBTQ organizations are plagued by a severe lack of sufficient resources and funding, inter-organizational collaboration is now necessary.

A lack of funding to provide quality services is a major roadblock faced by many nonprofit organizations. According to Surfus (2013), there are 8.7 million LGBTQ people in this country, which is approximately 3.8% of the United States’ population (p. 70). However, grant dollars allocated to organizations that serve the

LGBTQ community from government agencies only amount to 0.22% of all grantmaking dollars distributed (Surfus, 2013, p. 71). Hence, deficient funding is a major contributing factor as to why most nonprofit organizations are now collaborating with other entities. Nonprofit organizations view collaboration as not just a new trend in the field, but as a necessity in order to provide the community with quality services.

Agranoff (2012) claims that collaboration is “aimed at creating or discovering solutions within given sets of constraints, for example, knowledge, time money, competition, and/or conventional wisdom” (p. 2). Collaboration between two or more entities allows for the sharing of individual organizational resources. This effort of resource contribution facilitates the delivery of services that address complex issues. A great amount of literature covers the topic of collaboration and its pervasiveness among public, private, and nonprofit entities. Despite this, Sowa (2009) claims that, “no dominant theory has yet been developed that fully explains why organizations engage in collaborations and what they seek to obtain from these collaborations” (p. 1005). Further, there is a lack of literature that assesses the circumstances that surround the collaboration of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community and other entities in the state of Texas.

In order to better serve its target population, nonprofit organizations collaborate with different levels of government, the private sector, and other nonprofit organizations. Recently, nonprofit organizations have also changed their leadership and management style to mirror those used in the private sector, while businesses have continued to broaden their social scope by contributing their

resources to help address communal needs. Although the nonprofit actor and the community may reap the most benefit from this relatively new trend of cross-sector collaboration, it is beneficial for all entities involved. While nonprofit organizations benefit by attaining the resources they need to provide more robust services to the community via collaboration, the meeting of external pressures to contribute to society also benefits the reputations of private organizations. Also, collaboration involving the government results in a public recognition that agencies are actively contributing to finding solutions to humanitarian issues and thus, invested in improving the quality of life of its citizens.

There are various terms used to label one or more entities coming together to serve the community. The various terms used in the literature include: partnership, coordination, network, and joint working. The use of synonymous terms has the potential to cause confusion because these terms may hold different meanings to different organizations. For the purpose of uniformity, the term “collaboration” will be used in this research to describe two or more entities working together in any capacity.

With both the demand for services and the competition for financial resources increasing, collaboration is needed to provide both efficient and effective public service. The entities in which nonprofit organizations collaborate with, the models of collaboration used, and the motives behind collaboration are important factors that required careful consideration in this research. The purpose of this research is to describe who nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, how and why they collaborate.

Chapter II: Conceptual Framework

Chapter Purpose

This chapter reviews the scholarly literature on collaboration in nonprofit organizations (NPOs), the models of collaboration used, and the motivations behind their collaboration. The information in this chapter will provide a thorough review of collaboration in NPOs. A conceptual framework that illustrates with who, how, and why NPOs collaborate is presented at the end of this chapter.

Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this research is to describe nonprofit collaboration and the conceptual framework serves as a tool to categorize the various aspects of collaboration. In *A Playbook for Research Methods*, Shields and Rangarajan (2013), present the conceptual framework of categories and elements. A thorough review of the literature undertaken to describe the nature of collaboration in NPOs resulted in five descriptive categories. They were: 1) types of collaborators, 2) models of collaboration, 3) acquisition of resources, 4) improvement of program outcomes, and 5) organizational needs. In this chapter, each category and its accompanying elements will be presented and explained in detail.

Category 1: Types of Collaborators

This category refers to the types of entities who collaborate with NPOs to solve issues related to their mission. The literature suggests that, in general, NPOs collaborate with one or more of the following entities: 1) public organizations, 2)

private organizations, and 3) nonprofit organizations. NPOs collaborate with public organizations, such as government agencies, private organizations, such as businesses, and other nonprofit organizations that share similar missions, values and target population.

1.1 Public Organizations

Levitt (2012) defines the “public sector” as a “part of the economy which is paid for (largely) from taxation and operated by central or local government, their agents and agencies” (p. 3). NPOs collaborate with public organizations such as government agencies at the federal, state, and local level to deliver public services. Moran, Joyce, Barraket, MacKenzie, and Foenander (2016) cite Salamon (2002) who claims that, “over the past two decades the function of government has decisively shifted in favour of governance” (p. 331). Due to this shift in focus and the growing public demand, government agencies are calling on NPOs to play a larger role in delivering public services that will improve citizens’ quality of life.

Contracts and grants outline the collaboration between NPOs and government agencies. These formal documents, created by government agencies, dictate which programs and services to deliver to the community and in what manner. In other words, programs and services delivered to a community are dependent on state, county, or municipal grants and contracts (Cohen, 2013). NPOs collaborate with government agencies to acquire funding for their existing programs or to expand existing programs and services. It is typical for a NPO to manage various grants and contracts from different government agencies at one

time (Cohen, 2013). As the government is unable to solve all problems without the help of other entities, the nonprofit sector has become an integral component of public service delivery.

The ongoing relationship between United Way and various government agencies is a notable example of collaboration between government and a NPO. United Way is a successful NPO that operates in “nearly 1,800 communities across more than 40 countries and territories worldwide” (United Way, 2016). United Way is focused on community-based involvement and a key component of their strategy involves collaborating with local government agencies. The success of this organization would be more difficult to attain without collaborating with local governments via grants and contracts in countries around the world.

1.2 Private Organizations

NPOs are known to collaborate with private organizations such as private foundations and businesses. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and the company, Timberland, both collaborate with nonprofit organizations to make a difference in communities around the world.

A notable collaboration between the nonprofit sector and a private foundation is the work done by the BMGF and various NPOs around the world. The BMGF is the largest private foundation in the country and has various programs focused on humanitarian efforts around the world. The foundation emphasizes the importance of working with local communities to make a difference. The BMFG website states, “Our job is to get results. We know that our results depend on the

quality of our partnerships” (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2016). With U.S. investor Warren Buffet announcing in 2006 that he will “contribute another US\$30 billion over the next decades,” the foundation and its collaborators have a bright future (Matthews & Ho, 2008, p. 409).

In addition to collaborating with private foundations, NPOs also collaborate with businesses. For example, the nonprofit organization, City Year, and the company, Timberland, have worked alongside each other for over two decades, placing admirable young adults into ten-month long community service projects. These young adults contribute their time to work on urban public education, leadership, and civic engagement (Crossroads’ Global Hand, 2016). According to Crossroads’ Global Hand’s website, “Timberland is a founding sponsor of the not-for-profit organisation City Year, making it the first youth service corps launched entirely through private sector support” (Crossroads’ Global Hand, 2016). This collaboration includes “Timberland donat[ing] financial support, products, employee volunteers, and management expertise” (Peloza & Falkenberg, 2009, p. 95).

1.3 Nonprofit Organizations

The literature refers to the term “nonprofit organizations (NPOs)” in various ways including: non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the voluntary sector, not-for-profit organizations, and the third sector. These terms are synonymous and are defined by the National Council of Nonprofits (2016) as “groups that are tax-exempt under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) as ‘public charities’ because they are

formed to provide 'public benefit'." This research will use the term "nonprofit organizations" or its acronym, "NPOs," when referring to these types of organizations.

Proulx, Hager, and Klein (2014) claim that, "the most common variety of interorganizational collaboration is when nonprofit organizations collaborate with each other, creating a dense web of information and resource sharing across the sector" (p. 747). This resource sharing usually occurs between NPOs that share common ground and serve the same target population. For example, two NPOs that serve LGBTQ youth are likely to collaborate on issues due to their common ground and shared interests. Collaboration between two organizations can range from short, informal collaboration to longer, more formal collaboration. The particulars of the collaboration depend on the specific issue that is being addressed and the collaborative strategy created.

Cases of two or more NPOs joining forces can be seen at the community, state, and national level. Smaller, community-level NPOs collaborate to handle specific issues affecting the LGBTQ population in their area, while national NPOs collaborate with smaller, community-based NPOs to facilitate measurable changes at the community level around the country. Since all organizations involved provide services to the same target population, collaboration between similar NPOs also decreases the likelihood of mission drift.

Category 2: Models of Collaboration

This category refers to the models of collaboration NPOs use when collaborating with other entities. Typically, nonprofit organizations collaborate via: 1) networks, 2) partnerships, and 3) contractual agreements.

Lewis, Baeza, and Alexander (2008) state that, “partnerships cover a multitude of coordination mechanisms, from public-private partnerships which can in effect be straightforward contracts, through to voluntary alliances between agencies where no funding is involved” (p. 280). These options include “short-term informal relationships (such as consultation, networking, or basic coordination for a particular project or short period of time) to long-term relationships (such as joint ventures and mergers), where the organisations merge to form one entity” (Lathlean, 2015, p. 594).

In addition to the various ways in which nonprofit organizations collaborate, the literature also suggests that there is a variety of interchangeable terms used for each type of collaboration. This, consequently, creates confusion that “impedes conceptual clarity” regarding how nonprofit organizations collaborate (Cornforth, Hayes, & Vangen, 2014, p.777). “There is confusion around the definition and terminology of partnership working, with many other labels – collaboration, coordination, co-operation, joint working, interagency working, networking and others – being used. Whichever term is used, it can mean different things to different people under different circumstances” (Wildridge, Childs, Cawthra, & Madge, 2004, p. 4). Adding to the confusion is the fact that there are many different

ways that entities collaborate. As of now, no comprehensive categorical system exists that encompasses all forms of collaboration.

