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Abstract

Not-for-profit organisations are set up to enact positive outcomes in the community, they undertake multiple roles and are significant contributors to the economic fabric of a nation. As part of a social change agenda, not-for-profit organisations can engage in activities that contribute to debate and influence the development of public policy. This thesis presents the findings from a qualitative study investigating not-for-profit organisation participation in advocacy activities examining how they are engaging in public debate and the implications of this engagement in terms of risk to their current and future sources of funding.

The outcomes of the study are presented in this hybrid thesis approach which combines a traditional thesis structure of introduction, literature review, methodology and discussion, with three published articles to present key findings of the research. A qualitative case study approach was adopted in four not-for-profit organisations in the health sector in Western Australia. In-depth interviews were conducted with key stakeholders across the four organisations to explore the what, how and why of advocacy.

The research identified that the extent of policy advocacy by not-for-profit organisations has not diminished in recent times. Not-for-profit organisations, increasingly aware of the changing funding landscape, however, are adopting a strategic approach and using advocacy strategies that minimise any risk to funding and potentially ameliorate political repercussions. A component part of this approach is volunteering and social activism, and how not-for-profit organisations involve their volunteers in policy debates.

Key outcomes from this research is the generation of a model of advocacy activities and a theory of advocacy engagement showing how not-for-profit
organisations make strategic choices about the approaches and tactics to be adopted. Building on the extant literature and identifying current issues facing not-for-profit organisations and their ability to advocate for policy change, the model offers insights into how organisations identified what they judge to be appropriate advocacy strategies to fit their organisational objectives, policies, funding sources and resources.
Acknowledgements

Completing a thesis is a journey that requires the guidance and support of others. There are many to thank who have encouraged and supported my journey.

Thank you to my colleagues, especially, Ian, Carole, and Jo-Anne who offered words of support and encouragement to help maintain my focus and vision; reminding me I could do this.

Thank you to my friends, checking that I was still doing this PhD thing, asking how it was going and then listening to whatever I said, when there were better conversations to have.

Special thank you to my supervisors, Dr Megan Paull and Dr David Holloway, for your wisdom, guidance, and support. You were patient and gave me the time and space to complete the thesis. This was a long and at times never-ending path, and you stayed with me. The journey has been one of professional and personal growth – it was worth it.

To my children, Sarah, Joseph, and Jack, thank you for your constant love, support, and willingness to listen. Anything is possible!
# Table of Contents

Author’s Declaration ........................................................................................................ iii
Abstract ............................................................................................................................... v
Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................ vii
Table of Contents ............................................................................................................. ix
List of Figures .................................................................................................................... xiii
List of Tables ..................................................................................................................... xv
List of Abbreviations ........................................................................................................ xvii

## Chapter 1 Introduction ................................................................................................. 1
  Personal reflection ........................................................................................................... 1
  1.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................. 1
  1.2 Context .................................................................................................................... 3
    1.2.1 Not-for-profit organisations: What are they? ..................................................... 3
    1.2.2 Not-for-profit organisations: Funding ............................................................... 5
    1.2.3 Not-for-profit organisations: Contribution ....................................................... 8
  1.3 Advocacy ................................................................................................................... 11
    1.3.1 Should not-for-profit organisations advocate? ................................................... 14
  1.4 Rationale for research ............................................................................................... 15
  1.5 Research Approach .................................................................................................. 20
  1.6 Outline of the thesis ................................................................................................. 21
  1.7 Limitations of the research ...................................................................................... 22
  1.8 Chapter Summary .................................................................................................... 23

## Chapter 2 Literature Review ....................................................................................... 25
  2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................. 25
  2.2 Systematic Literature Review Methodology .......................................................... 26
  2.3 Is there evidence that not-for-profit organisations are advocating? ....................... 29
  2.4 Types of advocacy activities: Models, approaches and frameworks in the literature ......................................................................................................................... 31
  2.5 Restrictions on advocacy activities ......................................................................... 34
    2.5.1 Constraints on advocacy .................................................................................... 36
  2.6 Evidence on continuing to advocate ....................................................................... 38
  2.7 Advocacy factors ..................................................................................................... 39
    2.7.1 Collective Advocacy ......................................................................................... 39
    2.7.2 Soft approach .................................................................................................. 40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>Commercialisation or Professionalism</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Synthesis and proposed model</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>Co-operative Tactical Position</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>Confrontational Tactical Position</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>Insider Tactical Position</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
<td>Outsider Tactical Position</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Recent Research</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.1</td>
<td>Stakeholder Theory</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.2</td>
<td>Resource Dependency Theory</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Research Approach</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Qualitative methodology</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Selection of case study organisations</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2.1</td>
<td>Case Study 1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2.2</td>
<td>Case Study 2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2.3</td>
<td>Case Study 3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2.4</td>
<td>Case Study 4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3.1</td>
<td>Identification and recruitment of participants</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3.2</td>
<td>Data collection – Interviews</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Ethical Considerations</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Limitations of Methodology</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Not-for-profit Advocacy Tactics</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Chapter Summary ..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Introduction ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Chapter Summary ..................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Introduction ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Research Questions ................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Are not-for-profit organisations advocating? ..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Advocacy Activities ........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Influences on engagement in policy advocacy ...................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Implications for Theory ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.1</td>
<td>Stakeholder and Resource Dependency Theories ..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.2</td>
<td>Theory of Advocacy Engagement ..................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Implications for Practice ...............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Implications for Policy ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Chapter Summary .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Introduction ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Contribution ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Limitations of Research ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Future Research ...............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Final Conclusion ..............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td>.........................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
<td>.........................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Consent Form .......................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information Letter ..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Consent Form ....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Questions ........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>..............................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Systematic review process ................................................................. 27
Figure 2-2: Tactical positions for advocacy by not-for-profit organisations ............ 44
Figure 7-1: Tactical positions for advocacy by not-for-profit organisations (reproduced from Figure 2-2) ................................................................. 86
# List of Tables

Table 2-1: Systematic Review - Summary of articles selected for inclusion ........................................ 28
Table 2-2: Published articles on not-for-profit advocacy approaches .................................................. 31
Table 2-3: Systematic Review - Summary of articles selected for inclusion post 2016 .................. 47
Table 3-1: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles .................................................................. 60
Table 3-2: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles and interview participants .................... 64
Table 3-3: Summary of themes and sub-themes ................................................................................. 69
Table 3-4: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles, including case study identification used in the empirical papers in the thesis .................................................. 71
Table 7-1: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles, including case study identification used in the empirical papers in the thesis (reproduced from Table 3-4) ........................................................................ 82
Table 7-2: Published articles on not-for-profit advocacy approaches (reproduced from Table 2-2) .............................................................................................................................................. 85
Table 7-3: Summary of Case Study Organisations themes and advocacy activities ...................... 88
Table 7-4: Summary of Case Study Organisations advocacy strategies and activities ............... 88
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOSS</td>
<td>Australian Council of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNC</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIC</td>
<td>Australian Securities and Investments Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATO</td>
<td>Australian Taxation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGR</td>
<td>Deductible Gift Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Fundraising Institute Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST</td>
<td>Goods and Services Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAVE</td>
<td>International Association for Volunteering Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTR</td>
<td>International Society for Third-Sector Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCVO</td>
<td>National Council Voluntary Organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1  Introduction

Personal reflection

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice (Article 19, United Nations Human Rights Office, 1976).

When I told a colleague my thesis was researching not-for-profit organisations the response was ‘Why? There is no money in not-for-profits’. This is a valid professional perspective and academically not the most prosperous sector to research; research funds are scarce and there are almost no ‘A’ journals in which to publish. So why not-for-profit organisations? The following chapter outlines the importance of not-for-profit organisations in the community, their value, the critical role they play, and the social capital they provide. Without not-for-profit organisations there would be a gap, a massive void in the community. These organisations are critical, and their voices need to be heard. The value and importance of this sector and their significant role in the community is the reason I decided that this was to be the focus of my thesis. Through my research, I hope I can assist in giving not-for-profit organisations that voice.

1.1  Introduction

As part of a social change agenda, not-for-profit organisations can engage in activities that contribute to debate and influence the development of public policy. This thesis presents the findings from a qualitative study investigating not-for-profit organisation participation in advocacy activities examining how they are engaging in
public debate and the implications of this engagement in terms of risk to their current and future sources of funding.

A qualitative case study approach was adopted in four not-for-profit organisations in the health sector in Western Australia. Not-for-profit organisations in the health sector were chosen as they often provide goods and services to a marginalised cohort in the community, a group that may be unable to advocate for themselves. By selecting organisations within a particular section of the not-for-profit sector, a more focussed comparative analysis was able to be used. In-depth interviews were conducted with key stakeholders across the four organisations to explore the what, how and why of advocacy. The outcomes of the study are presented in this hybrid thesis approach which combines a traditional thesis structure of introduction, literature review, methodology, and discussion, with three published papers to present key findings of the research.

The not-for-profit sector provides services and goods to the community that the private sector and governments are either unable or unwilling to supply (Tschirhart & Bielefeld, 2012; Worth, 2017). Diverse in size, economic output and input, not-for-profit organisations are varied in the form, position and status they have in the community (DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990; Pynes, 2013). Research into not-for-profit organisations acknowledges the contribution of the sector and the value placed on these organisations by existing communities (Buffardi, Pekkanen, & Ratgeb Smith, 2017; Lu, 2018a; Mosley, 2011). Human service not-for-profit organisations have a unique position in the community and can become a voice for marginalised cohorts that would otherwise be disenfranchised. They can provide a conduit between people, and business and governments, offering communities valuable resources and support. They also provide an opportunity for a democratic voice for those who might otherwise not be
heard. All these activities require resources. The source of those resources is likely to influence the activities of not-for-profit organisations.

1.2 Context

1.2.1 Not-for-profit organisations: What are they?

Not-for-profit organisations are referred to by a variety of labels: non-profit, not-for-profit, third sector, charitable, voluntary sector, social economy, community organisation, community sector, civil society organisation, communal enterprise, public benefit organisation, and non-government organisation (Lyons, 2001; Productivity Commission, 2010; Pynes, 2013). The literature provides many definitions. Lyons (2001) for example defines the not-for-profit sector as:

All those organisations that are not part of the public or business sectors. The third sector consists of private organisations: that are formed and sustained by groups of people (members) acting voluntarily and without seeking personal profit to provide benefits for themselves or for others; that are democratically controlled; and where any material benefit gained by a member is proportionate to their use of the organisation (p. 5).

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) offers the following definition; “legal or social entities, formed for the purpose of producing goods or services, and whose status does not permit them to be a source of income, profit or financial gain for the individuals or organisations that establish, control or finance them” (ABS, 2015, Glossary).

While definitions vary, including legal definitions, there are several consistent elements and shared characteristics across the range. For the purpose of this thesis, not-for-profit organisations are legal or social entities, self-governing, separate from
government, sovereign entities, formed for the purpose of producing services and goods, and are not profit distributing.

Not-for-profit organisations are active across many areas: culture and recreation; education and research; health; social services; environment; development and housing; law, advocacy and politics; philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism promotion; international; religion; and, business and professional associations and unions (United Nations, 2003). Not-for-profit organisations also have diverse organisational forms and structures. This multiplicity can make comparison within the sector difficult. There are, however, common features and trends within groups in the sector, which do enable critical analysis and discussion (Kyle, Kearns, & Milligan, 2015; Leiter, 2013; for example, “formally constituted; non-governmental in basic structure; self-governing; non-profit-distributing; and, voluntary to some meaningful extent” see Salamon & Anheier, 1992, p. 268).

The not-for-profit sector in Australia is estimated to be made up of around 600,000 organisations with 58,779 organisations deemed economically significant (for example, employ staff or access tax concessions) (Productivity Commission, 2010). At the end of 2017, there were 56,560 charities registered with the Australian Charities and Not-for-profit Commission (ACNC) (ACNC, 2018a). These are not-for-profit organisations registered as charities to access tax concessions (these organisations were previously registered in Australia by the Australian Taxation Office (ATO)). The exact number of not-for-profit organisations is difficult to determine because of the diverse interests that are involved, the different sizes, and how these organisations are established. Not-for-profit organisations that are not incorporated, or not registered with ACNC or Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), may not be included in any count. Some smaller not-for-profit organisations may only exist for a
short period of time. Once an objective has been met a small not-for-profit organisation may be disbanded. Competition in the industry may also result in some not-for-profit organisations ceasing to exist as they are unable to compete for the limited resources that are available.

The form and structure that not-for-profit organisations take can also vary. The Productivity Commission (2010, p. 56) reported that the number of not-for-profit organisations incorporated under the Federal Corporations Law as companies limited by guarantee was 11,700; 136,000 not-for-profit organisations were incorporated as Associations under various state jurisdictions and 440,000 were unincorporated entities.

### 1.2.2 Not-for-profit organisations: Funding

All not-for-profit organisations require funding to provide services and goods. Resource Dependency Theory has been used to explain the need for organisations to acquire and maintain adequate resources to survive (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Worth, 2017). The theory posits that organisational survival requires that not all funding comes from a single source; reliance on a single source could lead to a failure to survive should that funding decline or disappear. Funding sources vary depending on the size, type and location of the not-for-profit organisation, and the type of services and goods they provide and to whom.

Sources of income are numerous and include: government funding (federal, state and local); foundation grants; donations; bequests; membership fees; philanthropy; fundraising (such as, raffles, fun runs, and bike rides); and, income from commercial and business operations (for example, the sale of services and goods, revenue from unrelated business ventures, or sponsorship), and interest on capital reserves. Not-for-profit organisations are also involved in social enterprise; mission-driven activity adopting entrepreneurial behaviours to create a social value (Abu-Saifan, 2012). Some
not-for-profit organisations are fully funded by governments while others receive no
government funding and rely solely on funding from private sources. The form of
government funding contracts will depend on factors such as, the level of government,
the service or agency being funded, and the type of industry and service provided. In
2012-2013, Australian not-for-profit organisations received $107.48 billion in income
and 38% was from government funding (ABS, 2015). In 2015, the 50,908 charities
registered with the ACNC received $134.5 billion in income with 41% from
government grants (Cortis et al., 2016). The nature of the funding contracts has changed
in recent years with governments procuring services via tender arrangements. The
government is not funding/giving to the sector but rather purchasing from the sector.
This can have implications for contractual relationships and advocacy. The sector needs
increased government/not-for-profit sector partnerships but at times this relationship is
at an impasse (Gilchrist, 2016).

Not-for-profit organisations require secure, reliable and sustained funding
sources for services delivery. Current funding regimes are unreliable, short term, and
often insufficient and inconsistent. To preserve existing contracts there has long been a
perception that those organisations that are fully funded by governments may be an
extension of the government (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Gazley, 2008; Lyons, 2001) or risk
developing “mission creep” (Mitchell, 2014, p. 88), where their funding influences their
mission more than it should. Not-for-profit organisations can avoid or reduce external
influences through “revenue diversification, commercialization, funding liberation,
geostrategic arbitrage, specialization, and selectivity” (Mitchell, 2014, p. 89). External
influences can also be moderated or averted with contracts that include “the rights and
responsibilities of each partner [to] not only empower partners but also build
accountability mechanisms in government-nonprofit partnerships” (Cheng, 2019, p.
Organisations have often had to identify and develop innovative and alternative sources of funding, if they are to avoid being solely reliant on government. Some funding sources are simple to access with little if any administrative costs or demands. Other sources of funds require extensive management support, maintenance, and reporting regimes. Not-for-profit organisations need a strategic approach to raising revenue (Mitchell, 2014) and to diversification of income streams to maintain autonomy, reduce risks of losing government contracts, and reduce costs of tendering for government funding (Hung & Hager, 2019).

Raising revenue for a not-for-profit organisation can be difficult and depends on the size, structure, governance, and type of organisation, and there is often the possibility that funds suddenly become unavailable making it difficult to deliver services (Lyons, 2001). In recent times, governments, private businesses and not-for-profit organisations have collaborated to identify alternative and new sources of funding. Social Impact Bonds are one such source of funding. Operating in the United Kingdom since 2010 and introduced in the United States, Australia, Canada, Germany, India, South Korea, and several other jurisdictions (Del Giudice & Migliavacca, 2019) direct financial investment procures a social outcome with investors receiving a return for the successful project (Gilchrist & Wilkins, 2016; Roy & Sinha, 2016).

Philanthropic and trust funds are among funding alternatives with social entrepreneurship activities becoming a viable funding option (Barraket, Collyer, O’Connor, & Anderson, 2010). There are several not-for-profit organisations in Australia offering philanthropic services including advice, specialist skills, and support to establish and administer funds (for example, Philanthropy Australia). Other Government supported projects facilitate funding opportunities and partnerships for not-for-profit organisations (for example, Social Ventures Australia).
Not-for-profit organisations benefit from tax concessions offered to them through exemptions in income tax, payroll tax, fringe benefits tax (FBT), goods and services tax (GST), and other state tax exemptions as well as the deductible gift recipient (DGR) offered to donors to the organisation. There are approximately 203,000 organisations registered with the ATO so that they can access various tax concessions and meet tax and superannuation obligations (ATO, 2018) with 56,560 charities registered with the ACNC (ACNC, 2018a) and 29,285 active deductible gift recipients (ATO, 2017). For the 2016-17 income year, tax payers claimed $1.3 billion in deductible gifts (The Treasury, 2018b). These taxation concessions reduce taxation expenditure, as well as increasing and encouraging private contributions. The concessions contribute to the not-for-profit organisation’s financial sustainability.

