Examining the Critical Role of Social Capital in Entrepreneurship:

A Qualitative Study of Emerging Nonprofit Organizations

by

Karen A. Reardon

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Sociology)
in the University of Michigan
2016

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Renee R. Anspach, Co-Chair
Associate Professor David J. Harding, Co-Chair, University of California
Professor Barry N. Checkoway
Professor Gerald F. Davis
Professor Brian J. Jones, Villanova University

Dedication

To all those women and men laboring to bring

their dreams to fruition.

"Happy are those that dream dreams

and are ready to pay the price to make them come true."

Leon Joseph Cardinal Suenens

Acknowledgments

I begin by thanking the members of my dissertation committee, a group of distinguished scholars and out of the box thinkers, who took a chance on this nontraditional candidate trying to finish the PhD after a nearly thirty-year hiatus. My work with co-chair, Renee Anspach, a qualitative scholar who produces beautifully nuanced work, leaves little doubt as to why she is both loved and admired by the many students who seek her out for their committee. She provided insightful and detailed feedback which both focused and enriched my dissertation. I am particularly grateful to co-chair David Harding, a truly gifted and in demand scholar, who not only agreed to work with me when my remote location already presented logistical challenges, but did not abandon ship even after moving on to the University of California at Berkley. Over our very first cup of coffee, I knew I had found a kindred spirit in Barry Checkaway and share his views about the importance of applied scholarship as evidenced by his significant and important body of scholarship and community work. Barry was encouraging from the moment we first met, affirming my decision to leave the law for other work to make a mid-life change he tells me the research shows few dissatisfied attorneys have the courage to do.   Jerry Davis' exceptional scholarship in the field of organizations and our conversations which help steer my research encouraged me to recognize how and where this study could make a contribution to the vast literature when others tried to discourage me from entering this "over-crowded" field. Last, but by no means least, I am grateful beyond words to Brian Jones, truly a lifelong mentor and friend who has been with me on this journey from its inception, first as my high school debate coach some forty years guiding my very first research on critical issues such as ocean pollution and population control, and always as my sociological sounding board. He has been there to challenge and encourage at every turn and there have been so many. That, independently, we both have developed an intellectual interest in the power that lies in social capital is testament to our enduring relationship.

I would be remiss if I did not extend a special acknowledgement to Pamela Smock, the graduate chair who supported my quest for readmission. I had been knocking on that proverbial door for many years before she opened it for me. Likewise, Sarah Burgards, our current graduate chair, has shown sensitivity and flexibility in working with me to make steady progress, albeit slow. She recognized and accommodated the many very real personal challenges I have encountered during the production of this research and dissertation. I also wish to thank the "Econometrics Gang," Robert Biggert, Sharon Jablonski and Richard Tabler, my Michigan sociological companions in those formative early years. Our nights studying at the UGLI helped me master subject matter that alone I might have struggled with indefinitely and kept me from lamenting my lack of a social life. I also wish to acknowledge my fellow students now, those whose defenses I have attended and learned from, and others who have shared their prospectuses or dissertations, offered housing in Ann Arbor, work-shopped my prospectus, or gave sage advice based on their own experiences. All have made me feel a little less isolated from my remote perch. Finally, I appreciate the University of Michigan Sociology staff who patiently suffered my questions and righted my path over the past six years.

I acknowledge the support of the University of Michigan Department of Sociology for tuition and research expense support; the University of Michigan Nonprofit Management Center for research expense support and the Rackham School for conference funding. I also thank the Association of Researchers in Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Associations (ARNOVA) for twice extending invitations to participate in its Dissertation Fellows Colloquium and also to its Young Scholars Roundtable Program which provided important feedback on my work in progress and its position in the nonprofit field. Finally, I acknowledge the support of the former dean of the LaSalle University School of Business, Paul Brazina, who provided financial support for my acquisition of the NVIVO software needed to manage my data and his recognition of the importance to me and LaSalle of the mission-centered research this dissertation represents. I also am grateful for a grant from the Brother Kelly Social Justice Fund at LaSalle which provided funds for the expenses of my student research assistant. I thank my graduate student research assistant, Marc Vallone, for his work on this research project. He provided enthusiasm and companionship in the collection and review of the data for which I am very much appreciative.

Because my journey to completion of this dissertation spans so long a time, there are many teachers and mentors to whom I owe a great debt. I would be remiss in not singling out two among them: William Evan and Edward Marciniak. While each is now too long departed this earth, their influence on me as scholars and persons of courage remains. Dr. Evan, Professor of Sociology and Management at the University of Pennsylvania, supervised my first qualitative research, extended me the privilege of working with him to edit one of his many books on the sociology of law, and encouraged me to continue my sociological studies at the graduate level. Ed Marciniak, Director of the Institute of Urban Life at Loyola University and author, became my friend and mentor as I became deeply engaged in issues of social justice while practicing law in Chicago. He inspired and supported me in the founding of HighSight, a nonprofit organization which nearly twenty-five years later provides tutoring, mentoring and scholarship support to low income minority inner-city youth in Chicago. He educated me about the City of Big Shoulders and its critical urban issues as no one else could and I came to share his passion for applying sociology in a way that would lift all boats, starting with the most vulnerable among us.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends for their love and encouragement, beginning with my parents, Jack and Joan Reardon, who have lovingly provided me and my siblings with every educational opportunity possible. Dr. Honora Werner, OP has been a friend and role model in more ways than I could ever have imagined or hoped for. Her intellectual curiosity, spirit and energy is contagious. While others might lament, “I am too old,” Honora earned her doctorate in preaching at about an age older than I am now. Her example and support have helped me both bear this burden and celebrate this joy. My best friend, Bridget Haggerty, has been my cheerleader in this life endeavor and others. I thank her for patiently listening to my war stories, for empathizing or sympathizing as appropriate, and pushing back to challenge me when I would begin to wallow. Last, but not least I thank “my guys,” my sons, Walter and Robert, and my husband, Dan. I am grateful to Robert for reminding me how important it is to stay in the race and cross the finish line and to Walter for his hugs, smiles and infectious sense of humor that brighten my life each and every day. Most importantly, I am grateful to my husband, Dan who has truly been my partner in this, never questioning the time or money committed to the endeavor, tending to the needs of our children when this work (on top of my day job) perpetually diverted my attention, and soldiering on with me even when the exhausting demands of our personal life would have called for me, for us, to quit. This is our moment; we have arrived. Let a new adventure begin.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

<u>Tables</u>

List of Appendices

Appendices

Abstract

This qualitative study examines how individual nonprofit organizations ("NPOs") emerge. I build on the limited empirical research by studying eight *emerging* NPOs in a single New Jersey county using forty qualitative interviews of both founders and early participants. Inclusion of early participants is a key aspect of this study's design responsive to concerns in the literature that studies with an exclusive focus on founders ignore critical information. I document how NPOs emerge in an iterative fashion and not pursuant to a business plan in three papers. The first examines how these fledgling organizations identify, recruit and motivate people. Contrary to what the literature tells us about the general volunteer population, I found that, *in the context of emerging NPOs*, social capital is being used to call forth volunteer assistance and resources in support of the organizations. The second paper compares the composition and experience of these new NPOs with what is known about their for-profit counterparts to adjudicate among theories of organizational emergence using the entrepreneurship and organizations literatures as a proxy for comparison. I find these NPOs are the product of teams working to access resources in furtherance of mission, adding to the growing evidence challenging the notion that entrepreneurship is the work of individual mavericks. The third paper shows how these budding NPOs task and manage their work. The data help reconcile disconnects in the literature about how volunteers experience unstructured work and their impact on the developing organization, finding a continuing role for social capital as task manager. Examining the data for signs of Weber's "routinization of charisma," I find the material differences among the organizations which I argue may be a key indicator of whether an organization, so initially dependent on individual relationships, is capable of surviving beyond the life or interest of its founder(s). Thus, failure to routinize charisma offers a possible explanation for scholarly observations about the liabilities of newness and smallness. This dissertation has important implications for policies and programs intended to encourage entrepreneurship as well as for nonprofit management educators and consultants, affirming that context is critical and must not be ignored.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In a challenged economy, characterized by widening disparity between haves and have nots, and with government-funded social services threatened by a shrinking tax base and soaring deficits, the nonprofit sector is becoming a larger and more significant actor in U.S. society. Its work preserves our history and culture, as well as addresses pressing social problems. It functions as a means both for preserving and redistributing wealth, as an embodiment of the tension between those nonprofits which support the elite and their lifestyle (country clubs, orchestras) and those nonprofits which assist persons who have fallen through the cracks of a market economy (homeless shelters, soup kitchens).[1] Its values largely are consistent with, and supportive of, our national origins, traditional values, and capitalistic economic aspirations. With societal needs ever growing and changing, the ability of the nonprofit sector to assemble resources and leverage the time contributions of volunteers is more important than ever.

Notwithstanding the important societal functions they perform relative to their for-profit and governmental organization counterparts, nonprofit organizations (NPOs) have been understudied. With the exception of scholarship that has focused on volunteers utilized by nonprofits and social movement organizations, Powell and Steinberg (2006) reiterate observations from more than twenty years ago by DiMaggio and Anheier (1990) that nonprofits

[1] Marquis, Davis, and Glynn (2011:3) find it useful to group and analyze nonprofits by differentiating between those that are elite-oriented and those that are social welfare-oriented.

have not been the focus of much sociological study. While recent scholarship has begun to focus on these "third sector" organizations (those separate from government [first sector] and commercial businesses [second sector]), the inchoate nature of the literature suggests that many open questions remain. One of the most salient involves organizational emergence, that is, how and why NPOs emerge including the processes through which such organizations come to exist and assemble resources to support their work.

This dissertation examines emerging organizations and entrepreneurship in general, by studying eight new NPOs in a New Jersey county through forty qualitative interviews of founders and early participants, enhanced by document review and participant observation. To position the study, I begin by discussing why we should study nonprofit organizational emergence and the broad questions which motivated this study. I then introduce nonprofit organizations both legally and sociologically. Next, I share some history on the nonprofit sector in the United States. I conclude by discussing the contemporary relevance of the sector and the research significance of the three papers which comprise this dissertation.

Why Study Nonprofit Emergence?

My research builds on the limited empirical research which explores the process of NPO foundings or their founders (Young 1983, 1985; Miller and Simmons 1992; Gartner 1993; Block 2002; Chiles, Meyer, and Hench 2004; Kenney Stevens 2005; Bolton and Spence 2006; Johnson 2007; Herrmann 2011; Carman and Nesbitt 2013; Chikito and Halicki 2013). This study contributes to the various academic literatures in four meaningful ways.

First, this research explores organizational emergence at the level of the individual organization and specified community. Theory and research to date has focused on the emergence of organizational forms at the field level. For example, the classic and often cited work of Stinchcombe (1965) examines societal forces to explain the emergence of types of organizations when they appear to emerge all at once.[2] By contrast, little research looks at the individual minds and hands that undertake the task. This research does that. I believe examining emergence from this different perspective helps mediate among various theories and models of emergence, including resource mobilization, institutionalism, organizational equilibrium, relational demography, and shared social processes.

Second, this study examines emergence with a focus on nonprofit organizations in particular. Theory and research that does exist on organizational emergence largely has examined the phenomenon in the for-profit sector, the government sector, or those nonprofits studied by social movement scholars which are formed for action in opposition to government or for-profit activity. By studying nonprofit emergence more broadly, I am able to compare and contrast my data with what is known about for-profit emergence to further test and refine existing theory.

Third, I examine the emergence of organizations through case studies by using an untapped source of empirical data, that is, interviews with participants in, or witnesses to, the organizational founding (in addition to organizational founders), a key distinguishing feature of this study's design. In this way, I am able to test theories which seek to credit the maverick individual with new enterprise creation while ignoring or discounting the contributions of the team, that is, giving preference to psychological over sociological explanations for organizational emergence.

[2] As examples, Stinchcombe (1965) points to the rise of craft trade unions between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of twentieth century and the rash of savings banks founded in the 1830s.

Finally, I study the organization and its founder(s) while in the process of establishing a nonprofit, a phenomenon which has not been the subject of sociological study in this context. By doing so contemporaneous with organizational foundings, I minimize the problem of success selection (Ruef, Aldrich, and Carter 2003:197) meaning that I study organizations with both the chance of success as well as failure, again, to more purely understand the actors and processes at work in the start-up phase of organizations.

Each of the three papers presented in the chapters which follow detail specific research questions. What they have in common is a focus on emergence as context and an examination of the processes associated with the establishment of a NPO along a macro-micro spectrum. In Chapter 2, I ask how new nonprofits identify and recruit participants and what motivates both founders and followers. In Chapter 3, I ask about the processes employed to establish these organizations and whether they are the same or similar to those employed by for-profit organizations which have been the subject of greater study. I argue that understanding the similarities and differences may help us better understand organizational emergence, including how to support or direct such activity. In Chapter 4, I ask how participants experience their work with and for the new organization. I inquire whether founders and others identify a need for the organization to outlive their own participation looking for evidence of Weber's "routinization of charisma" (Weber 1947)? Mindful of these questions focused on the life of emerging nonprofits, the next sections introduce the nonprofit organization generally from three different perspectives: legal, sociological, and historical.

What is a Non-Profit Organization?

A nonprofit organization is a corporation organized under the laws of a state for a religious, scientific, educational, or charitable purpose. It can be a member or non-member organization. *Member organizations or associations* are corporations formed by persons to serve or benefit the membership population. The American Sociological Association and the American Association of Retired Persons are such organizations. The assets of a membership organization belong to its members; its policies and activities are directed by the members; and its leadership is chosen by the members. While it may engage in charitable works, typically such an organization is established to support member interaction and collective action. *Non-member organizations* are those corporations formed by persons who are its incorporators in support of a charitable, scientific, educational, or religious purpose or mission. Examples of non-member organizations are the American Red Cross or Habitat for Humanity. The assets of a non-member organization belong to the corporation only and may be distributed only in accord with its purpose or mission. Its policies and activities are controlled by a board of directors. The board of directors chooses future board members and any employed executive director. The executive director, typically, is charged with day-to-day management, including the hiring of staff and the recruiting of volunteers. Should the non-member corporation cease doing business, it must be dissolved and the assets transferred to a nonprofit corporation organized for a similar purpose. Non-member organizations can further be divided into those that provide services, known as operating public charities, and those that provide funding to other nonprofits, usually organized and known as private foundations.[3]

[3] Some private foundations, like public charities, do provide services directly. The distinction between foundations and operating nonprofits largely concerns the source of funds, the accounting of same and income distribution requirements. Foundation funds usually are raised from more limited sources with a close connection to the persons establishing the foundation.

Characteristics of Nonprofit Organizations

The above discussion identifies what legally constitutes a nonprofit organization, but sociologists such as Salamon (1999:10-11) identify the following six characteristics as common among nonprofit organizations, regardless of the purpose for which each was established. First, they are formal organizations which persist over time distinct from their founders, members or officers and legally are capable of holding property and contracting. Second, they are organizations separate from government. Third, they do not distribute profits and have no owners as such, though they may buy and sell goods and services and are not prohibited from paying handsome salaries to those who operate them. Fourth, they are self-governing, guided by their directors and or members. Fifth, they are voluntary, meaning that the men and women who sit on the boards are not compelled to do so, but do so of their own volition and, ordinarily, for little or no compensation. Finally, they serve some public benefit as statutorily defined.

While as a group they may share the essential characteristics identified by Salamon (1999, 1987), nonprofits are diverse, not only in the substantive work they do and the issues they address, but also in the means employed in the undertaking. Minkoff (1999) developed a typology used by others (for example, Levitsky 2008) to examine organizations which might be said to constitute a social movement at the field level. Minkoff (1999, 1994) divides the constituents into organizations that: (1) *advocate*: those that rely on lobbying and litigation to advance their position and promote change; (2) *serve*: those that provide tangible goods and services; (3) *protest*: those that employ disruptive means to influence policymakers or challenge those in power; and (4) *enhance culture:* those that use means such as art, film, or education as a way of enriching the community and showcasing its values. Many of these organizations, if and when formalized, are legally constituted as nonprofits. While those that advocate for change and protest have been the subject of considerable sociological study, the garden variety nonprofits that enhance culture or provide services have garnered less attention, except to the extent they have been considered to be part of a larger social movement (Levitsky 2008).

History of Nonprofit Organizations

Nonprofit origins in the United States can be traced back to colonial times. Under British rule, religious institutions were part of the political establishment, that is, there was no separation of church and state. Thus, in addition to attending to the spiritual needs of congregants, churches largely provided for their education and social welfare needs, functioning much like government agencies with the benefit of government resources. As the colonies fought for and became independent, a different regime emerged. In it, there was no room for religion in government; church and state were separated—not only philosophically, but practically. Historians interested in the roots of American society and its nonprofits have identified the post-colonial period as the time when nonprofits first emerged. Churches, which had provided education and social welfare services as part of the establishment, were no longer part of government or funded by its coffers. The infant American government had too many demands on its diminutive form to provide funding to remedy social problems on any scale. Thus, to continue to furnish these vital services, churches were forced to raise funds to support social welfare work by soliciting private donations, charging fees for service, and holding lotteries. Recounting this history, Hammack (2002, 2001) attributes both the demand for and supply of nonprofit organizations to the constitutional change accompanying the American Revolution. According to Hammack (2002, 2001), since then nonprofits have grown in number, size and variety, ebbing and flowing in relation to the focus of government. Thus, they thrived as the beneficiaries of government largesse (for example, federal land grants to colleges in the 1860s and 1870s) and by contrast, they plateaued from 1900 to 1960 as a consequence of government policy embodied in the New Deal which provided assistance directly from government agencies to individuals, thus eclipsing the established nonprofit community (Hammack 2002:1659).

The “associative state”—a term coined by Ellis Hawley (1974) to describe the nonprofit community— appeared to grow again in the 1960s and 1970s in direct relation to the action of government. Beginning with the advent of Johnson’s Great Society and growing affluence, the nonprofit sector experienced exponential growth. In addition, the civil rights movement made it possible for more persons—including women and minorities—to legally establish nonprofits when federal courts began to curtail the longstanding practice of denying access to such individuals by deeming them to be unsuitable incorporators (Hammack 2002:1662). In more recent decades, the political and economic environment has been even more fertile for nonprofit development and growth, beginning with the rise of neoliberalism inaugurated in the Reagan years (and Thatcher, among others, abroad). Virtually all U.S. presidential administrations which followed have embraced that philosophy and, in the case of George W. Bush through his "Thousand Points of Light” campaign and “compassionate conservatism,” expanded its reach through his administration’s particular emphasis on government support of private faith-based initiatives.

Notwithstanding our nation’s ostensible desire to look to organizations outside of government to ameliorate societal needs, today’s economic climate is one in which it is challenging for these organizations to operate. A shrinking charitable dollar pie and government community chest, together with increased competition for those dollars from the growing number of nonprofits, makes establishing and sustaining nonprofit operations a formidable endeavor. I submit that this is yet another reason to study the brave (or foolish) souls who set out to establish nonprofits.

In another consideration of the history of U.S. nonprofits, Hall (2006), echoing Durkheim and de Tocqueville, focuses on the role of the associative organization as an intermediary between individual and government. He argues that throughout history, government, which he posits should be the servant of the governed, is actually the master. He observes that, except at election time, there is no substantive way for citizens to influence its actions. According to Hall (2006), by filling the gap when there is unmet need, associations serve to insulate government from pressure that its citizenry might exert to compel government to meet that need. Whether that is a good thing is an open question. Hall (2006) recounts a history in which there was hostility to such nonprofit corporations with the regulation of their activity varying widely from state to state. It was thought that these “collectives” were tools exclusive to the elite, thus making some citizens more equal than others and endowing them with the power both to influence government separate from the electoral process as well as to insulate government from that process. Thus, associations could be seen as a threat to democratic government.

From any perspective, nonprofit organizations have played an important role throughout the United States’ history and continue to do so today. Their numbers are on the rise. Given that these organizations are increasingly viewed as a way to meet societal needs that government and for-profit organizations cannot or will not meet, it is important that we understand who is forming them, why and how they come to exist and be sustained, or as most do, fail. The review of the academic literature presented in the three papers which follow reveals that nonprofit emergence is a phenomenon that few have examined empirically.

Nonprofits Today: Research Significance

While individual researchers have collected and analyzed data on nonprofits for study for some time now, until recently no meaningful data on NPOs was organized for more general study (Cordes, Steuerle, and Twombly 2001). The data on nonprofits and their constituents that exists largely can be attributed to the Urban Institute's National Center on Nonprofits and Indiana University's National Center of Philanthropy and, more recently, private sector vendors such as Guidestar. Such database assembly has been undertaken only within the last ten to fifteen years. Prior to that, virtually no data were available for study on the existence and operation of nonprofit organizations, other than what was internally kept by the IRS for its own purposes.[4] Given that nonprofits are an increasingly important source for the delivery of social services and employment, that lack of consideration is striking. Fortunately, data now available from these institutions makes it possible to position and undertake this study.