In an attempt to provide structure to the different forms of collaboration, Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) present a framework detailing how entities collaborate in *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*. Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) argue that, “all collaborative relationships derive from one of three governance forms: contracts, partnerships or networks (Thompson *et al.*, 1991)” (p. 4). Notwithstanding the fact that these categories may not perfectly translate into the actual act of collaboration, these three governance forms serve as the basis of the descriptive categories in this research detailing how nonprofit organizations collaborate. I will apply this framework to collaboration involving LGBTQ nonprofit organizations.

2.1 Networks

Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) refer to informal alliances as “networks” in *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*. According to them, these networks “are constituted on the basis of informal relationships regulated by obligations of trust and reciprocity” (p. 4). “Individual relationships that transcend organizational boundaries” are usually the basis for these collaborative networks (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2003, p. 5). Networks grant the entities involved in collaboration the opportunity to work together without the pressures associated with binding, legal contracts.

Due to the fact that networks do not require any formal, legal agreement, collaborators are free to use them in whichever way they see fit. Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) state that these networks “are fluid relationships that may grow up in response to a particular policy or service issue and will continue to operate for as long as the need exists and the network members are willing to sustain the relationship” (p. 5). Instead of relying on a formal contract, staff members in both entities rely heavily on trust and the shared vision to reach organizational goals.

Lewis et al. (2008) assert that, “without a doubt, the need to coordinate the activities of a growing and increasingly diverse range of agencies involved in delivering public services requires novel approaches and new frameworks” (p. 281). These networks serve as one of those novel approaches and are by far the most malleable type of collaboration. Chen and Graddy (2010) cite Poole (2008) who claims that informal alliances, such as networks, “mobilize resources . . . and reduce gaps and overlaps in service delivery” (p. 406).

Networks commonly develop via inter-organizational personal relationships. These relationships transcend organizational boundaries and have no set time frame. An example of a network is the relationship between two entities in which the referral of clients takes place. Client referrals occur when an organization is unable to provide a client with the services he or she needs. For example, if a client contacts an LGBTQ nonprofit organization that does not offer HIV-testing at its facilities, the client can easily be referred to another organization that offers that service. This web of networks is invaluable because no one organization can offer all services to provide for the diverse needs of a given population.

2.2 Partnerships

In *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*, Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) cite Bailey et al. (1995) who define “partnerships” as “the mobilisation of a coalition of interests drawn from more than one sector in order to prepare and oversee an agreed strategy for the regeneration of a defined area” (p. 5). A partnership “allows for the diffusion of responsibilities to all social actors and sectors involved” (Seitanidi, 2010, p. 5). The entities involved in a partnership share decision-making duties, the performance of the public service, and overall responsibility for the product (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2003, p. 5). Not only do the two entities share decision-making duties, but they also do so for a longer period of time than just the short-term (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2003, p. 5). Partnerships allow both organizations the opportunity to reach goals that would have been either unattainable or much harder to reach if undertaken independently.

A key difference between partnerships and networks is the fact that partnerships require a formal agreement, which states the purpose and strategy for service delivery (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2003, p. 6). Instead of relying solely on trust and a shared vision, as collaborators in networks do, entities involved in partnerships often draft a written document that outlines their joint venture. An example of a formal agreement that partnerships use as their strategic guide is a memorandum of understanding (MOU). Lathlean (2015) attests that organizations should utilize an MOU to “ensure they have clearly set out their various obligations, including in relation to costs and liability” (p. 595). Although this is a formal document expressing the entities’ parameters for collaboration, it is not a legally

binding document in most cases. Therefore, there are no legal repercussions if one of the organizations involved violates the agreed upon conditions within it.

Although the ways in which NPOs create partnerships vary, one of the most common is when NPOs partner with other NPOs who share a similar mission and/or target population. This common ground shared by multiple organizations has resulted in the creation of silos for individual service areas. For example, silos consisting of NPOs and other entities collaborate via partnerships to handle issues involving LGBTQ youth, while other silos do the same for issues relating to health care in a given community. The partners' agreed upon service and the manner in which it is delivered depends on the contents of the MOU, or other form of written agreement.

2.3 Contractual Agreements

Lewis et al. (2008) cite Lowndes and Skelcher (1998) who assert that contracts are “very different from networks which emerge on the basis of mutual benefit, trust, and reciprocity” (p. 281). While networks are less formal, contractual agreements are legally binding and “display hierarchical and market mechanisms and characteristics, in addition to their network attributes” (Lewis et al., 2008, p. 281). In other words, contractual agreements create a power dynamic between the funder and the service provider. Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) define this as a “principal-agent relationship,” where decision-making of what services to provide and the actual production of these services are handled by two different entities. Sullivan and Skelcher (2003) state that, “the public authority (the principal)

specifies the service to be delivered, including any necessary service standards, . . . and the contractor (the agent) agrees to deliver these in return for a fee” (p. 82). This method of collaboration and the responsibilities assigned to each entity is inconsistent with the shared responsibilities seen in partnership collaboration.

Contractual agreements often occur in collaboration between the nonprofit sector and government agencies. “Contractual relationships are most closely associated with the delivery of public services by non-state bodies such as companies or voluntary organisations, or by state agencies operating on a trading basis at arm’s-length from the purchaser” (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2003, p. 4). When two entities are involved in a contractual agreement, such as when a NPO operates under the funding of a government grant, the nonprofit organization has “some ability to shape their own local priorities, but cannot do so without reference to central government priorities” (Lewis et al., 2008, p. 282).

Whereas networks depend on mutual trust and personal connections, a contractual agreement between two entities revolves around the components of the contract. The contract dictates the plan of action for the collaboration. “The contract spells out what will be provided, at what level of quality, and for what cost” (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2003, p. 4). If an entity fails to follow the guidelines included in the contract, the legality of the form grants the other entity the ability to impose a penalty or sanction toward the organization at fault.

Category 3: Acquisition of Resources

Collaboration has not only become a new norm in service delivery, but is in some cases the only way to provide quality services because many nonprofit organizations lack the adequate resources to serve the diverse needs of the public. This category describes why the need to acquire resources serves as a major motivation to collaborate for NPOs. The literature suggests that the motivations for NPOs to collaborate with other entities include: 1) to acquire financial resources, 2) to enhance capacities and 3) to acquire non-monetary resources.

3.1 Financial Resources

Nonprofit organizations depend on adequate funding to continue providing their services and programs. However, in an increasingly competitive market, it is becoming more difficult to fund these services and programs independently. Proulx et al., (2014) cite La Piana (2000) who argues that this financial “resource scarcity” is due to the nonprofit sector’s growth and the fact that private organizations are now in competition for public service contracts as well (p. 749). The scarcity of financial resources creates an environment where “a vast number of NPOs feel severely underfunded in proportion to their missions” (Austin, 2010, p. 8). Due to an increase in competition and lack of available funding, many NPOs now realize that collaboration is necessary to overcome these depleted resources.

Combining the financial resources of two or more entities allows all involved to focus on the actual act of service delivery. By decreasing the burden of worrying about how services will be funded, organizations are able to focus on the actual act

of service delivery, such as providing educational programs to at-risk youth and broadening the scope of services provided to the community. Thus, collaboration presents a win-win scenario for both the organizations involved and the community at large.

Although organizations do not often directly benefit financially from collaboration, the joint programs and services and the target population reap the benefits. Following a series of interviews of government officials and nonprofit agencies in the southeastern part of the United States, Shaw (2003) observes that the interviewees “acknowledge[d] that by working in partnership, they could leverage dollars so that the final product would be better than if there had been no partnership” (p. 114). In agreement, Proulx et al. (2014) cite Hill and Lynn (2003) in *Models of Collaboration Between Nonprofit Organizations*, who argue that nonprofit collaboration “leads to better results-per-dollar than if organizations work individually” (p. 747). In short, the literature suggests that combining the financial resources of two or more entities grants them all the opportunity to deliver programs or services at a lower cost than if one entity had produced it on its own.

In regard to NPOs that serve the LGBTQ population, the literature suggests that there is a disparity in the appropriation of funds among national and local organizations. Surfus (2013) asserts that, “while some of the largest national LGBT organizations receive a majority of LGBT funding, local LGBT organizations continue to struggle to address key issues . . . and social services” (p. 65). This “LGBT funding” refers to the funding provided by any combination of government agencies, private organizations, and individual donations. Surfus is arguing that more widely known

NPOs operating at the state or national level, such as the *Human Rights Campaign* or *Equality Texas*, are receiving a disproportionate amount of funding when compared to local organizations. This disparity in funding presents local NPOs with further motivation to collaborate with other entities to compensate for their funding deficiencies.

3.2 Enhance Capacities

According to the National Council of Nonprofits (2016) “capacity building” is defined as “whatever is needed to bring a nonprofit to the next level of operational, programmatic, financial, or organizational maturity, so it may more effectively and efficiently advance its mission into the future.” Whether it is lack of staff, time, or physical space, diminished capacities plague NPOs. Enhancing capacities serves as a significant motivation to collaborate with others.

In *The Collaboration Challenge: How Nonprofits and Businesses Succeed through Strategic Alliances*, Austin (2010) introduces the concept of “inescapable interdependence” (p. 10). This refers to the fact that no single entity has all the adequate capacities necessary to effectively and efficiently provide a population with needed services (Austin, 2010, p. 10). Austin (2010) goes on to state that, “collaboration becomes a prerequisite to effectiveness” when organization’s lack capacity (p. 10). Without sufficient capacities to build and sustain services, NPOs struggle to provide effective services to their communities.