The contribution by not-for-profit organisations to society is substantial and yet funding issues and revenue options are a consistent problem, both at operational and strategic levels. Not-for-profit organisations want long term financial sustainability to achieve their mission and achieve their organisational goals.

1.2.3 Not-for-profit organisations: Contribution

Not-for-profit organisations are usually established to be a positive benefit; to advance a cause or change an aspect of society. These organisations add value to the community that goes beyond the initial contact and service delivery. Not-for-profit organisations often exist where government and the private sector do not provide such services (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). The need for not-for-profit organisations has long been argued to be partly the failure of the state and market to provide these services and goods (Lecy & Van Slyke, 2012; Weisbrod, 1977). Under this premise, the market will not provide a product that is perceived to have little or no profit potential, is
available to anyone, and does not necessarily require payment (Berman, Brooks, & Murphy, 2006; Salamon & Anheier, 1998).

Berman and others (2006) argue that not-for-profit organisations are better able to provide social services and goods because they are “not motivated by profit and are assumed to be more altruistic, non-profit agencies are more trusted” (p. 85). In addition, Cribb (2006) suggested that one of the main reasons governments contract with not-for-profit organisations is because they deliver the services at a cheaper cost and provide enhanced value for money.

Thomas (1996, p. 11) described Social Capital as “those voluntary means and processes developed within civil society which promote development for the collective whole”. Dekker and Uslaner (2001) refer to Putnam’s (1993) definition of Social Capital as “features of social organisation such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitated coordinated actions” (p. 2). Adler and Kwon (2002, p. 23) considered that,

Social Capital is the goodwill available to individuals or groups. The source of Social Capital lies in the structure and content of the actor's social relations. The effects flow from the information, influence, and solidarity it makes available to the actor.

Social Capital can be about how people interact with each other, the networks and bridges that are formed, and the relationships and trust that support society (Productivity Commission, 2010). Social Capital varies across a range of scenarios with diverse agendas. Civil Society is that space where public debate and conversation can occur, bringing together people with the aim of improving their community. A not-for-profit organisation is in a unique position to provide Social Capital, improving the quality of life for individuals and the whole community.
Other than those organisations formed for political purposes, not-for-profit organisations’ “primary purpose is service provision not political involvement” (Mosley, 2011, p. 436). Where the main purpose is to provide services and goods to marginalised groups in the community, most not-for-profit organisations believe they are primarily accountable to their clients (Cribb, 2006). The role they have in a social democracy, however, is unique and vital. Reid (1999) argued that they have several roles: strengthen democracy, engage individuals who otherwise would not be involved in decision making and, in the community, voice social demands, deliver services, act as watchdogs and be involved in policy processes. “Politically active nonprofits contribute to democratic governance by representing civic concerns in policymaking, by enlarging opportunities for citizen participation in public decisions, and by creating accountability between government and citizens” (Reid, 1999, p. 293). DeSantis (2010) refers to this as ‘civic participation’. Mosley (2011) believes that the clients of not-for-profit organisations “are often significantly marginalised and underrepresented” (p. 436) in the democratic process and need not-for-profit organisations to advocate on their behalf.

Involvement in social debate by not-for-profit organisations is necessary for a healthy and robust democracy (Maddison, Hamilton, & Denniss, 2004). Not-for-profit organisation participation forms part of a “strong, supportive state and vigorous civil society” (Muetzelfeldt, 1998, p. 122; see also Boris & Krehely, 2002). Many people support not-for-profit organisations acting as “advocates in the public policy processes is, in fact, essential to a healthy democracy” (Maddison & Denniss, 2005, p. 378). Maddison and Denniss (2005) posit that “in the democratic embrace the determination of public policy outcomes should therefore be seen as an ongoing process in which debate, deliberation and even dissent are seen as constitutive elements” (p. 379).
There is statistical evidence that the contribution to society is substantial. In 2012-2013, Australian not-for-profit organisations employed 1,081,900 people and used 3.9 million volunteers contributing 521 million hours, an estimated economic value of $17.3 billion (ABS, 2015). Estimates of the value of the contribution have acknowledged that labour force, volunteer hours and economic value are insufficient to capture the true level of contribution; however, there is no agreement about calculating the overall level of contribution (Muller, Arthur, Harvey, Fisher, & McMahon, 2015).

1.3 Advocacy

Not-for-profit organisations are involved in advocacy. This may be individual advocacy where a worker will represent an individual client to assist that client to receive benefits or services, for example, advocating on behalf of a client to a landlord where the client has unpaid rent and negotiating an arrangement to pay. This form of advocacy is necessary and part of the services that are offered to clients by the not-for-profit organisation. There is no issue that these organisations should undertake this form of advocacy. The other forms of advocacy that can be and is undertaken by not-for-profit organisations is advocacy for the system (systemic advocacy, where the organisation will represent a group or industry to the government or authority to facilitate a change or receive some benefit for that group or industry); and advocacy for the advancement of a social agenda (for example, the building of social capital). This thesis examines systemic advocacy and advocacy for the advancement of a social agenda under the umbrella of policy advocacy.

Advocacy in the context of this thesis refers to policy advocacy; attempts to sway policy and/or public opinion. Advocacy is “any attempt to influence the decision of any institutional elite on behalf of a collective interest” (Reid, 1999, p. 291). Advocacy is for the benefit of others, incorporating the ability of an individual or group
to promote a particular position and to attempt to influence legislators or those in positions of power. Definitions of advocacy include practices of representing and supporting the interests and rights of a group of people. “Through advocacy, nonprofits may instil their group’s perceptions of the common good into wider notions of the public good or public interest” (Reid, 1999, p. 291). Onyx, Dalton, Melville, Casey, & Banks (2008) define advocacy as “active interventions by organisations on behalf of the collective interests they represent, that have the explicit goal of influencing public policy or the decisions of any institutional elite” (p. 632). Advocacy promotes “the interest of a group or a public issue by influencing public policies, policy makers, business leaders, or other decision makers” (Mosley, 2011, p. 444).

Advocacy is known by many names: activism, advising, campaigning, commenting, consulting, dialogue, engagement, education, feedback, giving voice, influencing, informing, input, lobbying, negotiation, participation, policy work, promoting improvements, and social action (Baggott & Jones, 2014; Bass, Arons, Guinane, & Carter, 2007; DeSantis, 2013). Not-for-profit organisations are careful about terminology and avoid the use of the word ‘lobbying’, instead labelling this activity as ‘impact analysis’ (Bass et al., 2007). The word lobbying lends itself to an implication of political involvement. Lobbying is attempting to influence public policy and policy makers while advocacy includes a wider range of activities (Ahmed, 2013). Although, in some situations the terms may be used interchangeably.

Not-for-profit organisations engage in many advocacy activities depending on the size of the organisation, resources, organisational goals, mission statement, and social agenda (Mosley, 2011). Reid (1999) categorises several different advocacy activities: legislative advocacy, grassroots advocacy, public education, public opinion shaping, electoral advocacy, administrative advocacy, legal advocacy, workplace
advocacy, corporate advocacy, media advocacy, and international advocacy. These categories separate advocacy activities according to the medium, timing, and tactics involved.

Not-for-profit organisations advocate through their membership of government committees, interacting with these committees, commenting on proposed legislation, meeting with policymakers, or releasing research reports to the public (Bass et al., 2007; Mosley, 2011). Advocacy activities may also involve individual members of the community through involvement in rallies, letter writing campaigns, boycotts, public meetings, or individual meetings with local political representatives. Not-for-profit organisations are assisted in these advocacy activities by groups who have encouraged volunteers to join the organisation, raised money for a cause, acquired additional resources to support advocacy activities, and become involved in research and education both internal and external to the organisation (Reid, 1999). Some not-for-profit organisations engage with governments by writing to members of parliament or ministers, writing submissions on government consultation papers, attending public workshops, attending meetings, or reporting on government-funded projects.

Advocacy aims to influence government decisions and policies. Governments legislate and control funding flows and wield significant power. Influencing governments can result in a change in the legislation, amend policy development, and alter the allocation of funding. The ability of the not-for-profit organisation to advocate is complicated by their existence in a unique context, constrained by limited resources, limited skill sets, and a disjointed workforce, combining both volunteer and paid employees. The sector covers a wide and varied area of interests and activities, constantly competing for funds from a limited resource base.
Disputing or protesting decisions made by governments and the large powerful funding bodies is known as dissent. The right to dissent or disagree is part of the checks and balances in any democratic and socially responsible society (Silverman & Patterson, 2011). Despite this, an organisation exhibiting dissent, particularly publicly, may suffer isolation, and lose access to resources provided by external powerful entities. The literature refers to this problem as ‘biting the hand that feeds them’ (Bass et al., 2007; Edgar, 2008; Maddison & Denniss, 2005). Effective interaction between governments, legislators, funders, and not-for-profit organisations in an open and honest forum provides an impetus for moral, social, and legal growth and change; the ability for decisions to be challenged is a key element of a democratic society. Community groups cannot deliver their services effectively if they are unable to challenge and question authority (Edgar, 2008; Maddison & Denniss, 2005).

1.3.1 Should not-for-profit organisations advocate?

Mosley (2011) and Reid (1999) argue that the general population, and in particular, marginalised communities, are often not able to address social issues and influence policy development. Lack of access to resources and governments limits advocacy. A not-for-profit organisation advocates effectively because of a closer relationship with government, access to appropriate resources and skills, and enhanced knowledge of the sector (Mosley, 2011; Reid, 1999). They can also collaborate with other groups in the sector to provide a stronger and more effective advocacy base.

Conversely, Public Choice Theory argues that governments may be influenced by groups that do not have representational legitimacy (Buchanan, 2003; Buchanan & Tollison, 1984). Johns (2004) argues strongly against such advocacy;

Charity work is no longer unambiguously good, or for the public benefit. It may be altruistic, but increasingly it is embedded in a political framework that seeks
to use public power for system change. These methods are unambiguously political in nature. Arguably, it is at odds with the donating public’s expectation of the charities. Lobbying by charities is meant to divert public resources to their favourite cause (p. 294).

Not-for-profit organisations are not democratically elected and there may be questions about the extent of influence and power they wield however,

“[i]t is difficult to conceive that organisations such as ACOSS [Australian Council of Social Services] or the Australian Conservation Foundation exert greater influence on policy than, say, News Limited Publishing and Broadcasting Limited (PBL), whose relationships with government exhibit far less transparency” (Butcher, 2006, p. 78).

Despite this the literature does posit that not-for-profit organisations have a very important role in advocating and influencing openly and transparently the development of public policy. An organisational goal for many not-for-profit organisations is to influence government policy and represent community voices in the development of public policy (Onyx et al., 2010; Onyx et al., 2008). Not-for-profit organisations provide services and goods that are not provided by any other group and it is, therefore, crucial that they represent their community and engage in policy debates (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). These organisations are naturally close to their client base and through their service work can work effectively to inform policy development (Avner, 2010; DeSantis, 2010).

1.4 Rationale for research

In a civil society there are obligations on the state to provide social services to the community. Where the government is unable to provide these social services there is an expectation and a requirement that the government support, financially and
politically, social services provided by non-government, not-for-profit organisations. As with any bureaucracy or organisation providing financial support or funding there is regulation and control over how the funds are to be managed, spent, or allocated.

Advocacy is a critical role for not-for-profit organisations. The general public is not always able to advocate for themselves and have limited power to participate, constrained by access to resources, income, or location (Reid, 1999). Not-for-profit organisations have the resources, skills, leadership, knowledge, and access to people that the general population may not possess.

The not-for-profit sector is under considerable pressure with funding arrangements, reduced sources of funding, competitive funding tenders, and short-term funding contracts which impact on the organisation’s ability to deliver efficient, sustained, and effective services (Berman et al., 2006; Productivity Commission, 2010). The insecurity of funding sources impedes the organisation’s ability to plan for the future. There are government policy and legislative changes affecting the sector and their ability to voice concerns (Bass et al., 2007; Maddison et al., 2004; Onyx et al., 2008) and trends, such as the ageing population, a move towards ‘individual’ funding packages, a decrease in the number of volunteers, and increased community expectations. Funding contracts require onerous reporting requirements and financial risk is passed to the organisation without appropriate compensation (Productivity Commission, 2010). There is competition for funding in an industry that has limited resources and covers a wide and varied area of interests and activities which can make challenging authority a difficult task to undertake. The decision to advocate is made by the board and management of not-for-profit organisations under these constraints (Mason, 2016).
Over the last two decades there has been significant debate about reform of the charity sector, including legislative changes. In Australia, several formal enquiries have made recommendations about reform; the majority of which have not been implemented (for example, Report on Charitable Organisation in 1995, Charity Definition Inquiry in 2002, Senate Committee on Economics report in 2008, and the Economic Audit Committee report in 2009). The most significant have been the Henry Report on taxation reform (Henry, Harmer, Piggott, Ridout, & Smith, 2009) and the Productivity Commission Report on the Contribution of the Not-for-Profit sector (Productivity Commission, 2010). The recommendations in these reports have been the precursor for the creation of the ACNC in 2012. Both the Henry Report and Productivity Commission Report recommended the introduction of such a Charity Commission as well as related taxation reform. These outcomes have been part of the wave of changes implemented by the Federal Government that continue currently, the most recent being the review of the ACNC Acts, a statutory requirement after the first five years of operation (The Treasury, 2018a). This level of reform may have acted as an additional constraint on advocacy activity.

The Australian Federal Government aims to reduce government spending on social services while emphasising a regimented and targeted reporting schedule for charitable organisations. There is pressure to reduce advocacy activity and for government to control the voice of charities demonstrated through changes in legislation and the appointment of a new ACNC chairperson in 2017, a vocal critic of charities (Leigh, 2017).

Not-for-profit organisations currently engaged in a funding contract with the Commonwealth of Australia cannot be limited in their advocacy activities in that
contract. Federal legislation prohibits restrictions on advocating in Commonwealth agreements;

Prohibited content is any requirement that restricts or prevents a not-for-profit entity (including staff of the not-for-profit entity) from commenting on, advocating support for or opposing a change to any matter established by law, policy or practice of the Commonwealth *(Not-for-profit Sector Freedom to Advocate Act 2013 (Cth) s 5)*.

The gag clauses in contracts aim to control protests and gatherings. The threat of gag clauses continues in government contracts in state jurisdictions. Initially introduced in Queensland in 2012, there have been additional attempts in New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia (de Kretser, 2016).

There are other key external factors affecting not-for-profit organisations. Expectations of the community about the range of services and goods delivered, requirements of clients receiving these services, and the expectation on early intervention and breaking the cycle to reduce wicked social problems. There are multiple external stakeholders including governments, funders, social researchers, social commentators, community, and media, critiquing and commenting on the role and actions of not-for-profit organisations. The challenge of collaboration and competition with other not-for-profit, for-profit and government organisations. Competition has also been increased by the marketisation of human services and the privatisation of human services through ‘outsourcing’ (Goodwin & Phillips, 2015). Governments’ penchant for neoliberal policies or economic rationalism (Kenny, Taylor, Onyx, & Mayo, 2015), put pressure on the not-for-profit sector through privatisation and dominance of market forces, emphasising the importance of measuring and reporting outcomes (for example, Social Return on Investment).
The not-for-profit organisation is also under pressure from internal drivers. Demands from executive management and the board, development of strategic approaches to meet the financial and social commitments, outcomes and performance management, expectations of employees and volunteers, and the pressure to be sustainable in a volatile market, while maintaining an effective focus on their mission.

The not-for-profit sector is an important and critical part of the community operating in a volatile and demanding market. Research in this context is vital. The initial research for the thesis identified that not-for-profit organisations are advocating but are constrained in their ability to advocate and dissent or disagree because of a heavy reliance on government funding. The aim of the research was to determine the ability of not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy and to identify any constraints or limitations, real or perceived, placed on the not-for-profit organisation by a key funding provider; the government.

While some research had been conducted in overseas jurisdictions and in New South Wales and Victoria, (states co-located on the east coast of Australia), this research had not previously been undertaken in Western Australia. Western Australia is a large state, geographically isolated from the rest of Australia; a separate legal jurisdiction, with diverse funding provisions, incorporating federal, state, and local governments. The not-for-profit sector is a valuable part of the Western Australian economy, with charities employing 7% of the Western Australian workforce and an annual revenue of $12.7 billion (Gilchrist & Knight, 2017). The decision was taken to conduct the research in Western Australia to identify any similarities or differences in the organisational approach to advocacy and advocating strategies.
1.5 Research Approach

The research examined four not-for-profit organisations in the health sector to uncover the ability of the organisations to engage in advocacy and identify what strategies were utilised. The central focus of this research is: What influences the advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations in Australia? The literature review informed the development of the research questions for this study. The principal research questions for this thesis are:

1. Are Western Australian not-for-profit organisations undertaking policy advocacy?
2. What are the policy advocacy activities being adopted/employed by not-for-profit organisations?
3. What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents?

A qualitative approach was applied due to the exploratory nature of the research—to examine the how and why. Using a case study approach provides an opportunity for in-depth research (Flyvbjerg, 2006). The data for the study was obtained from a combination of interviews, and material from the not-for-profit organisation’s website, annual reports, media, and newsletters. Interviews were identified as the best method of obtaining detailed information about the activities in the organisation. The selected participants were senior managers within each organisation and no interviews were conducted with employees who were operational, that is, working directly with clients. The not-for-profit case study organisations selected are of varied sizes and governance structures, and all are involved in policy advocacy. It was important to select organisations that do advocate to determine how they advocate, why they advocated and how they fund their advocating strategies and resources.
1.6 Outline of the thesis

The thesis is presented in eight chapters. A hybrid thesis approach has been used, which combines a traditional thesis structure of introduction, literature review, methodology, and discussion, with three published papers to present key findings of the research.