According to the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS), in 2014 there were over 1.41 million NPOs in the United States, contributing roughly 5.4 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) and paying 9.2 percent of wages (The Urban Institute 2015). What is more, the nonprofit economy is growing at a faster rate than the for-profit sector with U.S. Department of Commerce, data showing that during the period 1992 to 1996, operating charities grew at an annual rate of 5 percent compared to 1.4 percent in for-profit businesses (Cordes, Steuerle, and Twombly 2001). Prior studies have also noted the differential in growth between nonprofits and for-profits, including Hodgkinson, Weitzman, and Abrahams (1996) studying the period 1977 to 1992 and Bowen, Nygren, Turner, and Duffy et al. (1994) studying the period 1981 to 1991.

[4] Nonprofits must file an annual return with the IRS (if assets exceed $25,000) as well as to state or local regulatory bureaus pursuant to their particular directives.

Nonprofits are largely dependent on legions of volunteer labor to deliver much-needed services. While they may suffer their own foibles,[5] to the extent nonprofits serve the public good it would seem prudent to encourage their development and growth. The General Social Survey and National Bureau of Labor Statistics have produced significant data over time about volunteers, including: the hours they contribute; their associated demographic characteristics; the nature of the organization to which hours are donated; and how they became involved with the organization. For the year ending September 2014**,** over 62.8 million or 25.3 percent of Americans report having volunteered in some capacity. (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). Two established nonprofits providing human services in the venue of my research report that a combined full- and part-time staff of about eight persons coordinates the work of over three hundred volunteers. In nonprofit organizations, volunteers are the backbone of operations and indeed, leverage matters. While there is a significant body of research which studies volunteers in mature organizations, little is known about the experience of volunteers who found and support emerging NPOs. This study builds on the research that is only beginning to look at volunteer motivation, activity and experience in that context. (Herrmann 2011; Carman and Nesbitt 2013; Chikoto and Halicki 2013).

Notwithstanding a political landscape that has fostered the growth of a nonprofit sector which is increasingly looked to as a means of addressing societal needs that individuals, informal groups, business or government do not address, there is not even one U.S. Congressional subcommittee with the authority to entertain legislation involving this growing economic sector (Rep. McCollum Legislative Director, ARNOVA Conference 2010). In 2010, Congresswoman

[5] Using survey research, Schulman (2008) found that respondents from nonprofit organizations report more incidences of deception and misconduct than those from for-profit organizations.

McCollum introduced HR 5533, “The Nonprofit Sector and Community Solutions Act” in an attempt to fill what appears to be a rather significant gap in our governmental oversight and regulatory framework as it relates to this burgeoning nonprofit sector of our economy.[6] In connection with the proposed bill, the first and only Congressional Research Service report on the nonprofit sector was commissioned as recently as 2009.

While researchers from a variety of disciplines have examined the role these organizations and their constituents play on the national stage, theory development about how individual organizations emerge remains in the nascent stage. Such organizations are not the product of magic; they do not spontaneously erupt. Their birth is the result of significant human effort. It is important, then, that we learn more about how and why these increasingly numerous and powerful organizations are being formed to aid in that theory development.

Our nation is, decidedly, a democratic and capitalistic society. It is one with a long and storied history of voluntary action which has spawned a myriad of nonprofit organizations. The landscape of this understudied third sector should tell us much about who we are, what we hold important, and what we aspire to be as a collective. Examining the individual actors who actually create the organizations that comprise the nonprofit sector should enhance our understanding of U.S. society by clarifying what distinguishes America (according to de Tocqueville a proverbial “nation of joiners”) from other democratic capitalistic societies with less robust nonprofit sectors (LeRoy, Gabel, and Velhuis 2003; Wright 2001).

This dissertation reports on a qualitative study of eight NPOs in a New Jersey county. Significantly, it does so while as they are in the process of emerging through forty qualitative

---

[6] After referral to various committees, HR 5533 died (U.S. Congress 2010).

interviews with founders and early participants, enhanced by document review and participant observation. The results of this research contributes to a number of sociological literatures as well as to the multidisciplinary research on nonprofit organization management.

Chapter Outline

In the first paper (Chapter 2), using the literatures on voluntarism and social capital each as a lens, I study how these fledgling organizations identify, recruit and motivate volunteers, critical if not penultimate tasks for the new nonprofit. Contrary to what the existing voluntarism literature tells us about the general volunteer population, I found support for the proposition that, in the context of emerging NPOs, social capital is calling forth volunteer assistance and resources in support of the organizations.

In the second paper (Chapter 3), I compare the composition and experience of these emerging nonprofit organizations with what is known from the literature about the experience of their for-profit counterparts, notwithstanding their different aims of seeking profit versus serving mission. Thus, I identify common characteristics which I posit are fairly attributable to emergence. For example, similar to their for-profit counterparts, the NPOs studied here are the work of homogenous teams largely comprised of spouses and kin with operations situated in intimate or virtual space. Unlike their for-profit counterparts whose entrepreneurs represent many socioeconomic classes, my data suggest that the work of establishing an NPO is disproportionately the domain of an educated and relatively-privileged white majority.

In the third paper (Chapter 4), I study how these fledgling NPOs task and manage their work. The data help reconcile apparent disconnects in the literature about how volunteers experience structured versus unstructured work, suggesting that context, social capital and relationship are key. Having discovered a pronounced role for relationship as task manager, I also look for evidence of Weber's "routinization of charisma" (Weber 1947) which I argue may be a key indicator of whether an organization is capable of surviving the life or interest of its founder. While these emerging organizations share many critical characteristics, their experiences diverge here, offering a possible explanation for Stinchcombe's "liability of newness" (1965:148) and why some NPOs may not enjoy organizational life beyond the life or interest of its founder(s).

I believe the findings reported herein provide a basis for mediating among competing theories of organizational emergence. By studying what organizational founders are attempting and doing, on a practical level, I hope these results give real world guidance to others engaged in or contemplating establishing a nonprofit. By studying nonprofit entrepreneurial activity in a relatively depressed economic region, I demonstrate how productive social and economic connections are still being forged. Such information has the potential to be useful to local and state government, institutions, and businesses seeking to collaborate to bolster regional economies. It also has the potential for influencing nonprofit education curricula and management by emphasizing that emergence as context matters and that one size may not fit all.

References

Block, Stephen R. and Steven Rosenberg. 2002. "Toward an Understanding of Founder's Syndrome: An Assessment of Power and Privilege among Founders of Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 12(4):353-68.

Bolton, Elizabeth B., and Lynda M. Spence. 2006. "A Study of Founders of Community Based Nonprofit Organizations: Implications for Extension Leadership Educators." *Journal of Leadership Education* 5(3):66-78.

Bowen, William G., Thomas I. Nygren, Sarah E. Turner, and Elizabeth A. Duffy. 1994. *The Charitable Nonprofits: An Analysis of Institutional Dynamics and Characteristics.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carman, Joanne G., and Rebecca Nesbit. 2013. "Founding New Nonprofit Organizations: Syndrome or Symptom?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42(3):603-21.

Chikoto, Grace L., and Michael Halicki. 2013. "Contextual Factors and Negotiating Spaces: Exploring the Emergence of Nonprofit and Hybrid Voluntary Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 23(3):347-65.

Chiles, Todd H., Alan D. Meyer, and Thomas J. Hench. 2004. "Organizational Emergence: The Origin and Transformation of Branson, Missouri's Musical Theatres." *Organizational Science* 15(5):499-519.

Cordes, Joseph J., C. Eugene Steuerle, and Eric Twombly. 2001. "Dimensions of Nonprofit Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Essay." Presented at the Public Policy and the Economics of Entrepreneurship Maxwell Policy Research Symposium, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY. Conference draft.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1835-40. *Democracy in America*. London: Saunders and Otley.

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Helmut K. Anheier, 1990. "The Sociology of Nonprofit Organizations and Sectors." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:137-59.

Gartner, William B. 1993. "Organizing the Voluntary Association." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice.* 17(2):103-6.

Hall, Peter Dobkin. 2006. "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations." Pp. 32-65 in *The Nonprofit Sector, A Research Handbook,* edited by W. W. Powell and R. Steinberg.

Hammack, David C. 2002. "Nonprofit Organizations in American History: Research Opportunities and Sources." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(11):1638-74.

Hammack, David C. 2001. "Growth, Transformation, and Quiet Revolution in the Nonprofit Sector over Two Centuries." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Quarterly* 30(2) 157-73.

Hawley, Ellis W. 1974. “Herbert Hoover, the Commerce Secretariat, and the Vision of an ‘Associative State,’ 1921-1928.” *Journal of American History* 61(1):116-40.

Herrmann, Andrew F. 2011. “Narrative as an Organizing Process: Identity and Story in a New Nonprofit." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* 6(3):246-64.

Hodgkinson, Virginia A., Murray S. Weitzman, with John A. Abrahams, Eric A. Crutchfield, and David R. Stevenson. 1996. *Nonprofit Almanac: Dimensions of the Independent Sector, 1996-1997*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, Victoria. 2007. “What Is Organizational Imprinting? Cultural Entrepreneurship in the Founding of the Paris Opera.” *American Journal of Sociology* 113(1):97-127

Kenny Stevens, Susan. 2005. “A Call Taken to Heart: The Entrepreneurial Behavior of Nonprofit Founders.” *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader* 16(5): N.p.

LeRoy, Sylvia, Todd Gabel, and Niels Velhuis. 2003. “Comparing Charitable Giving in Canada & the United States: Canada’s Generosity Gap.” *Fraser Forum*, December 2003, pp. 9-15.

Levitsky, Sandra R. 2008. “Niche Activism: Constructing a Unified Movement Identity in a Heterogeneous Organizational Field.” *Mobilization* 12(3):271-86.

Marquis, Christopher, Gerald F. Davis, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2013. “Golfing Alone? Corporations, Elites, and Nonprofit Growth in 100 American Communities.” *Organization Science* 24(1):39-57.

Miller, Lynn, and Karen Simmons. 1992. “Differences in Management Practices of Founding and Nonfounding Chief Executives of Human Service Organizations.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 16(4):31-9.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1999. “Bending With the Wind: Strategic Change and Adaptation by Women’s and Racial Minority Organizations.” *American Journal of Sociology* 104(6):1666-703.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1994. “From Service Provision to Institutional Advocacy: The Shifting Legitimacy of Organizational Forms.” *Social Forces* 72(4): 943-69.

Powell, Walter W. and Richard Steinberg. 2006. *The Non-profit Sector: A Research Handbook*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ruef, Martin, Howard E. Aldrich, and Nancy M. Carter. 2003. “The Structure of Founding Teams: Homophily, Strong Ties, and Isolation among U.S. Entrepreneurs.” *American Sociological Review* 68(2):195-222.

Salamon, Lester M. 1999. *America’s Nonprofit Sector: A Primer.* 2nd ed. New York: Foundation Center.

Salamon, Lester M. 1987. “Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations.” Pp. 99-117 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shulman, David. 2008. “More Lies than Meet the Eyes: Organizational Realities and Deceptions in Nonprofit Organizations.” *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law* 10(2):5-14.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. “Organizations and Social Structure” Pp. 143-93 in *Handbook of Organizations,* edited by J. G. March. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2015. *Volunteering in the United States, 2015*. Report USDL-16-0363. Retrieved May 20, 2015 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm).

U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. *Nonprofit Sector and Community Solutions Act of 2010.* H.R. 5533. 111th Congress, 2nd session, 2010. Retrieved April 19, 2012 (http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/111/hr5533).

The Urban Institute. 2015. *The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2015.* Retrieved May 2, 2016 (http://www.urban.org/research/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2015-public-charities-giving-and-volunteering).

Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Economic and Social Organization,* translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Wright, Karen. 2001. "Generosity vs. Altruism: Philanthropy and Charity in the United States and United Kingdom." *Voluntas* 12(4):399-416

Young, Dennis R. 1983. *If Not for Profit, for What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Young, Dennis R. 1985. *Casebook of Management for Non-Profit Organizations: Entrepreneurship and Organizational Change in the Human Services*. New York: Hawthorne Press.

CHAPTER 2

Beyond the Founder: Exploring the Use of Social Capital in Emerging Nonprofit Organizations to Identify, Recruit and Motivate Volunteers

Abstract

Volunteers are a critical resource for nonprofit organizations (NPOs). Both scholars and practitioners wonder what motivates them and how they can be identified and mobilized to assist both the individual NPO, the nonprofit community and society. Scholars have identified the context of volunteering and volunteer motivation among important issues worthy of closer study. In this paper, I examine volunteer identification and recruitment, including motivation, in the context of NPO emergence—a topic that has not been the subject of much study. I do so using data derived from forty qualitative interviews of founders and early participants across eight emerging NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. Contrary to what the existing literature tells us about the general volunteer population, I hypothesized and found support for the proposition that, *in the context of emerging NPOs*, social capital is at work calling forth volunteer assistance and resources in support of the fledgling organizations.

Keywords

Volunteer, nonprofit organization, NPO, social capital, founding, emergence, context, motivation, entrepreneurship

Particularly in countries such as the United States, with a limited welfare state, many of the services citizens receive are delivered in nonprofit organizations (NPOs). But many NPOs rely for their very existence on a vast workforce of volunteers who are critical to the operation of these organizations. For example, for the year ending September 2014**,** nearly 63 million persons or over 25 percent of the population, reported they volunteered time in the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). Thus, recruiting and retaining these volunteers is often one of the central tasks, if not *the* central task of these organizations. But herein lies a puzzle that has preoccupied sociologists for decades: why would anyone give up one of their most cherished resources—their time—with no expectation of monetary compensation? Would it not be more rewarding for people to spend spare time in recreation, with family or friends, or just work to make more money? Why not succumb to the inevitable temptation to become a "free rider," making the proverbial tax-deductible annual contribution, knowing that others will do the work (Olson 1965)?

While the giving literature assembled by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) is rife with ideas about how and why people choose to volunteer time or resources, the existing research largely focuses on volunteers of established organizations or surveys the experience of volunteers in general. In fact, we know little about the experience of volunteers involved in founding or working with emerging NPOs which my experience suggests is quite different from that of established organizations and those who work for them. We should be curious about these new recruits to a growing nonprofit sector which, according to the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) of the Urban Institute, includes over 1.41 million U.S. NPOs contributing roughly 5.4 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). (The Urban Institute 2015). Moreover, the nonprofit economy is growing at a faster rate than the for-profit sector (Cordes, Steuerle, and

Twombly 2001). Who and what drives that growth and these start-ups? Those who study entrepreneurship in general largely focus attention on the for-profit sector (Aldrich and Ruef 2006). With the foundational research of Young (1983, 1985) as a notable exception, nonprofit scholars are only beginning to examine the experience of NPOs in the context of organizational emergence and the persons who choose to launch or affiliate with them (Bolton and Spence 2006; Carman and Nesbitt 2013; Chikoto and Halicki 2013; Herrmann 2011; Kenny Stevens 2005).

In particular, I am mindful that preeminent scholars in this area identify the role of context in volunteering (Musick and Wilson 2008) and volunteer motivation (Handy and Mook 2011; Mook, Handy, and Quarter 2007) as worthy of further study**.** Thus, this paper will address this conundrum of volunteering in the emerging NPO. How do emerging NPOs identify and recruit volunteers? Why do people respond to the call? Voluntarism in the context of the emerging NPO, I suggest, differs in important ways from voluntarism in established organizations.

This research is a qualitative study of eight emerging NPOs in a single county in New Jersey using the literature on established organizations as a proxy control for purposes of comparison. I use multiple subjects to identify commonalities in the volunteer experience across emerging NPOs, and where I encounter differences, seek to understand why. I do so by analyzing primary data from forty qualitative interviews, document review, and participant observation. Unlike other studies on emergence that have focused exclusively on founders, I include both founders and early participants as interview subjects to test my theories about the role played by social capital in NPO foundings.

I hypothesize that social capital plays a salient role in launching the nonprofit organization. In this paper, I show what social capital is utilized and how is it deployed as NPO founders and early participants go about the essential tasks of organization establishment such as recruiting volunteers, assembling resources, and so forth. While I recognize that it is certainly possible to establish an organization by using monetary capital to provide goods and services or by using human capital in the form of employees, I hypothesize that most NPOs are created and sustained principally by leveraging social capital to enlist volunteer labor and secure other needed resources including, but not limited to, money and expertise. Unlike virtually all recent studies involving emerging NPOs, in addition to founders I also interview early participants for a more comprehensive look at the fledgling organization. This is a key difference in my study design.

Theoretical Orientation

Organizational Emergence as Context

While this is largely a grounded study in which I look for themes to emerge from the data (Glaser 1992; Strauss 1988), my preparation and research focus is guided by the academic iterature on voluntarism and giving. A comprehensive literature review on voluntarism conducted by sociologist John Wilson was reported in the *Annual Review of Sociology* in 2000 and updated in 2008 in *Volunteers: A Social Profile*, co-authored with Marc Musick. Wilson and Musick observe that study of the contextual effects on individual volunteering is "one of the least understood issues in the field" and has not been the subject of much study (2008:229). Wilson cautions against looking at volunteering using the individual as the exclusive unit of analysis; he warns that other influences may be at work calling volunteers into action and keeping them at work. I concur, and thus have chosen the NPO as my unit of analysis, examining its experience through interviews with those who are in the process of launching and supporting it.

In contrast with psychological studies and general surveys which treat the decision to volunteer as an individual attribute, sociologists focus on the importance of social context and relationship. Wuthnow (1995) presumes framework or context is key, and that groups and/or structures at the origin influence the individual's decision to volunteer as does the affiliated organization. Musick and Wilson (2008) frame the key question that I believe is important for studying volunteers who are founders and/or early participants in the emerging NPO:

> Each framework calls forth, defines, and legitimizes its own set of motives. Each provides its own "vocabulary" for talking about motives… The sociological question thus becomes: why are these motives acceptable in this context? For the sociologist, the question, "What was their interest in volunteering?" is a prelude to other questions like, "Why does one group of people have one motivation and another group of people have another motivation?" In short, sociologists believe that motives are socially determined rather than fixed attributes of individuals. They believe that social surveys showing that the reasons people give for volunteering vary systematically across social groups indicate that a social location, such as social class position, determines motives rather than individual needs. (P. 72)

Conceptually, Wilson and Musick divide volunteering into two forms: "informal," such as assistance persons might offer to family, as distinguished from "formal," such as assistance persons might render to organizations. Wilson and Musick refer to informal volunteering as "helping" and see it as "more private and […] not organized" such as baby-sitting a grandchild (1997:700). They argue that "helping" arises from obligation and relationship while formal volunteer work does not. They note that "[p]arents do not 'volunteer' to help their children out with baby-sitting" (1997:700), thus pointing out that frequency and duration of helping depends on one's ability to meet the request. This led Wilson and Musick to ask and explore the following questions: might some people volunteer in a formal setting, such as for an organization, out of this same sense of obligation and relationship? What about the sense of obligation people may have to others if they are asked to help in a formal setting?

Wilson and Musick (1997) found that social capital, operationalized as informal social interaction and number of children in the household, was positively related to formal volunteering. However, in the general volunteer population, their assertion that "most formal volunteers are persuaded to volunteer by family members, coworkers, or fellow worshipers" (1997:700) was unsubstantiated (1997:708). In essence, they found that while persons volunteering in formal organizations are identified as having social capital, they are not acting in response to its direct call or request. Based on personal experience in founding and working with emerging NPOs, I believe the opposite to be true in the context of emergence: that those who volunteer for the fledgling NPO are, in fact, "persuaded to volunteer by family members, coworkers, or fellow worshipers." I set out to test that proposition by treating organizational emergence as a specific context in which to explore voluntarism consistent with my theory that there is a heightened role for social capital in that context. Thus, I examine context by looking at the volunteer experience during organizational emergence.

To advance this literature, I collected and analyzed empirical data to address these specific questions involving context (Musick and Wilson 2008) and motivation (Handy and Mook 2011). I ask whether the means for identifying and recruiting volunteers in new NPOs differs from the volunteer experience in established NPOs as described in the literature. Second, I query whether volunteer motivation differs as well. It is plausible that volunteering in emerging NPOs more closely resembles the "informal helping" described by Musick and Wilson (1997) because it is largely relationally oriented in early organizational emergence. That is a stage of organizational development in which it is difficult to differentiate between the founder(s) or leaders as separate from the organization itself.