Although many NPOs lack certain capacities, these capacities can be strengthened via collaboration with other entities. Collaboration essentially has the

potential to fill in the gaps in individual organizations. Dentato, Craig, and Smith (2010) focus on community-based collaboration between nonprofit organizations and public organizations in *The Vital Role of Social Workers in Community Partnerships: The Alliance for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning Youth*. Dentato et al. (2010) cite Ferguson (2004) and Provan et al. (2005) who assert that these “community partnerships” target “complex health and human services needs” and are “based on the premise that leveraging resources and sharing information can enable participating organizations to strengthen their capacities to serve” (p. 324). By collaborating with other entities, NPOs obtain the ability to better address complex issues, such as the public and mental health needs of the LGBTQ community.

While collaborating can lead to increased capacity, both entities must realize that some autonomy may be lost. Despite this fact, Proulx et al. (2014) argue that organizations are willing to surrender autonomy in order to increase capacities and resources (p. 749). Proulx et al. (2014) cite Snavely and Tracy (2002) who argue that this “resource dependence suggests that organizations are looking for a tangible benefit from their collaborations” (p. 749). In other words, enhancing capacities to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services and programs is of greater importance to NPOs than the need for total control of the operation.

3.3 Non-monetary Resources

While some organizations are sufficiently funded and do not necessarily have to collaborate to gain financial resources, they may need to acquire non-monetary

resources to effectively provide their community with services and programs. These non-monetary resources include all resources that are non-economic in nature, such as the sharing of knowledge, expertise, volunteers, and political power.

Berger, Cunningham, and Drumwright (2004) refer to collaboration that involves at least one nonprofit partner and aims to achieve non-economic objectives as “social alliances” (p. 59). These social alliances provide access to various resources such as “managerial advice, technological and communications support, and a skilled volunteer workforce” (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright, 2004, p. 59). For example, in a social alliance between two NPOs, “Organization A” may lack a solid volunteer workforce, while “Organization B” has had to turn away interested volunteers after reaching an adequate amount. Since the two organizations share common ground, serve the same population, and are in a social alliance, “Organization B” may offer their volunteer workforce to address a program or event “Organization A” is undertaking. Social alliances provide NPOs the opportunity to sharpen or acquire skills that are lacking in their organization, consult with experts from other sectors, offer or request volunteers, and bolster their confidence to take on pressing issues.

Austin (2010) proclaims that some collaboration focuses less on the acquisition of resources and more on developing relationships with other entities that “share a common concern about [a] particular problem” (p. 10). This is referred to as “critical mass” in Austin’s (2010) *The Collaboration Challenge: How Nonprofits and Businesses Succeed through Strategic Alliances*. Instead of exclusively contributing resources or filling the voids in each other’s organizations, these two

entities are concerned with building “collective confidence, knowledge, financial resources, or political power to enable them to be effective” (Austin, 2010, p. 10). As social issues become more complex and private actors begin to compete in service delivery, NPOs must garner sufficient knowledge and political power to stay competitive.

While technology allows organizations to easily share information with stakeholders, build an online community, and call that community to action when needed, its advances present a new component in organizational collaboration (Guo & Saxton, 2013, p. 73-74). While technological advances have improved the efficiency of organizations, the growing necessity for all sectors to use social media poses the potential for a learning curve. In a study of social media use among NPOs, Guo and Saxton (2013) found that 93% of NPOs are utilizing social media in some capacity (p. 63). Although most organizations are now using social media, their level of proficiency is not readily apparent. Nonprofit collaboration can lead to the exchange of technological knowledge and strategies, where one organization that is more proficient in social media use shares their social media strategies with another, less-knowledgeable organization. In order to operate a successful NPO in the twenty-first century, organizations must keep up to date with technological advances or be a part of a collaborative team that is.

Category 4: Improvement of Program Outcomes

A nonprofit organization revolves around the services and programs it provides to its community. The quality of these outputs depends on various factors

such as the organization's financial resources and the available organizational capacity to execute goals. Another motivation to collaborate is to improve the organization's program outcomes. The literature suggests that the motivations for NPOs to collaborate with other entities include: 1) to increase the number of people served, and 2) to improve programs/services.

4.1 Increase in Number of People Served

The number of those served by a nonprofit organization depends on its capacity and amount of resources available at any given time. The possibility of increasing the number of people served by an organization's programs is a contributing motivator to collaborate with other entities.

Austin (2010) states that, "enhanced breadth of services can increase convenience and utility for, and thus attract more, clients, increasing the use of the combined facilities" (p. 10). In other words, improving the services and programs provided has the capability to increase the amount of people served. Collaboration allows NPOs to cast a wider net and make a tangible difference in the lives of more people.

Austin (2010) attests that, "some collaborations between NPOs and businesses have enabled the nonprofit to scale up from a local to a nationwide operation" (p. 10). This achievement undoubtedly increases the number of people who can be served by the organization's programs and services due to the increase in funding and other resources. An example of a NPO that advanced from a local organization to one operating nationwide is Teach for America. Grant and

Crutchfield (2007) attest that cross-sector collaboration is a main reason why Teach for America was able to become a nationwide organization. By collaborating, the organization was able to create more meaningful impact and expand their services to more people than it could have reached alone (Grant & Crutchfield, 2007).

4.2 Improve Programs/Services

In the nonprofit sector, “programs” are essentially the structured services that are offered to the community. The quality and sustainability of these programs is essential to the organization’s mission and goals. Proulx et al. (2014) cite Arsenault (1998) who claims that, “an organization might choose to collaborate to maintain or increase its mission-driven programming” (p. 750). Improving the quality of these programs by means of collaboration is yet another motivating factor that goes into an organization’s decision to collaborate.

In the article *The Collaboration Decision in Nonprofit Organizations*, Sowa (2009) examined twenty interagency collaborations and the motivation behind each. This study found that organizations collaborate with other entities “to derive benefits both for the services they deliver and for their organization as a whole” (p. 1004). This finding further supports the notion that NPOs are motivated to collaborate to improve existing programs or receive outside support in the creation of new programming. Moreover, not only does collaboration have the ability to improve programs, but it can also contribute to the needs of the organization as a whole (Sowa, 2009, p. 1004).

An example of how collaboration can improve programming is seen when social workers or counselors collaborate with NPOs. These skilled professionals play a vital role in the psychological treatment of LGBTQ youth and adults. According to Dentato et al. (2010), social workers can contribute to community partnerships in various ways ranging from providing direct practice, such as mental health counseling, to facilitating program development (p. 324-325). The contribution of skilled professionals, such as these, adds another level of knowledge and expertise to programs and services. The collective work between NPOs and health field professionals has the potential to improve major aspects of an organization's programming.

Category 5: Organizational Needs

An organization itself has to fulfill certain needs in order to operate and continue providing quality services and programs. The final category describes nonprofit organizations' motivation to collaborate with others to address organizational needs. The literature suggests that the motivations for NPOs to collaborate with other entities include: 1) to meet mandates and pressures to collaborate and 2) to further legitimize the organization.

5.1 Meeting Mandates and Pressures to Collaborate

Government agencies have substantial control over grant requirements and NPOs must adhere to these conditions in order to receive the allotted funding.

“Federal policymakers have had a strong influence by inserting requirements for

collaboration in legislation” (Snaveley & Tracy, 2000, p. 146). For example, federal funding may require two or more entities “to provide evidence that they will work in partnership with local government in order to qualify for project funding” (Shaw, 2003, p. 107). In doing this, government agencies are fundamentally changing the strategic processes of the nonprofit sector and placing mandates on them to collaborate in order to receive government funding. As the government provides billions of dollars in grants to nonprofit organizations across the nation, the decision of NPOs to oblige with these mandates is simply logical.

Proulx et al. (2014) state that, “as more and more organizations begin to collaborate, collaboration begins to be viewed as the right way to do things. Nonprofits may feel pressured to collaborate to prove their legitimacy in this regard” (p. 750). This new pressure to collaborate, whether it stems from the need to acquire resources or to meet a mandate, is a motivating factor for organizations to work together.

This external pressure to collaborate comes from aspiring to operate the organization in a similar way as other, more successful organizations. Sowa (2009) cites DiMaggio and Powell (1983) who refer to this practice as “mimetic isomorphism” (p. 1017). This phenomenon occurs when “organizations imitate those with practices they admire to be sure that they are doing the ‘right’ things” (Sowa, 2009, p. 1017). Consequently, organizations are now pressured into taking part in collaboration with other entities, so others perceive that they are delivering their services in the “right way.” Due to mandates from funders and either internal

or external pressures, collaboration serves as an integral part of a nonprofit organization's operational strategy and service delivery.

5.2 Institutional Legitimacy

Collaboration has the capability to “expand the partners’ visibility and sphere of impact, potentially improving image or credibility” (Austin, 2010, p. 9). This potential to improve the image and credibility of organizations is immensely important because it can lead to a myriad of opportunities for both entities. In reference to the section of this paper discussing the pressures nonprofit organizations face to collaborate, Sowa (2009) cites DiMaggio and Powell (1983), Meyer and Rowan (1977), and Scott (1995) who state that, “scholars studying institutional theory maintain that organizations, to achieve legitimacy in their organizational field, will seek to structurally adjust themselves to meet institutional influences” (p. 1017). Thus, increasing its own legitimacy is a strong motivating factor that influences a NPO's decision to collaborate.

The legitimacy of an organization can also directly impact its ability to accumulate the funding necessary to ensure its survival as its own entity. Improving the legitimacy of an organization may influence or encourage funders to donate to an organization. In support, Proulx et al. (2014) state that, “increased visibility or legitimacy could lead to more donations, or meeting a requirement to engage in collaboration could lead to additional grant funding” (p. 749). So, if an organization strengthens its legitimacy and proves its capability of producing quality services via

collaboration with other entities, government agencies may take this into consideration when awarding future grants.