The first chapter, the introduction, introduces the research topic, explains the relevance, importance, and contribution of the sector being researched and summarises the context of the research.

The second chapter is the literature review. The literature review is a systematic literature review methodology that was adopted to analyse the state of the academic literature on not-for-profit advocacy with a view to evaluating the level of policy advocacy engagement by Western Australian not-for-profit organisations.

The third chapter explains the research methodology used in the thesis and the justification and appropriateness of a qualitative case study design. This chapter expounds the interpretivist paradigm under which the research was undertaken. The chapter also details the data collection method, the approach to data analysis, the ethical considerations, and limitations of the research methodology.

Chapter 4 examines the issue of volunteering and social activism, and how the volunteers in the case study organisations are involved in advocacy. This is the first of three publications detailing the findings of the research.

Chapter 5, the second published paper, examines the tactics and activities used by two of the case study organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to engage in policy advocacy.
Chapter 6, the third publication, discusses the role of decision makers of not-for-profit organisations in adopting strategies to manage multiple stakeholders and deciding why and when to advocate.

Chapter 7 synthesises and interprets the findings, as presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. This chapter presents a theory of advocacy engagement to explain the interactions of the four case study organisations and details the impact the research has for theory, practice, and policy.

The final chapter, Chapter 8, concludes the thesis.

1.7 Limitations of the research

A qualitative paradigm was applied to the research. While qualitative research has been criticised for lacking rigor and evidence (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013), the qualitative research approach can provide a more holistic perspective (Gray, 2017), adding depth and the opportunity for detailed analysis and interpretation. A case study approach was adopted as a strategy for building theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007) and to provide knowledge of practices and outcomes (Flyvbjerg, 2011).

The research was conducted in four not-for-profit organisations in the health sector in Western Australia, a single jurisdiction in Australia. Limiting the research to a single jurisdiction may limit the findings applicability to other jurisdictions where the legal framework may differ. Similarly, this study investigates one category of not-for-profit organisation potentially limiting the application of the findings to other categories of not-for-profit organisations. Other categories of not-for-profit organisations include: Culture and Recreation; Education and Research; Environment; Development and Housing; Law, Advocacy and Politics; Philanthropic Intermediaries and Voluntarism; International; Religion; and, Business and Professional Associations (ABS, 2015). These limitations are acknowledged in the conclusion in chapter 8.
1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has introduced the research topic; not-for-profit organisations and advocacy, detailing the context of the research topic, and describing the relevance, importance and contribution of the sector. Not-for-profit organisations are established to contribute to the community, to make a positive difference. Not-for-profit organisations provide services and goods, as well as having a role in the community to advocate on behalf of their constituents. The question about should, or should not, not-for-profits organisations engage in policy advocacy was also posed. The chapter introduced the rationale for the research and the research approach adopted. A qualitative case study approach has been used and four not-for-profit organisations in the Western Australian health sector were included in the research. The limitations of the research have been identified. The next chapter presents the literature review of the thesis.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1  Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review for the thesis. A systematic literature review methodology was adopted to assess the state of the academic literature on not-for-profit organisations’ advocacy with a view to researching advocacy by Western Australian not-for-profit organisations. A systematic literature review is a form of literature review that uses a systematic method to gather and analyse research papers (Tikito & Souissi, 2019). A systematic review includes establishing the review focus questions and identifying a review procedure with inclusion and exclusion criteria (Oliver et al., 2005). Systematic review methodology has been utilised for third sector research (Garkisch, Heidingsfelder, & Beckmann, 2017; Igalla, Edelenbos, & van Meerkerk, 2019; Laurett & Ferreira, 2018). The systematic process provides a replicable approach (Maier, Meyer, & Steinbereithner, 2016), and minimises the potential for some of the biases found in more traditional literature reviews (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003; see also, Grant & Booth, 2009; Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, Feldt, & Schaufeli, 2016; Oliver et al., 2005). The aim was to acquire an understanding of current thinking and to develop a synthesis or overview.

The literature review is in two parts. The first part is the systematic literature review conducted prior to data collection taking place, which not only framed the research but also identified key components in a consequential model that synthesises and distils the range of advocacy positions and activities on tactical positions adopted by the not-for-profit organisations based on the extant literature prior to 2016. The model captures, conceptually and practically, the advocacy options and level of flexibility to organisations in different contexts during the robust, and sometimes
contentious, advocacy process. The second part is an update on the literature which demonstrates three aspects: increasing interest in not-for-profit advocacy, there is still limited research in the area of not-for-profit advocacy in Australia and identifying the strategic approach to advocacy undertaken by not-for-profit organisations.

2.2 Systematic Literature Review Methodology

The search tool Google Scholar was used to identify articles for review. The selection of Google Scholar was based on a preliminary search using the library database which searched a combination of database; including, but not limited to, Academic OneFile, Factiva, JSTOR, ProQuest, EBSCOhost, General OneFile, SAGE Journals, and Scopus, and concluded that similar material resulted from these sources. The first search was conducted using the search terms of ‘nonprofit, ‘non profit’, and ‘not-for-profit’, in combination with the terms; advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying, and government, to identify a list of article titles. The search was limited to articles published between 2011 and early 2016, and ‘citations only’ were excluded. This initial search identified 318 articles. The search was then expanded using terminology relevant to other jurisdictions and included the terms ‘Voluntary Sector’, ‘Third Sector’ and ‘Community Sector’ combined with the terms advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying, and government. The search ‘Voluntary Sector’ yielded a list of 32 articles. A similar search using the term ‘Third Sector’ identified 57 articles and five articles were found for the search term ‘Community Sector’.

This initial list of 412 articles was sub-sequentially refined by the exclusion of articles which were not journal articles or empirical studies, published in English and subject to peer review. This process eliminated, for example, books, book reviews, and theses. The remaining articles were reviewed to eliminate those which were not relevant to the three focus questions:
1. Does the extant literature demonstrate that not-for-profit organisations are advocating?

2. What evidence is there in the literature of the types of advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations?

3. Is there evidence in the literature of not-for-profit organisations’ advocacy activities being restricted, limited or modified to suit funders, in particular government funders?

This systematic process (see Figure 2-1) identified 15 articles for review.

Figure 2-1: Systematic review process

- **Search terms**
  - ‘Nonprofit’ or ‘not for profit’ and advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying and government (n = 318)
  - ‘Voluntary Sector’ and advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying and government (n = 32)
  - ‘Third Sector’ and advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying and government (n = 57)
  - ‘Community Sector’ and advocacy, policy, money, funding, lobbying and government (n = 2)

  **Electronic Search**
  - Articles identified from Google Scholar

  **Identification**
  - 412 articles

  **Screening**
  - Screening Criteria:
    - Empirical studies
    - In English
    - Peer Reviewed
    - Duplicate
  - 236 articles excluded

  **Eligibility**
  - Eligibility Criteria:
    - Full text articles assessed for eligibility
  - 161 articles excluded

  **Inclusion**
  - 15 studies included in review
The search process identified only one Australian article. However, Phillips and Goodwin (2014) did not address the focus questions, although the authors did discuss the issue of advocacy through policy research activities. To ensure that this was not a product of the search strategy, a reverse search on Google Scholar identified other Australian researchers using the principal Australian scholars Onyx and others (2010), Phillips (2006), Dalton and Lyons (2005), and Maddison and others (2004) who had published on this topic pre-2010. This process yielded a further three Australian articles: Bailey, Robertson and Hulme (2014), Butcher and Dalton (2014), and Jacobs (2015). Again, the three studies identified did not answer the three focus questions (above), although they demonstrated active research in the area of policy engagement by Australian non-for-profit organisations. These articles were then excluded from the review. The table below (Table 2-1) provides a summary of the final fifteen articles included in the review.

Table 2-1: Systematic Review - Summary of articles selected for inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Are NFP advocating?</th>
<th>Advocacy strategies discussed</th>
<th>Government funding limits advocacy</th>
<th>Government funding increases advocacy</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Advocacy Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baggott and Jones (2014)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Policy involvement; Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaney (2015)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delamont (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Advocacy; Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott and Hugh (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans and Shields (2014)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everest and McGraw (2015)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geu and Zhang (2014)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampe and Cherry and Crotty (2016)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLeod and Whalen (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neave and Schneider and Meyer (2013)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pargande and Talibane (2017)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverman and Patruno (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Dikson (2012)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorachuha and De Corte (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang and Gao (2017)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there evidence that not-for-profit organisations are advocating?

The research demonstrated that not-for-profit organisations do have a role in advocating on behalf of their community and are involved in ‘civic participation’ as well as representing the needs and requirements of their members (Mellinger, 2014). Not all not-for-profit organisations can be involved in advocacy activities or believe that they are able to have such influence (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). The total number of staff in an organisation and financial size are strong predictors of public policy participation. Small entities may not be involved in policy advocacy as they are too busy providing services or raising funds. They may not have the capacity to engage in public policy matters which excludes their voice and those they serve from public policy debates (Bass et al., 2007).

Beyond the academic literature, the contemporary evidence indicates that some not-for-profit organisations see advocacy as important. They have a clear and determined advocacy strategy; “we actively advocate on behalf of disadvantaged children and young people to ensure that their voices are heard, and their needs met.” (The Smith Family, 2019, Research and Advocacy). The larger not-for-profit organisations have a role to advocate on behalf of their members. These organisations include statements about advocacy to governments, decision makers, and the community in their mission documents (for example, FIA, 2019; Red Cross, 2019; World Vision, 2019).

Only some organisations have an activist agenda. Professional organisations, unions, and social welfare organisations (for example, ACOSS), have been established to specifically take on the role of participation in the policy process, because their
members may not be able or prefer not to be engaged in advocacy activities. Advocacy associations, also known as peak bodies associations, are established when there is a perceived sector-wide need for an effective body to negotiate with governments (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). Advocacy associations provide a specialist set of skills to help member organisations. An advocacy association is better resourced and has the appropriately skill set to undertake advocacy activities more effectively. Activities undertaken by advocacy associations include: training for not-for-profit organisations; lobbying on behalf of the sector; research; establishment of policy priorities; commenting on proposed legislation; conducting meetings and information sessions; and, educating policy makers (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). An advocacy association can offer a strong voice by representing the sector’s interests as a whole to government and policy makers.

Not-for-profit organisations can contribute to public policy discussion by working collaboratively with other not-for-profit organisations or through peak bodies (Onyx et al., 2008). This move is more effective and resource efficient because these organisations have well established networks and relationships (Acosta, 2012; Onyx et al., 2010). Such sector-wide collaboration can help to develop a culture of advocacy and a sense of partnership across not-for-profit organisations enabling larger organisations to take on leadership roles within the sector (Onyx et al., 2010). Collaboration reduces the potential risk for not-for-profit organisations of losing funding through being active advocates.
2.4 Types of advocacy activities: Models, approaches and frameworks in the literature

There is evidence in the literature of the types of advocacy activities not-for-profit organisations employ. Studies which presented models and/or frameworks for the advocacy tactics used by not-for-profit organisations were specifically identified during the process of reviewing the articles selected. These studies, all published in or prior to 2011, (see Table 2-2) have been well cited in the literature and used extensively in describing the different approaches to advocacy in use by not-for-profit organisations.

Table 2-2: Published articles on not-for-profit advocacy approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Advocacy Approach</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry and Arons</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Cooperative including working on government committees, meeting with policymakers, providing government with information, informal gatherings with government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Confrontational including involvement in public hearings, reporting research to media and public, involving members in lobbying activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binderkrantz</td>
<td>Direct strategies</td>
<td>Administrative including contacting ministers, using public committees Parliamentary including contacting parliamentary committees and other members of parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect strategies</td>
<td>Media including writing letters to the editor, issuing press releases, publishing research reports, contacting reporters. Mobilization including organising campaigns, strikes, public demonstrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo and Saxton</td>
<td>11 advocacy strategies</td>
<td>Research; Media advocacy; Direct lobbying; Grassroots lobbying; Public events and direct action; Judicial advocacy; Public education; Coalition building; Administrative lobbying; Voter registration and education; and Expert testimony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyx et al.</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Relationship building with governments including members on government committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>External democratic processes including rallies, public meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosley</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Relationship building including participating in the development or revision of regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Public education, mass media, protests, demonstrations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berry and Arons (2003) found that not-for-profit organisations and their funding agencies had a cooperative relationship. Not-for-profit organisations rethink their strategy occasionally to reduce the risk of losing their funding. “If the downside of these relationships was a tempering of the nonprofits’ advocacy, the upside was the tremendous opportunity they had to talk to agency administrators” (p. 107).

‘Legislative’ strategies were considered more aggressive and ‘administrative’ strategies were less aggressive. Not-for-profit organisations, who do not lobby, lose an opportunity to educate legislators as, “part of this process is recognizing that government relations include legislative lobbying” (p. 164).

Not-for-profit organisations who advocate use a combination of strategies. Binderkrantz (2005) categorised direct advocacy strategies as either Administrative or Parliamentary, and indirect strategies as Media or Mobilization. Not-for-profit organisations with access to policy makers engage in ‘direct’ tactics, and also engaged in media campaigns or member campaigns. Indirect strategies are used most by cause-related groups. An indirect strategy is not the only option for groups who are not inside the policy development space.

Guo and Saxton (2010) did not categorise advocacy activities in two main groups. Instead, they identified 11 distinct advocacy strategies: Research; Media advocacy; Direct lobbying; Grassroots lobbying; Public events and direct action; Judicial advocacy; Public education; Coalition building; Administrative lobbying; Voter registration and education; and, Expert testimony were all classified as advocacy, with the list later reduced to ten (Guo & Zhang, 2014). They argued that not-for-profit organisations, with representative membership on their board and membership involvement with strategic decision making, had more opportunity for and increased levels of advocacy. However, not-for-profit organisations with higher levels of
government and private funding had decreased levels of advocacy (Guo & Saxton, 2010).

Onyx and others (2010) analysed various strategies used by not-for-profit organisations with all advocacy strategies carrying some risk to funding sources. The organisation may need to be selective and make concessions on less significant issues or causes. They posited that although advocacy can be classified as either radical or institutional advocacy; these activities are not mutually exclusive. Radical advocacy involves “external democratic processes” (p. 46) and includes rallies, letter drops, or public meetings. These activities allow for a distinct level of independence and there is less risk of co-option as a government utility. One risk identified by Onyx and others, however, is that the organisation is seen as inappropriate or unconnected. Institutional advocacy means advocating directly with or to governments; developing relationships, developing policy papers or being members of committees. There is a possible risk of co-option, and the perception of a ‘closed door’ in which only a few or an elite group can be involved. These ‘insider’ relationships require time, resources, and a level of professionalism to develop and some not-for-profit organisations struggle to engage.

Mosley (2011, p. 443) argued that “advocacy involvement and government funding may have an iterative relationship”. A large not-for-profit organisation with high levels of professionalisation and that is ‘Institutionalised’ has better access to policy makers. Government funding received provides additional opportunities to develop and maintain the relationship and provide more access for advocacy. This is referred to as ‘insider tactics’, drawing on “new institutional theory and resource dependency theory” (Mosley, 2011, p. 438). Funding contracts encourage advocacy to maintain funding and government can continue to have a not-for-profit organisation provide the services. In this scenario, the government has knowledge about the
organisation and has confidence about the delivery of services. Not all not-for-profit organisations use these ‘insider’ tactics. Lack of skill, experience, knowledge, resources, and time prevents involvement by some organisations. These not-for-profit organisations may prefer to use ‘indirect tactics’ when advocating.

What was evident from the extant literature is that the tactics used are not mutually exclusive. Less formalised not-for-profit organisations rely on indirect tactics to advocate because they do not have either the resources or access to governments and policy makers.

2.5 Restrictions on advocacy activities

Governments have a unique relationship with not-for-profit organisations. Oakleigh (2009) refers to this relationship as a ‘delicate dance’ (see also Brock, 2003). Governments recognise the importance and existence of not-for-profit organisations. These groups help to provide resources and services that governments are either unable to provide or are too costly (Butcher & Dalton, 2014). Their services are vital to the broader community and, therefore, governments will provide these groups with direct funding and other financial and non-financial support reducing the burden on government agencies. Not-for-profit organisations act as a bridge between the community and government. They provide services that government cannot deliver as effectively or efficiently.

The relationship between not-for-profit organisations and governments is a partnership based on contractual, semi or “quasi-contractual” relationships (Butcher, 2006, p. 72). This can be construed as an “interdependent relationship between third sector organisations and government, between civil society and the state” (Muetzelfeldt, 1998, p. 119). Agreeing to contract with governments involves a range of trade-offs. Strict compliance clauses and disclosure regimes in contracts can have negative effects
(Oakleigh, 2009). Guo and Saxton (2010) found that the “scope and intensity of non-profit advocacy tend to…decrease with the growth in government funding and private contributions” (p. 1). Bloodgood and Tremblay-Boire (2017) found that not-for-profit organisations with a higher percentage of government funding reported less expenditure on advocacy.