Social Capital: Relationship as Both Resource and Motivation

The accumulation of trust through social interaction would appear to be among the most valuable resources needed in the process of establishing a nonprofit organization. Consequently, social capital theory is instructive. Putnam (1995) describes the concept of social capital concisely when he says "social networks provide the channel through which we recruit one another for good deeds, and social networks foster norms of reciprocity that encourage attention to others welfare" (p. 67). While Putnam worries that social capital in America may be on the decline, Jones (2011) argues that perhaps it is simply shifting. In examining how socializing has changed over time, Jones finds that while recent investments in social capital related to family and neighbor relations have declined, greater investments are being made in friendships. We know from Putnam and Jones that changes are occurring in the structure of social capital, but we know little about whether (and if so how) it might be mobilized and expended in the creation of a nonprofit organization. This study explores those processes.

Because emerging NPOs often lack the resources that established NPOs may have, I posit that there is a heavier reliance on social capital. This includes more relationship-building and networking to identify, recruit, train, manage and retain volunteers than in established organizations with greater human (e.g., employees), institutional (e.g., systems and operations) or financial (e.g., money and property) capital at their disposal. The work of Lin, Cook, and Burt (2001) attempts to define the boundaries of social capital as a sociological construct which, they observe, has become a term that is generally (over) employed with little consistency of usage to the extent that the concept has begun to lose meaning. Lin Cook and Burt emphasize the need for a shared perspective for research to be meaningful. They trace the origins of the term social capital back to Marx (1933) and his notion of capital, that is, surplus value from investment. Lin credits others for advancing the concept of capital to include other forms such as “human” capital (investments a person makes such as in education) and “cultural” capital (investments that a class or group of persons might make in formal symbols and practices recognized by the group which have meaning, can be shared and by which the group itself may be identified.) Social capital, Lin maintains, is distinct from human capital (exhibited by an individual) or cultural capital (exhibited by a group or class) (p. 29-30). Taking guidance from Lin, as well as from Ostrom and Ahn (2008) who have studied the history and usage of social capital across disciplines, I refer to social capital as representing that attribute of an individual and his/her relationships that enhances his/her ability to solve collective action problems which become embedded in individual relationships, networks and institutions as trust. In other words, it is an investment in social relations with expected returns, not unlike an investment using monetary capital intended to produce interest or profit. Lin’s definition of social capital refers to resources that are (1) “embedded in a social structure”, (2) which are “accessed or/or mobilized”, (3) in “purposive action” for both “instrumental” and “expressive” outcomes. (Lin 1999). (p.33, 34). Social capital is utilized for an *instrumental* outcome when it is tapped to cause something to happen. Social capital is utilized toward an *expressive* outcome when the goal is to maintain or extend relationships and ties for future utilization or support. I anticipated that in the NPO formation process, I would find that social capital is tapped for instrumental outcomes and dispensed for expressive outcomes.

What We Know About Volunteer Motivation and Participation

As noted above, Musick and Wilson (2008) catalog a rich body of quantitative sociological research on volunteers obtained through surveys and experiments which I discuss in some detail below. As the Volunteer Factor Inventory (VFI) first conceived by Clary and Snyder (1999) has been developed and tested in empirical studies, six motivations are consistently associated with volunteer work including: (1) values, the desire to achieve goals consistent with one's true conception of self; (2) personal enhancement, the desire for learning experiences; (3) social, the desire to fit in and get along with members of a group; (4) career, the desire to obtain benefits relevant to one's career; (5) protection, the desire for experiences designed to help cope with inner conflict or feelings of inadequacy; and (6) understanding, the desire for experiences to enhance personal growth (Musick and Wilson 2008:57-63). A different psychological approach to sorting out the motivations of volunteers is employed by Batson, Ahmad, and Tsang (2002) who view motives as "goal directed forces induced by threats or opportunities related to one's values" and values as "stages of mind which can change depending on context." (p. 430). Batson et al. identify four classes into which volunteer motivations can be assigned. They are: (1) egoism, the desire to increase one's own welfare; (2) altruism, the desire to increase the welfare of others; (3) collectivism, the desire to increase the welfare of a group; and (4) principalism, the desire to uphold one or more moral principles. Nowhere among these motivations is the desire to respond to and support an existing relationship, unless one were to somehow reframe that as a personal value or principle.

What More We Might Learn in Context

Much of this work which has attempted to identify and categorize volunteer motivations was conducted in laboratory experiments or broadly administered surveys. In contrast, there is far less qualitative research on these organizations and their legion of volunteers. One notable exception is the now over twenty-year-old work of sociologist Robert Wuthnow (1995). Wuthnow conducted extensive interviews with persons who volunteered in a variety of contexts to tell their stories and look for common themes, including interviews of high school and college aged volunteers. Another exception is the trailblazing work of Susan Ostrander (1980) who, in querying upper class women, learned that their motivation for volunteer work was not social climbing or altruism as thought, but the need to hold on to power and prestige.

I examined recent qualitative work for what may already be known about the motivation of volunteers in general. Handy and Mook (2011) in a case study of volunteer experience in an established organization found that volunteers, whether board members or ground-level laborers, are motivated by benefits associated with the volunteer experience. These benefits include "…professional and personal development, social and professional contacts, and resume building" (p. 418). Studying both board members and "on the ground" service workers they argue that both are similarly motivated. Handy and Mook argue that human service volunteers "enjoy a relative positional advantage in health, income, or social/human capital… thus, volunteers enjoy a warm glow derived from helping actions and their positional advantage" (p. 414). Their analysis of board members concluded that in addition to the benefits enjoyed by "on the ground" workers, the exclusivity of board seats creates "an aura of selectivity" (p. 414), an added benefit that trustees enjoy. An emerging organization, however, is unlikely to be in a position to offer such inducements as the prestige of board membership or encounters with persons who may help them achieve positional advantage that more established organizations can and do. Would volunteers of emerging organization say they seek or derive these same benefits?

Suspecting there is more to be learned by drilling deeper, I also employ qualitative methods to shed light on voluntarism in the context of contemporary NPO foundings, including the motivation and experience of early participants engaged in the endeavor of organizational creation. I ask whether these same factors are at work in calling and motivating volunteers into the service of emerging NPOs. I maintain that qualitative research focused on emerging NPOs is needed to supplement and test reported experimental findings on motivation. Because this study examines motivation in context through contemporaneous independent observation and inquiry and does not rely exclusively on founder self-reports, it has the promise to build a more comprehensive view of motivation and activity associated with NPO foundings.

Qualitative interviews are a particularly powerful tool for assessing process, the meaning associated with work, and the resources employed to accomplish the work. This is information which is difficult to get at using quantitative methods, and virtually impossible to obtain in a constructed social laboratory. Because organizational emergence is a dynamic process most often communicated through story-telling, a qualitative approach is most likely to get at the essence of the founding experience. Interviews are particularly well suited to enable the researcher to compare and contrast experiences of organizations which: (1) are formed for different organizational missions and objectives; (2) utilize different processes; (3) are dynamic and evolving; and (4) whose founders and leaders may attribute different meaning to the emergence (Kvale, 1996).

By inquiring about identification, recruitment and motivation through interviews with participants within and across emerging organizations, my research generated data which suggests that volunteers of emerging organizations are somewhat differently sourced and motivated than volunteers generally, and that the context is key. What might persons who organize an animal rescue have in common with those who educate about human trafficking? Anything? What distinguishes them, their efforts and their affiliated organizations?

Methods

This research builds on and expands existing research through a qualitative study of eight emerging NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. It uses the literature on established organizations as a proxy control for purposes of comparison. I use multiple subjects to identify commonalities about the volunteer experience across the organizations. I use data derived from in-depth qualitative interviews with forty individuals (including both volunteer founders and early supporters), participant observation (e.g. at organizational events and organization participation in public events) and document review (e.g. websites, press, and IRS filings) to explore context and motivation. I use these methods to better and further explore the notion that volunteer experience in emerging NPOs has contextual determinants, which surveys or interviews of individual volunteers (separate from the organizations they serve) are not structured to ascertain. My approach is responsive to concerns in the literatures of both voluntarism (Wilson 2000) and entrepreneurship (Starr & Fondas 2010) that there is an overemphasis on founders in the limited research which explores emergence. Thus, I study the organization as the principal unit of analysis and do so by including early volunteer participants in addition to founders as interview subjects.

I study contemporary foundings, that is, NPOs with an IRS Rule Date between 2010 and 2012, using the Rule Date as an imperfect proxy for formal organizational founding.[1] I examine emerging NPOs to minimize the possibility of lost founders, faulty memory or reconstruction of historical events, as well as to minimize the problem of success selection (Ruef, Aldrich, and Carter 2003) meaning that I examine NPOs with the possibility of both success and failure. While beyond the scope of the research reported on here, studying NPOs with the potential for either success or failure, leaves open the possibility for the study, over time, of organizational survival, change and death.

Sampling

I selected cases from the universe of emerging organizations in a single county (also a U.S. Census Bureau Core Based Statistical Area) during a three-year period. This controls, albeit imperfectly, for other contexts such as time, location, economic and political influences in order to study the selected context of emergence. My review of National Center of Charitable Statistics (NCCS) data for this county, revealed 99 public charity organizations with a Rule Date falling between 2010 and 2012. I utilized Guidestar, NCCS and IRS databases to identify persons associated with such organizations to approach for possible interviews. For example, Guidestar identifies organizations by zip code, shows each organization's officers and directors by name, and appends the organization's IRS filings which contain critical information about organizational structure, resources, operations and plans.

[1] My experience bears out the imperfect nature of the proxy, having unmasked a number of organizations that appear to be in the process of emerging by reference to their IRS Rule date, but with respect to their operations are quite mature organizations with a significantly longer history of organizational existence.

Recognizing that the population was not sufficiently large to ensure a statistically representative sample as would be possible with a broadly administered survey instrument, I purposively selected organizations to permit comparison across organizations formed with different missions and designed to engage in different activities, specifically seeking to obtain representation from among the predominant organization activity types[2] discovered in the county.

Table 1. Population of Organizations in Subject County by IRS Type

Organizational Type of Emerging NPOs	**Number Each Type in Population**
religious	17
human services	16
health	13
sports	8
education	7
animal protection	6
culture	6
community development	5
volunteer promotion/philanthropy	4
environmental	4
other types- aggregate ($n \geq 3$)	13
total	99

Through purposive selection, I also sought to maximize differences among the NPOs in order to be able to more confidently attribute identified similarities to emergence. I used publically available information on the demographics of the populations of all zip codes in the county where an NPO was formed during the designated time frame. Using that information, I

[2]These are organizational activity types identified by each nonprofit in its IRS applications for tax exempt status.

selected organizations from communities with different socio-economic bases. I endeavored to include organizations from communities with racially diverse populations as well as those with racially homogeneous compositions. I included NPOs organized in communities with different median household incomes. I also looked at where the NPOS were geographically situated in the county to include those formed in urban, rural and suburban communities. Finally, I chose both organizations which serve the community in which they are formed and others which do not. Table 2 summarizes my sample cases.

Table 2. Summary of Participating Organizations by Activity Type, Mission and Founding Story

Organization Pseudonym	Activity Type	Mission and Vision	Founding Story
Pet Food Bank	Animal Protection & Human Welfare	To keep pets in their homes by providing supplemental food, litter and other basic necessities to persons with demonstrated financial need.	Co-founders shared recognition of importance that the comfort of a pet can provide during the death of a family member. Started NPO to keep owners and pets together.
Youth Philanthropy	Philanthropy	To facilitate the collective efforts of children to work in support of charities in their communities through raising money, by performing age-appropriate chores.	When founder could not find volunteer opportunities for her kids, she organized them to raise money for a local charity. NPO formed when others wanted to participate in the work.
Animal Rescue	Agricultural Program & Animal Rescue	To provide for the well-being of abused and abandoned animals, particularly farm animals, on a privately owned farm.	Founder and her mother started taking in stray and wounded animals that no one else would.
Community Gardens	Nutrition Education & Agricultural Program	To develop urban gardens and educate the public on the nutritional benefits of adding fresh, homegrown produce to their diets to help combat diseases such as diabetes.	Founder, a restauranteur, volunteered with NPOs, schools and churches to develop healthy eating programs and community gardens. NPO formed when she identified others who wanted to participate in her work.
Human Trafficking	Education & Human Services	To support and advocate for victims and survivors of sex trafficking, forced labor, and domestic servitude.	Founders are social workers, counselors and teachers who have worked with populations at risk of being human trafficking victims. NPO formed after their collaboration on a government task force.
Christian Development	Christianity & Urban Community Development	To bring hope through programs and services to meet the physical, spiritual, and social development needs of individuals and families in need to develop community.	Founders are pastor and wife of new inner city church. NPO is the companion organization designed to be able to attract resources beyond the church community.
Youth Baseball	Baseball & Softball	To cultivate the ideals of good sportsmanship, honesty, loyalty, courage and respect for authority in the children and community to develop better citizens.	Founder discovered that longstanding organization had lost its 501(c) (3) status due to administrative neglect. Recognizing it would be challenging to repair those issues a new NPO was formed to support existing league.
Law Enforcement	Mutual Benefit: Fraternities & Sororities	To support members by providing their families college scholarships and monetary assistance for a tragic event or terminal illness.	Founders are officers of a longstanding law enforcement agency social committee. NPO formed to gather and hold resources in a more formal and organized manner.

Starting with NPOs which had referenced a website or e-mail address on the initial 990 filed with the IRS, I began by contacting directors and officers with names appearing there in order to identify founders and early participants for interviews. Non-responses were first followed up in the same format and then by U.S. mail, recognizing that e-mail may be considered spam and not reach its intended target. I approached twelve organizations seeking interviews. Two organizations did not respond at all to the outreach described in this paragraph; one initially agreed to participate, but after consultation with its full board declined to participate citing over-commitment; a fourth initially agreed to interviews and then, due to material personnel changes, was unable to follow through on the commitment.

Data Collection

I began by interviewing one person affiliated with each of the eight organizations which responded to my outreach. I continued both by reaching out to other persons affiliated with the organizations as identified from public records and by contacting persons to whom interviewees referred me, continuing until I had at least forty interviews among the eight organizations. These interviews were intended to explore how and why persons come to form a nonprofit or participate in the early life of the nonprofit. Questions were designed to probe for: (1) what the respondent *thinks about* as he or she is engaged in the process (meaning); (2) what the respondent *feel*s about his or her work; (3) what he or she is *doing* (both individually and with others) to create the organization; and (4) where the work is taking place. I studied the script Wuthnow (1995) used for his extensive qualitative interviews of volunteers in preparing my own. Like Wuthnow, I employ questions that are largely open-ended and designed so that respondents will be free to tell the story of the organizational emergence, his or her role in it and that of others. I used a semi-structured guided interview format employing a script to elicit the same type of information across subjects to facilitate comparison (See Appendix A. p.182).

Preceding the interview, each subject was asked to provide written consent to the interview pursuant to IRB approval sought for this study (See Appendix B. p. 184). I conducted the majority of the interviews myself. The remaining interviews were conducted by an individual employed in the nonprofit sector and MBA graduate student. With experience as a nonprofit and for-profit organization founder, I had a high level of confidence that I could direct the interviews in such a way that critical information would be elicited from each respondent. I did not anticipate, and largely, did not encounter difficulty with access. I have found that persons involved in nonprofit formation are passionate about the undertaking and are eager to speak about it. This proved to be true**.** After each interview, my colleague or I asked the subject to complete a face sheet to obtain identifying and demographic information which I then coded and maintained separate from the interview to protect confidentiality (See Appendix C. p. 186).

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for coding using an inductive approach to allow the data to speak to the theories discussed herein. I transcribed the first few interviews myself as a way of becoming familiar with the content as well as to inform the conduct of the remaining interviews and to aid in development of a coding scheme. Thereafter, I utilized a transcription services company for the remaining interviews. All persons assisting with these tasks were asked to and did execute a confidentiality agreement (See Appendix D. p. 187). Once the transcriptions were received, I reviewed them while listening to the audio recordings as a means of checking the transcripts for accuracy.

In preparation for the interviews, I reviewed public documents as background to obtain information about the respondent as well as the emerging organization, including documents created by the organization or respondent as well as those written about the subject organization or respondent including legal documents, websites, traditional media, and social media.

My colleague and I engaged in limited participant observation to obtain information about the founders, early participants and organizations. While it was not realistic to sociologically infiltrate the eight organizations, we learned about them through attendance at public events such as information sessions, public meetings, fundraising events and the like.

Data Analysis

Given the limited research on nonprofit organizational emergence at the level of the individual organization as detailed above, the multiple case study method which I use is particularly helpful in exploring organizational emergence. As in the study of learning activities (Liu and Ko 2012), case studies have been employed to understand dynamic processes. As Yin (2009) suggests, the multiple case study approach enables social scientists to examine real-life events in such a way as to permit them to generalize beyond what a single case study would permit. By using replication logic, the multiple case study helps in theory building when similar themes arise across the data generated from multiple cases. Modifying a research approach suggested by Light's (2005) comment on the lack of empirical work in this domain, my objective was to build careful records on each organization and its respective founder(s) and other participants. In order to deduce patterns, my assistant and I developed codes while engaged in our initial data review. Examples of coded variables for founders and /or early participants included demographic information (e.g. age, sex, education, race, income) as well as experiences and associations. Examples of coded variables for emerging organizations included partners, missions, objectives, challenges and strengths. I used NVIVO 10 to organize and analyze data for analysis.

The stories of organizations are complex because they are the result of collaborations among individuals and other organizations as well as interaction with the physical, social, political and economic environment. Thus, to enhance the validity of the stories of organizational emergence, I triangulated the data using different sources and methods to compare and contrast the stories as told by documents, interviews and observations (Denzin 2006).

Results

For purposes of confidentiality, I refer to each individual respondent by an assigned pseudonym as set forth in Table 3 (Appendix E. p. 188). I refer to each NPO studied by its organizational pseudonym (also appearing in Table 3) derived from its predominant activity as set forth in Table 2 above.

Emerging NPO Volunteer Demographic Profile

While acknowledging that mine is not a random sample and that I purposively sampled organizations and not individual respondents, the emerging NPO volunteers interviewed "look" like the general volunteer population as reported in the literature in that they share similar demographic characteristics. Consistent with the literature on the general volunteer population, these NPO volunteers were: Caucasian (90%); educated (82.7% holding at least a college degree); married (72.5%) and female (62.5%). They have children (70%); an annual household income of $100,000 or more (62.5%) and self-identify as middle class or higher (80%). A majority of the respondents (80%) identified with a conventional religious group (Christian 40%; Catholic 25%; Jewish 12.5%; Other 2.5%) but less than half (45%) reported being active in their religion. Only one NPO employs staff. Its staff of one is an executive director who began work with that organization as a volunteer and is charged with doing fundraising to cover his salary.

Identification and Recruitment

For each NPO, networking to identify and recruit volunteers was vital to its establishment. Using personal connections and appeals, the founders of all of these organizations identified and recruited prospective volunteers by first approaching people with whom they had close, existing relationships whether in the home, the family, the community or on the job. Unlike the reports from the general volunteer population as chronicled in the academic literature above, these persons *are* responding to personal appeals of those close to them to serve or affirmatively are offering to volunteer in anticipation of that person's needs or aspirations.

Volunteer Identification and Recruitment Begins at Home

The founder's search for volunteers doesn't start further than the household. When I asked Jess, co-founder of Pet Food Bank, about its volunteers, the answer was comedic but very clear: "Our husbands are our biggest volunteers, whether they like it or not, ha-ha! Those guys do a tremendous amount…". One of our interview subjects was Tim, the husband of Lauren, the other founder. He described his relationship to Pet Food Bank as "related by marriage."

Spouses would seem like a natural fit for providing support. Their strong commitment to the other person, their character, motivations and desires make them excellent start-up volunteers. Maria, Pastor Sam's wife and a founder of Christian Development shares:

> [As] far as actually starting [the NPO] it was really my husband and I. […] When my husband started it, I did all the secretarial work, getting a legal entity, 501(c)(3) and had to... figure out how to do that… It was my husband's idea so I naturally just went along with that. The legal end of it, I did."

Instead of seeking professional legal advice, the spouse took matters into her own hands by doing research about the required regulatory paperwork and then completing and filing it herself.

Jane, an early key volunteer for Christian Development, conceded that Maria's work was vital to establishing the organization as a legal 501(c) (3). "She's great with administration. She did a lot of the legal… made sure that we were up to standards."

Spouses and significant others, where founders had such relationships, were recruited and heavily relied on in other organizations as well. Lee, founder of Animal Rescue, describes the critical support offered by her live-in boyfriend, Dan:

> My boyfriend is a behind the scenes guy. He is actually a big financial backer. When he moved here—he moved in with me—I said I will take care of all of the house, the mortgage, the cable, the phone, the electric, the water. You just have to pay for feed. And when he moved here it was seven bags of feed. Now, it's up to 32 bags of feed and then there's hay and then there's building things…I think he put in like $50,000 last year into [Animal Rescue]. So, without him, I wouldn't be able to have half the amount of animals.