Not only does collaboration further legitimize a NPO, it also legitimizes and improves the reputation of private organizations. Zatepilina-Monacell (2015) cites Berger, Cunningham and Drumwright (2004), Dacin, Oliver and Roy (2007), and Simpson, Lefroy and Tsarenko (2011) who state that, “from the corporations perspective, partnerships with nonprofits meet societal expectations, grant legitimacy, and improve reputation, whereas from the NPO’s perspective, partnerships with businesses provide additional resources and increase public awareness of the cause” (p. 217-218).

Although Zatepilina-Monacell categorizes the benefits of collaboration by sector, an increase in legitimacy does not solely benefit the private sector. All entities involved in a collaboration experience a higher level of legitimacy if the public service delivery is successful. Also, in a sense, the increase in a NPO’s legitimacy has a ripple effect because if an organization receives more funding due to their higher level of legitimacy, it is ultimately provided the tools to produce higher-quality programs and reach more of those in its target population. Therefore, collaboration has the power to legitimize organizations and provides the opportunity to acquire additional resources.

Summary of Conceptual Framework

The literature reviewed in this chapter fit into five categories: Types of Collaborators, Models of Collaboration, Acquisition of Resources, Improvement of

Program Outcomes, and Organizational Needs. The framework and its supporting literature are summarized in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Title: Describing the Nature of Collaboration in Nonprofit Organizations that Serve the LGBTQ Community in Texas	
Purpose: The purpose of this research is to describe who nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, how and why they collaborate.	
Category	Supporting Literature
WHO	
1. Types of Collaborators	
1.1 Public Organizations	Cohen (2013); Cohen (2013); Levitt (2012); Moran, Joyce, Barraket, MacKenzie, and Foenander (2016); United Way (2016)
1.2 Private Organizations	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2016); Crossroads' Global Hand (2016); Matthews and Ho (2008); Pelosa and Falkenberg (2009)
1.3 Nonprofit Organizations	National Council of Nonprofits (2016); Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014)
HOW	
2. Models of Collaboration	
2.1 Networks or Informal Alliances	Chen and Graddy (2010); Lewis, Baeza, and Alexander (2008); Sullivan and Skelcher (2003)
2.2 Partnerships	Lathlean (2015); Seitanidi (2010); Sullivan and Skelcher (2003)
2.3 Contractual Agreements	Lewis, Baeza, and Alexander (2008); Sullivan and Skelcher (2003)
WHY	
3. Acquisition of Resources	
3.1 Financial Resources	Austin (2010); Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014); Shaw (2003); Surfus (2013)
3.2 Enhance Capacities	Austin (2010); Dentato, Craig and Smith (2010); National Council of Nonprofits (2016); Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014)

3.3 Non-monetary Resources	Austin (2010); Berger, Cunningham, and Drumwright (2004); Guo and Saxton (2013)
4. Improvement of Program Outcomes	
4.1 Increase in Number of People Served	Austin (2010); Grant and Crutchfield (2007)
4.2 Improve Programs/Services	Dentato, Craig and Smith (2010); Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014); Sowa (2009)
5. Organizational Needs	
5.1 Meeting Mandates and Pressures to Collaborate	Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014); Shaw (2003); Snively and Tracy (2000); Sowa (2009)
5.2 Institutional Legitimacy	Austin (2010); Proulx, Hagar, and Klein (2014); Sowa (2009); Zatepilina-Monacell (2015)

Chapter III: Methods

Chapter Purpose

The main purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods of data collection and research procedures used in this study. Details about survey development and survey dissemination are presented in detail. This chapter also provides details about the sample, Institutional Review Board exemption and measures taken to protect human subjects. It concludes with the presentation of the operationalization table and a summary of research design and methods.

Research Participants

As this research pertains to the nature of collaboration in NPOs that serve the LGBTQ community in the state of Texas, surveying administrators of LGBTQ nonprofit organizations in Texas was deemed essential. As the structure of NPOs differ from one another, the survey was sent to either a Director, a President or a high-level administrator for completion. It was vital to survey these top-level nonprofit administrators because they are primarily responsible for envisioning the nature of collaboration in their respective organizations. Responses from them provides insights into nature of collaborators, models and motives of collaboration.

Operationalization of Conceptual Framework

The methods discussed by Shields and Rangarajan (2013) in *A Playbook for Research Methods* served as the basis for the operationalization of the conceptual

framework. Since this research is descriptive in nature, the conceptual framework of *categories* was chosen. The concepts that emerged from the literature on collaboration in nonprofit organizations were organized into categories and provided a basis for the development of the survey. This conceptual framework was then “operationalized through creation of the corresponding questionnaire item” (Shields & Rangarajan, 2013, p. 77).

Survey Instrument

A survey was created using the categories in the conceptual framework as a foundation. Survey items corresponding to each category were developed. Each of the survey questions concentrated on a specific element of the five categories of nonprofit organization collaboration.

For example, the category “types of collaborators” had three elements, one of which is “public organizations.” This element had two questionnaire items associated with it, one to determine the number of public organizations each NPO collaborates with and another to determine the name of these public organizations: e.g. “How many public organizations does your organization collaborate with?” and “Please list the public organizations your organization routinely collaborates with.”

The web survey was created using the Qualtrics web platform and administered to nonprofit administrators via email. Pilot testing of the survey also helped catch any grammatical or stylistic errors in the survey. The survey instrument was pilot tested to ensure that the estimated time for completion was 10 minutes or less. This information was provided to the participants in the

introductory page of the survey. To encourage completion of the survey, the survey's length was kept short and a progress bar was included. The survey consisted of a mix of open-ended, multiple choice, five-point Likert type scale questions, and questions that required respondents to rank order some options. A series of demographic questions were included in the survey to get a better sense of respondent characteristics. Demographic questions tapped into gender, educational attainment and race/ethnicity.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Survey Technique

In this research, the researcher used the survey method to collect data on the collaboration of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community. The use of a web survey to conduct research has both advantages and disadvantages.

A key advantage of using a web survey is that it allows for the dissemination of the survey to a large group of people at a low cost. This is especially important in this study as this research surveys nonprofit administrators throughout the state of Texas. Also, the web survey's use of open-ended questions allows the participants to provide honest and detailed responses that may be unique to their organization: e.g. barriers their organization faces when collaborating with others. Johnson (2015) states that open-ended questions may also provide quotable quotes that may be used in the key findings of the research (p. 128). Additionally, the web service, Qualtrics, has the capability to automatically record all survey responses and transfer them to an SPSS or Microsoft Excel file. This facilitated data analysis.

A disadvantage of using a web survey is that the response rate from the participants may be low. This low response rate may be due to out-of-date email addresses or the email containing the survey being routed accidentally to junk/spam folders. The possibility of a low response rate was taken into account before the survey was sent to nonprofit administrators. To mitigate this, a Director from a local nonprofit organization agreed to email the nonprofit administrators once they received the survey from the researcher to further encourage their response to the survey. Further, as the researcher has crafted the survey questions, a potential disadvantage of the survey technique lies in the fact that the questions have not been pretested. This has the potential to weaken this research.

Research Procedure

Initial contact with respondents was made using Qualtrics. This contact was in the form of an email that included the link to the actual survey. The email explained the research purpose, the value of their insight to the research, and two examples of the types of questions included in the survey. The web surveys were distributed on March 9, 2017. A week after the distribution of the web survey, the researcher sent a reminder email to those who had not yet completed it. This email included a short paragraph explaining the importance of contribution to this research and a link to the survey. A final reminder email was sent on March 22, 2017, which included the deadline to complete the survey.

Surveys were sent only to administrators of NPOs that serve the LGBTQ community in the state of Texas. In order to prevent the same organization from

responding to the survey multiple times, each web survey was sent using a personal link for each nonprofit administrator. This ensured that one top-level administrator represented their organization as the sole respondent to this survey. The results, however, do not contain any information that can be traced back to any individual nonprofit administrator.

Data Collection

Data were collected on types of collaborators, models of collaboration, acquisition of resources, improvement of program outcomes, organizational needs, and demographic characteristics.

In the types of collaborators category, data were collected to answer how many public, private, and nonprofit organizations each NPO collaborates with. Further, the respondents were asked to provide a list of all public, private, and nonprofit organizations they collaborate with. These questions were presented as open-ended questions as answers were likely to vary.

In the models of collaboration category, data were collected to answer which entities NPOs collaborate with in specific models. For example, participants were asked to state which types of entities their organization collaborates with via a network. Additionally, participants were asked to provide the percentage of their organization's collaboration with public, private, and nonprofit organizations.

In the acquisition of resources category, data were collected to answer how strongly the nonprofit administrator agreed or disagreed with the assertion that collaborating with other entities allows their organization to acquire financial

resources, enhance their capacities, and acquire non-monetary resources.

Respondents indicated their level of agreement with statements related to these.

In the improvement of program outcomes category, data were collected to answer how strongly the nonprofit administrator agreed or disagreed with the assertion that collaborating with other entities allows their organization to increase the number of people served and improve their programs and/or services.

Respondents indicated their level of agreements on a five-point Likert type scale.

In the organizational needs category, data were collected to answer how often their organization felt pressured to collaborate with others and how often the organization felt the need to collaborate to further legitimize itself. Respondents indicated the frequency in which they felt pressure to collaborate using a scale that ranged from “*never*” to “*frequently*.”