Not-for-profit organisations tend to believe that the government does not like to be criticised and prefers to silence dissent (Maddison et al., 2004; Onyx et al., 2008). Many not-for-profit organisations “have found themselves increasingly constrained and excluded from the policy-making process” (Maddison & Denniss, 2005, p. 373). Smaller organisations do not advocate because of a lack of relevant skills, funding, and concern about possible reprisal by funding agencies (Onyx et al., 2010). Bass and others (2007) argue that government funding is a covert way of pressuring not-for-profit organisations to conform and to reduce levels of advocacy. Some funding agencies do not support advocacy activities being undertaken by not-for-profit organisations and can place restrictions on using grant funds for lobbying purposes (Bass et al., 2007). This influence can be part of the service contract, implied or perceived through the relationship with the funder.

[G]overnment at times exerts undue influence on funded organisations — including undue government control over funded activities, such as: highly prescriptive contract conditions that are disproportionate to risk; undue overall control and influence where government is only part-funding an activity; and, government control over activities unrelated to the purpose of the funded activity, such as advocacy (Productivity Commission, 2010, p. 293).

As government funding increases as a share of an organisation's revenue, so too does the perceived barrier to participating in public policy fora. Many not-for-profit
organisations cite fear of retribution for a lack of engagement in public policy debate (Bass et al., 2007).

2.5.1 Constraints on advocacy

The Australian Productivity Commission (2010) identified four major constraints which affect a not-for-profit organisation: regulation and legal compliance costs; contracting constraints with governments; funding and financing constraints; and, lack of business skills. Not-for-profit organisations report also that other barriers to policy participation include limited financial resources, taxation laws, and limited staff or volunteer skills (Bass et al., 2007), with contracts not granted to organisations who are advocating against government (Muetzelfeldt, 1998).

One way in which governments control the ability of organisations to advocate is through legislation, including regulatory requirements. Governments can reverse a not-for-profit organisation’s eligibility for taxpayer deductibility, specific government payments, and require a declaration about political or other affiliations. Historically, the ATO has on occasion removed the charitable status of an organisation when it has become involved in a ‘lobbying’ activity. A change in status was a selective punishment process imposed on an organisation (Lyons, 2003). This has been seen as a way of government controlling advocacy activities.

Legislation can determine how much time and resources an organisation is permitted to spend on advocacy by requiring organisations to report just how much is being spent on these activities. The United States government limits spending on advocacy activities under Internal Revenue Service (IRS) rulings for charitable and social welfare organisations. In addition, the Lobbying Disclosure Act requires lobbyists to be registered. This presents significant challenges for not-for-profit organisations to understand and then apply the law (Ruggiano & Taliaferro, 2012).
The not-for-profit sector reform debate focuses on the importance and the necessity to have an informed donor market rather than the imposition of an additional regulatory burden in an industry already under-resourced. There is concern that the introduction of new legislation has taxation implications for social enterprises. Consequently, such legislation forces organisations to be more careful about their activities or risk losing either funding or taxation benefits (Balassiano & Chandler, 2010). However, an appropriate level of regulatory control is required to maintain community confidence and help create an efficient and sustainable environment (Johns, 2004).

Not-for-profit organisations do require appropriate funding to undertake their roles and to provide quality services. Funding, therefore, is a method through which an organisation can be influenced and controlled. Not-for-profit organisations will accept the constraints and confidential restrictions that may come with funding agreements. Government contracts have included clauses supposedly to assist in the management of the funding arrangement. “Regulatory compliance was seen as a necessary evil” (Cribb, 2006, p. 28).

The use of ‘disclosure of information’ and ‘commercial in confidence’ clauses limits and controls advocacy activities (Berman et al., 2006; Muetzelfeldt, 1998). The use of words that can be construed as ‘management speak’, such as ‘micromanagement’, ‘accountability’, and ‘compliance’ is an indication of the more subordinate types of relationship that government prefers (Onyx et al., 2008). The level of monitoring, auditing, and reporting to government may be superficial, unnecessary, and resource consuming (Cribb, 2006; Muetzelfeldt, 1998). Service contracting means micro-management and is a relationship with government that lacks trust (Productivity Commission, 2010). Cribb (2006, p. 31) posited that “[i]ntensifying monitoring and
reporting regimes…may not be a useful way to improve accountability for either party.”

Government and not-for-profit organisations usually have similar goals; such as wanting to make the community a better place in which to live, with an underlying intention to make a positive difference to society.

2.6 Evidence on continuing to advocate

Not-for-profit organisations that rely on government funding have continued to undertake and commit resources to advocacy despite the perception of external threats and possible withdrawal of funding (Dalton & Lyons, 2005). Government funding, may in fact, create advocacy opportunities (Mosley, 2012). The contractual funding relationship can place the not-for-profit organisation in a better resourced position to influence policy and contribute to public debate. Neumayr, Schneider, and Meyer (2015) found that public funding did not diminish not-for-profit organisations’ advocacy activities’ and several other studies suggest that access to government funding increases the not-for-profit organisations’ advocacy activities (Fyall & Allard, 2017; MacIndoe & Whalen, 2013; Smith & Pekkanen, 2012; Zhang & Guo, 2012). Mosley (2011) found that there was no reduction in the amount of advocacy undertaken by not-for-profit organisations but that there were changes in the type of advocacy; increased government funding increased the use of ‘insider tactics’.

In the 2010 Australian sector wide survey, 73% of respondents indicated they were able to speak publicly about their clients’ issues (ACOSS, 2010). The research literature is divided over the reality [or perception] of the ability of the not-for-profit organisations to speak out against government policy. DeSantis (2010) found that some not-for-profit organisations believed that government funding affected their approach to advocacy while other organisations had no such concerns. Chaney (2015) identified concerns from not-for-profit organisations over the negative consequences of
advocating, while DeSantis (2013) referred to ‘advocacy chill’ within the sector. More recently, ACOSS called for governments to “ensure no contracts proscribe organisations from participating in independent research, policy development, and public debate, including advocacy” (ACOSS, 2014, p. 4), highlighting concerns arising from the 2014 sector survey. Similarly, the United Kingdom Prime Minister was lobbied to reconsider plans for an anti-campaigning clause in all grant agreements (NCVO, 2016).

2.7 Advocacy factors

A range of additional factors shape the positioning of a not-for-profit organisation with respect to its tactics. These include collective advocacy, ‘soft’ tactics, language, and commercialisation.

2.7.1 Collective Advocacy

Not all not-for-profit organisations want to contribute to the larger public policy debate. Playgroups, reading groups, bingo clubs, toy libraries, sporting clubs, and smaller groups formed for a single purpose are not participants in the public policy processes and leave any government engagement to peak bodies (Maddison & Denniss, 2005). Consequently, large not-for-profit organisations and advocacy associations have an important function to fulfil and many have assumed a key role to be “the ‘voice’ of the non-government welfare sector and a credible critic of government policies” (Berman et al., 2006, p. 88). Advocacy groups can assist the not-for-profit organisation in providing specialist skill sets and support mechanisms. By specialising in this role, advocacy groups enable not-for-profit organisations to focus on their primary role of delivering services to their clients.
2.7.2 Soft approach

In addition to the ‘co-operative’ approach, not-for-profit organisations have often adopted ‘softer’ forms of advocacy (Verschuere & De Corte, 2015). Onyx and others (2010, p. 59) have identified that “overt political advocacy is repressed and in decline [with] an emphasis on forming relationships with government and the professionalisation of the third sector as an ‘industry’.” They posited that “organisations that grew out of earlier social movements many have lost their strong activist orientation and collectivist work practices and instead adopted more bureaucratic and professional structures, and a focus on seeking out stable and secure funding sources primarily from government” (p. 45).

What has then developed is “advocacy with gloves on: advocacy that is non-confrontational and incremental rather than traditionally confrontational and demanding” (Onyx et al., 2010, p. 43). Not-for-profit organisations would undertake milder forms of institutional advocacy rather than radical advocacy. The development of ongoing professional relationships means that they are in a position to quietly inform and influence public policy. They can be viewed by governments and the community to be in a position of trust and thus be independent, resourceful, and intelligent (Onyx et al., 2010).

Not-for-profit organisations have recognised that it is important to maintain effective and harmonious relationships with government and they understand the importance of selecting the most appropriate approach, and topics, for advocacy. Governments prefer robust discussions and any serious criticism to be conducted privately, not in the public domain. These types of discussions and relationships can be productive but there is a risk that the not-for-profit organisation becomes merely a
conduit for government and unable to critique robustly the government of the day (Onyx et al., 2008).

2.7.3 Language

The meaning of words, while a separate study in linguistics, is relevant in the discussion of not-for-profit advocacy. The manner and style of language is important for not-for-profit organisations when engaging in advocacy activities (Elliott & Haigh, 2013). Bail (2016) refers to building “cultural bridges” (p. 11823) to facilitate public conversation about not-for-profit organisations’ issue.

There is no agreed definition for advocacy or lobbying. Advocacy is for the benefit of others, incorporating the ability of an individual or group to promote a position and to attempt to influence legislators or those in positions of power. The word lobbying lends itself to an implication of political involvement. Lobbying is attempting to “influence specific legislation through appeals to policy-makers or individuals” (Almog-Bar & Schmid, 2014, p. 5). “The key difference between lobbying and other forms of advocacy is that lobbying involves taking and promoting a position on specific legislation” (Salamon, Geller, & Lorentz, 2008, p.2). Advocacy includes a wider range of activities (Ahmed, 2013). While the terms ‘advocacy’ and ‘lobbying’ are used interchangeably, they do not mean the same thing and is not always the language used by not-for-profit organisations.

The “avoidance strategy” (Taliaferro & Ruggiano, 2013, p. 163) of not wanting to be involved in a strategy that may have negative connotations and, in an effort, to not offend policy makers, funders, and the general public, not-for-profit organisations have many different terms for their advocacy activities. Alternative expressions of advocacy include: involvement in the policy process (Baggott & Jones, 2014), impact analysis (Bass et al., 2007), educating (Bass et al., 2007; Ruggiano & Taliaferro, 2012), outreach
or talking to legislators (Mosley, 2012), and campaigns (Baggott & Jones, 2014; DeSantis, 2013). The use of the term ‘lobbying’ is not preferred because of a ‘negative association’ with oppositional positions and political motives (Bass et al., 2007; Taliaferro, 2013; Mellinger, 2017b). Not-for-profit administrators, although engaging in ‘lobbying’ activities will not use this word but will refer to their activities as educating or advocating (Taliaferro & Ruggiano, 2013).

2.7.4 Commercialisation or Professionalism

The evolution of not-for-profit organisations over the last twenty years has included adoption of elements of for-profit governance. Management has focused on professionalisation and the implementation of models of ‘good’ governance as well as developing, forming, and maintaining critical relationships (Edgar, 2008; Mosley, 2011; Onyx et al., 2010). Almog-Bar and Schmid (2014, p. 28) identified that “advocacy skills relate to political, personal, and interpersonal interactions with actors in the political arena.” Not-for-profit organisations require structures and staff that can sustain their organisational requirements and prosper in an increasingly competitive market environment.

Those that rely on government funding must employ political skill and cultivate public support…those that rely on charitable donations must develop fundraising mechanisms and build emotional connection…those that rely heavily on business revenues more closely resemble the economic dynamics of a business corporation (Collins, 2006, p. 21).

Large not-for-profit organisations that have professional leadership, more collaborative decision-making, and greater staff involvement and engagement were associated with increased advocacy (Mosley, 2011; Onyx et al., 2008). Not-for-profit organisations
need to be able to afford to advocate, both in terms of funding, and in terms of the potential risk to funding (ACOSS, 2010; 2014).

Smaller not-for-profit organisations risk being left behind and becoming financially unsustainable if they are not able to professionalise their operations and compete effectively (Dalton & Butcher, 2014). Such organisations often do not have the resources or opportunity to professionalise (Onyx et al., 2010). Consequently, some large not-for-profit organisations are dominating their part of the sector (Dalton & Butcher, 2014). This creates a growing gap between the small, community based not-for-profit organisations and the larger, more commercially oriented not-for-profit organisations (Butcher, 2006). The gap affects the ability of not-for-profit organisations to advocate on behalf of their constituents (Baggott & Jones, 2014; Brennan, 1998; Mosley, 2012).

2.8 Synthesis and proposed model

This review has identified that senior management in not-for-profit organisations believe participation in public policy debate is essential and is, therefore, a key management responsibility. Spending time on public policy matters, however, detracts from other critical work, such as fundraising, running direct services, public education programs, and handling day-to-day crises (Bass et al., 2007). When a not-for-profit organisation does not participate in advocacy this has “the effect of reducing government accountability, sustaining existing inequities and, ultimately, diminishing the quality of Australian democracy” (Maddison & Denniss, 2005, p. 373). As a result, effective advocacy needs to be fostered and encouraged.

The relative ‘interdependence’ of not-for-profit organisations and governments means governments can fund and influence the activities of these organisations. This interdependence also allows not-for-profit organisations to influence governments as
part of the “essential features of healthy liberal societies” (Muetzelfeldt, 1998, p. 122). Not-for-profit organisations can create public policy changes that have a substantial beneficial impact on society. The combination of knowledge, community involvement, and broad support provides an effective platform for the (re)shaping of public policy (Avner, 2010).

Many not-for-profit organisations believe advocacy is a key goal. Various strategies have been adopted to mitigate possible negative ramifications while continuing advocacy activities. These strategies are dependent on the structure, political framework, leadership, and environment within which not-for-profit organisations operate (Oakleigh, 2009). The strategies and tactics identified in the literature have been analysed and detailed in the proposed model below (Figure 2-2).

**Figure 2-2: Tactical positions for advocacy by not-for-profit organisations**
The model (Figure 2-2) encapsulates what the literature argues about how not-for-profit organisations approach advocacy. The choice of approach varies according to an organisation’s size, resources, skills, and the advocacy issue being considered. This model, developed from a synthesis of other work, allows for different scenarios, and identifies that organisations are flexible in their advocacy stance and not strictly aligned to one tactic; a contingency based approach. The model is fluid and not-for-profit organisations are not limited to just one quadrant. Instead, the model represents a set of options available for advocacy. Not-for-profit organisations engage in those tactics suitable to an issue or agenda, contingent upon a range of factors.

2.8.1 Co-operative Tactical Position

Not-for-profit organisations using co-operative tactics seek to influence policy makers in a supportive and obliging manner. These tactics are co-operative in nature, do not seek to disrupt and wish to work with other parties in negotiating changes. In the public arena these tactics can be seen through branding, reputation building of the not-for-profit organisation, and development of relationships with policy makers. Not-for-profit organisations who do not have a relationship with policy makers take a more low-key approach and may work jointly on research reports or in network meetings to engage in the policy debate.

2.8.2 Confrontational Tactical Position

Confrontational tactics include activities and methods used by not-for-profit organisations to engage in advocacy where they seek to challenge policy makers. This may be in a public forum through public meetings, rallies, demonstrations, or media engagement. Not-for-profit organisations may first confront the policy makers through private meetings, as a precursor to a more public confrontation, or to signal a change in advocacy stance.
2.8.3 Insider Tactical Position

An ‘insider’ organisation has an effective working relationship with policy makers, has significant contacts within the bureaucracy and regularly communicates with government agencies. Part of the ascription of ‘insider’ status means government respects the activities of these organisations and consults them regularly on key policy matters. ‘Insider’ organisations spend considerable time and resources developing and maintaining these close relationships.

2.8.4 Outsider Tactical Position

An ‘outsider’ organisation communicates less frequently with government and is not included on a regular basis in policy development or consultation processes. These organisations do not have the time or resources to spend on developing this relationship. Some deliberately position themselves as distinctly separate from government to establish their independence. They seek to avoid any perception that they are compromising their stance, values or mission. ‘Outsider’ status is adopted by organisations for specific purposes. An organisation may have developed a solid and respectful working relationship with government but may then decide that a particular issue has become untenable which means a different approach is required. An organisation previously considered to be an ‘insider’ does not just use co-operative tactics but will consider more confrontational approaches. Conversely, an organisation that has traditionally not developed an insider relationship with government may move to use co-operative (insider) tactics as well as confrontational tactics.

2.9 Recent Research

The initial systematic literature review was completed in early 2016. The findings from the systematic review informed the data collection and empirical analysis
of the case studies. A more recent review of the literature was completed, from early 2016 to 2018, to identify relevant, current literature. Using the same search methodology 195 articles were identified as meeting the search criteria. These articles were scanned, and nine articles were identified as relevant and are listed in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3: Systematic Review - Summary of articles selected for inclusion post 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Are NFP advocating?</th>
<th>Advocacy strategies discussed</th>
<th>Government funding limits advocacy</th>
<th>Government funding increases advocacy</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Advocacy Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffardi, Peligman and Ratchek Smith (2017)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Policy involvement; Advocacy; Lobbying; Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, Pauill and Holloway (2017)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyall (2016)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying; Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Lo and Tang (2017)</td>
<td>Qualitative &amp; Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby, Donnack and Mazer (2017)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying; Campaigning; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu (2017)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu (2018a)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason (2016)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Advocacy; Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan and Tang (2016)</td>
<td>Qualitative &amp; Quantitative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not-for-profit organisations continue to engage in policy advocacy identifying an appropriate strategy and are “diverse in the nature of their engagement” (Buffardi et al., 2017, p. 1242). The leaders of not-for-profit organisation influence the advocacy activities (Mason, 2016). Resource and institutional factors can also determine the advocacy approach (Li, Lo & Tang, 2017), with advocacy participation being compromised because of resource competition, government funding, and community commitment (Lu, 2017).