Leslie, founder of Youth Philanthropy had this to say about her spouse and family: "[F]rom May through August, I spend a gazillion [hours], is that a number? I mean, you know, my poor kids and my husband. Luckily, they are so supportive…" At the Youth Philanthropy annual kickoff event, her husband and daughters were observed doing whatever was needed, registering guests, facilitating groups, tallying votes, etc. Leslie's best friend and initial Youth Philanthropy board member Louisa had this to say about the involvement of her family:

> Our children, did not necessarily have a choice… It was not like we sat down with them and said, "We found this great program, do you guys want to do it?" [Laughs] Year after year when we are reaching out to families and we are saying, "Are you coming back this year?" and they say, "Well, let me talk to my kids." I do not talk to my kids. I just say, "What size shirt do you want me to give you for this year?" [So] my husband …just becomes the schlepper again; so it is clearly a family commitment.

Similarly, Brenda of Human Trafficking involved her young son in its work. I observed him helping with registration at Human Trafficking's annual walk, designed to raise awareness and funds.

Youth Baseball didn't differ. Not only are NPOs utilizing spouses as volunteers, we see in each these volunteers engaged in the three traditional forms of giving, that is, time, talent and treasure. Whether they assist by providing expertise, doing manual labor, or donating funds, significant others and family members offer critical early volunteer support. Brad of Youth Baseball explained how family resources, including time and money, easily become those of the NPO:

> Time, money, yeah, if you volunteer here, time comes out of your pocket. I mean, sure, and money comes out of your pocket. You know, we travel, we stay at hotels. I pay for that. The kids do not pay for that. You know, gas. If I am driving to Pennsylvania, you give of your time, you give of, you know, your family's time.

Sometimes, as in the case of Law Enforcement, the "household" is the workplace. Richard explained how they identified volunteers. "We mostly recruit by word of mouth and invitation. That's how I was recruited. We look around and see who has what it takes to be successful with what we do and recruit them." Joyce of Law Enforcement described how she became an early volunteer:

> A lot of it had to do with me already being, I will use the word, secretary. Who was going to do the paperwork? Initially, that's how I got involved in it. I was already the [Law Enforcement associated organization] secretary, and they were "Ok, now we are going to rope you into this."

In discussing the roles of others, she added "They were pretty much told that this was the role they were going to take," with the clear implication that persons were "volunteered" and found it hard to say no, consistent with the culture of the parent organization.

Law Enforcement, born to support employees of a parent organization, stands out as a bit of an exception in the sample. It is the only group which referred to "culture" as a component of volunteer identification and recruitment. Because it has a history by association with another organization, it has a culture. (By contrast, I consider the other NPOs I studied to be "preculture".) Fred, the first recruit of the "founding fathers," explained that "[Law Enforcement] has a very strict culture, you are not really recruited you are just told to do something so you do not say anything. We are a very para-military organization." Bev admitted that volunteers are drawn from a close circle. "Most of them are either [law enforcement] or civilian employees, some friends of the organization or family members." I believe that Law Enforcement's symbiotic relationship with its long established "parent" organization (under which it first operated as a program), has caused it to develop some behaviors that differ from those exhibited by more purely emergent organizations, particularly those behaviors centered on volunteer recruitment. However, other behaviors, including what work is done and how it is organized and executed are similar to the other fledgling organizations. Fred of Law Enforcement explained what agreeing to be an early volunteer involved:

> Basically you put together a lot of time when it first started. Most people, it is hard to say if you put your own money out, you do not even realize what you are doing you just go out and get things, get it done. It was more of a donation on your end then you do not even realize you are doing it.

Widening the Spiral: Reaching Out to Friends and Family

While receiving support on the home front is important, it is unlikely that an enterprise could be sustainable if reliant exclusively on spouses and immediate family members. In Pet Food Bank's case, networking with extended family, in-laws and friends was instrumental to its establishment. Jess volunteered:

> We had a very generous donation early on…through Lauren's brother-in-law that helped us move a little forward, paying some of those incidentals for filing [the 501(c)(3)] and stuff…. [It] was personal connections, letting people know what we were doing, seeing who wanted to get involved. We talked to all of our friends, business people that we knew, employers that we had, we put it out there for everybody and we did get a lot of support. People offering to volunteer, that sort of thing.

In this start-up phase, there was an expectation of support. Lauren explained:

> I really have a lot of generous friends who are really supportive…. We now have people that will say, "just say the word if you need money; we will write you a check." A lot of people I know […] who don't have the time necessarily or the inclination to do the leg work […] contribute financially and that's great because you need it all.

Claire of Community Gardens described the important role of her sister, who also works for her for profit business:

> [M]y sister joined me….in the office doing like the books and like she is really good on the computer, and she is helping with [Community Gardens] … working on bringing [Community Gardens] up-to-date with all the projects that we are doing and getting the Facebook going and everything, especially for this fundraising thing that we are trying to do. We just applied for all these grants…Well, I am learning how to write grants. And, my sister is helping me big-time. She is definitely the more organized one.

Mimi, one of the board members, acknowledged Claire's sister, Sallie's, critical contributions.

> [H]er sister is real, real involved now as far as helping her, [Claire]. And she has been – she is her right hand. And I always get emails from [Sallie] about when the next meeting is, what is going on with the garden. Between her and [Claire] I am constantly being updated through emails as to okay, these events are coming up. Can you come help? I am actually going to be working the market table at one point this summer.

Leslie of Youth Philanthropy also detailed how familial support reached beyond her own household:

> I also was very fortunate enough to have a family who has the means and the belief in me to give me what I needed to get started. I put together packets and kind of pitched it to them…. So, I was very fortunate in that, in that alone … I still get a lot of support from family, or connections to family who keep up my administrative fund so that I can pay the lawyer and the taxes. So, I have been able to keep 100% [of the children's fundraising going to the selected nonprofits], so I would say personal connections for me have played a huge role in allowing this dream to be a reality. Because, the reality is the money, and that is, I have been able to get that…

But family is not the end of the story. Leslie continued:

> Okay, so again, all personal connections or one way or the other. So, [our program in XXX] Maryland, was my best friend growing up. So, she started it there. She has since moved to Texas and someone who just was a participant in it the last couple of years loved it. They took it over. [XXX] Township, is the wife of the manager where my husband works, and they are first-year, like every Friday did a charity day and gave us money. So, our first year closing ceremony, I gave him a plaque and he brought the family. And, she was like, 'Wow, what is this, dah, dah, dah, dah.' So, since she has

> started [a program there]. And, [XXX] County, Pennsylvania, another personal friend of mine, who the first year they did it, even though they are far away, just had her kids be part of our group to see what it was all about, loved it. Now, she has not only led Pennsylvania, but had to be president of [Youth Philanthropy] in PA, since they have their own [incorporation and tax ID] number. And, [XXX,] Ohio. [I] was, over Christmas at my sister's house and one of her best friends…wanted something for their kids and she agreed to jump in. So, you know, it is all word of mouth.

Brenda, a founder of Human Trafficking, described how essential the family of another founder was to the organization's inception in this way:

> [Denise] is very business…. All her … family and relatives, is all like attorneys and insurance companies and these people that we really needed. We would have never got the incorporation through, and also like the accountant and like all those business pieces, like she really, because, [we had] no clue about any of that. And, I am willing to admit, and I think that is the same with everybody else that we, the business end was not our forte. And, [Denise] was great at that. She still is great at that.

Kevin, a volunteer for Youth Baseball, conceded the necessity to rely on friends and family to recruit volunteers and to get things done within the organization. "[Y]ou have to use personal connections, because you always have to get things done." Even when starting with a list of willing volunteers, emerging nonprofits work personal connections. Kevin continued, "I will usually work hand-in-hand with the coordinators when we need to find and recruit coaches. And, that is typically done by phone calls, emails, based on names I recognize or guys I know, [I] reach out to them first."

Again, Law Enforcement stands out as the exception. They recruit volunteers exclusively from their ranks. Bev explained that "[m]ost of them are either [law enforcement] or civilian employees, some friends of the organization or family members." Unlike the other organizations, no one really speaks about the desire to involve friends and family as volunteers or the expectation of support; rather, such involvement appears incidental at best. For example, when asked whether friends or family attend their events, Bev gave a somewhat lukewarm response:

"Some of the events they will come to" conveying little expectation of or desire for help or support. Others interviewed did not identify friends or family as a material source of organizational support, nor express that such support was sought.

Even Wider: Tapping Professional and Personal Networks

The NPOs added additional volunteers to their ranks as founders and early volunteers worked their personal and professional networks for support. In the case of Pet Food Bank, a board member was identified and recruited as an unintended consequence of the founders' efforts to encourage the pet stores, veterinary hospitals and clinics they used in caring for their own pets about the possibility of placing bins there for food donations. Store manager Melissa, a former veterinary student, told the story of how she connected with Pet Food Bank:

> In that year that I met them [the founders] I've seen a lot of animals just abandoned at different doors at the vet hospital at the facility … When I met them [the founders] and they told me what they were doing, I thought it was a great idea to try to get people to stop doing that.

In this case, Melissa saw a common goal in her own line of work as well as her personal and professional beliefs. She volunteered for two years before becoming a board member. From there, more volunteers were identified and recruited within Melissa's networks. As anticipated, it began with family: "My mother-in-law, ha-ha, came with me and I drove up and down the coast delivering food. We started packing [for distribution day] in Lauren's basement."

Like others, Melissa's outreach began but did not end with family. She told us that "[a] lot of my really good friends are veterinarians … They've helped me so much … they've put our bins in their hospitals, which has been amazing, and they've donated so much stuff to us." This potential help was not lost on those who recruited her. By identifying and recruiting well-connected professionals the founders used to service the needs of their own pets, they were hoping to gain access to a new group of people to support the NPO. One said:

> We knew what she could provide to us – she had a lot of connections, she knew a lot of people, not just in the community, but also through the pet supply companies, all these people she knows in the pet world that she could tap into.

In the case of Pet Food Bank, connecting the organization to other prospective volunteers was not restricted to personal relationships, but extended to professional employment contacts. Similar to the experience Human Trafficking described above, this is how Pet Food Bank found an accountant who volunteered pro bono services and who used his contacts to obtain legal help as well. Lauren explains that "[h]e was instrumental … He works with a lot of NPOs and did all of the accounting work for nothing … He got a lot of pro bono attorney work done for us that, I don't know where we would be if he didn't."

These kinds of professional connections were particularly salient in the case of both Animal Rescue and Community Gardens, the founders of which are each for-profit business owners. Animal Rescue's founder Lee explains:

> Oh my gosh. All my employees at [the company] help me. They come over [to her home] after work and anything I need they'll design. We designed our own tickets. I printed them here. I had one of the girls there design them. And then the other girl sat and cut them all out. Like, we didn't go to a real printer. We just did them ourselves because we're graphic designers. And then the other girl that works with me she helped me build the baskets along with another [client] employee. She came over and helped me make baskets. I had people donating baskets this year. They would say here; I have something for you.

One of our respondents was Animal Rescue volunteer Lily who works for a client of the founder's for-profit company. She observed that "[t]hey're [the volunteers] employees of her arts and graphics company. It's all on their personal time that they help out."

Youth Baseball told a similar story about connectedness and the importance of personal contacts and networks in getting the job done or finding someone to do the job. Given that this organization serves many children, the leadership considers their families to be part of an extended network. "I always say [this] is the biggest little community in all the world. Everybody knows everybody and everybody is in everybody's business," said one Youth Baseball parent volunteer. Stan, the volunteer baseball director concurred and reflected on the continual need to network to find volunteers: "It is just connections you make out here with different guys that you coach with or your kid plays against or with."

Brad of Youth Baseball explains:

> It is all personal connections. Yeah, you use what you can, you know, take this, you know, we need a sign … I know of a lady I coached years ago, she owns a printing shop, so we go to her. We grab that discount. You know…we have a gentleman who, just public works, lines our fields three days a week. Another gentleman, who is a landscaper, does [it] on the other days of the week for us. So, by knowing that personal relationship, it is easy, you know, it saves money as well as time, because we could never do it.

Carl, a volunteer for Community Gardens described in detail the deep "web" of relationships that comprise its board:

> I grew up with Bill. He lives five blocks from me. He's a friend. He's my gardener. You join these boards a lot of times depending upon who else is on it or whether or not it'll be a good experience for you. On this board, I knew a lot of people on it so I knew it would be an interesting endeavor. Bill is one I know. Al—I don't know if you've talked to him. Al is also a friend of mine. We surf together. He is on the board. He donates his time. Claire of course runs the restaurant I used to spend a ton of time and money in. I thought she should pay me to be on the board rather than me donating my time, just getting back some of the money I spent at her restaurant. Mimi is the principal at the school I went to as a kid, although she is younger than me. My kids went to that school as well and know her. Jack is also involved. He went to school around here. He's a local guy. He's my brother's age. I know Jack from that—just local connections from growing up.

Finally, the internet and social media now make it possible for founders and early volunteers to draw additional family and friends into service. We see that in the use of Facebook by Christian Development's Jane. She told us that "[t]wo friends with whom I went to high school… one was older than me and one was younger than me, just kind of saw what we were doing [while] on Facebook and were interested. They both are now board members."

Family, Friends and Professional Contacts Widen the Spiral: They Also Reach Out

In the case of Animal Rescue, not only are Lee's for-profit employees and clients helping in response to Lee's ask, but they too are making their own pitch for help to their friends, family, and professional and personal networks. As Lily, employed by the for-profit company's client, reported, "Gosh, I had over 20 people at the fundraiser, personal friends, coworkers, that want to come and help, want to attend this annual barbecue." Another Animal Rescue volunteer, Cara, a longtime friend of the founder Lee, remarked about the depth of Lily's involvement and enthusiasm, including how she has utilized her personal contacts in service of Animal Rescue:

> I know [Lily] with her daughter's gymnastics thing has…whenever they've needed an event venue, [asks] well have you heard about the [Animal Rescue]? For a small donation you know you could have your event there and it's really nice and it would give the kids activities. They'll turn around and cut a $600 check to Lee for being able to use or picnic tables for the afternoon. Here they're supposed to be fundraising [for the gymnastics group], but it's actually paying it forward [to Animal Rescue]. They're using a facility, that's also fundraising. So, it's a win/win for everybody. Yeah, I know Lily has put the [Animal Rescue] name to the fore for events and things like that…Joan, the rabbit lady, she works at [a book store]. Any time she attends she'll get them to donate things to [Animal Rescue] and that sort of thing for our raffles. Last year she was able to get us a ton of books and Beanie Babies. Or, she'll ask [the book store], 'Can I set up a collection box so that people can buy new things and put them in here?' [The book store] being a pretty high traffic area, especially around the holidays and stuff, you get a lot of people that otherwise never would have heard of [Animal Rescue.] Yeah, I think we all, to a certain extent you know, lean on somebody that might have some information that could help us out, might be able to donate something to help us out. There's a soap shop over here that makes handmade all natural soaps. I go in there constantly. They know me by first name because my daughter has very sensitive skin. Whenever I go in, I'll be like "Tammy, [Lee] has got her farm thing going on. Since I am one of your best customers…" before you know it, I'm walking out with a basket. I have no qualms asking for something. The worst that somebody can tell you is no.

Recruited to the board through a professional connection known to Community Gardens founder Claire, Mimi in turn reached out to her contacts: “I have actually called my father and my mother. And I am like okay. I know you guys can help somehow. Who can you call? Who can you help us with?”

Eventually, the volunteer is recruited in such a way that the founder and his/her family and contacts no longer have a direct connection to the recruited volunteer. Identified through the ever “widening spiral” described above, a Pet Food Bank volunteer became engaged through contact with the pet store where Melissa works. It wasn’t the customer, Sarah, but her eight-year-old daughter Sandra, who initially sought to volunteer. While founder Jess admitted that there is not a lot an eight-year-old can do, she described the role they created for her on food distribution days as “key:” Sandra works the entry door of the parking lot letting clients of Pet Food Bank in and out of the parking lot in order to pick up food.

This data clearly tells the story of how social capital is used instrumentally to identify and recruit volunteers to do work for the organization and get things done. In the next section, I present results on motive, that is, what our respondents say is their reason for taking on the volunteer work that founders and others invite them to do.

Motivation

When asked directly about their motivation for founding or supporting the NPO, more than half of our respondents (55%) cited some aspect of personal relationship as their primary motivation; mission was a somewhat distant second, cited by almost a quarter of respondents (22.5%). Other primary motivations mentioned by one or two respondents included the desire for legitimacy and accountability; a work requirement or benefit; work culture; and the desire or need to give back. When a respondent provided multiple motivations, mission emerged as a strong secondary motivation (42.5%) with relationship a secondary motivator of others (17.5%) followed by other motivations noted above. Thus even when primarily motivated by the organization's cause or purpose, some aspect of relationship to others was frequently cited as a motivational factor.

Relationship and the desire to support another in his/her efforts rang loud and clear as the predominant motivation. Respondents were direct and unapologetic about what drove them. Most volunteers identified their relationship with, and respect for a founder or a leader as the reason for both initially taking up as well as continuing their volunteer work.

In the case of Youth Philanthropy, it was all about relationship to the founder, to their own children and, for a teacher, to her students. Louisa was motivated to create volunteer opportunities for her children just as her friend and organization founder Leslie wanted for her own children. Louisa laughed when describing herself as the "supporting cast." She explained in detail that she is there to support the founder: "I am, what is that? A chef, cook and bottle washer. This is [Leslie's] baby." Another early volunteer, Ashley, also was motivated by her own children: "I just wanted to get my kids [to get involved.]. I already saw that they were interested in helping out other people. So this was a way they could help at their level." Trisha, a teacher, explained how her students drove her to connect for herself and her daughter:

> My motivation for getting involved was to see the excitement of my students and the programs that they would run. If I knew about something they were volunteering with…a lemonade stand or something they had set up…I would try and go. They all wear the t-shirts and the kids are excited. They are little and they are charity minded and when I saw my students and how many were involved I wanted it for my daughter too.

In sum, for those associated with Youth Philanthropy, relationship is the critical motivation**.**

The Animal Rescue volunteers told a story about their motivation for working with the organization, with its founder Leslie clearly at the heart of it all. Lilly responds to the motivation question with this: “I would like to help [Leslie] as much as I can. I don’t have a whole lot of money, so what I can do is volunteer my time in any way possible. And also I’m an animal lover.” Speaking of her motivation, Darla concurs: “I think it's … her [Leslie].” Rounding out the chorus of support, Cara gushes “[Leslie] is just wonderful. You know, she’s just such a warm, big-hearted person. So first off, you never mind helping [Leslie] because she’s so incredibly grateful and appreciative.”

When asked about the motivation for her work with Community Gardens, Mimi exclaimed:

> [B]ecause I believe 110 percent in [Claire] and all the work that she does. When she first asked me, I was not really sure what I was getting myself into. But she does so much for the schools here, for our community here. I felt like I had to…. And all of us are there to support her. I mean that is really what I see is we are all there to just support and help her achieve her goal. Like I said, I would do anything for her. I think she is amazing.”

Lila echoed the thought:

> I would definitely say to support [Claire]. I mean, there’s no question that there’s an aspect of PR that I get for my business, which is nice, and certainly a third party endorsement, which is nice. But, I would say the main reason was I wanted to be more involved with her and again be able to learn from her and see how she does things.

Julie weighed in:

> I can’t tell you how many times we would call for a work session and it would be [Bill], [Claire] and I. And I thought nobody would dare call her a diva, because when it’s drizzling out and [Bill] and I are the only ones there. There’s [Claire] with her gloves and her jeans and her dirty sneakers saying, “Let’s go.” She always follows through on that commitment that she makes… She’s always been there for me. I have such a strong desire to be there for her and make it happen.

Julie’s husband, Bill, embraced the sentiment, saying he was motivated simply because “[s]he [Claire] put me on the Board.” Even those who came to the volunteer table a bit reluctantly, like Carl, pointed to Claire as the motivation: “I know deep down that what [Claire] does and what the board does is a good thing.” He admits, “I think I probably stayed with this one [Community

Gardens] like I have… because I know everybody…" Rounding out the Community Gardens group, Jack, the lone volunteer who offered up mission as his primary motivation, still connected it to his friendship with the founder Claire:

> My motivation is that I like to feel like I'm contributing to building a better society in either some small way or some large way. We don't all get to do the large way. So, in some small way, I like to do that…. They need 12 garden beds built. I build them, I deliver them, I install them. I like to see tangible results, and I like to create those results myself. So, that and a friendship with [Claire] just all aligned very well.