The additional questions section contained questions that ranged from asking participants to explain the barriers their organization faces when collaborating with other entities to how important collaborating was in acquiring resources. The questions in this section were a combination of rank order, open-ended, and two-way scale questions. Lastly, the demographic questions focused on both the nonprofit administrator and information regarding their associated nonprofit organization.

Institutional Review Board Exemption

This project, 2017544, was approved by the Texas State Institutional Review Board (IRB) on March 3, 2017. Pertinent questions or concerns about the research,

research participants' rights, and/or research-related injuries to participants should be directed to the IRB chair, Dr. Jon Lasser 512-245-3413 (lasser@txstate.edu) or to Monica Gonzales, IRB Regulatory Manager 512-245-2334 (meg201@txstate.edu).

Human Subject Protection

This research involved survey research to describe collaboration in nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community. Eliciting responses about this from survey participants was not controversial nor could within reason place the subjects at risk of psychological or physical harm. This research did not collect any sensitive information from respondents that could have jeopardized the standing of any employee of any organization. The participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could stop taking the survey at any time. By clicking the “start” button at the beginning of the survey, the administrator offered their consent to take part in this research.

The report does not disclose any personal information such as a nonprofit administrator’s name, age, job title, etc. Complete anonymity of the administrators was maintained throughout the reporting process. Before being granted approval from the Texas State IRB, the researcher successfully completed the online Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative training on human subjects protection and received a certificate of completion.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the process undertaken by the researcher to operationalize the conceptual framework of Chapter II. The operationalization of the framework involved the creation of a survey instrument. In addition, this chapter discussed in detail the survey methodology including the following: the research purpose, procedures, strengths and weaknesses of the survey method, and data collection.

Table 3.1: Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework

<p>Title: Describing the Nature of Collaboration in Nonprofit Organizations that Serve the LGBTQ Community in Texas</p> <p>Purpose: The purpose of this research is to describe who nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, how and why they collaborate.</p>	
Category	Questionnaire Items
1. Types of Collaborators	
1.1 Public Organizations	<p>How many public organizations does your organization collaborate with? (Open-ended)</p> <p>Please list the public organizations your organization routinely collaborates with. (Open-ended)</p>
1.2 Private Organizations	<p>How many private organizations does your organization collaborate with? (Open-ended)</p> <p>Please list the private organizations your organization routinely collaborates with. (Open-ended)</p>
1.3 Nonprofit Organizations	<p>How many nonprofit organizations does your organization collaborate with? (Open-ended)</p> <p>Please list the nonprofit organizations your organization routinely collaborates with. (Open-ended)</p>
2. Models of Collaboration	

2.1 Networks	Which entities does your organization collaborate with via network? (Multiple Choice) (Public Organizations, Private Organizations, Nonprofit Organizations, Other)
2.2 Partnerships	Which entities does your organization collaborate with via partnership? (Multiple Choice) (Public Organizations, Private Organizations, Nonprofit Organizations, Other)
2.3 Contractual Agreements	Which entities does your organization collaborate with via contractual agreement? (Multiple Choice) (Public Organizations, Private Organizations, Nonprofit Organizations, Other)
3. Acquisition of Resources	
3.1 Financial Resources	Collaborating with other entities allows my organization to acquire financial resources. ** How important is collaborating with other entities to acquire financial resources for your organization? ***
3.2 Enhance Capacities	Collaborating with other entities allows my organization to enhance its capacities (i.e. staff, time, and physical space). ** How important is collaborating with other entities to enhancing your organization's capacities? ***
3.3 Non-monetary Resources	Collaborating with other entities allows my organization to acquire non-monetary resources (i.e. knowledge, expertise, volunteer workforce, and political power). ** How important is collaborating with other entities to acquire non-monetary resources for your organization? ***
4. Improvement of Program Outcomes	
4.1 Increase in Number of People Served	Collaborating with other entities allows my organization to increase the number of people served. **
4.2 Improve Programs/Services	Collaborating with other entities allows my organization to improve programs/services. **
5. Organizational Needs	
5.1 Meeting Mandates and Pressures to Collaborate	How often does your organization feel pressured to collaborate? *
5.2 Institutional Legitimacy	How often does your organization feel the need to collaborate to further legitimize itself? *

6. Additional Questions	
6.1 Prevalence of Collaboration	Please rank the following entities based on frequency of collaboration: Public Organizations, Private Organizations, and Nonprofit Organizations. (Rank Order; 1 = most often and 3 = least often)
6.2 Barriers	What barriers does your organization face when collaborating with other entities? (Open-ended)
7. Demographic Questions	
7.1 Age	What is your age?
7.2 Gender	What is your gender?
7.3 Ethnicity	What is your ethnicity?
7.4 Level of Education	What is the highest level of education you have completed?
7.5 Primary Level of Operation	Does your organization primarily operate locally, statewide, nationally, or internationally?
7.6 Location	In which geographic region is your organization located/based?
7.7 Service Area	Which service area best describes your organization's primary focus?
7.8 Annual Revenue	Which range best describes your organization's total annual revenue?
<p>* Response scale: (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Frequently ** Response scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree *** Response scale: (1) Not at all Important, (2) Slightly Important, (3) Moderately Important, (4) Very Important, (5) Extremely Important</p>	

Chapter IV: Results

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results from the web survey on the nature of collaboration of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. Details about the sample characteristics and findings are presented in detail.

Respondent Characteristics

This section presents the respondent characteristics and is broken up into three sections. The first section explains the response rate of the survey. The second includes demographic information of the nonprofit administrators who completed the survey and the third presents demographic information of the nonprofit organizations.

The web survey was sent to 62 nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. 16 emails bounced. Out of the 46 organizations that received the web survey, 17 organizations opened and answered the survey to some extent. Of those 17 organizations, 15 completed the survey in its entirety, while two organizations started the survey but failed to complete it. This web survey had a 33% response rate. The results reported in this chapter are based on data obtained from the 15 completed surveys.

The majority of respondents to this survey were either Executive Directors or Presidents (66.66%) of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. The remaining respondents were made up of Board Members (13.33%), a

Program Director (6.67%), a Development Manager (6.67%), and a Chief Program Officer (6.67%). The majority of the respondents were also female (60%). The vast majority identified as White/Caucasian (73.33%). Almost a third were college graduates (33.33%) and 53.33% had a postgraduate degree. Demographic information of the respondents is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Respondent Demographics

Age		Gender	
18-29 years old	0%	Female	60%
30-49 years old	40%	Male	26.6%
50-64 years old	46.7%	Trans Man	6.7%
65 years old or older	13.3%	Prefer Not to Answer	6.7%
Total (n = 15)	100%	Total (n = 15)	100%

Ethnicity		Level of Education	
White/Caucasian	73.33%	Postgraduate Degree	53.33%
Hispanic/Latino	13.33%	Some Postgraduate Work	6.67%
Black/African American	6.67%	College Graduate	33.33%
Prefer Not to Answer	6.67%	Some College	6.67%

Demographic questions were also asked to gather data on the nonprofit organizations that employ the administrators. Of the 15 organizations, most operated at the local level (85.71%), while the rest operated at the statewide level (14.29%). Most of these organizations (60%) also indicated that their annual revenue was \$100,000 or less, while one-fifth of them (20%) stated that their annual revenue was \$1 million or more. 40% of the respondents were from Central Texas. One-fifth of the organizations (20%) were located in North Texas and 13.33% were located in either East or West Texas. Only one respondent worked for an

organization that was located in South Texas. Lastly, one organization chose the “Other” option but failed to report their location in the text box provided.

Organizational demographic data are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Organizational Demographics

Location		Annual Revenue	
Central Texas	40%	\$100,000 or less	60%
North Texas	20%	\$100,000 - \$200,000	13.33%
East Texas	13.33%	\$200,000 - \$400,000	6.67%
West Texas	13.33%	\$400,000 - \$600,000	0%
South Texas	6.67%	\$600,000 - \$800,000	0%
Other	6.67%	\$800,000 - \$1 million	0%
		\$1 million or more	20%
Primary Level of Operation		Service Area	
Local	85.7%	LGBTQ Social	26.67%
Statewide	14.3%	Other	20.00%
		LGBTQ Mental Health Care	13.33%
		LGBTQ Youth Development	13.33%
		LGBTQ Arts & Culture	13.33%
		LGBTQ Health Care	6.67%
		LGBTQ Legal	6.67%
		Total	100%

The most frequent primary service area indicated was LGBTQ Social (26.67%). The LGBTQ Social service area refers to NPOs that primarily organize social events such as gay pride festivals and/or provide the LGBTQ community with opportunities to socialize in a safe space. Although certain LGBTQ service areas were provided as options that respondents could check off in the survey, 20% of the respondents chose the “Other” option and entered their organization’s specific service area in the provided text box. Analysis of responses in the “Other” category

revealed that some specifically catered to transgender policy issues, some worked on law enforcement and community policing initiatives for the LGBTQ community, and some others on eliminating homelessness in LGBTQ young adults.

Analytic Plan

The next section of this chapter reports the results of the web survey. Each questionnaire item is examined individually in detail. For questionnaire items that used a 5-point Likert type scale, similar response classifications were grouped together in three distinct categories: “% Disagree,” “Neither Agree nor Disagree,” and “% Agree.” For example, responses “*Agree*” and “*Strongly Agree*” were grouped into the “% Agree” category as both indicated that the nonprofit administrator showed agreement with the statement.

Findings

Types of Collaborators

The three types of collaborators studied in this research were public, private, and nonprofit organizations. As shown in table 4.3, most of the nonprofit administrators (80%) stated that their organization collaborates with public organizations, while 60% of administrators indicated that their organization collaborates with the private sector. It is not surprising that all of the respondents stated that their organization collaborates with other nonprofit organizations.