The strategy is about shaping and developing the form of the advocacy activity. Categorising strategies and tactics, for example into insider and outsider categories, remain fluid depending on the activity and the issue (Li et al., 2017). Not-for-profit organisations are aware of the risk of political repercussions (Li et al., 2017) and are
less likely to use confrontational tactics (Buffardi et al., 2017). However, not-for-profit organisations report success in changing, stopping or creating policy (Buffardi et al., 2017; see also Tschirhart & Bielefeld, 2012).

Government funding has been found not to diminish advocacy (Li et al., 2017) and may make the advocacy voice stronger (Fyall, 2016). Lu (2018a, p. 211) found that “government funding might be a feeble catalyst, rather than a barrier, for nonprofits to participate in the policy process.” However, connections with government in some jurisdictions may constrain the ability of the not-for-profit organisation to engage in policy advocacy (Zhan & Tang, 2016). The challenge can be evaluating advocacy activities within different locations but Libby, Deitrick and Mano (2017) found that models could be used to compare the advocacy frameworks across jurisdictions.

This recent research identified similar findings to the initial literature review. That not-for-profit organisations were continuing to engage in policy advocacy using ‘insider’ tactics. While in the United States, the issue of advocacy remains an important area of research, other jurisdictions, for example, China and Israel, have begun studies in this area.

2.10 Theory

Theories are used to describe and explain the subject matter being studied (Punch, 2006). “A theory consists of a coherent set of propositions that offer an explanation of some phenomena by describing the way other things correspond to this phenomenon” (Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2013, p. 38). Theory is concerned with the relationship between concepts and the description of social behaviour (Ezzy, 2002, p. 4) with concepts as “the building blocks of theory” (Zikmund et al., 2013, p. 39). “Theory is a formal, logical explanation of some events that includes predictions of how things relate to one another” (Zikmund et al., 2013, p. 38). “Theories arrange sets of
concepts to define and explain some phenomenon” (Silverman, 2010, p. 109). Concepts “describe or explain a phenomenon of theoretical interest” (Gioia et al., 2013, p. 16). The research in this thesis applied two theories relevant to the topic, Stakeholder Theory and Resource Dependency Theory.

2.10.1 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory considers that a stakeholder is "any individual or group of individuals who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Stakeholder theory proposes that there are several groups or individuals who influence the organisation with differing levels of importance.

“Nonprofits are accountable to multiple stakeholders” (Prentice & Brudney, 2017, p. 953) and need to consider the interests of all stakeholders (Mason, Kirkbride & Bryde, 2007). “It makes sense to say that firms ought to initiate and facilitate respectful, honest and productive multilateral communication with their stakeholders” (Noland & Phillips, 2010, p. 48). Who are the stakeholders? In some situations, the client was the most important stakeholder (Cribb, 2006). An important stakeholder could be the primary funder. The issue for the not-for-profit organisations is the multiplicity of stakeholders; government, funders, clients, other not-for-profit organisations, employees, volunteers, and community. This list of stakeholders is not exhaustive and may be different for each organisation.

2.10.2 Resource Dependency Theory

Not-for-profit organisations need to respond to the expectations and demands of their external environment. “The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, p. 2). Resource Dependency is part of the relationship organisations have with their environment (Helmig, Jegers, &
Lapsley, 2004) and is relevant in the discussion of not-for-profit organisations because of their dependency on funders. Resource Dependency Theory has been used to explain the need for organisations to acquire and maintain adequate resources to survive (Worth, 2017). Resource Dependency theory can help to explain not-for-profit organisations closer involvement with governments to help maintain and strengthen the relationship and protect their funding levels (Butcher & Dalton, 2014). Resource Dependency Theory can also explain the control and change in the form and direction of the advocacy activities undertaken by a not-for-profit organisation. Those organisations relying heavily on government funding may become more concerned with maintaining this critical bond and thus avoid advocacy activities that could potentially jeopardise such a dependent relationship.

One risk to the organisation under Resource Dependency Theory is goal displacement (Worth, 2017). A not-for-profit organisation behaves in a way to satisfy the external agency and changes their activities to meet the requests of an external stakeholder, usually the entity paying the bills. The Theory also suggests that not-for-profit organisations adopt processes and behaviours and become more like their external stakeholders. This process is known as isomorphism (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Worth, 2017). The constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions. Organisations can reduce their dependency on external stakeholders and maintain autonomy by diversifying their funding sources.

The political and economic climate drives the advocacy agenda in a “market-driven civil society” (Feldman, Strier, & Koreh, 2017, p. 1). The behaviour of organisations is influenced by their dependent relationships (Worth, 2017). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) believe that organisations need to acquire and retain resources to
survive. However, acquisition of resources can be challenging in an environment where resources are scarce, short term, inconsistent, or unreliable (Froelich, 1999). Therefore, Resource Dependency Theory can help to explain the decisions by not-for-profit organisations to engage in advocacy and the strategies they use (Ahmed, 2013).

2.11 Chapter Summary

While not all not-for-profit organisations engage in advocacy, this remains an important and crucial role for many. The ability to advocate and engage in policy development with governments can ensure that the mission of the organisation and the services delivered meet the needs of the organisation and those they represent. The evidence in the literature is that not-for-profit organisations are continuing to advocate (Grønbjerg & Prakash, 2017) and are using tactics and methods appropriate to their advocacy platform and resources. Several authors have proposed categories of advocacy tactics used by not-for-profit organisations. These categories have been synthesised to create a model, which can be used to assist not-for-profit organisations determine how they advocate. The model does not intend not-for-profit organisations adopt a static position. Rather it serves to illustrate how not-for-profit organisations will engage in the range of tactics suitable to an issue or agenda on a contingency basis. The model may provide a vehicle by which not-for-profit organisations can identify suitable advocacy tactics to protect valuable relationships and yet remain financially viable while ensuring an active voice in public comment and policy development. This model has been used to analyse the advocacy activities by the case study organisations in this thesis and are presented in the discussion chapters.

The literature review chapter has analysed the extant literature and this analysis has been used to inform the research and the development of the research questions. The following chapter presents the research methodology for the thesis.
Chapter 3  
Research Methodology

3.1  
Introduction

The previous chapter detailed the literature on studies in not-for-profit organisations engagement in policy advocacy. This literature has informed and guided the research approach chosen for this thesis. This chapter explains the research methodology used in this thesis, and the justification and appropriateness of a qualitative case study design. The chapter expounds the interpretivist paradigm under which the research was undertaken. The chapter also details the data collection approach, the data analysis, the ethical considerations, and limitations of the research methodology.

3.2  
Research Approach

Ontology refers to the way to make decisions about the most appropriate way to answer the overarching research question. “What is the form and nature of reality?” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108). Ontology is the study of “the nature of existence and what constitutes reality” (Gray, 2017, p. 21). “A social scientific perspective addressing how realities are made” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 342). In other words, the study of being. Epistemology, on the other hand, defines the strategy for selecting methods to answer the research question. This relates to the study of knowledge. How do I know this is the way to study this problem? The research, in this thesis, utilised a constructivist perspective. Constructivists view meaning of the world as being constructed; individuals “construct their own meaning in different ways” (Gray, 2017, p. 22). Where “constructivism research addresses the “processes” of interaction among individuals” (Creswell, 2013, p. 25).
Primary research is a theory of investigation, a scientific method, used to develop research questions and collect data (Driscoll, 2011). Kuhn (1970) used the term paradigm to describe normal science, “that some accepted examples of actual scientific practice—examples which include law, theory, application, and instrumentation together—provide models from which spring particular coherent traditions of scientific research” (p. 10). Guba and Lincoln (1994, p. 107) view a paradigm as a “set of basic beliefs.” Punch (2006, p. 31) describes paradigms as “a set of assumptions about the social world, and about what constitutes proper techniques and topics for inquiring into that world;” a way of looking at the world. “Paradigms are normative; they determine what the practitioner views as important and unimportant, reasonable and unreasonable, legitimate and illegitimate, possible and impossible…Thus all theories as well as the methods generated by them are, ultimately, paradigm based” (Ratcliffe, 1983, p. 165). “Paradigms tell us what is important, legitimate, and reasonable” (Patton, 2002, p. 69).

This research was undertaken from an interpretivist perspective. Interpretivism implies that, “the social world is observed by seeing what meanings people give to it and interpreting these meanings from their viewpoint” (Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler, 2014, p. 17). The interpretivist perspective explains how people interpret the social world, gathering of data from which relationships are identified, generalisations can be made, and meanings constructed (Gray, 2017).

The informing theories, Stakeholder Theory and Resource Dependency Theory, were detailed in the previous chapter. Stakeholder Theory is relevant in the explanation of not-for-profit organisations behaviour because of the involvement of multiple and varied stakeholders. In addition, the not-for-profit organisations’ dependence on external sources of funding can result in behaviour able to be explained by Resource Dependency Theory.
3.3 Methodology

“A methodology is a structured set of guidelines or activities to assist people in undertaking research or intervention” (Mingers & Brocklesby, 1997, p. 490), the process of research (Creswell, 2013). The primary methodologies of research inquiry are qualitative and quantitative, and both methodologies require rigor as a research goal (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002). Quantitative research assesses data utilising numerical analysis. Qualitative research can provide a more holistic perspective (Gray, 2017) since it explores the underlying stories and the reasons about why and what is happening through studying phenomena in their natural environment (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). A qualitative approach involves the systematic analysis of text and assists in studying involved social issues. The nature of the research and the associated research questions should determine the appropriate methodology (Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

3.3.1 Qualitative methodology

A qualitative methodology was selected as appropriate for this research. As this research was exploring relationships and sought to understand participant perceptions of the phenomenon being investigated, the application of a qualitative methodology was identified as more suitable and relevant. Denzin and Lincoln (2011, p. 3) define qualitative research as “a situated activity that locates the observer in the world.” Qualitative research aims to acknowledge, understand, and give meaning to the human experience (Gerson & Horowitz, 2002; Hussein, Hirst, Salyers & Osuji, 2014; Sarma, 2015). Qualitative research does not rely on numerical measurement but is an exploratory research process using data that is “textual, visual, or oral” (Zikmund et al., 2013, p. 135).
Qualitative research can facilitate critical thinking and identify new theoretical trends (Bansal, Smith, & Vaara, 2018) but has been criticised for lacking rigor and evidence (Gioia et al., 2013). Such criticisms can be countered through undertaking thorough processes and following the established traditions associated with the approach adopted (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Morse, 2015; Sarma, 2015). “Verification is the process of checking, confirming, making sure, and being certain” (Morse et al., 2002, p. 17). Morse and others (2002) identify five verification strategies to ensure quality of data: methodological coherence; appropriate sample; concurrent and iterative collection and analysis of data; theoretical thinking; and, theory development. The process undertaken by this research followed the strategies as proposed by Morse and others (2002).

This thesis research aimed for methodological coherence where the research questions determined the form of semi-structured interviews undertaken. This meant that the interview questions became flexible and investigative to obtain the data but always related back to the specific thesis research questions. The interviews were conducted with participants with the knowledge and roles to answer appropriately the research questions being posed; this was the most appropriate sample to be used for the research topic. The data was collected and analysed concurrently to allow an iterative process of investigation and to inform the continuing research project. Constant reiteration of theory informed the research with a view to continue to apply and develop a relevant theory to the thesis topic.

3.3.2 Research Questions

This study investigated the policy advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations. “Research questions express the research objectives that can be addressed by the research” (Zikmund et al., 2013, p. 120).
The central focus of this research is: What influences the advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations in Australia? The extant literature examined in the previous chapter demonstrated that some research was being undertaken about not-for-profit organisations policy advocacy and its relationship with funding and policy makers, and addressed the following questions:

1. Does the extant literature demonstrate that not-for-profit organisations are advocating?
2. What evidence is there in the literature of the types of advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations?
3. Is there evidence in the literature of not-for-profit organisations’ advocacy activities being restricted, limited or modified to suit funders, in particular government funders?

The literature identified the evidence about advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations and the relationship with funders. Areas of further exploration and analysis have emerged. There is a need for a conceptual framework for the strategic decision making of not-for-profit organisations about engaging in advocacy activities, including analysis about the influence, or otherwise of funding sources on advocacy activities. Another theme is the choice of funding sources and diversification of funding portfolios.

The literature review informed the development of the research questions for this study. The consequential principal research questions for this thesis were:

1. Are Western Australian not-for-profit organisations undertaking policy advocacy?
2. What are the policy advocacy activities being adopted/employed by not-for-profit organisations?
3. What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents?

3.4 Methods

3.4.1 Case study

A qualitative comparative case study approach was used because it provides insights into everyday reality and thinking. The case study approach is not just a methodology “but a choice of what is to be studied” (Stake, 2008, p. 119). Eisenhardt (1989) described the case study as a “research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within a single setting” (p. 534). Flyvbjerg (2011) prefers the simple Merriam-Webster’s definition of a case study as “an intensive analysis of an individual unit (as a person or community) stressing developmental factors in relation to environment” (p. 301). Yin (2009) offered an often-adopted definition of, “a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18).

A case study approach seeks to answer the ‘how’ and why’ questions of a social phenomenon (Sarma, 2015; Yin, 2009), where the case becomes the “unit of analysis” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014, p. 28) and is a suitable research strategy for “explanatory, descriptive and exploratory research” (Blumberg et al., 2014, p. 304). The purpose of a case study is to “gather comprehensive, systematic, and in-depth information about each case of interest” (Patton, 2002, p. 447). The depth offered by case study approach allows for research of a complex matter and a thorough investigation of an entire organisation (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Zikmund et al., 2013). Case study research is built on several sources and methods, including interviews,
observations, and secondary data sources and views that provide a wider perspective of the phenomenon being studied (Blumberg et al., 2014).

This thesis is a multiple-case study (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2009). The intention was to examine the similarities and difference in the case studies, selecting contrasting case study organisations. A case study approach provides the potential for a range of data sources, including: interviews, interviewer observations, internet documents, and annual reports (Patton, 2002). The wealth of data allows the researchers to have an opportunity to reach a “holistic understanding of the phenomenon being studied” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 554). However, the risk for the researcher is that the process can be time consuming and can result in being inundated with data (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2009).

Case studies can also be used for theory building and theory testing (Tsang, 2014). Case studies “are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (Yin, 2009, p. 15). Yin (2009) recommended the case study method used in this thesis; selecting case study organisations, conducting the research, drawing cross-case conclusions, and writing the report.

3.4.2 Selection of case study organisations

A case study approach was taken to allow for intensive, exploratory research, to answer the how and why. Case studies were conducted in four not-for-profit organisations in the human services social sector in Perth, Western Australia. The not-for-profit organisations selected were of varied sizes and governance structures and all were selected because they are active in policy advocacy, as stated on their respective websites. A decision was made to select different sized organisations, to represent a range of governance and management structures, in order to examine the influence of size, structure, and funding arrangements on advocacy (Table 3-1).
Table 3-1: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Level of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>100% private &lt; $100,000</td>
<td>1 administrative staff, Several volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transitioning to Large</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>30+ staff, 70+ volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>90% Government $35.5M</td>
<td>600+ staff and volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>60% Government $52M</td>
<td>1,000+ staff, 175 volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The not-for-profit sector is extremely diverse, and this can make it difficult to study empirically. For this research the selected case study organisations were all in the health services area. Not-for-profit organisations in the health sector were chosen as they provide goods and services to a marginalised cohort in the community, a group that may be unable to advocate for themselves. By selecting organisations within a particular group in the not-for-profit sector, a comparative analysis was able to be used. However, confining the selected cases to this part of the sector may also pose limitations for generalisability.

3.4.2.1 Case Study 1

The first case study is a small not-for-profit organisation and receives no government funding. The organisation receives donations of money and goods, which are given to the clients, and relies on financial contributions from individuals and fundraising activities such as raffles. The organisation did previously receive state government funding. However, with limited resources and a volunteer workforce, the administration of this contract became too demanding and too time-consuming, and the contract was ended. There is only one paid full-time employee, who is responsible for
general administrative functions of the organisation. The board members are all volunteers and are responsible for the fundraising, mission and profile, and for determining and developing the social services that are to be undertaken by the organisation.

This not-for-profit organisation provides counselling, support, and accommodation for women. The organisation relies on volunteers to provide the counselling and support service. The board has eight volunteer members and meets monthly. The board is responsible for the policy decisions and management decision-making within the organisation. There is no management level to direct and manage the organisation; this is all undertaken by the board. The board includes high-profile and commercially experienced individuals, deliberately selected to provide appropriate direction and support. Board members are involved in advocating for the mission of the organisation to the wider community and government.

3.4.2.2 Case Study 2

Case Study 2 is a medium-sized, transitioning to large, not-for-profit organisation that receives nearly $5 million per year from the Australian federal government and the Western Australian state government. The organisation receives almost no private funding and relies on government grants to finance its services. The organisation provides support for over 2,000 carers each year with counselling, self-help support groups, education, information, and advocacy. Support services are provided in the Perth metropolitan area and in regional locations. Areas of operation include core and remote services, youth services, school holiday programs, school education programs, and respite services. This organisation employs over 30 paid staff and has more than 70 volunteer staff. There is an active board with ten members which governs the organisation. The board has finance and risk management, and governance
committees, and has adopted a strategic plan. The organisation has a stated commitment to advocating at a policy level.