In contrast to those who support her, for Claire, mission is paramount and she identifies it as her principal motivation:

> So, the mission is to get as many kids as possible in the garden, getting their hands dirty and into the kitchen and cooking what they grow, and tasting what they make. And, just providing that for them. And, to me is like as plain as day, because, I was not a great student growing up, because I am the kind of person that needs to be on the move. And, if I had had something like that, I think I probably would have done a lot better. And, I think a lot of kids are in that boat. And, even kids that do well, they need, like sitting in the classroom, is like they have shown that that is not the ideal way to learn for many kids.

When founders like Claire were asked to characterize their motivations, most articulated a mission-based reason as motivation for the founding and for their initial and ongoing participation. Lauren, the co-founder of Pet Food Bank, succinctly articulated the founders' mission-driven motivation:

> Really [I was] wanting to make a difference with animals and I didn't know how to do it short of doing rescue work which I knew wasn't for me. So when she [co-founder Jess] presented me with this idea it seemed like a no-brainer because we realized that we would be helping, our goal was to keep animals out of shelters, so we knew we would be working with people who were desperate to keep their animals, but couldn't afford to. So it seemed like a natural thing to gravitate toward because I think we put ourselves in that same position saying what would happen if we financially couldn't keep our pets. She's an animal lover like I am. I think that's what got us, lit the fire to get it all started.

By contrast, Jess provided an example of a founder articulating relationship as the primary motivating factor in NPO founding:

> It was so funny because a lot of people tie the organization and the work that we do solely to the pet. But my inspiration was never really for the pet. I adore pets, I have many pets, I'm a complete pet lover, but my inspiration was never really for the pets, it's the relationship with the person, and what that person had. I love pets, I don't think they feel the grief we do, so the pain and grief that we feel losing that pet I don't think it has the same impact. So I'm inspired by people.

Among non-founder volunteers across organizations, relationship was almost universally articulated as the driver of their initial participation and continuation; only a few persons, discussed below, articulated another principal source of motivation for involvement. Providing evidence that relationship is key, Tim, husband of a Pet Food bank founder summed up his motivation in a few simple words: "If it makes her happy, it makes me happy." Volunteer Sarah echoed the sentiment with this remark about her motivation:

> My daughter. Strictly my daughter. I encourage them to volunteer and when she became so impassioned about it, I followed her and gave her every opportunity to help them out. I mean, I do love dogs. I have two dogs that are rescued so you know, I love what they do. I love what they stand for. But yeah, it was my daughter who brought me to them.

Those associated with NPOs that arise from close connections to other organizations with similar or complementary missions (for example, Human Trafficking and Christian Development) largely cite mission as the primary motivation behind their work. When pure mission is the motivation, founders and volunteers do not have to reach far for the words. Cliff, an early volunteer with Human Trafficking got right to the point. "Hmm? What I would describe my motivation? Say over 2.8 million kids in sex trafficking yearly." Founder Jenny echoes his sentiment: "It makes me crazy that kids are hurt ... I mean most of my life I've worked at protecting kids. And that's my motivation."

Sometimes the calls of mission and relationship are intertwined and difficult to separate such as expressed by founder Brenda when she identified both the issue of human trafficking and the desire to provide for the victims with whom she has developed a relationship in her occupation as a social worker:

> My passion for the subject matter, my understanding of that, understanding the need behind it, because my regular day job, I meet those girls all the time, every day, all day. And, I am not in a capacity there to be of any type of real [help to them]. I can say go here for counseling or go there for this or go there for that. But, I cannot, it is just a different way of dealing with them so it is seeing it from that perspective, I am like, wow, they really need this, or wow, they really need that, wow, there is no services. Wow, people in this community are really uneducated, which I think is my biggest, like the stigma behind human trafficking is so bad. People do not understand at all what is going on. And, so I think my thought process and understanding the girls and boys that I work with, wanting to make a change for them.

Another example of mixed motivation came from founder Tessa:

> I do not really think I was ready to retire. It was politics that got me to say, "I'm, you know, I'm done with, y'all." It was an early retirement, and I think it [Human Trafficking] was a way for me to keep working, because I, emotionally and psychologically, and in no way was I prepared to not be working. I mean, that was 35 years of my life. I raised my family, you know, the whole thing. That was my life. So, it allowed me to continue in that life.

In the end, it comes back again to relationship. Tessa has been able to extend her lifelong career and relationships built as a social worker through her work with Human Trafficking**.**

Even when mission or work requirement or benefit is cited as primary motivation, relationship almost always finds its way into the equation for emerging NPO volunteers. Founder Brenda put it best:

> Teamwork. [Laughs] Teamwork makes the dream work. And, I think the dedication of the trustees is huge, willingness to, no matter what, do what needs to be done. And, we work together as a team, and we each have our own, we are very different people. And, I think that has been huge, because it is like pieces of the pie and you put it all together and it works. And, I think that alone has been the single driving force behind us.

Jenny, another founder, agreed. "I think the most important thing about [Human Trafficking] again is the people that are involved because like I said, no one gets paid a dime and it's very time consuming, but everybody shows up and does whatever we need to do to make it happen."

In the case of Christian Development, founder Sam found it easy to identify mission as his motivation:

> More needs to be done for the poor than just charity, number one. Number two, I think you need, like I said, this city needs folks who are going to buckle down and figure out a way to help with the systemic problems that I mentioned earlier, fatherlessness, working with dads to be good dads, and homelessness. Not necessarily, we do not feel called to be a city mission. But in terms of preventing people from becoming homeless, helping them keep their homes, or find safe, affordable housing, that whole thing. I felt that that was, you know, Jesus calls us to love our neighbor.

Independently, his wife Maria concurred:

> Okay. I am very compassionate; I have empathy across the board for a whole lot of things. I grew up very poor, raised by a single mom of four kids and I remember us eating just the same three things every night for dinner. They just rotated, but it was the same three things every night I really have compassion for the poor. I am absolutely committed to racial reconciliation. I think it is appalling that we do not appreciate each other; we do not want to learn from each other. In this day and age there is still segregation I am appalled by it. I am also appalled that the human race can be mean to each other. I find it just inexcusable. So being part of [Christian Development] we can touch on these things.

Early Christian Development volunteers Jane and Daniel, while sharing those underlying values, were clearly motivated by relationship—with the Pastor, his church (the companion organization that spawned Christian Development) as well as with the larger denominational community. They found that they had discovered a home and a sense of comfort in the relationship that principally motivated their participation. Jane framed her story of, and motivation for involvement in this way:

> I've been a Christian for a long time. I've been in many churches. I married [Daniel] who is Jewish. When we got married and had children, we decided to look for our own church, not my parents' church. We had a hard time finding something that fit us because we're kind of quirky, and not many people get us. I was working for a realtor at the time, and he was helping Pastor [Sam] find a house to move here for our church plan. I met Pastor [Sam] through that. He invited me to a Bible study, and we learned what the core values were for his church, which had a lot to do with racial reconciliation, community development, and those sorts of things—showing mercy and justice to the poor and the widowed. I was intrigued by it. I liked the fact that this was like social justice, active. I'm a Christian. Now, what? The Bible says that by grace you are saved through faith, but [also] to do good works, so what are these good works? It really touched my heart. I

> immediately jumped on the bandwagon of the church. And then I learned more about it. I read *Beyond Charity* by John Perkins who talks about community development. Pastor [Sam] wanted to model the church kind of after one that is in XXX, which is New City Fellowship of XXX. There are few around the country. There is a[n] [Urban] Fellowship in XXX. Because the pastoral end of things is so much work, they wanted to outsource the deed parts of it. You need more resources besides just the church. It's hard to do that when you're just a church. So [Urban] in XXX formed a separate 501(c) (3) that has board members of people from different churches, so it's not just that one church. It gives you more resources and ideas and strengths and weaknesses. Now the XXX one did not form a separate 501(c) (3). Their church and nonprofit are basically in one, but we felt like we would like to follow that other model. So we decided to do that here. At first it was a small group of us, so Pastor [Sam] said, well, who's interested. We took a few trips to the other places to see how they did it, and if this is something that we're really interested in. My husband and I were.

Her husband Daniel independently told his story of motivation through relationship, of being inspired by the work and success of others they met and those persons' willingness to help and serve as resource:

> I think this is, that's a good question and I didn't know it at the time, but I think it's important looking back, the motivation for it was the comfort and confidence in knowing it had been done and we weren't re-inventing. I think what really gave me confidence was being able to lean on and speak to directors in XXX and speak to directors in XXX, to go to those places and physically see that this can happen 'cause on paper some of the stuff we talked about sounded impossible, stupid and crazy, so I think the reason I jumped in and kind of, with my faith, other than my faith, spiritually, is just knowing that this is a proven model that can be repeated. I think a lot of times when you go off script and like I said, try to reinvent the wheel and start from total scratch you are really setting yourself up for an uphill battle. I think it's better to say know what you don't know, find somebody that does know so if those two other [Urbans] didn't exist, I don't know if I would take that job. I think that's what gave me the confidence is the seeing it in action, functioning, working.

The founders and early volunteers of emerging NPOs associated with longstanding organizations (Youth Baseball and Law Enforcement) were somewhat differently motivated. Those organizations were formed intending to legally reorganize existing operations. For them, the work was about accounting and legitimacy because the operations, which they valued, did not have the structure to run as they felt they should. Evan, the Youth Baseball founder, had this to say:

> The motivation was to make sure that we were a legitimate entity; that I could go and solicit donations and not have to worry about it. We can run legal raffles. I want everybody to know that I'm running a raffle so I can sell a ticket and the Mayor can buy one.

When asked about his motivation, early volunteer Brad echoed the sentiment:

> To do it right. To recognize it, right. I mean, we were, we were on the, you know, from the, we were on a list with the state as, you know, being registered, but not being, existing. So, with that paperwork, we actually like you were able to find us through that. You know, we, technically, we were here, but we did not exist. [Laughs] If that makes sense. So, when they finally, you know, you do the proper paperwork. Now, we actually exist, you know.

Others, including Stan, recognized and worked in support of Evan's goal to make Youth Baseball legally sound and accountable, but Stan quickly acknowledged that he wouldn't have pursued setting up (or fixing) the NPO on his own:

> I will be honest with you, if [Evan] did not pursue this, it is probably not something that would have even been on my radar. It would not be something in my day-to-day activities as baseball director that I would see as a core responsibility or something that needed to get done. And, as baseball director, I have a lot of responsibilities out here. But, getting us set up and then receiving the benefits of being a non-profit would not be something that was on my radar.

In the case of Law Enforcement, the organization was created as a separate legal entity accountable for its work out of a desire to formalize the work of the social committee of a longstanding companion organization. Richard explained:

> The "founding fathers" wanted to take the organization to the next level: to raise more money, to get more people involved, and to have more resources available when needed and they knew they couldn't do it without an organization so it could be legitimate.

Non-founder volunteers, however, largely expressed that culture was the motivation behind their getting behind the effort. Fred shared his story about becoming a "volunteer":

> I actually just at a Christmas party, was collecting money for a 50/50 and what we did was just raise money for the events that we do. I collected I guess the most amount of money that ever was collected and I was told that was my new job, I was the now treasurer. That is how I got into it. That was prior to the [Law Enforcement] Board that was during the social committee years.

Fred went on to describe the recruitment as having "…a very strict culture, you are not really recruited you are just told to do something so you do not say anything. We [referring to the longstanding parent organization] are a very para-military organization." While relationship was not cited as the primary motivation for forming the NPO or responding to the proverbial tap on the shoulder to volunteer, its volunteers do identify relationship as the principal driver of its ongoing work. Bev explained that "… every law enforcement agency is similar in the fact even though they are not related it's a family atmosphere. They want to help out their coworkers more than the norm." In response to being asked why, Bev continued. "I think it's the bonding that they go through, working shift work, being together 12 hours every night, knowing the struggles that go on at home." Joyce expressed a similar sentiment: "It helps its own, that's what it comes down to. It helps its own. The organization was formed to help its own people, plain and simple." Richard weighed in:

> I think the best thing you can do is to give to others and that's what we do. We're not the most popular people; these days police are vilified. We can do 500 great things and the press picks up on and beats us up on the one mistake or bad thing that is done. It is increasingly a thankless job. [Law Enforcement] is a way for us to support each other and to show the public that police officers are human too.

While legitimacy and accountability are the drivers for reorganizing work under the auspices of a new formal, organization, relationship still presents as a secondary theme for both Youth Baseball and Law Enforcement.

Discussion

In sum, my data support the following propositions**.** First, emerging NPO volunteers share similar demographic characteristics with the general volunteer population as reported in the literature. Second, while volunteer identification and recruitment is similar across emerging NPOs, (notwithstanding their different missions and activities) such practices differ from emerging NPOs from that of volunteers in established organizations as reported by the literature. It more closely resembles "informal helping" characteristic of families and is motivated in the same way: through relationship. Fourth, the more closely connected a new NPO's origin is to an existing nonprofit, relationship as motivation diminishes and gives way to other sources of motivation such as mission, legitimacy, work requirement/benefit, etc.

Based on these results, I argue that there is an important relationship between the nature of volunteer identification and recruitment and organizational maturity. I conclude that emerging organization volunteers are (1) identified and recruited as volunteers first through the social capital of NPO founders and, soon thereafter, of other participants and (2) motivated to participate by virtue of these personal relationships and networks. I attribute this to the heightened role of social capital at work in emerging organizations which calls—even compels—people to respond to invitations to volunteer.

My research suggests that emerging NPOs are employing (and may need to be guided to employ) different approaches to volunteer identification and recruitment than more mature organizations; in other words, one size does not fit all. For those advising persons who aspire to start NPOs, this study suggests it is wise for such individuals to do an inventory of their own social capital and willingness to utilize it to support the NPO and that methods employed by more established nonprofits may not be appropriate or effective in this context.

While it is beyond the scope of this paper, my research suggests that there are other ways in which emerging NPOs and more established NPOs are different. For example, they differ in the ways in which they task, manage and reward work, and how that process is connected to volunteer identification, recruitment and retention. In Chapter 4, I tackle that issue. In Chapter 3, I examine the work needed to establish these new organizations, regardless of mission. I examine how emerging NPOs think about and manage opportunities and challenges and the impact these decisions have on mission, focus and form. In studying these fledgling organizations, I believe and argue that, in many ways, they more closely resemble their for-profit brethren than elder nonprofit statesmen. I observe and report on a close connection between many of our start-ups and other for-profit ventures which the work of others (Marquis, Davis, and Glynn 2011) suggests is likely. At their intersection is information that likely could inform and assist both nonprofit and for-profit start-ups; one likely convergence is that emergence as context is key. Given the critical role of social capital I have identified in nonprofit start-ups, perhaps it is not a lack of human, institutional or financial capital that imperils start-ups, but limited social capital, that leads many to an untimely demise.

Of course, this study is not without its limitations. I acknowledge that it is modest in scope. Because I interviewed respondents associated with these eight organizations only and did not choose these organizations or persons in a random fashion, there is no prospect of statistical generalizability. As with all qualitative work in which the researcher designs and directs the inquiry as well as interprets the results, there is the issue of researcher subjectivity and the potential for bias in the presentation of results.

I believe this study has value, however, in identifying and showcasing the critical role social capital plays in emerging nonprofit organizations and the importance of exploring emergence as context in order to isolate key mechanisms at work. When volunteers are studied in this context, one discovers different sources of motivation, with relationship being the critical driver. Specifically, volunteering more closely resembles “informal helping” than “formal volunteering” as categorized by Wilson and Musick (1997) and is similarly motivated.

Finally, given that initial volunteers appear to be identified and recruited though relationship and motivated by relationship, additional research questions are suggested. One is whether and how such organizations evolve or transition to develop the more formal structures or cultures that we know characterize established organizations. Do we see evidence of Weber's "routinization of charisma" as the organization grows or formalizes: that is, does volunteer identification and recruitment become less dependent on relationship, particularly relationship with the founder? (Weber and Eisenstadt 1968). What the data here suggest is that as the spiral widens, the "connection" to the volunteer work gradually moves away from the founders and to more to the organization and mission. So while second- or third-level people may still be extending invitations, one wonders if and how the nature of "the ask" changes as those extending invitations are not and cannot be as closely associated with the organization as is the founder. I suspect that organizations which don't widen the spiral, don't grow or may die; in fact, they really don't become "organizations" per se, but simply the legal form alter-ego of the person or persons who founded them to achieve a purpose. So, while founders are motivated by vision and mission, most early volunteers respond from relationship. Eventually, as the spiral widens, the budding organization appears to be evolving and we begin to see new volunteers motivated in ways we associate with more established organizations.

Conclusions

Given that NPOs are increasingly important as a driver of our economy and community welfare, they are worthy of further study as are the founders and volunteers who drive their foundings and operations. However, sociologists caution, however, against relying too heavily on the accounts of founders only or on studying volunteers out of context. Context may be an important determinant in how volunteers are identified, recruited and motivated to assist nonprofits in important work. The present study which focuses on emergence as context suggests that there are important differences in the characteristics of fledgling and established nonprofits. One critical difference is the role that social capital plays in the identification, recruitment and motivation of volunteers associated with emerging nonprofit which typically constitute its entire workforce. My data suggest that this is fertile ground for further study and that there may be other important differences between emerging and established organizations. Discovering and fully appreciating these differences should influence how we train and advise nonprofit practitioners, fashion policy, and formulate regulation applicable to these organizations.

References

Aldrich, Howard E., and Martin Ruef. 2006. *Organizations Evolving*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications: London.

Batson, C. Daniel, Nadia Ahmad, and Jo-Ann Tsang. 2002. "Four Motives for Community Involvement." *Journal of Social Issues* 58(3):429-45.

Bekkers, René, and Pamela Wiepking. 2011. "A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(5):924-73.

Bolton, Elizabeth B., and Lynda M. Spence. 2006. "A Study of Founders of Community Based Nonprofit Organizations: Implications for Extension Leadership Educators." *Journal of Leadership Education* 5(3):66-78.

Carman, Joanne G., and Rebecca Nesbit. 2013. "Founding New Nonprofit Organizations: Syndrome or Symptom?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42(3):603-21.

Chikoto, Grace L., and Michael Halicki. 2013. "Contextual Factors and Negotiating Spaces: Exploring the Emergence of Nonprofit and Hybrid Voluntary Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 23(3):347-65.

Clary, E. Gil, and Mark Snyder. 1999. "The Motivations to Volunteer: Theoretical and Practical Considerations." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 8(5):156-59.

Cordes, Joseph J., C. Eugene Steuerle, and Eric Twombly. 2001. "Dimensions of Nonprofit Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Essay." Presented at the Public Policy and the Economics of Entrepreneurship Maxwell Policy Research Symposium, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY. Conference draft.

Denzin, Norman. 2006. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Glaser, Barney G. 1992. *Emergence vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Handy, Femida, & Laurie Mook. 2011. "Volunteering and Volunteers: Benefit-Cost Analyses." *Research on Social Work Practice* 21(4):412-20.

Herrmann, Andrew F. 2011. "Narrative as an Organizing Process: Identity and Story in a New Nonprofit." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* 6(3):246-64.

Jones, Brian J. 2011. *Social Capital in America: Counting Buried Treasure*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Kenny Stevens, Susan. 2005. “A Call Taken to Heart: The Entrepreneurial Behavior of Nonprofit Founders.” *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader* 16(5): N.p.

Kvale, Steinar. 1996. Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Light, Paul C. 2005. “Searching for Social Entrepreneurs: Who They Might Be, Where They Might Be Found, What They Do.” Paper prepared for the 34th annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, November 17-18, Washington, DC.

Lin, Nan. 1999. “Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. “Connections 22(1): 28-51.

Lin, Nan, Karen S. Cook, and Ronald S. Burt. 2001. *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Liu, Gordan and Wai-Wai Ko. 2012. “Organizational Learning and Marketing Capability: A Study of the Charity Retailing Operations of British Social Enterprise.” Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 41(4):580-608.

Marquis, Christopher, Gerald F. Davis, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2013. “Golfing Alone? Corporations, Elites, and Nonprofit Growth in 100 American Communities.” *Organization Science* 24(1):39-57.

Marx, Karl. 1933 (1847). *Wage, Labour and Capital*. New York. International Publishers Co.

Mook, Laurie, Femida Handy, and Jack Quarter. 2007. “Reporting Volunteer Labour at the Organizational Level: A Study of Canadian Nonprofits.” *Voluntas* 18(1):55-71.

Musick, Marc A., and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2012. Number of Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1999-2009. Retrieved July 7, 2016 (http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/PubApps/profile1.php).

Ostrander, Susan A. 1980. “Upper Class Women: The Feminine Side of Privilege.” *Qualitative Sociology* 3(1):23-44.