Table 4.3: LGBTQ Nonprofit Organization Collaborators

Organization Type	Frequency	Percentage
Public Organizations	12/15	80%
Private Organizations	9/15	60%
Nonprofit Organizations	15/15	100%

In addition to gathering data on which entities nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, the respondents were asked to provide the number of collaborators of each type of organization. The range of the number of organizations that each NPO collaborates with is illustrated in Table 4.4. The results indicate that every NPO studied collaborates with at least one organization in the public, private, and nonprofit sector. Potentially, an average number of collaborators can be calculated, however, not all respondents provided definitive numbers and instead provided responses such as “many,” “some,” and “more than 15.” Due to this, a comprehensive average was not calculated.

Table 4.4 Range of Number of Collaborators

Organization Type	Minimum	Maximum
Public Organizations	1	15
Private Organizations	3	17/100*
Nonprofit Organizations	1	15

*One organization was a statistical outlier as the respondent indicated that their organization collaborates with 100 private organizations.

Lastly, the respondents were asked to list each public, private, and nonprofit organization their organization collaborates with. This long list of collaborators is presented in Appendix A.

Models of Collaboration

Data on the models of collaboration were gathered to determine which models were used in collaboration with each type of collaborator. The following section details the frequency in which LGBTQ nonprofit organizations use networks, partnerships, and contractual agreements in collaboration. The frequency in which each model is used is presented in Table 4.5.

i. Network

40% of the nonprofit organizations studied indicated that they collaborate with public organizations via a *network*, while one-third of respondents (33%) stated their collaboration with private organizations is via a *network*. An overwhelming majority of respondents (73%) indicated that their organization collaborates with other NPOs via a *network*. This alludes to the fact that nonprofit administrators of LGBTQ organizations rely mostly on trust and reciprocity when collaborating with other nonprofit organizations.

ii. Partnership

While one-third of administrators (33%) stated that their organization's collaboration with both public and private organizations are via a *partnership*, more

than half (53%) indicated collaboration with other NPOs are via a partnership. This may indicate that LGBTQ nonprofit organizations not only rely on the trust and reciprocity seen in *network* collaboration when collaborating with other NPOs, but also reach formal agreements. This includes the process of the organizations drafting a document, such as a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that states the collaboration's purpose and strategy.

iii. Contractual Agreement

One-third of collaboration (33%) with public organizations is via a *contractual agreement*. The use of contractual agreements was more prevalent in collaboration with private and nonprofit organizations. The most counterintuitive result was that only one-third of NPOs collaborate with public organizations via a contractual agreement. The use of contractual agreements in collaboration with public organizations was expected to be more prevalent after reviewing the literature.

Table 4.5: Frequency of Models of Collaboration

Organization Type	Model of Collaboration		
	Network	Partnership	Contractual Agreement
Public Organizations	6/15 (40%)	5/15 (33%)	5/15 (33%)
Private Organizations	5/15 (33%)	5/15 (33%)	6/15 (40%)
Nonprofit Organizations	11/15 (73%)	8/15 (53%)	6/15 (40%)
Other	1/15 (6%)	2/15 (13%)	1/15 (6%)

Acquisition of Resources

The respondents were asked to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding the effect of collaboration on their organization's ability to acquire financial resources (i.e. funding from grants, private foundations, and corporations), enhance its capacities (i.e. staff, time, and physical space), and acquire non-monetary resources (i.e. knowledge, expertise, volunteer workforce, and political power).

A clear majority of respondents (93.33%) *agreed* with the assertion that collaborating with other entities allows their organization to acquire financial resources, enhance their capacities, and acquire non-monetary resources. Zero respondents *disagreed* that collaboration allows their organization to acquire financial resources and only 6.67% *disagreed* that collaboration allows their organization to enhance their capacities or acquire non-monetary resources (See Table 4.6). These results indicate that administrators of LGBTQ nonprofit organizations in Texas emphatically agree that collaboration positively affects their ability to acquire resources.

Table 4.6: Level of Agreement: Collaboration Leads to the Acquisition of Resources

	% Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Acquisition of Financial Resources	0%	6.67%	93.33%
Enhancement of Capacities	6.67%	0%	93.33%
Acquisition of Non-monetary Resources	6.67%	0%	93.33%

Further, the level of importance collaboration plays in acquiring resources and enhancing capacities was gauged using a scale ranging from “*Not At All Important*” to “*Extremely Important.*” In terms of the importance collaboration plays in acquiring financial resources, most nonprofit administrators (80%) stated that it was either *very important* or *extremely important*. Respondents also indicated that collaboration was at least *very important* to enhancing their capacities (67%). All respondents (100%) stated that collaboration was at least *moderately important* to acquire non-monetary resources such as knowledge, expertise, volunteer workforce and political power (See Table 4.7).

Table 4.7: Importance of Collaboration in Acquiring Resources

	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Acquisition of Financial Resources	6.67%	0%	13.33%	46.67%	33.33%
Enhancement of Capacities	0%	6.67%	26.67%	40%	26.67%
Acquisition of Non-monetary Resources	0%	0%	13.33%	53.33%	33.33%

Improvement of Program Outcomes

Nearly all of the administrators (93.33%) *agreed* that collaboration helps increase the number of people served by their organization and improve their programs and services. Only one organization (6.67%) *disagreed* with the assertion that collaboration helps improve their programs and services (See Table 4.8). This resounding agreement among nearly all respondents suggests that collaboration has

facilitated the efforts of LGBTQ nonprofit organizations to reach more people in the community and improve the programs and services provided to them.

Table 4.8: Level of Agreement: Collaboration Leads to Improvement of Program Outcomes

	% Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Collaboration Helps Increase Number of People Served	0%	6.67%	93.33%
Collaboration Helps Improve Programs/Services	6.67%	0%	93.33%

Organizational Needs

In terms of feeling pressured to collaborate, the most frequent response (40%) was that organizations *rarely* felt pressure to collaborate with other entities. Further, one-fifth of respondents (20%) indicated that they have *never* felt this pressure. In terms of collaborating to gain legitimacy as an organization, the most frequent response (46.67%) was that organizations *rarely* felt this pressure. However, more than half of the respondents (53.34%) stated that they felt this pressure at least *sometimes*. Table 4.9 presents the frequency LGBTQ nonprofit organizations felt pressured to collaborate.

Table 4.9: Frequency Organizations Felt Pressure to Collaborate

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
Pressure to Collaborate	20%	40%	20%	20%
Pressure to Collaborate for Legitimacy	0%	46.67%	26.67%	26.67%

Additional Questions

In addition to the five categories in the conceptual framework, the respondents were asked two additional questions that targeted the prevalence of collaboration and the barriers their organization faces when collaborating with other entities. The prevalence questionnaire item was presented in a rank order format and 11 of the 15 nonprofit administrators completed this question. Of the 11, most administrators (64%) stated that their organization collaborates with nonprofit organizations most often. Approximately one-fourth (27%) of respondents stated that they most often collaborate with public organizations and only one organization stated that most of their collaboration is with private organizations.

An open-ended question was asked to gain insight into any barriers nonprofit administrators face when collaborating with other entities. The following responses were recorded in the text box provided to the administrators:

Table 4.10 Barriers to Collaboration Faced by LGBTQ Nonprofit Organizations

Barriers
• Competition**
• Lack of time***
• Lack of experience
• Unwillingness to share
• Contracts, rules, and regulations
• Homophobia
• Deadlines
• Duplication of services
• Ensuring missions align
• Privacy-related issues regarding clients
• Inadequate number of volunteers

- Entities being territorial
- Fear of losing minimal resources by working together

** Indicates response was given by two organizations

*** Indicates response was given by three organizations

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of the web survey. It included information on the respondent characteristics, an analytic plan, findings of the research, and concluded with a list of the barriers to collaboration faced by LGBTQ nonprofit organizations in Texas.

Chapter V: Conclusion

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the key findings from this study. The results are provided both in verbal and tabular format. Results pertaining to each category in the conceptual framework are presented in this chapter. It concludes with the limitations of this research and the potential directions for future research.

Research Summary

This research described the nature of collaboration and focused on who nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas collaborate with, how and why they collaborate. Literature was reviewed to examine the nature of collaboration and to develop a conceptual framework. This framework was used to create a survey that would help describe who NPOs collaborate with, how and why they collaborate.

The literature reviewed revealed that the various elements of nonprofit organization collaboration could be described using five distinct categories. A conceptual framework was then developed using these five categories and their corresponding elements. The first category, types of collaborators, included identifying the three most common types of collaborators in NPO collaboration. The second category, models of collaboration, referred to how NPOs collaborate with other entities. Acquisition of resources, the third category, consisted of the various resources that can be acquired from collaboration. The fourth category,

improvement of program outcomes, focused on the potential of collaboration to increase the number of people served and the quality of programs and services of the nonprofit organization. The final category, organizational needs, consisted of the motives to collaborate to meet the needs of the nonprofit organization.

A survey was sent to administrators throughout Texas to determine the nature of collaboration of NPOs that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. Each category and its corresponding elements were operationalized into individual survey questions. A total of 46 organizations received the survey, 15 of which completed the survey. The survey had a 33% response rate.

Key Findings

This section presents the key findings from the results of this research. In order to identify trends in the data, the NPOs studied were categorized, using their reported annual revenue as the independent variable. Of the 15 respondents, nine organizations reported annual revenue of \$100,000 or less and three reported annual revenue of \$1 million or more. To present these trends lucidly in this section, organizations that reported annual revenue of \$100,000 or less are referred to as “smaller organizations,” while organizations that reported annual revenue of \$1 million or more are referred to as “larger organizations.” Table 5.1 presents the key findings from the results.