3.4.2.3 Case Study 3

The third case study is a large not-for-profit organisation with an annual income of $35.5 million, nearly 90 per cent of which is government-funded. The organisation was established over 60 years ago to support parents of children with severe intellectual disabilities. The organisation works with individuals with complex disabilities and their families to provide support services and accommodation. Case Study 3 employs around 630 paid staff. The board, with ten members, has experience in the disability sector and commercial experience, and includes both staff and family representatives.

3.4.2.4 Case Study 4

Case Study 4 is a large faith-based provider of aged care, family, health, and community services. The organisation employs over 700 staff and 150 volunteers, delivering more than 40 programs and services from over 30 locations throughout Western Australia. The organisation is 60 per cent government-funded and has a deliberate policy to diversify its funding portfolio. Current funding is received from state and federal governments, social enterprises, and the sale of services and goods.

3.4.3 Data collection

The four not-for-profit organisations operate in the health services sector in Perth, Western Australia and initial contact was made with the primary person; the chief executive officer (CEO), or chairperson of the board or senior executive manager. After the initial contact a written request was made to the primary person within the organisation to establish an agreement to conduct the research. When approval had been obtained and a relationship established, a list of names was obtained from the organisation for suitable individuals from which an interview would be sought. Each
individual was personally contacted by the researcher and invited to attend an interview. All participation was voluntary. To comply with the University ethics approval requirements and the agreements with the participating organisations, the identity of the not-for-profit organisations and the individual participants remain anonymous.

3.4.3.1 Identification and recruitment of participants

In each case study organisation, a similar group of participants was recruited. In all cases, those recruited were involved in the management of the organisation and had no direct involvement in the care of clients or the delivery of services. The participants included CEOs, senior managers, and in one organisation the chairpersons. For Case study 1, the smallest organisation, the previous and current chairpersons agreed to be interviewed as there was no management staff. The Executive Officer and three senior managers were interviewed in case study 2. Case study 3 involved a group interview with 10 management staff and the CEO. Case study 4 involved individual interviews with seven management staff including the CEO and the organisation’s executive director of advocacy. The organisations included in the research have been summarised for size, sources and amount of funding/proportion of government funding, level of employment in the organisations, and number of interview participants (refer Table 3-2).
Table 3-2: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles and interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Level of employment</th>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>100% private &lt; $100,000</td>
<td>1 administrative staff, Several volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Two chairpersons (previous and present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transitioning to Large</td>
<td>100% Government $5M</td>
<td>30+ staff, 70+ volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>CEO and three management staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>90% Government $35.5M</td>
<td>600+ staff and volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>CEO and ten management staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>60% Government $52M</td>
<td>1,000+ staff, 175 volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>CEO and six management staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3.2 Data collection – Interviews

The data for the study was obtained from a combination of interviews, and from the not-for-profit organisation’s website, annual reports, media, and newsletters. Interviews were identified as the best method of obtaining detailed information about the activities in the organisation. “Interviews provide the opportunity to examine how large-scale social transformations are experienced, interpreted, and ultimately shaped by the responses of strategic social actors” (Gerson & Horowitz, 2002, p. 201). The interviews were conducted at the organisation’s place of business for convenience of the participants. Face to face interviews allowed the opportunity for follow up questions and to obtain in-depth responses. Semi-structured interviews were used in this research, supplemented by contextual data such as annual reports, internet profile, and media. A semi-structured interview provides structure using a prepared list of questions but allows flexibility during the interview for the interviewer to adjust the questions or the focus of the interview (Saldaña & Omasta, 2017).

A group interview method is where the participants can interact and converse about a topic (Saldaña & Omasta, 2017). A group interview is a useful tool for gathering qualitative data (Morgan, 1996). A group interview allows an opportunity to observe the interaction between the participants (Blumberg et al., 2014). Documents
also provided an additional source of evidence, a form of augmentation (Blumberg et al., 2014).

The selected participants were senior managers within each organisation, who had responsibility for funding and advocacy, and were involved in management and financial decisions; for example, senior staff/service managers, CEO, finance manager, operations manager, and board members. No interviews were conducted with employees who were operational, that is, working directly with clients. Each of the participants received a copy of the set of standard questions prior to the interview (Appendix D), and opportunities were provided for the participant to explain and identify issues relevant to the research questions and their experience in the sector. The use of standard questions was to ensure consistency in the data obtained.

The interviews took approximately an hour to complete. The interviews were semi-structured, with open-ended questions allowing the opportunity for the participant to explain and identify any issues. Participants were probed to provide deeper explanations and examples (Zikmund et al., 2013). Written consent was obtained from the participants to conduct and record the interview (Appendix C). An additional request was made of the participant to have the interview audio recorded. This verbal consent was confirmed on the audio tape. All participants agreed to be interviewed and to have the interview recorded. This procedure was in accordance with the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics approval.

The interview recordings were transcribed. Field notes were also kept by the researcher, and these were included in the data. In addition, the case study for each organisation was informed by its web presence and internet activity, as well as data such as annual reports and media communications.
The interview questions (Appendix D) were open ended, asking participants to consider their experiences in relation to advocacy, government policy, and funders. Guiding questions such as “What and how questions help establish the problems and issues…Who, where, and when questions focus on specific actors, events, and activities that relate to the problems or issues at hand” (Berg, 2009, p. 255).

A central focus of this research was: What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents? In answering this question, the researcher wanted to establish if not-for-profit organisations were undertaking policy advocacy and if they were what policy advocacy activities being adopted/employed by not-for-profit organisations. To identify any influences on the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy one area of investigation was to establish how not-for-profit organisations funded their activities and identify the influences and restrictions the source of funding placed on the not-for-profit organisation. The principal sources of funding for not-for-profit organisations include Government, private (philanthropy and donations), fundraising, sale of services and goods, social entrepreneurship, and payment for services. The interviews included questions about the main sources of funding and whether this principal source of funding had changed over the previous five years.

No definition of advocacy and dissent was provided to the interviewee but how the participant defined and used these terms (or equivalent terms) was included as a question, to gain an understanding of their approach to advocacy and enable comparison across the organisations. The interview questions also asked about staffing arrangements, in particular, staff resources applied to advocacy and funding contracts. The researcher wanted to identify how the organisation was structured in relation to
staffing and management, and if there had been changes to professionalise the organisation.

3.5 Data Analysis

Analysis includes summarising the data and looking for relationships and themes (Ryan & Bernard, 2003), and is “the application of reasoning to understand the data that have been gathered” (Zikmund et al., 2013, p. 68). Analysis involves “theorising about data using a consistent model of social reality” (Silverman, 2013, p. 247). The analysis “follows standard procedures for observing, measuring, and communicating with others about the nature of what is ‘there’, the reality of the everyday world as we experience it” (Wolcott, 2009, p. 29). The analysis examines social action, reaction, and interaction through the lens of routines, rituals, rules, roles, and relationships of social life (Saldaña & Omasta, 2017). Eisenhardt (1989) described analysing data as the “heart of building theory from case studies” (p. 539). Case studies allow for the study of constructs and the testing of theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Cross-case analysis allows for identification of common themes (Creswell, 2013).

Analysis begins at the interview stage. Categories begin to emerge before the formal structured analysis.

Interpretation, by contrast, is not derived from rigorous, agreed-upon, carefully specified procedures, but from our efforts at sense-making, a human activity that includes intuition, past experience, emotion—personal attributes of human researchers that can be argued endlessly but neither proved nor disproved to the satisfaction of all. Interpretation invites the reflection, the pondering, of data in terms of what people make of them (Wolcott, 2009, p. 30).
“Qualitative data analysis is an interpretive task” (Ezzy, 2002, p. 73) and using computer software can assist in this task. Computer software for qualitative data analysis is an organized storage system (Creswell, 2013) and can assist in coding and sorting text but does not analyse the data (Yin, 2009). NVIVO software (CAQDAS = Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software) was used to facilitate analyse of the data. This “code-and-retrieve” (Ezzy, 2002, p. 112) software cannot interpret the data but assists the researcher in identifying patterns through the utilisation of advance search tools. Use of software for data analysis in qualitative research has its critics but Bazeley and Jackson (2013, p. 3) identified five ways in which Nvivo can assist in the analysis of qualitative data: manage data; manage ideas; query data; visualise data; and, report from data. Nvivo was employed to assist with the coding and analysis. The interview transcriptions were uploaded to NVivo for analysis (Woods, Paulus, Atkins, & Macklin, 2016). All interview transcripts were compared to identify trends and commonality in responses to the standard interview questions. An “interactive and iterative process” (Gerson & Horowitz, 2002, p. 217) was used working continuously with the data and developing themes.

Codes and themes are generated from the data. Coding gives meaning to the data and was undertaken by creating categories. For example, a word search was completed on the transcripts for words like advocacy, government, funding, and volunteer. Coding was an evolving process, where codes were revised throughout the analysis (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013; Miles et al., 2014). The codes were then linked to create themes and sub-themes (Flick, 2014). These themes and sub-themes are summarised below in Table 3-3.
### 3.6 Ethical Considerations

To undertake this research, ethics approval was obtained from the University Research Ethics and Integrity Office. Participants were given an information letter (Appendix B), assured of confidentiality for their responses and anonymity in the reporting of the findings. Anonymity and confidentiality of participants meets the requirements of the University ethics approval and the agreements with the participating organisations, and is important in a small community like Perth, Western Australia, where participants and their organisations are well known to each other. Participants were required to sign a consent form (Appendix C) prior to the conduct of the interview. Consent (Appendix A) was also obtained from the organisations involved in the research.

### 3.7 Limitations of Methodology

A case study approach will not be a representation of the entire population (Blumberg et al., 2014; Stake, 2008), but can provide a possibility of what might occur in similar situations. Case study research has been critiqued as lacking generalisability,
but this is contentious (Ruddin, 2006). Case studies generally use “an analytic or conceptual generalization, rather than of reaching for a numeric one” (Yin, 2013, p. 327). The analytical claim permits a case study to generalise to other situations (Yin, 2012). This method is an appropriate strategy for building theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). A multiple-case approach does not change the issue of generalisability (Miles et al., 2014). While lacking ‘statistical significance’, the case study approach can provide knowledge of practices and outcomes (Flyvbjerg, 2011). The case study approach provides depth into the how and why of a social phenomenon and can “contribute to the cumulative development of knowledge” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 241).

3.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has explained the research methodology used in this study and the justification and appropriateness of a qualitative case study design. The chapter also detailed the data collection method and the data analysis.

The following three chapters set out the findings of the research as presented in two journal article publications and a published conference proceeding. Chapter 4 examines the issue of volunteering and social activism and how the volunteers in the case study organisations are involved in advocacy. There are examples in the case study organisations of volunteers advocating on behalf of the organisation to influence the policy process. Chapter 5 examines the tactics and activities used by two of the case study organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to engage in policy advocacy. Chapter 6 discusses the role of decision makers of not-for-profit organisations in adopting strategies to manage multiple stakeholders and deciding why and when to advocate.
A summary of the case study organisation profiles, identifying the relevant case study organisation in the published papers in chapters 4, 5, and 6, is presented in Table 3-4.

**Table 3-4: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles, including case study identification used in the empirical papers in the thesis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Level of employment</th>
<th>Volunteering Article</th>
<th>Voluntas Article</th>
<th>ANZAM Refereed Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>100% private &lt; $100,000</td>
<td>1 administrative staff, Several volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 1</td>
<td>Organisation B</td>
<td>Organisation D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transitioning to Large</td>
<td>100% Government $5M</td>
<td>30+ staff, 70+ volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 2</td>
<td>Organisation A</td>
<td>Organisation C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>90% Government $35.5M</td>
<td>600+ staff and volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 3</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Organisation B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>60% Government $52M</td>
<td>1,000+ staff, 175 volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 4</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Organisation A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4    Volunteers as Social Activists

4.1    Introduction

The previous chapter detailed the research methodology that was applied in the thesis. The findings from the research are presented in the following three chapters as published papers. This consists of two journal papers and one refereed conference publication. Chapter 4 examines the issue of volunteering and social activism and how the volunteers in the case study organisations are involved in advocacy. There are examples in the case study organisations of volunteers advocating on behalf of the organisation to influence the policy process. Early versions of this paper were originally presented at the International Association for Volunteering Effort (IAVE) Conference, in Gold Coast, in 2014 and the National Volunteering Conference, in Canberra, in 2016 and the feedback from these conferences was used to inform the final published paper. The presentation at conferences allowed for testing of emerging understanding with an informed practitioner and researcher audience.


Attribution: Anne Peachey (formerly Clear) developed the concept, reviewed the literature, undertook the data collection, interpreted the findings, and wrote the manuscript. Thank you to my research supervisors Megan Paull and David Holloway for their critical review and feedback on the draft manuscript. Feedback was also received during the publication process from two anonymous reviewers. Anne Peachey (formerly Clear): 100%.

This material has been removed due to copyright restrictions.
4.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter has identified that not-for-profit organisations are advocating but are using tactics and methods appropriate to their advocacy platform and resources, including using volunteers to advocate. The case study organisations identified that volunteers do have a key role in policy advocacy and each organisation engaged volunteers in various advocacy activities depending on resources, availability of paid staff, and capacity of volunteering workforce. The two larger not-for-profit organisations with paid professional staff, diversified income portfolios, and resources to advocate had a lower level of volunteer policy advocacy engagement compared to a smaller organisation with minimal paid staff and high volunteer workforce where the volunteer policy advocacy engagement was high.

The findings presented in the research paper confirm that the Western Australian case study not-for-profit organisations are undertaking policy advocacy. In advocating for policy change the case study organisations are employing various activities, including using volunteer resources. However, the larger case study organisations are more careful with their advocating strategies and have minimal volunteer engagement in policy advocacy.
Chapter 5  Not-for-profit Advocacy Tactics

5.1  Introduction

The previous chapter presented findings from the research on how not-for-profit organisations are engaging volunteers to influence the policy process. Chapter 5 examines the tactics and activities used by two of the case study organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to engage in policy advocacy. An early version of this paper was originally presented at the International Society for Third-Sector Research (ISTR) Conference, in Stockholm, in 2016 and the feedback from this conference was used to inform the final published paper. The presentation at the conference allowed for testing of emerging understanding with an informed practitioner and researcher audience.


Attribution: Anne Peachey (formerly Clear) developed the concept, reviewed the literature undertook data collection, interpreted the findings, and wrote the manuscript. Megan Paull and David Holloway contributed to the development of the manuscript by engaging in discussion about emerging concepts and revising and contributing to drafts of the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final version. Feedback was also received during the publication process from two anonymous reviewers. Anne Peachey (formerly Clear): 80%.

This material has been removed due to copyright restrictions.
5.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter examined the tactics and activities used by two of the case study not-for-profit organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to engage in policy advocacy. The findings demonstrate the different processes and methods used by the not-for-profit organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to advocate on behalf of their clients while seeking to remain sustainable. While there may be some not-for-profit organisations who do not advocate, and this may be a policy decision by their leadership or because of a lack of resources and skills, the case study organisations were active in policy advocacy.

This research has identified that the perception is real; not-for-profit organisations have acknowledged that they need to be careful with what they say especially if they rely on funding from governments. For this reason, not-for-profit organisations have developed an array of tactics and strategies they use to advocate on behalf of their constituency. This paper applied a model developed from the extant literature, as a key part of the contribution of this thesis, to explain the advocacy activities. The model can be used to guide and assist not-for-profit organisations in creating and implementing an advocacy strategy. These strategies and tactics depend on the organisations’ resources, time, policy, mission statement, leadership and cause. There are times when an organisation needs to be vocal and express dissent or disagreement against government and policy makers. The use of language in advocating is important. Dissent was not a term used by the participant organisations but acknowledged there are times when unpopular causes need to be advocated for and this is a role that not-for-profit organisations take seriously.
The case study organisations are using tactics appropriate to their particular issue or agenda, contingent upon a range of factors. The case study organisations are engaging in innovative yet practical approaches to this dilemma.
Chapter 6  Strategic Management of
Advocacy Approaches

6.1  Introduction

The previous chapter presented the findings from the research on the tactics and activities used by two of the case study organisations in dealing with the dilemma of whether to engage in policy advocacy. Chapter 6 discusses the role of decision makers of not-for-profit organisations in adopting strategies to manage multiple stakeholders and deciding why and when to advocate.


Attribution: Anne Peachey (formerly Clear) developed the concept, reviewed the literature, undertook the data collection, interpreted the findings, and wrote the manuscript. Thank you to my research supervisors Megan Paull and David Holloway for their critical review and feedback on the manuscript. Anne Peachey (formerly Clear): 100%.
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6.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter has examined the different approaches used by different sized not-for-profit organisations and the role of the decision makers in the case study not-for-profit organisations in deciding why and when to advocate. Strategic management was used to explain why the decision to advocate or not to advocate is with the CEO.

The research found that the larger case study not-for-profit organisations exercise a higher degree of care about their advocacy activities. There emerged a perception of a real risk to funding and an emphasis on the importance of reputation and branding. The larger organisations negotiated behind closed doors and nurtured the relationship with government and policy makers. The CEO had a deliberate management strategy, developing a strategy that will ensure financial and reputational survival.

The smaller organisations also adopted an advocacy strategy that accommodated their mission and needs of their stakeholders. There was an expectation that not-for-profit organisations engage in policy advocacy as part of their social agenda. It was important that the minority had a voice.