Ostrom, Elinor, and T. K. Ahn. 2008. “The Meaning of Social Capital and its Link to Collective Action.” P.p. 17-35 in *Handbook on Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science, and Economics*, edited by Gert T. Svendsen and Gunnar L. Svendsen. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital.” *Journal of Democracy* 6(1):65-78.

Ruef, Martin, Howard E. Aldrich, and Nancy M. Carter. 2003. "The Structure of Founding Teams: Homophily, Strong Ties, and Isolation among U.S. Entrepreneurs." *American Sociological Review* 68(2):195-222.

Starr, Jennifer A., and Nanette Fondas. 1992. "A Model of Entrepreneurial Socialization and Organization Formation." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 17(1):67-78.

Strauss, Anselm. 1988. "The Articulation of Project Work: An Organizational Process." *The Sociological Quarterly* 29(2):163–78.

United States National Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. *Volunteering in the United States, 2015*. Report USDL-16-0363. Retrieved May 20, 2016 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm).

The Urban Institute. 2015. *The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2015.* Retrieved May 2, 2016. (http://www.urban.org/research/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2015-public-charities-giving-and-volunteering).

Weber, Max and Samuel Noah Eisenstadt. 1968. On Charisma and Institution Building. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, John. 2000. "Volunteering." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215-40.

Wilson, John, and Marc Musick. 1997. "Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work." *American Sociological Review* 62(5):694-713.

Wilson, John, and Marc Musick. 1999. "The Effects of Volunteering on the Volunteer." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 62(4):141-68.

Wuthnow, Robert.1995. Learning to Care: Elementary Kindness in an Age of Indifference. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, Dennis R. 1983. *If Not for Profit, for What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Young, Dennis R. 1985. *Casebook of Management for Non-Profit Organizations: Entrepreneurship and Organizational Change in the Human Services*. New York: Hawthorne Press.

CHAPTER 3

Nonprofit Entrepreneurship: A Qualitative Study of Emerging Organizations

Abstract

Drawing on data derived from a qualitative multi-case study of eight fledgling nonprofit organizations (NPOs) and using findings from the for-profit entrepreneurial literature as a proxy for purposes of comparison, I examine what emerging nonprofit organizations might have in common with their for-profit counterparts. I ask, "Will we find similar processes at work in emerging nonprofits?" (Dorado 2006). The apparent differences between organizations seeking profit and those serving mission would seem to suggest that their organizational origins may differ as well. In this paper, I argue that the opposite is true: that fledgling nonprofits have much in common with their for-profit counterparts. I attribute that commonality to emergence as context and the need for entrepreneurial teams to prioritize trust and participant well-being in furtherance of organizational processes and structures over the pursuit of profit or mission. In other words, in this emerging phase, creating and establishing the organization itself takes precedent over the respective aims of both for-profit and nonprofit enterprises.

Keywords

Entrepreneurship, organizational formation, founding, nonprofit organization, NPO, social capital, emergence, start-up, context, founding teams, entrepreneurial groups.

Entrepreneurship is hailed in the popular media and press as the apparent and easy answer to a troubled economy, as evidenced by the popularity of television shows such as ABC's *Shark Tank*, which suggests that everyone is a potential entrepreneur who may go from "zero to hero" with a good idea and a bit of elbow grease. Scholars, however, are a bit more tempered in their enthusiasm. They know that most new start-ups will fail (Stinchcombe 1965; Patel 2015) and more research is needed to understand entrepreneurs, their circumstances, partners and preparation as well as the processes through which they attempt to construct organizations (Mair, Battilana, and Cardenas 2012). Scholars acknowledge that existing research is limited in at least two respects: it is largely focused on for-profit start-ups to the exclusion of nonprofit or public sector organizations (Aldrich and Ruef 2006) and is characterized by an overemphasis on the individual entrepreneur or founder as the unit of analysis (Starr and Fondas 1992).

What more might we learn about entrepreneurial activity and actors if we studied emerging nonprofits and, in particular, their teams?

Given the apparent differences between organizations driven by profit and those dedicated to service, intuitively one might imagine their origins would be strikingly different as well. It makes sense that activity and processes surrounding the organizational birthing process would be arranged to service the organization's principal focus whether mission (nonprofit) or profit (for-profit) in order to launch, survive and attain stated objectives. For example, when we examine the mature versions of nonprofit and for-profit organizations, we find material differences in operations, orientation and structure. Nonprofits are highly dependent on volunteer labor, manpower seemingly unavailable to their for-profit counterparts; nonprofits garner income from donations, a vehicle foreign to for-profits which exchange ownership rights for investments; for-profits pay many taxes and fees from which many nonprofits are exempt; for-profits are owned by proprietors, partners and shareholders with accrued value that can be transferred by sale; nonprofits are not owned, but rather are operated and managed largely by boards with a fiduciary obligation to serve mission and who cannot retain for themselves, or sell, any accumulated value. In fact, when ceasing operations nonprofits are legally obligated to transfer such value to another nonprofit organization.

With these differences in mind, this study examines the circumstances of nonprofit emergence to compare it with what is known about for-profit origins and entrepreneurship from the academic literature. I posit that by identifying generic features that characterize new organizations in the throes of emergence, regardless of their for-profit or nonprofit orientation, there is much we can learn about emergence as context. Contrary to what one might expect to find, I argue that at their origins these organizations have much in common, perhaps more so with each other than with their mature brethren. My analysis of the data reveals that nonprofit founding is a team effort and that these teams act much like their for-profit counterparts with similar priorities. Like for-profit entrepreneurial ventures, they are born of shared social processes and are supported by the social capital of founders, family, close friends and colleagues. These nonprofit teams largely are homogenous and, in that regard, they look like their for-profit counterparts with one unanticipated and striking difference. While for-profit foundings are the work of a diverse array of persons across the socio-economic continuum, nonprofit foundings appear to be the work of the relatively privileged, that is, educated, middle to upper class Caucasians.

Positioning the Study

Organizational scholars have diminished the work associated with organizational foundings by offering such comments as, “[t]he building blocks of organizations come to be littered around the societal landscape; it only takes a little entrepreneurial energy to assemble them into a structure” (Meyer and Rowan 1977:45). Contrary to this oft-cited statement, emerging research and my experience suggests that this early work—whether for-profit or not—is neither easy nor intuitive and calls for a certain nimbleness with “all hands on deck.” For example, Johnson’s (2007) study of the establishment of the Paris Opera suggests that the work associated with an organization’s origins is critical; it also suggests that there is a strong correlation between an organization's form at its origin (a form it is likely to retain) and the form that will ultimately lead to its success or demise. We argue it is precisely because this work is complex and takes more than “a little entrepreneurial energy” from a single individual that most new enterprises fail (Stinchcombe 1965:148; Wagner 2013). But what more does it take and how does it start?

While growing, research on entrepreneurship and individual organization establishment in general is still in its early stages. Whether for-profit or not, Mair, Battilana, and Cardenas (2012) observe that little is known about the processes through which individual organizations are constructed. Thus, scholars pose important questions for future research including “[t]hrough what process do founders construct new organizations?” (Aldrich and Ruef 2006) and, in comparison with for-profit startups, “[w]ill we find similar processes at work in emerging nonprofits?” (Dorado 2006).

This study builds on and extends existing research using a qualitative approach to examine eight emerging nonprofit organizations (NPOs). I do so by analyzing primary data from forty qualitative interviews of nonprofit founders and early participants, document review, and participant observation in each venture. This study design departs from others examining nonprofit emergence which have largely focused on founders and their attributes, to the exclusion of other participants in the emergence process. I am responsive to Gartner's (1993) admonition:

> Rather than celebrating the achievements of the individual entrepreneur, the entrepreneurship field might seek more recognition for those individuals who play a critical role in supporting the context of organizing: the first buyers of a product, investors, the first employees hired, silent partners, and the entrepreneur's spouse and family. (P. 103)

As a result, I believe this study is better positioned to grasp the phenomena of emergence. The NPOs I study each have an IRS Rule Date that falls within the years 2010-2012 which I use as a proxy for founding. I examine emerging NPOs to minimize the possibility of lost founders, faulty memories or reconstruction of historical events[1] as well as the problem of success selection (Ruef, Aldrich and Carter 2003). I use multiple subjects to identify commonalities in the start-up experience across emerging NPOs and, where we encounter differences, seek to understand why. In order to explore how the experiences of these fledgling organizations compare with those of their for-profit counterparts, I use the academic literature on organizations and entrepreneurship as a control proxy for purposes of comparison with a particular emphasis on Ruef's findings based on his analysis of data from the National Panel of Entrepreneurship study.

---

[1] While using interviews as a method for gathering data is inherently subject to the problems of faulty memories and reconstruction of historical events, I attempt to minimize the issue, at least with respect to the key event of organizational founding, by arranging for the interview to be temporally close to such event.

Focused on the role of the volunteer in the emerging nonprofit, Chapter 2 shows the critical role social capital—of both the founder(s) and others—plays in NPO launches. There, I detail what social capital is utilized and how is it deployed as NPO founders and early participants go about the essential tasks of organization establishment, such as assembling a workforce, gathering resources, seeking advice, and identifying and complying with regulations. I show that founders and early participants heavily utilize their own social capital in aid of organization formation (in addition to, but more often in lieu of monetary capital). While recognizing that it is certainly possible to establish an organization by using monetary capital (accumulated or borrowed) to acquire goods and provide services or human capital in the form of employees, our study strongly suggests that NPOs are created and sustained principally by leveraging social capital to enlist volunteer labor and secure other needed resources including, but not limited to, money and expertise.

In this Chapter 3, I explore the following research question: "[I]n comparison with for-profit startups, are these processes similar?" (Dorado 2006). I seek to understand the preparation, processes, resources, partnerships and catalysts involved in nonprofit formation.

So here I ask, what are founders doing to give birth to and sustain the emerging organization, and who accompanies them on the journey? Like Ruef (2003), I ask what those founding teams look like. I explore the composition, experiences and work of our eight entrepreneurial groups looking for patterns and themes to emerge. I then compare them to what the academic literature characterizes as for-profit founding teams and experiences. I share background on the individual and collective entrepreneurial minds and hands which bring these organizations to life. I argue that an exploration of the commonalities and differences between nonprofit and for-profit startups can provide useful insights. These insights offer the potential for informing policy designed to encourage start-ups; curricula used to teach entrepreneurship; as well as entrepreneurial decision-making and investments at the individual, organization and enterprise level.

Theoretical Orientation

While this is largely a grounded study in which I look for themes to emerge from the data (Strauss 1988; Glaser 1992; Strauss and Corbin 1998), my preparation and research focus are guided by the academic literature on entrepreneurship and organizations. The scholarship of entrepreneurship has shallow theoretical roots outside of economics (Tolbert, David, and Sine 2011). Modern day economists, looking to refine traditional thinking on entrepreneurship by Schumpeter (1934) premised on the notion that entrepreneurs are the principal agents of innovation and the driving force behind capitalistic economic progress, are beginning to look at and model sociological concepts such as social capital for use in explaining the phenomena (Westlund and Bolton 2003). This shift of focus is consistent with the observation that existing research has over-emphasized the individual entrepreneur or founder as the unit of analysis (Starr and Fondas 1992).

Sociologists who have studied entrepreneurship largely concentrate on understanding change in established organizations rather than emerging organizations, and principally have done so in the for-profit sector (Aldrich and Ruef 2006). While acknowledging the work of Stinchcombe (1965) and others who have theorized at the field level about the emergence of a particular organizational form (labor unions, craft unions, etc.) Scott (1992:169) observes that field-level analysis does not explain how individual organizations are created and maintained. This remains a lingering question in the organizational literature.

While largely developed with reference to for-profit organizations, there are a number of existing theories and models that help us think about emergence at the organization or meso level including: resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977); the Barnard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium (Simon 1976); association theory (Clark and Wilson 1961; Gartner 1993); relational demography theory (Ruef, Aldrich and Carter 2003; Ruef 2011); institutional theory (Young 1983; Marquis, Davis, and Glynn 2013); and creation model (Alvarez and Barney 2007; Walsh and Bartunek 2011). At the macro level, three theories predominate: the three failures theory (Weisbrod 1986; Salamon 1987), nondistribution constraint theory (Hansmann 1987) and contract theory (Young 2012). The three failures theory suggests that nonprofit emergence is dependent on needs and opportunities presented by the failure of the government and for-profit sectors. The nondistribution constraint theory posits that consumers prefer dealing with organizations which are legally bound to retain or deploy revenues consistent with its purpose. The contract theory argues that services provided by for-profits are viewed with suspicion because of the profit motive and thus consumers would prefer to deal with nonprofits ("contract"). At the individual level, expressive theory suggests that emerging organizations are simply extensions of their founder and that they aggregate leadership qualities of founders in an attempt to characterize these actors (Kenny Stevens 2005; Bolton and Spence 2006) which may explain why organizational leadership exercised by founders differs from that of non-founders (Miller and Simmons 1992, Block and Rosenberg 2002).

Resource Mobilization

According to Scott (1992:169), resource mobilization, the processes by which resources (people, materials, energy, information, etc.) are gathered and harnessed for an organizational purpose, provides the only credible explanation for why organizations emerge and survive

(McCarthy and Zald 1977). While the concept of resource mobilization was developed to explain the phenomena of social movements, scholars such as Scott suggest it has far broader implications. Resources to be mobilized in support of a collective purpose exist in a variety of forms (for example, monetary capital, physical goods and structures, relationships, natural resources, knowledge, culture, other organizations, and communities) and at different levels (such as individual, group, organizational, industry, field, sector and societal). Resources can be (1) self-produced (that is, made and sold, such as a baked goods sale) or (2) gathered through means of exchange relationships that assist in the aggregation (that is, bringing together resources held by various individuals, such as donations or expertise, for a collective purpose) and appropriation (that is, use the resources others have acquired or assembled, such as another organization's space, for a collective purpose) or (3) bestowed as a form of patronage (that is, funds from foundations and government granting institutions.) These exchange relationships both enable and restrain the individuals and organizations which rely on them and they come at some cost. Thus, at its core, resource mobilization theory posits that much of what is needed for an organization to emerge and survive is external to it and its organizers. In other words, organizational emergence and survival highly depend on societal structures and institutional relationships beyond the influence of, or avenues available to, the individual actors seeking to establish it (Edwards and Gillham 2013).

Eisenstadt (1958) described such resources of modern society as "free floating" and readily available for mobilization in service of specialized goals, but how is this accomplished? After only briefly discussing resource mobilization and emergence, Scott (1993) retreats to a discussion of Stinchcombe's (1965) work on organizational type, focusing once more at the field level. I suspect he does so because there is a void in both the theoretical and empirical landscapes as to why or how individual organizations emerge.

Organizational Equilibrium and Association

At the individual organization level, the Barnard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium (see Scott 1992:171) suggests that there must be a balance of organizational inducements to cull from any individual a contribution to sustain organizational growth. I do not find empirical exploration of this theory in the context of nonprofit emergence. In the for-profit sector, such inducements might be presumed to be largely monetary in nature; not so in the nonprofit sector. This leads us to pose such questions as: What do contributions and inducements look like in the nonprofit arena, and in particular in the context of emergence? Gartner (1993:103) observes that

> [T]he entrepreneurship network literature has not yet answered the question of how an entrepreneur's contacts with other individuals eventually results in their involvement in the entrepreneurial process.… Rather than assuming that individuals involve themselves in organizations solely for direct economic benefits (e. g., salary, investment income and capital gains), we need to consider other types of benefits that accrue to individuals through membership.

Might they be strictly of an associational nature as suggested by the work of Clark and Wilson (1961)?

Relational Demography

Advocating for relational demography as an explanatory theory, Ruef (2010) challenges the popular notion that the organizational founder is a maverick. He asserts, as did Freear, Sohl, and Wetzel (1995) before him, that social ties and networking are critical to the entrepreneurial process, an assertion theory which finds support in the results set forth in Chapter 2. Ruef's extensive work (2010) which analyzes data from the National Panel Surveys on Entrepreneurship to ascertain the composition of founding teams, finds a striking homophily in the composition of those teams in the for-profit world. In advancing relational demography as a model of emergence, he posits that four factors which characterize the entrepreneurial team experience are: (1) in-group biases based on demographic characteristics (p. 209); (2) relationship to spouses, partners and kin (p. 211); (3) the tendency to organize activity in intimate or "virtual" space (p. 212); and (4) goals that prioritize social and psychological well-being over monetary gain (p. 213). Studying social entrepreneurs, Mair, Battilana, and Cardenas (2012) see similar relationships at the heart of emergence, observing that entrepreneurs must identify, attend to the needs of, and value others in the venture formation process. In doing so, they leverage four types of capital: social, economic, human and political.

Institutionalism

Empirical research has increasingly supported institutional theories of NPO foundings (Marquis, Davis, and Glynn 2013), which is that there is a close association between nonprofits and other organizations, particularly for-profit corporations, which might be credited for their birth. Such observations can be traced back to the foundational work of Young (1983) who assembled fourteen case studies of nonprofit and government human services organizations and programs, including recitations of the origins of those organizations or programs. Young makes observations about how and why change takes place and the impetus for emergence, grouping the nonprofits studied as to whether they were established in connection with an existing organization or not. He theorizes that there are three main impetuses for nonprofit creation: (1) response to a problem of a programmatic nature; (2) personal response to a crisis or frustration; and (3) organizational response to an existing failing organization.

Shared Social Process

The work of Walsh and Bartunek (2011) examines in some depth the last of Young's suggestions by looking at whether and how dying or deceased organizations are a harbinger of new organizational life and finds they are such a source.[2] Surveying the literature, they observe that "many entrepreneurship studies have emphasized a planned approach to organizational founding based on rational assessment of the economic environment and implementation of a well-developed business plan" (Walsh and Bartunek 2011: 1034) citing Klepper & Sleeper (2005), and that organizations can be seen to emerge when they "exhibit intention" (ibid.) citing Campbell (2010), Ruef (2005), and Katz and Gartner (1988). To the contrary, Walsh and Bartunek's data suggest that organizational establishment is "more consistent with a creation model of entrepreneurial action" (ibid.). This is consistent with the process described by Alvarez and Barney (2007) who observe that such organizations are not planned, but instead "are emergent over time" (Walsh and Bartunek 2011:1034) and were observed to be in response to "painful and raw emotions triggered by such experiences" (ibid.) such as those associated with organizational death. They note that the work of prior scholars, while making observations about the emotional toll of organizational demise, do not examine the onward behavioral consequences (Sutton 1987; Cameron, Whetten, and Kim 1987). Building on those observations, Walsh and Bartunek identify such behavioral consequences as the salient contribution of their own study: it brings to light "the primary role of shared social processes that unfold during and after organizational death" (p.1034). One wonders if these "shared social processes" are unique to those who create new organizational life from dying or defunct organizations. Might other

[2] Walsh and Bartunek study for-profit organizations with the possible exception of one small college which may be a nonprofit organization, but is not so identified by them.

emergent organizations also evolve over time as a result of a similar shared social experience (whether negative or positive in nature) and process? Is their observation generalizable to other types of emergent organizations, including those which do not operate for-profit?

Notwithstanding their principal focus on for-profit enterprises, I argue that the foregoing conceptualizations are useful in thinking about nonprofit emergence. There is promise for theory development in comparing and contrasting NPO emergence with that of organizations in the for-profit sector. Such comparisons may include the demographic characteristics of founders, founding team composition, networks utilized in the founding process (strong, weak and contacts), resource mobilization processes and tactics, knowledge assembly, as well as organizational framing and story (Aldrich and Ruef 2006). In short, I believe that emerging nonprofits have more in common with their for-profit counterparts than not. However, I am mindful of Dorado's (2006) work on social entrepreneurship which cautions that scholars should be careful when using for-profit entrepreneurship research and theory to explain different types of organizations such as hybrid organizations (that is, those that operate both for-profit and for mission) suggesting that logics should be added to the list of factors involved in the entrepreneurial process. Clearly, as noted above, there are material differences between for-profit and nonprofit organizations both in structure and orientation just as there are between for-profit and hybrids, so this caution is apt.

Nonprofit Scholarship: Theory Building and Testing

With the exception of the foundational work of Young noted above, only recently have nonprofit scholars across disciplines begun to study emergence empirically and think about it theoretically (Cordes, Steuerle & Twombly 2001). As confirmed by nonprofit scholars[3] at the November 2012 ARNOVA Dissertation Fellows Workshop and Annual Conference, the thin research which examines NPO foundings largely examines individual founder leadership qualities and managerial abilities and thus is not intended to, nor is it well-suited for, use in adjudicating sociological theories of organizational emergence. For example, Kenny Stevens (2005) studying arts organization founders and Bolton and Spence (2006) studying nonprofit founders in general provide information about NPO founder leadership qualities based on self-reports, but did not query nonprofit founders in the process of emergence; look at the experience of the corresponding organization founded or others associated with the process; or examine anything other than personal history and leadership attributes.[4,5]

Those few studies that examine emergence empirically include Herrmann (2011), who studied the volunteer experience in a single emerging nonprofit observing a predominant "do it yourself" philosophy and management style at work. He concludes that individual narratives are

---

[3] Peter Frumpkin (University of Pennsylvania), Carl Milofsky (Bucknell University), and Mark Hager (Arizona State University).