Table 5.1: Key Findings

Category (#)	Key Finding
Types of Collaborators (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All nonprofit organizations collaborated with at least one public, private, and nonprofit organization. • The majority of smaller organizations reported they most often collaborate with other nonprofit organizations. • The majority of larger organizations reported they most often collaborate with public organizations.
Models of Collaboration (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While larger organizations reported a consistent use of the three models of collaboration across sectors, smaller organizations collaborated via a network most frequently with all collaborators.
Acquisition of Resources (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 93%, there was overwhelming agreement amongst all nonprofit administrators that collaboration led to acquisition of financial and non-monetary resources and the enhancement of capacities.
Improvement of Program Outcomes (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 93%, there was overwhelming agreement amongst all nonprofit administrators that collaboration helped increase the number of people served and improved their organization's programs and services.
Organizational Needs (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the larger organizations reported they frequently felt a general pressure to collaborate and to further legitimize the organization.
Barriers of Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller organizations reported that lack of time, homophobia, contracts, rules, and regulations, unwillingness to share, and fear of losing minimal resources by working together were barriers. • Larger organizations reported that lack of time, competition, duplication of services, ensuring alignment of missions, and privacy-related issues regarding clients were barriers.

Limitations

A limitation of this research is that the distribution of the web survey was confined to nonprofit administrators in the state of Texas. As it studied the nature of collaboration of Texas-based NPOs that serve the LGBTQ community, it did not

include organizations outside of the state. Also, by using a web survey, a second limitation of this research was the fact that the response rate was not high enough. In order to avoid the possibility of a low response rate in future research, structured interviews with nonprofit administrators may provide the researcher with more rich data via in-depth responses. While the present research provided valuable quantitative data, interviews can provide qualitative data that may be analyzed to get a closer look into the nature of collaboration of NPOs that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas.

Future Research

This research filled a gap in the literature on collaboration of nonprofit organizations that serve the LGBTQ community in Texas. The results of this research can be utilized in future research studying the nature of collaboration of these types of NPOs. As the key findings of this study indicate, we know that NPOs serving the LGBTQ community collaborate via networks. Future research could go in-depth to uncover why networks are the most preferred model of collaboration. In-depth interviews could be conducted with these NPOs to understand the circumstances and dynamics of certain types of collaborative efforts.

Also, while it was important to study the barriers that organizations face in collaboration, future research should also address the facilitators of collaboration. It would be of value to compare facilitators of collaboration to the barriers reported by nonprofit administrators in this research. Since this study focused only on the perspective of nonprofit administrators in describing the nature of collaboration, it

is imperative to also understand the perspectives of other stakeholders in the process, such as the LGBTQ community and others, to determine the effectiveness of collaboration. While this study took a cross-sectional approach, a case study approach might be very useful as well. A handful of NPOs that have a history of effective collaboration could be studied in great detail. This would help unpack the nature of collaboration in a more detailed and comprehensive manner.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. (2012). *Collaborating to manage: A primer for the public sector*. Georgetown University Press.
- Austin, J. E. (2010). *The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances* (Vol. 109). John Wiley & Sons.
- Berger, I. E., Cunningham, P. H., & Drumwright, M. E. (2004). Social alliances: Company/nonprofit collaboration. *California management review*, 47(1), 58-90.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (2016). *What We Do*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/What-We-Do>
- Cohen, Rick (2013). *Government Contracting and Payment Practices: Lingering Problems for Nonprofits*. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Retrieved from: <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2013/12/06/contracting-payment-practices-of-states-a-lingering-problem-for-nonprofits/>
- Cohen, Rick (2013). In Shelby County, Tenn., a Case Study in Government Grant Choice. *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Retrieved from: <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2013/02/07/in-shelby-county-tenn-a-case-study-in-government-grant-choices/>
- Chen, B., & Graddy, E. A. (2010). The effectiveness of nonprofit lead-organization networks for social service delivery. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 20(4), 405-422. doi:10.1002/nml.20002

- Cornforth, C., Hayes, J. P., & Vangen, S. (2014). Nonprofit–Public Collaborations Understanding Governance Dynamics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764014532836.
- Crossroads' Global Hand (2016). Timberland Mentors Youth Through City Year. Retrieved from <http://www.globalhand.org/en/search/success+story/document/27992>
- Dentato, M., Craig, S. L., & Smith, M. (2010). The vital role of social workers in community partnerships: The Alliance for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning Youth. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 27, 323–324.
- Donaldson, L. P. (2007). Advocacy by nonprofit human services: Organizational factors as correlates to advocacy behavior. *Journal of Community Practice*, 15, 139–158.
- E. Proulx, K., A. Hager, M., & C. Klein, K. (2014). Models of collaboration between nonprofit organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(6), 746-765.
- Grant H. M., & Crutchfield, L. R. (2007). Creating High-Impact Nonprofits. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, Fall 2007*. Retrieved from: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/creating_high_impact_nonprofits
- Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2013). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764012471585.

- Johnson, G. (2015). *Research methods for public administrators*. London: Routledge.
- Lathlean, E. (2015). How far is too far? Collaborations, mergers and everything in between. *Governance Directions*, 67(10), 594.
- Levitt, T. (2012). *Partners for good*. [electronic resource] : business, government and the third sector. Farnham, Surrey : Gower ; Burlington, VT : Ashgate, © 2012.
- Lewis, J. M., Baeza, J. I., & Alexander, D. (2008). Partnerships in primary care in Australia: Network structure, dynamics and sustainability. *Social science & medicine*, 67(2), 280-291.
- Matthews, K. R., & Ho, V. (2008). The grand impact of the Gates Foundation. Sixty billion dollars and one famous person can affect the spending and research focus of public agencies. *EMBO Reports*, 9(5), 409–412.
<http://doi.org/10.1038/embor.2008.52>
- Moran, M., Joyce, A., Barraket, J., MacKenzie, C., & Foenander, E. (2016). What Does 'Collaboration' Without Government Look Like? The Network Qualities of an Emerging Partnership. *Australian Journal Of Public Administration*, 75(3), 331-344. doi:10.1111/1467-8500.12195
- Mustanski, B. b., Andrews, R., & Pucket, J. A. (2016). The Effects of Cumulative Victimization on Mental Health Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Adolescents and Young Adults. *American Journal Of Public Health*, 106(3), 527-533.

National Council of Nonprofits (2016). What is capacity building?. Retrieved from:

<https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/tools-resources/what-capacity-building>

Peloza, J., & Falkenberg, L. (2009). The Role of Collaboration in Achieving Corporate Social Responsibility Objectives. *California Management Review*, 51(3), 95-113.

Rustin, B., Carbado, D. W., & Weise, D. (2003). *Time on two crosses: The collected writings of Bayard Rustin*. Cleis Press.

Shaw, M. M. (2003). Successful collaboration between the nonprofit and public sectors. *Nonprofit management and leadership*, 14(1), 107-120.

Shields, P. M., & Rangarajan, N. (2013). *A playbook for research methods: Integrating conceptual frameworks and project management*. New Forums Press.

Snaveley, K., & Tracy, M. B. (2000). Collaboration among rural nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 11(2), 145-165.

Sowa, J.E. (2009). The Collaboration Decision in Nonprofit Organizations: Views from the Front Line. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 1003-1025.

Sullivan, H., & Skelcher, C. (2003). Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 11(2), 185-185.

Surfus, C. R. (2013). Equity issues in LGBT funding: Inequality remains despite national progress. *SPNHA Review*, 9(1), 7.

United Way (2016). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from:

<https://www.unitedway.org/contact-us/faqs>

Wildridge, V., Childs, S., Cawthra, L., & Madge, B. (2004). How to create successful partnerships—a review of the literature. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 21(s1), 3-19.

Zatepilina-Monacell, O. (2015). Small Business–Nonprofit Collaboration: Locally Owned Businesses Want to Take Their Relationships With Community-Based NPOs to the Next Level. *Journal Of Nonprofit And Public Sector Marketing*, 27(2), 216-237. doi:10.1080/10495142.2015.1011511

Appendix A: List of Collaborators

Public Organizations	Private Organizations	Nonprofit Organizations
Work Force Solutions	Nurse Practitioners	Dress for Success
City of Austin Health Care Department	Sentient Counseling	Beat Aids
Seminary of the Southwest	Our Lady of the Lake University	Work Force Solutions
Vox Veniae Church	Frisco Chamber of Commerce	Unify
DSHS	Plano Chamber of Commerce	Haven for Hope
HHSC	GLBT North Texas Chamber	Center for Health Care Services
OAG	CURE	AARC LGBT Clinic
Office of the Governor	North Texas Pride	Roy Moss Alternative Center
Houston Health Department	GDMAF	Frisco Fast PACS
Houston Housing and Community Affairs	Cathedral of Hope	CURE
Houston Housing Authority	Resource Center	North Texas Pride
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Human Rights Campaign	Resource Center
SAMHSA	Equality Texas	GDMAF
Houston/Harris Co AAA	DFW Trans Kids and Families	Equality Texas
HRSA	Trans-cendence International	Human Rights Campaign
Harris Co PHES	TENT	Out Youth
TX Child Protective Services	St. David's Foundation	Cine Las Americas
Harris Co CPS/APS	United Way THRIVE Partners	Pride Film Festival
The Harris Center for Mental Health and IDD	Alliance for Multicultural Community Services	Austin Film Society
Out Youth	Bank on Houston	Care Communities
Human Rights Campaign	Capital IDEA - Houston	CommUnity Care
Austin Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce	Career and Recovery Resources, Inc.	KIND
Anti-Defamation League	Chinese Community Center	Waterloo Counseling
Matthew Shepard Foundation	Christian Community Service Center	Wright House
Equality Texas	Covenant Community Capital	Project Transitions
Austin PRIDE	Easter Seals of Greater Houston	Seminary of the Southwest
SafePlace	Family Houston	Vox Veniae Church
Austin Police Association	Goodwill Industries of Houston	Austin Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce
Austin Police Women's Association	Greater Houston Partnership	Anti-Defamation League