The decision-makers in an organisation are the Board or the CEO (with executive management). This research has identified that the CEO is the decision-maker driving the advocacy agenda for not-for-profit organisations. In all the case study organisations it is the CEO (or where there is no CEO, the board) as the decision-maker, driving and controlling the advocacy agenda for the not-for-profit organisations.
Chapter 7 Synthesis and Interpretation

7.1 Introduction

“80% of our funding comes from Government. We are in a meeting with the Minister and criticising the government. Will this affect how much funding we receive? Maybe we should keep quiet?” (Comment by Executive Director of case study not-for-profit organisation).

This chapter integrates the results of the research findings as presented in the previous three chapters. Chapter 4 presented the published findings of the research on the advocacy activities of volunteers in the four case studies. Chapter 5 sets out the details of the advocacy activities of case study 1 and 2, describing these activities using an advocacy model. Chapter 6 explored the strategic choices made by all the case organisations in deciding whether to advocate or not. This chapter will synthesize and interpret the findings, presenting a theory of advocacy engagement to explain the interactions of the four case study organisations, and detail the implications of the research for theory, practice, and policy.

The presentation of the case studies in these papers is summarised in Table 7-1. The four case study organisations were selected as they represented different structures, sizes and funding sources. A small not-for-profit organisation was included in the research and this was to contrast their activities with larger not-for-profit organisations. In Australia 37% of Australian charities are small, having income less than $50,000, and 80% of small charities had no paid employees and engaged high levels of volunteers (Powell et al., 2016). Smaller charities also received a lower proportion of government funding at 5.7% compared to all charities 41%, relying on donation and gifts (Powell et al., 2016).
Table 7-1: Summary of Case Study Organisation profiles, including case study identification used in the empirical papers in the thesis (reproduced from Table 3-4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Level of employment</th>
<th>Volunteering Article</th>
<th>Voluntas Article</th>
<th>ANZAM Refereed Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>100% private &lt; $100,000</td>
<td>1 administrative staff, Several volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transitioning to Large</td>
<td>100% Government $5M</td>
<td>30+ staff, 70+ volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 2</td>
<td>Organisation A</td>
<td>Organisation C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>90% Government $35.5M</td>
<td>600+ staff and volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 3</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Organisation B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>60% Government $12M</td>
<td>1,000+ staff, 175 volunteers, Volunteer Board</td>
<td>Case Study 4</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Organisation A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2 Research Questions

The central focus of this research was examining the influences on advocacy activities of not-for-profit organisations. The following research questions informed the process of the research as presented in the preceding research papers:

1. Are Western Australian not-for-profit organisations advocating?
2. What types of activities are not-for-profit organisations engaging for policy advocacy?
3. What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents?

Additional questions emerged from the principle research questions. Including:

How willing were not-for-profit organisations to risk their funding for advocacy activities? What influences the organisations’ willingness to take such risks? What sort of tactics do they adopt and are these relative to a perceived risk? Who in the organisation makes the decision to advocate or not? The research considered the risk and control as part of strategic decisions about advocacy and funding. The published papers in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 explored elements of these questions and the following
sections presents the synthesis and interpretation of the responses by the case study organisations participants to the research the questions.

7.3 Are not-for-profit organisations advocating?

Not-for-profit organisations believe that engaging in policy advocacy is an important and critical role for not-for-profit organisations and is an important part of meeting their mission (Mellinger, 2014; Mosley, 2012) with advocacy being “mission-driven” (Mellinger, 2017b, p. 155). All the not-for-profit case study organisations in this research believed they had a role to play in policy advocacy and undertook advocacy activities (see Table 7-3 below). This answers positively the first research question; Are Western Australian not-for-profit organisations undertaking policy advocacy? The case study organisations referred to; [being] the conscience of the nation (case study 2); [having a] voice for those people who don’t have a voice (case study 2); we need voices out there (case study 4). Case study 4’s published strategic imperatives includes, ‘Building social justice advocacy’ and case study 2 has an ‘Advocacy Strategy…for achieving systemic change.’ Case study 3 annual report identifies an important activity of the management is ‘lobbying to ensure that all residents receive the required level of funding to support their specific needs.’ (To comply with the University ethics requirements, the identity of the not-for-profit organisations and the individual participants remain anonymous).

Advocacy is the “active interventions … on behalf of the collective interests they represent, that have the explicit goal of influencing public policy or the decisions” (Onyx et al., 2008, p. 632). To promote “the interest of a group or a public issue by influencing public policies, policy makers, business leaders, or other decision makers” (Mosley, 2011, p. 444). Advocacy aims to influence policy makers and governments, and at times to sway public opinion on behalf of the cohort the not-for-profit
organisation represents. Case study 2 participants described advocacy as about advocating for *improvements in the system that supports [our clients] and....talking to government and to other organisations and the wider community about how to improve the plight of all*. Case studies 3 and 4 asserted that volunteers and staff are advocating and spreading the mission through their work; delivering the services and goods.

Case studies 3 and 4 had significantly more full-time paid staff, compared to case studies 1 and 2, and dedicated time, staff, and resources to developing close relationships with government departments and representatives. These relationships allowed the organisations to negotiate and enact their policy advocacy. Not-for-profit organisations with full time paid staff are more likely to participate in policy advocacy (MacIndoe & Whalen, 2013). The case study organisations acknowledged that some not-for-profit organisations chose not to engage in policy advocacy; limited by resources, organisational size, expertise, funding, and relationship with government (Lu, 2018b). As all the case study organisations engaged in policy advocacy, identifying it as a critical activity of not-for-profit organisations, the issue facing the case study organisations is the type of advocacy activities to be adopted and the strategic management of these activities.

### 7.4 Advocacy Activities

The literature review identified the different strategies used by not-for-profit organisations in other jurisdictions. These were discussed in Chapter 5 and are summarised below in Table 7-2.
Table 7-2: Published articles on not-for-profit advocacy approaches (reproduced from Table 2-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Advocacy Approach</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry and Arons (2003)</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Confrontational including working on government committees, meeting with policymakers, providing government with information, informal gatherings with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Confrontational including involvement in public hearings, reporting research to media and public, involving members in lobbying activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binderkrantz (2005)</td>
<td>Direct strategies</td>
<td>Administrative including contacting ministers, using public committees Parliamentary including contacting parliamentary committees and other members of parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect strategies</td>
<td>Media including writing letters to the editor, issuing press releases, publishing research reports, contacting reporters, Mobilisation including organising campaigns, strikes, public demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo and Saxton (2010)</td>
<td>11 advocacy strategies</td>
<td>Research; Media advocacy; Direct lobbying; Grassroots lobbying; Public events and direct action; Judicial advocacy; Public education; Coalition building; Administrative lobbying; Voter registration and education; and Expert testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyx et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Relationship building with governments including members on government committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>External democratic processes including rallies, public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosley (2011)</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Relationship building including participating in the development or revision of regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Public education, mass media, protests, demonstrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes and the advocacy approaches adopted by the not-for-profit organisations identified in the literature were summarised in the model at Figure 7-1, presented in the literature review, in chapter 2 and subsequently analysed in Chapter 5. The advocacy strategies can be categorised as either; Confrontational or Co-Operative, and Insider or Outsider. The model represents the range of fluid positions that can be adopted depending on the prevailing circumstances.
The research found that the case study organisations engaged in a range of policy advocacy; answering the second research question. The case study organisations identified with the tactical positions described in this model, but the evidence was clear that they were not limited to one quadrant. Case study 1 had an outsider approach and with no relationship with government, used confrontational tactics as their advocacy strategy. There was no risk to government funding as case study 1 was solely private funded. Case study 2, on other hand, engaged in both insider and outsider positions, working co-operatively with the government on committees while engaging in confrontational tactics of letter writing and the utilisation of media. Meanwhile, case study 3 took an insider approach and was reluctant to engage in confrontational tactics, preferring a co-operative strategy with a clear strategy of building relationships with
policy makers. The case study 4 organisation also adopted an insider approach but this could be co-operative, working with the government in committee meetings, or confrontational, when in private discussions with government ministers, matters of concern were raised (see Table 7-3 and Table 7-4). Case studies 3 and 4 were careful about their advocacy strategies, allowing only senior executive staff or the chairperson to engage with government and at times carefully choosing their fights. Both case study organisations relied heavily on government funding although case study 4 had begun diversifying its funding portfolio and identifying and building alternative sources.

All the case study organisations recognised the benefits of working in collaboration with other similar organisations to engage in policy advocacy, consistent with findings in the literature (Chin, 2018). While case studies 3 and 4 were reluctant to challenge the government on policy, they did at times work collaboratively with other similar not-for-profit organisations to send messages of dissent or disagreement.
### Table 7-3: Summary of Case Study Organisations themes and advocacy activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Case Study 1</th>
<th>Case Study 2</th>
<th>Case Study 3</th>
<th>Case Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>The role of the nonprofit to advocate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful use of language</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Activities</strong></td>
<td>Insider tactics</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outsider tactics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative tactics</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confrontational tactics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other nonprofits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use volunteers to advocate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercialisation</strong></td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive/Management</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of advocacy; real or perceived</strong></td>
<td>By Governments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk to funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy ‘Success’</strong></td>
<td>Changes to government policy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7-4: Summary of Case Study Organisations advocacy strategies and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Strategies</th>
<th>Advocacy Tactics</th>
<th>Case Study 1</th>
<th>Case Study 2</th>
<th>Case Study 3</th>
<th>Case Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insider/Co-operative</strong></td>
<td>Relationship building with policy makers</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial approach</td>
<td>✗ (only the board)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behind closed door - Private communications and meetings</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member Government committees</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outsider/Confrontational</strong></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rallies and demonstrations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other not-for-profits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Peak Bodies/Sector associations</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use volunteers to advocate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(board members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Insider, Co-operative</td>
<td>Insider, Co-operative</td>
<td>Insider, Co-operative</td>
<td>Insider, Co-operative</td>
<td>Insider, Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outsider, Confrontational</td>
<td>Outsider, Confrontational</td>
<td>Outsider, Confrontational</td>
<td>Outsider, Confrontational</td>
<td>Outsider, Confrontational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building relationships “with individuals, groups, coalitions, and other organisations” is an important aspect of advocacy (Mellinger, 2017b, p. 155). There was a strategic approach by the not-for-profit case study organisations to the issue of advocacy and financial sustainability. Evidence emerged of a clear relationship with the type of advocacy activity undertaken by the not-for-profit organisation and their relationship with the funder. The not-for-profit organisations were not always willing to risk their funding for advocacy activities. The case study organisations engaged in tactics which prioritise risk relative to the mission of organisation. Consideration was also given to the reputation and branding of the organisation; damage to this could jeopardise current and future funds. However, none of the case study organisations reported a loss of funds because of any advocacy activities.

7.5 Influences on engagement in policy advocacy

The themes and advocacy issues identified in this research are similar to those experienced in other jurisdictions (DeSantis, 2013; Elliott & Haigh, 2013; Mosley, 2011; Onyx et al., 2010). The third research question asked; What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents? The research found that the four case study organisations adopted advocacy strategies that accommodated their mission and needs of their stakeholders. There was an expectation that not-for-profit organisations do engage in policy advocacy as part of their social agenda, to give the minority had a voice. All case study organisations were aware of the risk of ‘biting the hand that feeds them’ (Bass et al., 2007; Maddison & Denniss, 2005). It was critical to ‘pick your battles’ and the type of advocacy activity chosen reflected these concerns. The case study organisations are making strategic choices about the appropriate advocacy strategies to fit their organisation’s mission, policies, funding sources, and resources.
The large not-for-profit organisations in this thesis were careful about their choice of advocacy activities. They perceived a risk to funding, even though these larger organisations had a more diversified funding portfolio. The larger organisations negotiated behind closed doors and nurtured the relationship with government and policy makers. The CEO drove the advocacy agenda in the larger organisations. This was a deliberate management strategy, thereby developing a strategy that would ensure financial and reputational survival. The key decision-makers in the organisations are the Board or the CEO (with executive management). This research identified that the CEO is the decision-maker driving the advocacy agenda for not-for-profit organisations. Strategic management explains why the decision to advocate or not to advocate is with the CEO. The managing bodies (CEO and board) build relationships with external stakeholders (Ahmed, 2013) and set the strategic directions of the organisations including advocacy activities (Miller-Steven & Gable, 2012; Lu, 2018b). Mosley, Maronick and Katz (2012) found that the size of the organisation was the most significant factor in determining the use of adaptive strategies in the involvement in advocacy strategies during times of financial uncertainty.

Australian registered charities can engage in advocacy for:

the purpose of promoting or opposing a change to any matter established by law, policy or practice in the Commonwealth, a State, a Territory or another country, if: (i) in the case of promoting a change—the change is in furtherance or in aid of one or more of the purposes mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (k); or (ii) in the case of opposing a change—the change is in opposition to, or in hindrance of, one or more of the purposes mentioned in those paragraphs (Charities Act 2013 (Cth) s 12 (1) (i)).
This can include: “involvement in the development of public policy; promotion of, or opposition to, particular laws, policies, practices or decisions of governments; and, awareness-raising” but cannot “have a purpose to promote or oppose a political party or a candidate for political office” (ACNC, 2018b).

Failure to satisfy the legislative requirements for registration could result in a reduction of funds, for example, loss of DGR status. To receive DGR status, tax deductible donations, the not-for-profit organisation must be registered with the ACNC. This is an important source of funding for many not-for-profit organisations. All the case study organisations have DGR status. Advocacy must be linked to the not-for-profit organisation’s charitable purpose. They will be permitted to advocate in relation to their charitable cause; to engage in public debate, to promote or oppose a change in law, policy, or practice related to their charitable cause. Advocacy is permitted if promoting or opposing laws or policies, and awareness raising for the organisation’s charitable purpose.

The current position in Australia for policy advocacy is one of disquiet. Maddison and Carson (2017, p. 1) identified the “path of quiet advocacy” and how organisations “do things quietly”, “treading very carefully in their advocacy work less they risk financial security and political retribution” (p. 53). Maddison and Carson (2017, p. 8) found that “despite the apparent recognition in law of charitable organisations’ right to advocate and engage in policy debate, many organisations report feeling vulnerable to having their deductible gift recipient (DGR) status revoked.”

Government attempts to pressure not-for-profit groups, and control and minimise advocacy include; the definition of charity legislation in 2013, the 2016 Inquiry into the Register of Environmental Organisations re tax deductible and charitable status (Parliament of Australia, 2016), and the Tax Deductible Gift Recipient
Reform Opportunities discussion paper and subsequent reforms (The Treasury, 2017; 2018c). The reforms to the Electoral Act, originally drafted in 2017, by the Federal Government’s Electoral Legislation Amendment (Electoral Funding and Disclosure Reform) Bill 2017, initially threatened to constrain advocacy by Charities but was subsequently reviewed and amended before being passed as the Electoral Legislation Amendment (Electoral Funding and Disclosure Reform) Act (Cth) 2018. The changes were the result of a concerted collaborative effort by the not-for-profit sector speaking together about the important role of advocacy by the sector. Charities do not pursue a private or business interest, and their activities must be in the pursuit of their charitable purpose, and are reviewed and monitored by the ACNC. However, while this campaign was successful in changing the proposed legislation, not-for-profit organisations need to be concerned about the impact of legislation and policy changes and the risk of ‘chilling’ advocacy (Murray, Gilchrist, McGaughey, Hansen, & Hill-De Monchaux, 2019).

In 2006, the charitable status of Aid/Watch was revoked by the ATO after the organisation criticised government overseas aid policy. The implications of the revocation had a chilling effect on the sector, fearing to speak about government policy (Arvanitakis, 2009). In 2010, the High Court of Australia upheld the appeal by Aid/Watch to restore their charitable status (Aid/Watch Incorporated v Commissioner of Taxation [2010]). While this restored the ability of charities to have a voice, the atmosphere of oppression continues. Continued government and business attacks on environmental groups (Aston, 2015; Borschmann, 2018; Flannery, 2017; Slezak, 2017) signals concern for all charities and not-for-profit organisations advocacy activities. There is pressure (real and/or perceived) from governments through implied threats to funding, government reviews and changes to legislation, and marginalisation of
organisations from policy discussions. The uncertainty and concern in the sector are further exacerbated by the 2018 change in leadership of the Federal government of the day, with the charity sector facing its sixth minister in five years.

7.6 Implications for Theory

7.6.1 Stakeholder and Resource Dependency Theories

The informing theories, Stakeholder Theory and Resource Dependency Theory, were detailed in the thesis (see Chapter 2).

Stakeholder Theory considers that a stakeholder is "any individual or group of individuals who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Stakeholder Theory is relevant in the explanation of not-for-profit organisations behaviour because of the involvement of multiple and varied stakeholders. The case study organisations have multiple stakeholders to whom they are accountable; clients, governments, funders, other not-for-profit organisations, employees, volunteers, and community. The research found that the four case study organisations adopted advocacy strategies that accommodated their mission, the needs and expectations of their stakeholders, and deciding why and when to advocate.

Not-for-profit organisations need to respond to the expectations and demands of their external environment. The challenge for not-for-profit organisations is to acquire resources in an environment where resources are scarce or unreliable, and there is competition for these limited resources. The not-for-profit organisations’ reliance on external sources of funding can result in behaviours aimed to protect access to these limited resources. The case study organisations perceived a risk to funding when engaging in policy advocacy and were aware of ‘biting the hand that feeds them’. There was also awareness of the need for relationship building and a professional approach with governments.
The decision to engage in policy advocacy and the tactics used by not-for-profit organisations can be explained using Stakeholder and Resource Dependency Theories.