[4] Kenney Stevens makes ten basic observations from her results observing "patterns " among nonprofit arts founders which include: (1) founders share similar bio-psycho-social patterns with other entrepreneurs; (2) early family experiences create an "inner script" for later founder behavior; (3) values brought to venture creation reflect the social times in which they were raised; (4) founders share early experiences of hard work and premature responsibility; (5) founders create organizations reflective of their own inner makeup and familial experiences; (6) incontrovertible tension exists between founders as entrepreneurs and founders as managers; (7) the founder's role and personal identity shifts as the organization evolves; (8) founders need boards of directors who support the organization's mission; (9) a founder's personal radar system that tells them when it is time to leave; (10) a founder's legacy is consistent with the values that inspired their call.

[5] I am aware of survey research being conducted by management faculty at Syracuse University (David Van Slyke) and the University of Georgia (Jesse Lecy) which attempts to query nonprofit founders on a large scale. They report very low response rates (less than twenty percent) and have not limited their inquiry to organizations in the founding process. Questions from the ARNOVA audience raised concerns about the study design including both the ability to generalize from the of results due to the low response rate and the problem of reconstructed history since the population includes mature organizations, concerns I address in my study design.

critical to the establishment of identity for the emerging organization. Herrmann cautions, however, that it is difficult to generalize from his single set of observations which may be unique to the lone organization he studied or to arts organizations only. More recently, Carman and Nesbit (2013) report on their survey of nonprofit founders involved in 2007 and 2008 nonprofit foundings in Charlotte, North Carolina. Based on a 54 percent survey response rate, they note empirical support for the three failures theory (that government and market failures set the stage for nonprofit emergence with the respective corollaries also at work, meaning that government and nonprofit failures presents market opportunity, etc.); contract theory (that nonprofits are formed in a market niche in which for-profits are viewed with suspicion and consumers would prefer to deal with nonprofits); as well as expressive theory (that nonprofits are formed by individuals as an extension of self). Incidentally, they note some similarities between for-profit and nonprofit founders, including the observation that some founders create organizations so they can earn a living at something they like to do. Their study, while examining founders somewhat temporally close to the founding experience, is focused on founders to the exclusion of others. Chikoto and Halicki (2013) in a case study of the Clean Air Campaign emphasize the importance of context and introduce the concept of “negotiated space”, that is, that nonprofit organizational emergence can be explained as a result of interaction among other actors (government, business and other nonprofits) to address important societal needs in contrast to explanations that attribute emergence to the failure of one or all those actors.

My study builds on this existing research by addressing these issues in the context of the understudied nonprofit sector, by studying those organizations which are actually in the process of emergence, and including other members of the entrepreneurial team as interview subjects in addition to the denominated founder(s). I ask the important questions of why and how nonprofits emerge and do so contemporaneous with the nonprofit founding.

As summarized above, the state of existing research suggests that examining the process of individual organizational emergence and the role played by founders as well as early participants has promise for helping to answer questions which linger. This study undertakes that probative research. Will we find patterns and processes at work in emerging nonprofits (Dorado 2006) similar to for-profit start-ups such as those identified by Ruef (2010)? Notwithstanding the absence of profit as driver, I hypothesize that nonprofit start-ups would resemble their for-profit brethren in key respects. Why? Like their for-profit counterparts, nonprofits also are corporations which must assemble a workforce and resources to produce products and deliver services effectively and efficiently in order to survive. I argue that social capital and networks are particularly critical to emergence—whether of the for-profit or nonprofit variety—which is precisely why these fledgling corporations have more in common with each other than with their respective elder statesmen. In the context of emergence, I believe social capital is readily used to garner resources and facilitate work that needs to be done while minimizing risk. I argue that the web of social capital functions much like (and serves as the precursor to the development of) the values, cultures, norms and systems of more established organizations. I presented evidence of this in Chapter 2 where I showed the process through which the emerging nonprofits identified and recruited volunteers to help drive their emerging enterprises.

Methods

This research builds on and expands existing research through a qualitative study of eight emerging NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. It uses the literature on established organizations as a proxy control for purposes of comparison. I use the multiple subjects to identify commonalities about the participants' experiences across the organizations. (Alvord, Brown, and Letts 2004; Chiles, Meyer, and Hench 2004). I use data derived from in-depth qualitative interviews with forty individuals (including both volunteer founders and early supporters), participant observation (for example, at organizational events and organization participation in public events) and document review (for example, websites, press, and IRS filings) to explore context and motivation. I use these methods to better and further explore the notion that volunteer experience in emerging NPOs has contextual determinants, which surveys or interviews of individual volunteers (separate from the organizations they serve) are not structured to ascertain. This is responsive to concerns in the entrepreneurship literature (Starr and Fondas 1992) that there is an overemphasis on the founder in the research which explores emergence. Thus, I study the organization as the principal unit of analysis and do so by including early volunteer participants in addition to founders as interview subjects.

I study contemporary foundings, that is, NPOs with an IRS Rule Date between 2010 and 2012, using the Rule Date as an imperfect proxy for formal organizational founding.[6] I examine emerging NPOs to minimize the possibility of lost founders, faulty memory or reconstruction of historical events, as well as to minimize the problem of success selection (Ruef, Aldrich, and Carter 2003) meaning that I examine NPOs with the possibility of both success and failure. While beyond the scope of the research reported on here, studying NPOs with uncertain futures,

[6] My experience bears out the imperfect nature of the proxy, having unmasked a number of organizations that appear to be in the process of emerging by reference to their IRS Rule date, but with respect to their operations are quite mature organizations with a significantly longer history of organizational existence.

meaning they have the potential for either success or failure, leaves open the possibility for the study over time of organizational survival, change and death.

Sampling

I selected cases from the universe of emerging organizations in a single county (also a U.S. Census Bureau Core Based Statistical Area) during a three-year period. This controls, albeit imperfectly, for other contexts such as time, location, economic and political influences in order to study the selected context of emergence. My review of National Center of Charitable Statistics (NCCS) data for this county, revealed 99 public charity organizations with a Rule Date falling between 2010 and 2012. (National Center of Charitable Statistics 2012) I utilized Guidestar, NCCS and IRS databases to identify persons associated with such organizations to approach for possible interviews. For example, Guidestar identifies organizations by zip code, shows each organization's officers and directors by name, and appends the organization's IRS filings which contain critical information about organizational structure, resources, operations and plans.

Recognizing that the population was not sufficiently large to ensure a statistically representative sample as would be possible with a broadly administered survey instrument, I purposively selected organizations to permit comparison across organizations formed with different missions and designed to engage in different activities, specifically seeking to obtain representation from among the predominant organization activity types[7] discovered in the county.

[7]These are organizational activity types identified by each nonprofit in its IRS applications for tax exempt status.

Table 1. Population of Organizations in Subject County by IRS Type

Organizational Type of Emerging NPOs	Number of Each Type in Population
religious	17
human services	16
health	13
sports	8
education	7
animal protection	6
culture	6
community development	5
volunteer promotion/philanthropy	4
environmental	4
other types ($n \geq 3$) aggregated	13
total	99

Through purposive selection, I also sought to maximize differences among the NPOs in order to be able to more confidently attribute identified similarities to emergence. I used publically available information on the demographics of the populations of all zip codes in the county where an NPO was formed during the designated time frame. Using that information, I selected organizations from communities with different socio-economic bases. I endeavored to include organizations from communities with a racially diverse population as well as those with a homogeneous racial composition. I included NPOs organized in communities with different median household incomes and looked at where the NPOS were geographically situated in the county to include those formed in urban, rural and suburban communities. Finally, I also chose organizations which serve the community in which they are formed and others which do not. Table 3.2 summarizes my sample cases.

Table 2. Summary of Participating Organizations by Activity Type, Mission and Founding Story

Organization Pseudonym	Activity Type	Mission and Vision	Founding Story
Pet Food Bank	Animal Protection & Human Welfare	To keep pets in their homes by providing supplemental food, litter and other basic necessities to persons with demonstrated financial need.	Co-founders shared recognition of importance that the comfort of a pet can provide during the death of a family member. Started NPO to keep owners and pets together.
Youth Philanthropy	Philanthropy	To facilitate the collective efforts of children to work in support of charities in their communities through raising money, by performing age-appropriate chores.	When founder could not find volunteer opportunities for her kids, she organized them to raise money for a local charity. NPO formed when others wanted to participate in the work.
Animal Rescue	Agricultural Program & Animal Rescue	To provide for the well-being of abused and abandoned animals, particularly farm animals, on a privately owned farm.	Founder and her mother started taking in stray and wounded animals that no one else would.
Community Gardens	Nutrition Education & Agricultural Program	To develop urban gardens and educate the public on the nutritional benefits of adding fresh, homegrown produce to their diets to help combat diseases such as diabetes.	Founder, a restauranteur, volunteered with NPOs, schools and churches to develop healthy eating programs and community gardens. NPO formed when she identified others who wanted to participate in her work.
Human Trafficking	Education & Human Services	To support and advocate for victims and survivors of sex trafficking, forced labor, and domestic servitude.	Founders are social workers, counselors and teachers who have worked with populations at risk of being human trafficking victims. NPO formed after their collaboration on a government task force.
Christian Development	Christianity & Urban Community Development	To bring hope through programs and services to meet the physical, spiritual, and social development needs of individuals and families in need to develop community.	Founders are pastor and wife of new inner city church. NPO is the companion organization designed to be able to attract resources beyond the church community.
Youth Baseball	Baseball & Softball	To cultivate the ideals of good sportsmanship, honesty, loyalty, courage and respect for authority in the children and community to develop better citizens.	Founder discovered that longstanding organization had lost its 501(c) (3) status due to administrative neglect. Recognizing it would be challenging to repair those issues a new NPO was formed to support existing league.
Law Enforcement	Mutual Benefit: Fraternities & Sororities	To support members by providing their families college scholarships and monetary assistance for a tragic event or terminal illness.	Founders are officers of a longstanding law enforcement agency social committee. NPO formed to gather and hold resources in a more formal and organized manner.

Starting with NPOs which had referenced a website or e-mail address on the initial 990 filed with the IRS, I began by contacting directors and officers whose names appear there in order to identify founders and early participants for interviews. Non-responses were first followed up in the same format and then by U.S. mail, recognizing that e-mail may be considered spam and not reach its intended target. I approached twelve organizations seeking interviews. Two organizations did not respond at all to the outreach described in this paragraph; one initially agreed to participate, but after consultation with its full board declined to participate citing over-commitment; a fourth initially agreed to interviews and then, due to material personnel changes, was unable to follow through on the commitment.

Data Collection

I began by interviewing one person affiliated with each of the eight organizations which responded to my outreach. I continued both by reaching out to other persons affiliated with the organizations as identified from public records and by contacting persons to whom interviewees referred me. This continued until I had at least forty interviews among the eight organizations. These interviews were intended to explore how and why persons come to form a nonprofit or participate in the early life of the nonprofit. Questions were designed to probe for: (1) what the respondent *thinks about* as he or she is engaged in the process (meaning); (2) what the respondent *feel*s about his or her work; (3) what he or she is *doing* (both individually and with others) to create the organization; and (4) where the work is taking place. I studied the script Wuthnow (1995) used for his extensive qualitative interviews of volunteers in preparing my own. Like Wuthnow, I employ questions that are largely open-ended and designed so that respondents will be free to tell the story of the organizational emergence, his or her role in it and that of others. I used a semi-structured guided interview format employing a script to elicit the same type of information across subjects to facilitate comparison (See Appendix A. p.182).

Preceding the interview, each subject was asked to provide written consent to the interview pursuant to IRB approval sought for this study (See Appendix B. p. 184). I conducted the majority of interviews myself. Having founded a nonprofit and for-profit organization, I had a high level of confidence that I could direct the interview in such a way that critical information would be elicited from each respondent or train another to do so. The remaining six interviews were conducted by an MBA graduate student employed in the nonprofit sector. I did not anticipate and, with few exceptions, did not encounter difficulty with access because, in my experience, persons involved in nonprofit formation are eager to speak with others about it. Typically, founders and early adherents are passionate about the undertaking and desire to engender support for the endeavor by talking about the experience. This proved to be true. After each interview, my colleague and I asked the subject to complete a face sheet to obtain identifying and demographic information about themselves which I then coded and maintained separately from the interview itself to protect confidentiality (See Appendix C. p. 186).

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed so that they could code them using an inductive approach to allow the data to speak (that is grounded theory) as well as to illuminate the various theories discussed herein. I transcribed the first few interviews myself as a way of becoming familiar with the content as well as to inform the conduct of the remaining interviews and to aid in development of a coding scheme. Thereafter, I utilized a transcription services company for the remaining interviews. All persons assisting with these tasks were asked to and did execute a confidentiality agreement (See Appendix D. p. 187). Once the transcriptions were received, I reviewed them while listening to the audio recordings as a means of checking the transcripts for accuracy.

In preparation for the interviews, I reviewed public documents to obtain background information about the respondents as well as the emerging organization. This included documents created by the organization or respondent as well as those written about the subject organization or respondent including legal documents, websites, traditional media, and social media.

I engaged in limited participant observation to obtain information about the founders, early participants and organizations. While it not realistic to be able to sociologically infiltrate all eight organizations, we have learned about them through attendance at public events, such as information sessions, public meetings, fundraising events and the like. For example, I observed our interview subjects and their families: in attendance and interacting at fundraising events; at a food bank distribution day where I met and heard stories about clients who were picking up food, identified and approached participant volunteers for interviews, and learned of operational issues and limitations experienced by that organization; and at an annual service kickoff event, we observed how the founder's family and friends assisted in manning(and managing) the event. In all, these observations served as confirmation of what was learned through interviews and provided additional context.

receding the interview, each subject was asked to provide written consent to the interview pursuant to IRB approval sought for this study. I conducted the majority of the interviews myself. The remaining interviews were conducted by an individual employed in the nonprofit sector and MBA graduate student. With experience as a nonprofit and for-profit organization founder, I had a high level of confidence that I could direct the interviews in such a way that critical information would be elicited from each respondent. I did not anticipate, and largely, did not encounter difficulty with access. I have found that persons involved in nonprofit formation are passionate about the undertaking and are eager to speak about it. This proved to be true**.** After each interview, we asked the subject to complete a face sheet to obtain identifying and demographic information which we then coded and maintained separate from the interview to protect confidentiality.

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed so that they could code them using an inductive approach to allow the data to speak to the theories discussed herein. I transcribed the first few interviews myself as a way of becoming familiar with the content as well as to inform the conduct of the remaining interviews and to aid in development of a coding scheme. Thereafter, I utilized a transcription services company for the remaining interviews. Once the transcriptions were received, I reviewed them while listening to the audio recordings as a means of checking the transcripts for accuracy.

In preparation for the interviews, I reviewed public documents as background to obtain information about the respondent as well as the emerging organization, including documents created by the organization or respondent as well as those written about the subject organization or respondent including legal documents, websites, traditional media, and social media.

My colleague and I engaged in limited participant observation to obtain information about the founders, early participants and organizations. While it not realistic to be able to sociologically infiltrate the eight organizations, we learned about them through attendance at public events, i.e., information sessions, public meetings, fundraising events and the like. For example, I observed interview subjects and their families: in attendance and interacting at fundraising events; at a food bank distribution day where I met and heard stories about clients who were picking up food, identified and approached participant volunteers for interviews, and learned of operational issues and limitations experienced by that organization; and at an annual service kickoff event, I observed how the founder's family and friends assisted in manning (and managing) the event. In all, these observations served as confirmation of what was learned through interviews and provided additional context.

Data Analysis

Given the limited research on nonprofit organizational emergence at the level of the individual organization as detailed above, the multiple case study method used here is particularly helpful in exploring organizational emergence. As in the study of learning activities (Liu and Ko 2012), case studies have been employed to understand dynamic processes. As Yin (2003) suggests, the multiple case study approach enables social scientists to examine real-life events in such a way as to permit them to generalize beyond what a single case study would permit. By using replication logic, the multiple case study helps in theory building when similar themes arise across the data generated from multiple cases. Modifying a research approach suggested by Light's (2005) comment on the lack of empirical work in this domain, my objective was to build careful records on each organization and its respective founder(s) and other participants. In order to deduce patterns, my colleague and I developed codes while engaged in our initial data review. Examples of coded variables for founders and /or early participants included demographic information (e.g. age, sex. education, race, income) as well as experiences and associations. Examples of coded variables for emerging organizations included partners, missions, objectives, challenges and strengths. I used NVIVO 10 to organize and analyze data for analysis.

The stories of organizations are complex because they are the result of collaborations among individuals and other organizations as well as interaction with the physical, social, political and economic environment. Thus, to enhance the validity of the stories of organizational emergence, I triangulated the data using different sources and methods to compare and contrast the stories as told by documents, interviews and observations (Denzin 2006).

Findings

For purposes of confidentiality, I refer to each individual respondent by an assigned pseudonym as set forth in Table 3 (Appendix E. p. 188). I refer to each NPO studied by its organizational pseudonym (also appearing in Table 3) derived from its predominant activity as set forth in Table 2 above.

I present study findings using Ruef's relational demography framework referenced above, because of the congruence between my findings and Ruef's observations based on his study of data from the National Panel Surveys of Entrepreneurship data. That said, I also note, throughout, connections to other theoretical perspectives suggested by the data.

Nonprofit Team Composition, Orientation, and Priorities

Chapter 2 revealed that our founding teams exhibit a great deal of homogeneity and resemble the general nonprofit volunteer population. Like their for-profit brethren, these homogeneous teams are comprised largely of the spouses, partners and kin which Ruef tells us characterize emerging for-profit enterprises (Ruef 2010:209-211). With the present inquiry, I looked for evidence of the other elements of Ruef's model of relational demography as characteristic of entrepreneurial endeavors. By inquiring about where the emerging organization can be found and does its work, as well as its aspirations and orientation, I explore whether our

NPOs are organized in virtual space and prioritize social and psychological well-being over monetary gain, (with monetary gain translated as mission for the non-profits) similar to the for-profit entrepreneurial endeavors studied by Ruef (p. 212-213).

I find strong support for Ruef's model of relational demography characterized by homogenous founding teams. Our nonprofit founders are not individual mavericks striking out alone. Much like their for-profit counterparts such as those Ruef studied using data from the National Panel Surveys of Entrepreneurship, our teams resemble each other demographically. While exhibiting in-group homogeneity, the individual nonprofit team members differ from their for-profit counterparts studied by Ruef. How? While Ruef observed homogeneity within group, he did not observe homogeneity across groups. Here I observe both.

Entrepreneurial Teams Have In-Group Biases Based on Demographic Characteristics

While acknowledging that my study, by design, does not analyze a random sample and that I purposively sampled organizations and not individual respondents, the emerging NPO founders and their teams that I interviewed share in-group demographic characteristics much like their for-profit counterparts. The following table summarizes the demographic characterizations of the NPO team members.

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics of Teams by Organization

Organization	**Gender** F=Female M=Male	**Race** C=Caucasian; Not Hispanic 0=Other	**Marital Status** M=Married 0=Other	**Employment Status** Y=Employed Outside Home N=Unemployed R=Retired	**Education** C=College Degree H=High School Degree	**Identify with a Religion** Y= Yes N=No
Pet Food Bank	FFFFF M	CCCCC 0	MMMMM	YYYY N	CCCC HH	YYYY NN
Youth Philanthropy	FFFF	CCCC	MMMM	YYY N	CCCC	YYYY
Animal Rescue	FFFF	CCC 0	MM 00	YYYY	CCCC	YY NN
Community Gardens	FFFF MMMM	CCCCCCCC	MMMM 0000	YYYYYYYY	CCCCCCCC	YYYYYYY N
Human Trafficking	FFFF MM	CCCCC 0	MMM 000	YYYYY R	CCCCCCC	YY NN
Christian Development	FF MM	CCCC	MMMM	YYYY	C HHH	YYYY
Youth Baseball	MMMM	CCCC	MMMM	YYYY	CCC H	YYY N
Law Enforcement	FF MMM	**CCCCC**	MMMMM	YYYYYY	**CCCCC**	YYYYY

Highly salient and worthy of further study is the fact that—unlike the entrepreneurs identified by Ruef—our nonprofit entrepreneurs are far more educated (the vast majority have completed college) and are far more likely to be white, married and identify with a traditional religion than the general population as shown in Table 5 below. In these respects, they resemble the general nonprofit volunteer population more so than the for-profit entrepreneur population. This represents a point of deviation in my overall thesis. So while the nonprofit teams are each largely homogenous, they do not display the demographic diversity *across* teams that is in evidence among for-profit start-ups. Thus, it would appear that nonprofit formation largely is the work of the privileged population. Furthermore, the data suggest that women are more likely to participate in nonprofit than for-profit foundings, another point of departure.