Texas Peace Officers Association	Houston Area Urban League	Matthew Shepard Foundation
Amigos N Azul	Literacy Advance	Equality Texas
Allgo	Local Initiatives Support Corporation	Austin PRIDE
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	Memorial Assistance Ministries	SafePlace
Lambda Legal	Neighborhood Centers Inc	Austin Police Association
North Texas Pride	Northwest Assistance Ministries	Austin Police Women's Association
GALA	SER - Jobs for Progress	Texas Peace Officers Association
Black Tie Dinner - Dallas	United Way THRIVE Center at Bay Area	Amigos N Azul
GLBT Chamber	Volunteers of America Texas	Allgo
The Family Shelter	Wesley Community Center	Goodwill
Crisis Intervention Unit	WorkFaith Connection	Montrose Center
The Children's Advocacy Center	Workforce Solutions	Santa Maria
The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council of the Concho Valley	Communities in Schools Houston	Bee Busy Inc
San Angelo Police Department	Evelyn Rubenstein Jewish Community Center of Houston	Houston Food Bank
Sheriff's Office	Houston Area Urban League	Coalition for the homeless
Celebration Church	Neighborhood Centers Inc.	Lambda Legal
QCinema	Katy Christian Ministries	Federal Club
MCC Agape	Lone Star Legal Aid	GALA
PFLAG	Asian American Health Coalition	The Family Shelter
Transendence	Doctors for Change	Crisis Intervention Unit
University of Houston	Missions of Yahweh, Inc.	The Children's Advocacy Center
City of Houston Library	Northwest Assistance Ministries	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council of the Concho Valley
TFN	S.H.A.P.E. Community Center	San Angelo Police Dept
ACLU	Urban Harvest, Inc.	MCC Church
Nurse Practitioners	Care for Elders	UUF Church
Sentient Counseling	Promise Credit Union & Neighborhood Tax Centers	Celebration Church
Dress For Success	Montgomery County Agencies	PFLAG
Beat Aids	Angel Reach, Inc.	QCinema
Unify	Big Brothers Big Sisters Lone Star	MCC Agape
Haven for Hope	Boy Scouts of America-Sam Houston Area Council	Transendence
Roy Moss Alternative	Bridgewood Farms	TENT

Center		
Center for Health Care Services	Children's Safe Harbor	Heritage Society of Houston
AARC LGBT Clinic	Crisis Assistance Center	Rice University
Our Lady of the Lake University	Easter Seals of Greater Houston	Gulf Coast Archive and Museum
Baptist Child and Family Services	Girl Scouts of San Jacinto Council	ARCH
Harris County DA	Gulf Coast Trades Center	NCTE
Drug Court	Literacy Volunteers of America - Montgomery County	
Houston PD	Montgomery County Student Support Services	
Harris Co Sheriff's office	Montgomery County Women's Center	
Houston City Council	Montgomery County Youth Services	
Houston Mayor's office	New Caney New Horizons	
Harris Co Pct 1	New Danville	
Harris Health System	Panther Creek Inspiration Ranch	
Houston ISD	Meals On Wheels Montgomery County	
	Tri-County Behavioral Healthcare	
	Volunteers of America Texas	
	YMCA	
	Legacy Community Health	
	Baylor College of Medicine Teen Health Clinic	
	Behavioral Hospital of Bellaire	
	Career and Recovery Resources	
	Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Galveston-Houston	
	Cenikor Foundation	
	The Center for Success and Independence	
	The Council on Recovery	
	Covenant House Texas	
	DePelchin Children's Center	
	EL Centro de Corazon	
	Family Services of Greater Houston (Family Houston)	
	Fort Bend Regional Council on Substance Abuse, Inc.	
	Harris County Psychiatric Center	
	Harris Health System	
	Healthcare for the Homeless-	

Houston
Houston Area Community Services, Inc. HACS
HGI Counseling Center
Houston Recovery Center
Interface-Samaritan Counseling Centers
IntraCare Behavioral Health
Jewish Family Service
The Jung Center
Krist Samaritan Center
Memorial Hermann Behavioral Health Services
The Menninger Clinic
Mental Health America of Greater Houston
Open Door Mission
Santa Maria Hostel, Inc.
SEARCH Homeless Services
St. Joseph Medical Center
Vecino Health Centers
Volunteers of America Texas, Inc.
West Oaks
The Women's Home
Baylor College of Medicine
One Voice Texas
United Way of Greater Houston
Houston Area Women's Center
Bay Area Turning Point
FamilyTime Foundation
Aid to Victims of Domestic Abuse
The Bridge Over Troubled Waters
Fort Bend County Women's Center,
Resource and Crisis Center of Galveston County
SAAFE House
Harris County Domestic Violence Coordinating Council
Jane's Due Process, Inc.
Katy Christian Ministries
Texas Advocacy Project
Coalition for the Homeless

	Association for the Advancement of Mexican-Americans, Inc.	
	Bay Area Council on Drugs and Alcohol, Inc.	
	Behavioral Health Alliance of Texas, Inc.	
	Brazoria County Alcoholic Recovery Center, Inc.	
	Change Happens!	
	Cheyenne Center Inc.	
	Mosaic Family Services, Inc.	
	Phoenix Houses of Texas, Inc.	
	The Gulf Coast Center	
	Tri-County MHMR Services	
	The Turning Point, Inc.	
	Unlimited Visions Aftercare, Inc.	
	Volunteers of America Texas Inc	
	AIDS Foundation Houston	
	Beacon (Cathedral Health Ministries)	
	Bee Busy, Inc.	
	Bee Busy Wellness	
	Bread of Life	
	Crossroads at Park Place	
	Disability Rights Texas	
	Emergency Aid Food Coalition	
	Houston Food Bank	
	Gender Infinity	
	Goodwill Job Connection	
	The HAY Center	
	Houston Volunteer Lawyers	
	Montrose Grace Place	
	Open Gate Homeless Ministry at Bering Memorial United Methodist Church	
	ReVision	
	Salvation Army	
	SER Jobs for Progress	
	Stand Up for Kids at The Haven Center	
	Tony's Place (Homeless Gay Kids - Houston)	
	Methodist Hospital	
	MD Anderson Hospital	
	Memorial Hermann Hospital	

San Jose Clinic
AccessHealth
Alliance for Multicultural Community Services
American Cancer Society
American Red Cross-Greater Houston
Area Chapter
AVANCE Houston, Inc.
AVDA (Aid to Victims of Domestic Abuse)
Avondale House
Bay Area Council on Drugs and Alcohol, Inc. (BACODA)
Bay Area Rehabilitation Center
Bay Area Turning Point, Inc.
Big Brothers Big Sisters Lone Star
Boy Scouts of America-Sam Houston Area Council
Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Houston, Inc.
The Bridge Over Troubled Waters
Career and Recovery Resources, Inc.
Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Galveston- Houston
Center for Hearing and Speech
The Center
Chinese Community Center
Colorado Valley Transit, Inc.
Community Family Centers
The Council on Recovery
Denver Harbor Senior Citizens, Inc.
DePelchin Children's Center
Easter Seals of Greater Houston
Evelyn Rubenstein Jewish Community Center of Houston
Family Houston
Fifth Ward Enrichment Program, Inc.
Fort Bend County Women's Center, Inc.
Fort Bend Regional Council on

	Substance Abuse, Inc.	
	Fort Bend Seniors Meals on Wheels	
	Girl Scouts of San Jacinto Council	
	Good Neighbor Healthcare Center	
	Houston Area Urban League	
	Houston Area Women's Center	
	Innovative Alternatives, Inc.	
	Interfaith Ministries for Greater Houston	
	Jewish Family Service	
	Legacy Community Health Services, Inc.	
	The Lighthouse of Houston	
	Literacy Advance of Houston, Inc.	
	Local Initiatives Support Corporation	
	Mental Health America of Greater Houston	
	Montgomery County Women's Center	
	The Montrose Center	
	Multicultural Education and Counseling	
	Through the Arts (MECA)	
	Neighborhood Centers Inc.	
	The Salvation Army	
	San Jose Clinic	
	Santa Maria Hostel, Inc.	
	SEARCH Homeless Services	
	Spaulding for Children	
	Star of Hope Mission	
	Target Hunger	
	University Speech, Language & Hearing Clinic	
	Volunteers of America Texas	
	Wesley Community Center	
	The Women's Home	
	Brown Foundation	
	Gilead Sciences	
	Chevron	
	Exxon	
	MACAIDS Foundation	
	Bunnies on the Bayou	

	Real Live Connections	
	DFW Trans Kids and Families	
	Family Pride Zone - Dallas	
	Teen Pride - Dallas	
	212 Bar	
	Xcel Energy	
	Wells Fargo Bank	
	Chicken Express	
	Metropolitan Community Church	
	Unitarian Universalist Fellowship	
	Living Out	
	Amarillo Transgender Alliance	
	Rice University	
	Heritage Society of Houston	
	Gulf Coast Archives and Museum	
	Planned Parenthood Gulf Coast	