7.6.2 Theory of Advocacy Engagement

Not-for-profit organisations are engaging in policy advocacy, using tactics and strategies that are most suitable to their mission, goals, and financial sustainability. This confirms and is largely consistent with the findings in the literature. What has been identified in this thesis is the strategic approach adopted by the case study organisations in deciding when, where, and how to engage in policy advocacy. This thesis proposes the Theory of Advocacy Engagement. The theory is in two parts. The first is a decision to advocate or not; the second part is about what tactics to use.

The theory identifies that not-for-profit organisations make a strategic choice whether to advocate or not. This is determined by the cause or issue, the importance of the issue to the organisation’s mission, and the possible consequences from engaging in advocacy, both financial and reputational. The choice to advocate, or not to advocate, is made by the CEO or board, the decision makers of the organisation.

The second aspect of the theory involves advocacy engagement in practice. Where the decision makers of the organisation have chosen to advocate on a cause or issue, a second choice is made about the most appropriate tactics or strategies to use. The choice of tactics or strategies to be used to advocate is made by the CEO or board, the decision makers of the organisation. The tactical positions taken by the organisation are summarised in Figure 7-1. The decision makers identify a strategy; co-operative or confrontational, insider or outsider, and then the tactic to be utilised. Every choice made to engage in policy advocacy can mean a different tactic or strategy employed.
7.7 Implications for Practice

Smith, Womack and Knierim (2017) found that not-for-profit organisation administrators avoided advocacy activities during times of policy crisis for fear of repercussions and alienation. This may be in part due to a lack of structure to advocate (Mellinger, 2014). The four case study not-for-profit organisations identified examples of policy shift or change as a consequence of advocacy. Sometimes, advocacy needed to be visual and strong, at other times a more structured and conservative approach was adopted.

Recently in the Foodbank case the community witnessed a ‘backflip’ by the Federal government in the allocation of funding (Worthington, 2018). Foodbank, a “hunger relief organisation in Australia – servicing over 2,600 charities in every state and territory to enable them to provide food to 710,000 people a month” (Foodbank, 2019, Our Story) was to have their funding reduced at the end of 2018, which would have seen a cut to services, but following a vocal protest by the community and the third sector that utilised conventional and social media, the government was forced to re-instate the original funding.

Not-for-profit organisation can and will engage in policy advocacy and this research has identified processes and strategies that can be adopted, suitable for the mission, cause, and goal of the organisation.

7.8 Implications for Policy

Not-for-profit organisations have an important role in undertaking policy advocacy to influence the legislative process, maintain a democratic voice, and ensure the continuation of providing services and goods to the community. There is a widening wealth gap (Oxfam, 2019) and the not-for-profit sector has a critical role in continuing
to influence policy makers to reduce poverty, inequality, and disadvantage. However, there are constraints on not-for-profit organisations with government pressure through legislative and policy changes. Strategies used to control not-for-profit organisations include; “defunding, public criticism, ministerial interference and criticism, excessive auditing and review” (Maddison et al., 2004, p. 40; see also, Chaney, 2015; Elliott & Haigh, 2013; Evans & Shields, 2014; Ljubownikow & Crotty, 2016).

Adopting strategic approaches to policy advocacy engagement can ensure that a voice continues to be heard. This can include using collaborative advocacy, identifying appropriate and relevant advocacy activities, and maintaining relationships with policy makers and within the sector. The model presented in this thesis provides a practical guide for not-for-profit organisations advocacy activities.

### 7.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the findings of the research. The empirical findings in this research consolidate the findings in the literature where not-for-profit organisations are engaging in policy advocacy but are strategic with their advocacy activities. Real or perceived, the fear about loss of funds persists. Not-for-profit organisations are engaging in advocacy but identifying strategies and activities that protect the financial sustainability of the organisation while meeting their mission. This thesis adds further evidence to the existing literature and aims to strengthen the not-for-profit organisation’s participation and influence in policy advocacy. A model was presented, built from the literature, which has been used to analyse the advocacy activities of the case study organisations. This model provides a practical guide for not-for-profit organisations advocacy activities. The next chapter concludes the thesis.
Chapter 8  Conclusion

8.1  Introduction

Not-for-profit organisations have several roles in the community which include; strengthen democracy, engage individuals who otherwise would not be involved in decision making and, in the community, voice social demands, deliver services, act as watchdogs, and be involved in policy processes (Reid, 1999). Kenny and others (2015, p. 207) believe “third sector organisations are essential ingredients for any healthy society, an important locus of active citizenship within civil society.”

Advocacy encompasses the ability of an individual or group to espouse a particular position and to attempt to influence legislators or those in positions of power in relation to this position. This individual or group will attempt to sway policy and public opinion in relation to the position they hold. The stronger the advocate the better they are to maintain and hold a position, the aim being to influence the outcome or even to remove an impediment. “Nonprofit human-service organizations are likely to engage in advocacy both to expand social benefits and to increase and secure the flow of government funding” (Garrow & Hasenfield, 2014, p. 81).

Advocacy can mean different things to different people. In the sector, some believe that advocacy is about doing your work, delivering those services in the community and the community seeing the work being done and the contribution being made to the community. The organisation is about being seen to be doing ‘good’. Advocacy has been described as sending a message, communication, education, and policy engagement.

The literature posits that the source of funding for a not-for-profit organisation may, through contractual restrictions, funding reduction or threat, or perceived threat, of
other forms of retribution, place constraints on the activities of the organisation. Not-for-profit organisation’s ability to advocate on behalf of their constituents may be restricted. Some organisations believe if they advocate they may lose funding (Reid, 1999). The four case study organisations perceived possible repercussions from their advocacy activities. They still chose to engage in advocacy identifying appropriate and relevant strategies for each individual issue. There was no one single, preferred advocacy activity.

This research set out to answer three principal research questions for this thesis:

1. Are Western Australian not-for-profit organisations undertaking policy advocacy?
2. What are the policy advocacy activities being adopted/employed by not-for-profit organisations?
3. What influences the choices made by not-for-profit organisations to engage in policy advocacy on behalf of their constituents?

The evidence from the findings answers the research questions. The Western Australian case study organisations are undertaking policy advocacy. They are employing strategies and tactics most appropriate for their organisations, considering; their mission, priority and/or importance of the issue, risk to funding and/or reputation, and resources. These organisations make strategic choices about their advocacy engagement taking into consideration the external influences, including government and multiple stakeholders.

8.2 Contribution

This research builds on studies undertaken in other jurisdictions. Similar research has been conducted in the United State of America, in some European jurisdictions, Russia and China. Similar studies were conducted in New South Wales in
2010 but this is the first study of this phenomenon in Western Australia. This study adds to the growing body of knowledge. Not-for-profit organisations wanting to engage in advocacy and policy debate need the ability to participate effectively in public debate and policy development. Good management and good governance include ensuring that organisational goals are met without putting at risk financial sustainability.

This thesis proposes a model, which captures conceptually and practically, the advocacy options and level of flexibility available to enable not-for-profit organisations to advocate, on behalf of their members and clients, in different contexts during the robust, and sometimes contentious, advocacy process. The choice of approach varies according to an organisation’s size, resources, skills, and the advocacy issue being considered. The not-for-profit organisation can identify a confrontational or co-operative position using insider or outsider tactics. The model is fluid and not-for-profit organisations are not limited to just one quadrant. Instead, the model represents a set of options available for advocacy.

This thesis also proposes the Theory of Advocacy Engagement. Not-for-profit organisations make choices; the first is a decision to engage in policy advocacy or not; the second is about what tactics to use if the first decision was to advocate. The theory identifies that not-for-profit organisations make a strategic choice whether to advocate or not. This is determined by the cause or issue, the importance of the issue to the organisation’s mission, and the possible consequences from engaging in advocacy, both financial and reputational. The decision makers then identify a strategy to be utilised. Every choice made to engage in policy advocacy can mean a different tactic or strategy employed.
8.3 Limitations of Research

All research studies have limitations because of the applied research methodology. The main limitations associated with this research are outlined.

A qualitative approach was applied to the research. Qualitative research has its critics and the nature of the data collection method employed has its limitation. A case study approach was adopted for the research and while lacking generalisability, is a valuable methodology for research (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Ruddin, 2006; Williams, 2000; Yin, 2012). Interview limitations include; self-serving responses by the interviewee, reactivity between interviewee and interviewer, bias in responses, varied emotional states of the interviewee, or lack of understanding of the questions. Group interview limitations include participant bias, researcher bias, or dominant or influential participants.

The not-for-profit sector is extremely diverse, and this can make it difficult to empirically identify and test across the sector. For this research the selected case study organisations were all in health services. By selecting organisations within a particular group in the not-for-profit sector, a comparative analysis was possible.

This research was conducted in four not-for-profit organisations in the health sector in Western Australia, a single jurisdiction in Australia. Limiting the research to a single jurisdiction may limit the findings applicability to other jurisdictions.

This thesis study investigated one category of not-for-profit organisation and this may limit the application of the findings to other categories of not-for-profit organisations. Other categories of not-for-profit organisations include: culture and recreation; education and research; health; social services; environment; development and housing; law, advocacy and politics; philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism.
promotion; international; religion; and, business and professional associations and unions (ABS, 2015; United Nations, 2003).

8.4 Future Research

There are several areas for future research. This research only evaluated not-for-profit organisations in the health sector in Western Australia. There are several other not-for-profit sectors; for example, arts, sports, education, and environment, that may approach advocacy in a different way. It may be possible to test the model in these sectors and in other jurisdictions. Supplementary research questions for future research might investigate: Does advocacy make a difference? How do not-for-profit organisations evaluate the success (or otherwise) of advocacy activities?

8.5 Final Conclusion

Not-for-profit organisations have a critical role in undertaking policy advocacy to influence the legislative process, maintain a democratic voice, and ensure the continuation of providing services and goods to the community. These organisations are in a position to be a voice for marginalised cohorts; that would otherwise be disenfranchised. They can provide a conduit between people, and business and governments, offering communities valuable resources and support. However, there are constraints on not-for-profit organisations; with government pressure through legislative and policy changes, regulation and legal compliance costs; contracting constraints with governments; funding and financing constraints; and competition within the sector for limited resources. Despite this, not-for-profit organisations are finding ways to influence the policy process, making strategic choices about their advocacy engagement and taking into consideration the external influences, including government and
multiple stakeholders. Through adopting strategic approaches to policy advocacy engagement not-for-profit organisations can ensure that a voice continues to be heard.
References


*Aid/Watch Incorporated v Commissioner of Taxation* [2010] HCA 42


Baggott, R., & Jones, K. (2014). The voluntary sector and health policy: The role of national level health consumer and patients' organisations in the UK. Social Science and Medicine, 123, 202-209.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.07.016


doi:10.1177/0899764009334588


*Charities Act 2013* (Cth)


Electoral Legislation Amendment (Electoral Funding and Disclosure Reform) Act 2018 (Cth)

Electoral Legislation Amendment (Electoral Funding and Disclosure Reform) Bill 2017 (Cth)


http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.05.002


Retrieved from


doi:10.1177/0275074016680024


doi:10.1080/15588742.2016.1214860


doi:10.1177/0899764009346335


doi:10.1093/jopart/mus003

Mosley, J. E., Maronick, M. P., & Katz, H. (2012). How organizational characteristics affect the adaptive tactics used by human service nonprofit managers


doi:10.1177/1356389005059383


doi:10.1007/s11266-009-9106-z


doi:10.1177/1077800406288622


doi:10.1023/A:1022058200985


doi:10.1080/03643107.2012.665821


doi:10.1111/ijmr.12024


Appendices
Agency Consent Form

Advocacy and funding in NFP

Agency Name _________________________

The Agency agrees to take part in the study. The information required about this study has been provided. Satisfactory answers have been given for all questions asked about the study.

It is understood that the agency will be participating in several interview sessions with the researcher and agency management staff.

It is understood that all of the information gathered through both the Interviews is treated as confidential. It is agreed that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published and no information will be published in a format that allows identification of the Agency or clients of the Agency.

Signature of Agency Representative _________________________ Date ________________

Print Name _________________________ Position _________________________
Appendix B  Information Letter

Dear,

We invite you to participate in a research study looking at the effects of funding within Not-For-Profit Organisations (NFP). This study is part of my Doctoral studies, supervised by Dr Megan Paull at Murdoch University.

**Nature and Purpose of the Study**
A substantial amount of funding of NFP is from Government sources. This research aims to identify how NFP are funded and how the funding source affects the activities of the organisation. This research is being undertaken in three NFP and it is hoped to identify constraints or limitations which may be placed on the NFP by their relationship with the funding body.

**What the Study will Involve**
If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer a set of standard questions in an interview session. It is estimated that the interview session will take approximately 45 minutes.

**Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study**
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. There may be a very small chance that your answers to the interview questions may inadvertently identify you but any identifying data will be used in an aggregate form. Every effort will be taken to prevent you from being identified and to ensure your anonymity.

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate.

**Benefits of the Study**
It is possible that there may be no direct benefit to you from participation in this research.

The benefits of this research will be to increase understanding of the relationships between NFP and funding providers, primarily governments.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please complete the Consent Form.

If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Anne Clear, on 9360 6021 or by email a.clear@murdoch.edu.au or my supervisor, Dr Megan Paull, on ph. 9360 6040 or by email m.paull@murdoch.edu.au.
My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have about this study. Your organisation will be able to access the outcomes of this research when a summary of findings is made available on the completion of my Doctorate.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely

Ms Anne Clear

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2015/042). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University's Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix C  Interview Consent Form

Consent Form
Interview

Advocacy and funding in NFP

Participant

I have read the participant information sheet, which explains the nature of the research and the possible risks. The information has been explained to me and all my questions have been satisfactorily answered. I have been given a copy of the information sheet to keep.

I am happy to be interviewed as part of this research. I understand that I do not have to answer particular questions if I do not want to and that I can withdraw at any time without consequences to myself.

☐ I consent for the interview to be audio taped
☐ I am not willing for the interview to be audio taped

I agree that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published provided my name or any identifying data is not used. I have also been informed that I may not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study.

I understand that all information provided by me is treated as confidential and will not be released by the researcher to a third party unless required to do so by law.

________________________________________  ____________
Signature of Participant                        Date

Investigator

I have fully explained to _____________________, the nature and purpose of the research, the procedures to be employed, and the possible risks involved. I have provided the participant with a copy of the Information Sheet.

________________________________________  ____________
Signature of Investigator                        Date

________________________________________
Print Name

________________________________________  ____________
Position

CRICOS Provider Code: 00125J
ABN 61 616 369 313
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Appendix D  Interview Questions

Interview Framework Questions (NFP):

1. Briefly describe your position/role in this organisation?
   • How long have you been in this position?
   • Qualifications
   • Previous experience
   • Management/financial responsibilities

2. Do you have a role/responsibility in the financial planning for this organisation?
   • Describe this role

FUNDING

3. How is this organisation funded?
   • Donations
   • Fundraising e.g., Raffles, fetes, doorknock
   • Philanthropy
   • Government (state/federal/local) funding
   • Fee for service
   • Commercial/social enterprise

4. Do you have a role in these funding activities? If yes, what is this role?

5. Describe any changes that have occurred in the last 5 – 10 years within your organisation in relation to how the organisation is funded?

6. Does your organisation have a preferred source of funding? What is this source and why is it preferred?
7. Do you experience any limitations/restrictions in your activities from your funding provider?
   - Briefly describe these limitations/restrictions.
   - Are these restrictions part of the funding document?

8. Briefly describe any funding received by your organization from government sources?

9. In your experience what may be seen as a limitation in applying/tendering for government funding?

**ADVOCACY**

10. What do you understand by the term advocacy?

11. Is (systemic) advocacy an important activity that a NFP should be involved in?
   - Is advocacy an important activity that your organisation should be involved in?

12. Are you involved in advocating as part of your responsibilities with this organisation?
   - Informally
   - As part of your role with the organization

If yes, have you experienced difficulties in undertaking these activities?
   - Briefly describe these difficulties
   - Are these difficulties because the funding provider is government and that is to whom the activities are directed?
   - Are you aware of a situation where advocacy activities have been restricted at the request/inference of the funding provider?
   - Are there activities which may attract attention?

If yes, how are the advocacy activities funded?
13. Is your organisation constrained/limited in any way in their role as an advocate for their clients?

- Briefly describe

14. There are organisations who are involved in advocacy activities on behalf of NFPs.

- Are you aware of these groups?
- Does your organisation use these groups?

**DISSENT**

15. What do you understand by the term dissent?

16. Is dissent an important activity that a NFP should be involved in?

- Is dissent an important activity that *your* organisation should be involved in?

17. Are you involved in dissent activities as part of your responsibilities with this organisation?

- Informally
- As part of your role with the organisation

If yes, have you experienced difficulties in undertaking these activities?

- Briefly describe these difficulties

- Are these difficulties because the funding provider is government and that is to whom the activities are directed?

- Are you aware of a situation where dissent activities have been restricted at the request/intersection of the funding provider?

- Are there activities which may attract attention?

- Does dissent put funding at risk?

18. Is there anything else you would like to say in relation to activities about funding either in relation to your organisation or generally?