Table 5. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents vs. General County Population

Demographic Characteristic	Sample Organizations	Subject County
Race	90 % White- Not Hispanic	56.8% White- Not Hispanic
Education	100 % High school graduate	84.5% High school graduate
	82.7% Bachelor's degree or higher	24.2% Bachelor's degree or higher (age 25+)
Sex	62.5% Female	51.6% Female
Marital Status	72.5% Married	47.44 % Married
Employment	5% Unemployed	11.6%-14.7% Unemployed
Religion	80% Identify with a religious group	42.7% Identify with a religious group
Income	Reported annual household income of $100,000 or more: (62.5%)*[8]	Median household income: $54, 235

(U.S. Census Bureau 2015; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis 2015)

Moreover, 91 percent (11 out of 12) of founders interviewed were self- or other-employed at the time they founded the NPO, with the sole exception of a stay-at-home mother with three children who served as president of the home and school society and was active in other community activities. Thus, the work of founding a nonprofit would appear to be taken up by already fully engaged people who choose to do even more.

Further, 67.5 percent of our subjects (both founders and other participants) share other entrepreneurial experience or exposure separate from the emerging NPOs they are associated with in this study. They have founded (or are in the process of founding and managing) another organization (often for-profit) and/or have a family member (most often a parent) who is or was an entrepreneur. By the numbers, 37.5 percent are both entrepreneurs in another venture and were exposed to entrepreneurship though family; 17.5 percent are entrepreneurs in a separate venture, but did not identify entrepreneurial exposure from family; and the final 17.5 percent were exposed to entrepreneurship though family, but are not entrepreneurs in a separate venture.

[8] I estimate the actual percentage to be higher given the occupations of respondents who declined to provide this information.

So what did the families of our entrepreneurial team members do? They owned flower shops, grocery stores, a truck stop, a creamery, a negotiations institute, a software company, a newsstand, a hotel, a sign company, a bakery, a retail tennis shop, a women's apparel shop, a bar, or founded and managed a nonprofit among other enterprises. Even team members who did not characterize themselves as "founder" spoke about entrepreneurial influences when asked about family background and in relationship to their own work history. They appear to have been socialized in such a way that entrepreneurship seems like a rational choice rather than one that is exceptionally risky or destined to fail.

Interestingly, our founding team members are as likely to have been born in the region as not, suggesting that something other than simply being deeply rooted geographically is at work in bringing them together. Likewise, they come from a panoply of paid occupations, suggesting that there is no specific occupational proclivity to become (or support) a NPO founder.

Entrepreneurial teams include spouses, partners and kin

In Chapter 2, I report results which demonstrate that spouses, partners and kin are the earliest recruits to emerging nonprofit organizations. They provide labor, monetary resources, expertise and social capital access for the fledgling nonprofit similar to the participation in, and support enjoyed by for-profit start-ups. Virtually none are paid for their service. (Only one organization reported a paid employee who was recruited from its volunteer ranks). So what exactly does that support look like? What roles do they assume and what tasks do family and friends undertake for the fledgling organization?

They are financiers. Lauren of Pet Food Bank provides some detail:

> It was right before Christmas and my husband and I went out to dinner with them [brother and sister-in-law] and I said, "Guess what we're gonna do?" And they had met [Jess], and I told them and I got an email the next day saying "well we have $10,000 we

> could give you to get it started" and I about fell off my chair because they didn't know if it was going to work out. They didn't know how we were going to manage the money. I mean, they had trusted me and I said, "We can absolutely not take that much," and they insisted on $3,000. So that gave us an operating budget. I have, I really have a lot of generous friends who are really supportive. When we got the rejection from the IRS saying we needed to change one line in our bylaws and send them another $450 and a friend and I were talking. She said, "What's the latest with [Pet Food Bank]?" And I said, "You won't believe this," because it had just happened that day. We had the money and I said, "Crazy IRS, they're saying we need to get this thing legally changed," and three days later I had a check in the mail for $450 from her… I know if we needed a lot more money tomorrow people would come forward.

They are labor. Leslie of Youth Philanthropy describes family contributions: "So, my kids have always been a big part of it. I call them my assistants, because they do every little thing with me from, you know, separating t-shirts and ordering things, taking pictures."

They are the source of professional expertise or do the work to acquire it. Co-founder Brenda describes the expertise provided by another co-founder's family:

> [Denise] is very business. She, all her like family and relatives is all like attorneys and insurance companies and these people that we really needed. We would have never got the incorporation through, and also like the accountant and like all those business pieces…And, I am willing to admit, and I think that is the same with everybody else that...the business end was not our forte. And, [Denise] was great at that. She still is great at that.

In the case of Youth Philanthropy, an adult daughter created and manages the organization's website. For Christian Development, Pastor Sam's wife Maria took up the work to figure it out how to incorporate:

> When we started [the church] I had to do all the legal work, I had to get that all on board getting all the legal work done with that, all the paperwork from the state get that going. [Christian Development] when my husband started it, I do all the secretarial work, getting a legal entity, 501(c)(3) and had to do all that, figure out how to do that.

They function as sounding boards and emergency funds. Lee of Animal Rescue tells us about how she sought counsel from her sister when she contemplated forming the NPO:

> I have a sister, so I would bounce things off of her all the time. She and I are very close…I'm like, "What do you think?" …She said, "Yeah, I think you should try it [form the nonprofit.]" For a while we talked about it and we're like no, we don't want people butting in our business telling us how to do things. And then it finally got to the point where she realized I was going to lose everything otherwise too.

They are fundraisers and grant-writers. Youth Baseball's Brad describes how his wife hustles to raise money for the travelling team he coaches: "My wife hits the pavement, goes in and out of stores, local shops, calling, you know, going in and out of Walmarts and ShopRites and Wawas and trying to get ahold of managers." Claire credits her sister for contributing the organizational skills that enable Community Gardens to pursue grants, noting "We just applied for all these grants…Well, I am learning how to write grants. And, my sister is helping me big-time. She is definitely the more organized one."

They coordinate communication and other administrative functions. Mimi of Community Gardens shares more information about the organizational role played by the founder's sister. "[H]er sister is real, real involved now as far as helping her… she is her right hand. And I always get emails from [her] about when the next meeting is, what is going on with the garden."

Entrepreneurial teams have a tendency to organize activity in intimate or "virtual" space

The work of the emerging organizations I studied largely takes place in intimate space. At their inception, none of these organizations had physical space, such as an office, dedicated to their enterprises; a year or more into their endeavor, most still do not, with their only public presence found in "virtual" space whether a dedicated website or social media presence. I discuss the use of intimate and virtual space in more detail below.

Intimate space: The NPOs I studied are run out of one or more founders' homes or the offices of other organizations with which the founders are affiliated, whether for-profit, nonprofit or governmental. An early Pet Food Bank volunteer shares that the founders initially ran the entire operation out of their homes; it doesn't get more intimate than that. "Well, I believe that they were the ones who came up with the idea. I know that they were running it out of one of their houses for a while. I know that they work like crazy to get donations to buy the food, to store the food."

Human Trafficking, Christian Development, Animal Rescue, Youth Baseball, and Youth Philanthropy founders also use their own domiciles as a place for volunteering and operations. Much of the work happens at the end of a busy day after other paid employment and family obligations are satisfied. In response to our question asking where Human Trafficking can be found, founder Brenda of Human Trafficking explains.

> My car. [Laughs] Right in my big comfy chair at home, and that is [Tessa] too. Like we all pretty much work from home… [I]t is like constant, at night, after my son goes to bed...

Christian Development houses small and large groups of mission volunteers in the founders' homes. Spouses Jane and Daniel, as well as Pastor Sam and his wife Maria, indicated that they host 15-20 people in their houses who come on mission trips to do service. "This group has only 20 people, so it's just our 2 houses. We had groups with as many as 60 maybe in 3 or 4 different houses." Similarly, Youth Philanthropy founder Leslie admits, "Okay. So, I have no office. I run it out of my home..." The Animal Rescue's founder's home is situated on the farm which is home to the rescued animals the organization supports.

Intimate space, however, is not limited to the home. Law Enforcement runs its operations out of the headquarters of its longstanding companion organization. It "borrows" space to operate a small store to sell t-shirts and other apparel and communicates through the companion organization's systems such as phones and email. Community Gardens operates out of the founder's restaurant, using its staff and systems for administrative functions and its space for fundraising. Animal Rescue's administrative operations are situated at the founder's for-profit graphics arts business. Youth Baseball administratively operates out of the homes of its volunteers and relies on the local municipality to provide access to fields and meeting space for its operations. Aside from its founders' homes, Human Trafficking now also operates out of office space in a church thanks to the largesse of its pastor, Cliff, who is a Human Trafficking volunteer.

For meetings and fundraising events, all of the fledgling organizations rely on borrowed space in the community such as schools, churches and community centers. After two to three years of formal operation, only Pet Food Bank (storage unit) and Christian Development (another youth organization's former clubhouse) rent dedicated physical space from a third party for some part of their operations. Law Enforcement, the most mature of the organizations, is the only NPO I studied that holds fundraising events (golf outing, comedy show) at commercial third-party facilities for which payment is exchanged for use.

Virtual Space: Each organization's identity is shared using "virtual" space; that is, its day to day public presence is internet-based, employing social media such as Facebook and Twitter to communicate who the organization is and to connect with actual and potential constituents. In response to the question "Where Can [Organization Name] be found?" 37 of 40 respondents first mention virtual space; all respondents eventually reveal the NPO's heavy reliance on virtual space to coordinate work. The work produced is shared by this means as well. Each organization largely communicates with the team as well as world through e-mail, posts, and cell phone texts and calls, mindful of the associated expense. Donations too are sought and accepted virtually. They do little traditional advertising or marketing and have no budget for same.

In response to a question asking where they "can be found" Jess of Pet Food Bank details their web of operations connecting through both virtual and intimate space:

> I'd say we're kind of virtual. We operate off of a pre-paid cell phone, so people can call us on the phone. We do have a website donated to us, so people can contact us through there as well. We started off with just the website, but the phone was necessary, we tried to eliminate that expense, but it just wasn't possible. Many people aren't computer savvy, they don't have access…The phone became necessary. We had the application online, but people couldn't download it so we needed to have the phone number for them. We work out of a storage facility, you could picture, you just slide up the thing it's a business operation in there, it looks kinda seedy, ha-ha. But that's how we operate, from our emails to our home, to our phones, we are there.

Brenda of Human Trafficking discusses the work entailed in creating a virtual presence:

> I sit for… two hours a night putting the website together… you know, I mean, just figuring out to get that PayPal button on the website. [Laughs] It was like four hours. [Laughs]… The email, every phone call that goes is routed to my phone…

Jane, also of Human Trafficking, underscores the impact of social media which helped them reach even a Tea Party group, one she expresses they would not have connected with but for the virtual presence:

> And I've got to tell you, people laugh about Facebook. Facebook has been a godsend. Because that's where we get a lot of information out and a lot of people that see our post on Facebook are contacting us to come out and teach [about human trafficking] …We've recently presented to two Tea Party meetings and I couldn't figure out what's their interest in this, but they were phenomenal, they just loved it.

Our respondents leave little room for doubt that they operate precisely in the same "space" as their for-profit counterparts to establish the new organization.

Entrepreneurial teams set goals that prioritize social and psychological well-being over monetary gain

In order to make an apt comparison, I translated Ruef's concept of "monetary gain" from the for-profit to the nonprofit setting. I looked at whether these teams prioritized social and psychological well-being over such things as assembling resources or meeting organizational goals for achieving mission by providing goods and services, in other words, the nonprofit equivalents of the for-profit objective of monetary gain. Given how closely and interdependently the teams work, I was not surprised to find that these founding teams resemble their for-profit counterparts as described by Ruef. They make it a priority to look out for their own social and psychological well-being (as well as that of those they serve) over objectives such as those one might find in a business plan. What do these social and psychological priorities look like in the emerging NPO?

Personal Development: Pastor Sam explains that Christian Development's priority is not to program; rather, "It is a process. And again, this is helping people develop." He goes on to detail how they seek and value growth in both those who do Christian Development's work as well as those in the community it seeks to serve. He explained how they decided just to get started without any real resources in order to satisfy their need to get out there and start to serve.

Integrity: Pastor Sam's wife, Maria, identifies integrity as a priority and explains how it has shaped certain organizational decisions: "Well, we made it a policy that I think it is fifty-one percent of the Board have to be members of [Urban] in order to keep the Christian integrity of the organization."

Providing Natural Disaster Relief: Prioritizing well-being above something as important as mission can mean providing services that are outside of the mission because it is what people need. Daniel of Christian Development explains:

> We don't pigeonhole ourselves into one specific area. Whatever the felt need of the community is, is what we do. We're getting better at being more agile to react to the problems as they change in the community… I know we have to be singular in our philosophy, but not in our activity. One of the things that helps us survive continually and willingly to bend and change and do what needs to be done … Right before [Hurricane] Sandy hit, I wouldn't have said we were a disaster relief [organization], but a disaster hit and a disaster happened. I am not gonna go to somebody's house and talk about anything else.

Responding to Client Need: Lauren of Pet Food Bank tells a similar story. When extreme hardships fell on two clients, Pet Food Bank monetarily supported them although it was outside of their domain. Related to that experience, Lauren expresses a desire to include even more services. "We want to try to provide as many ancillary services as we possibly can, beyond the food," she says. "Our goal is to help with food and litter, but we would like it to go beyond that if we can." She goes on to identify one of those services as connecting the constituents with potential landlords and job opportunities as well as spay and neuter procedures for their pets. Both co-founders admit that if those ancillary services would require digging into their own personal funds, they would. "If somebody needs something and you know it's not convenient to access the funds or for some reason it doesn't conform, then we'll just reach in our pocket and just make things happen that way."

Personal Comfort and Fit: The Pet Food Bank co-founders tell the story of facilitating the exit of a well-intentioned and highly qualified board member because that person's drive and ambition made them feel that they were being pushed to move forward at a pace which felt uncomfortable. In contrast, they recruited and expanded the role of others with whom they shared an *espirit de corps*.

Quelling Fear of Inside and Outside Threats: The need to prioritize social and psychological well-being can come from a place of fear as well, including fear that ad hoc operations might be perceived as illegitimate; that participant integrity might be questioned or subject the organization to penalties such as the loss of tax-exempt status or ability to raise funds from a reputational injury. This was a particular concern of the two organizations (Law Enforcement and Youth Baseball) born from other organizations that experienced or observed similarly-situated organizations' experience, such consequences. Joyce of Law Enforcement explains:

> We just needed to become a 501(c) because there were other [law enforcement agencies] getting in troubles with their social committees. They weren't following an SOP [standard operating procedure] and this truly took us out of the limelight and gave us guidelines to follow, just to keep us from having to shut down our social committee which is what it was before that.

John of Law Enforcement explains how that fear motivated them to work to structure the organization:

> And we were doing this [starting Law Enforcement] with transparency. And that none of us could ever be accused of any wrongdoing. So we had to make sure that we [had] certain things in place so that if we were ever questioned, here we have the big accounting firm right down the street here on [XXX] Road that does all of our accounting. We have other layers built in so that if anyone would question where we are raising money, we are doing this, where is it going, there is absolutely nothing to hide.

Evan, founder of Youth Baseball, tells a similar story, how he "saw some crazy stuff going on" before reorganization and wanted to "make sure that we were a legitimate entity [so] that I could go and solicit donations and not have to worry about it."

Maintaining Control: For others, psychological well-being means keeping one's own counsel and not sharing control, but reserving the right to call on others when needing a push to keep going and move forward. Leslie, founder of Youth Philanthropy explains:

> I am a little bit of a control freak, and they [the Youth Philanthropy board] are always willing. I mean [Kit], you know, she does not live here anymore. But, when she comes, she will go through my file cabinet, my paperwork and organize it, which is great, I love that. And, [Louisa] is just kind of there if I need anything, running around for closings, things like that, but no, no super, really official. One of my other team leaders in [XXX] Township is also on the board. Great, you know, the role they play is when I am kind of like 'I cannot do this anymore.' It is great [to have] people to brainstorm with, we all philosophically agree. It is enough to… keep me going and that kind of thing.

Caring for Each Other: Respondents detailed how each organization fundamentally prioritizes care, of participants and clients. Ultimately, this sustains the organization itself. Julie of Community Gardens paints a picture of the kind of care founder Claire lavishes on volunteers and those the organization seeks to serve; how she draws people in and connects them to the organization, by prioritizing care to gain trust and allegiance.

> I trust in her larger view of what our area can be and how people can experience food. I'm going to tell you a quick story, which really sums up [Claire's] view of how we're supposed to eat. I stopped by the restaurant one day to drop something off and she was experimenting with these breakfast cookies. She's like, "Hey, I want you to try something. I just made this alternative breakfast cookie" .... She goes over to get me a piece of whatever it was and I held up my hand. She said, "No. No. No." She goes over and she goes onto her shelf and she takes out a dessert plate and she puts it on the plate and then she said, "Come on. Come with me." And we go through the swinging double doors and we go into the empty dining room and she pulls out a chair and she puts it in front of the plate and she says, "Sit down." I thought to myself, "That's what we're trying to impart [through Community Gardens]. That's what we're trying to teach. We're trying to teach that. It's not something that you gobble on the go. It's not something you do in the middle of something else. This is an act in itself."

Consistent with the data reported above, it is the desire for social and psychological well-being—theirs or others—that launched these ventures without a real business or operations plan in sight. This is similar to the emotional response that Sutton (1987) and Cameron, Whetten, and Kim (1987) observed as present during organizational demise: an emotional response which incites action.

Assembling the "organizational building blocks" that are "littered around the societal landscape": How easily it is done and what does it take?

So, what does it take to launch? Is it as simple as the language quoted from Meyer and Rowan (1977) would suggest? Similar to the reports made by for-profit entrepreneurs, these nonprofit entrepreneurial teams tell us that the founding experience is not at all easy; it involves time-consuming and tedious work that requires founders and leaders to be tenacious, agile and persistent. The work itself includes acquisition, overcoming resistance, fighting bureaucracy, finding time, planning events, and gathering resources (talent, advising funds, space, etc.) as well as creating structure and process.

Becoming Knowledgeable about How to Proceed and Getting Past the Bureaucratic Red Tape: Lee of Animal Rescue would concur that getting an organization off the ground takes more than a "little effort." Hear her frustration when she speaks of the bureaucratic nightmare of just trying to get out of the starting blocks:

> I just made the decision in 2011 [to form the nonprofit] and I found out it was going to cost $6,000 to get a lawyer to do it. I thought, "I read government contracts. I can do this." It took me an entire year to do it. I did it wrong. I would send it back to the state, the state would send it back. I was ready to give up a few times with that. I was just in tears and I finally got to somebody at the state and she was a sweet lady. She said, "Listen, I'm going to send you the verbiage. You put this verbiage on there. Don't change anything, just cut and copy what I'm giving you, and it will go through." And it did, finally. It was almost a year to the day.

Overcoming Resistance and Outright Opposition: Youth Baseball "officially" re-organized because its founder realized that others before them had not been good stewards of the organization. The "new guard" wanted to do more for the kids; that would require a significant amount of fundraising and the lack of formal organizational recognition impeded those efforts. Bob explains:

> Over the last two or three years is when we went and became an official nonprofit, which, [Evan] is the person you want to talk to about that, because he is the one that spearheaded all that. For all these years this has been going on, we should have been [a legally-recognized nonprofit], but we were not, you know. Those people just showed up and they went through the motions. They did not close those ties that they needed with the paperwork and with the state, and finally, you know, we realized it and fixed the issue. So, the organization has been here for all those years, but as far as being a non-profit, I think we are in our second year…, I mean it helps us out a lot, especially with, you know, like I was talking about with the travel. With the rec, we are funded through sign-up fees and township money…. we are constantly hitting up businesses, we are constantly looking for ways to generate money. And, being a nonprofit and being able to offer a tax break back to people has helped us tremendously with fundraising, which in turn helps the kids, because you can do more…[W]e were on a list with the state as, you know, being registered, but not being, existing. So, with that paperwork…you were able to find us through that. You know, we, technically, we were here, but we did not exist. [Laughs]

> If that makes sense. So, when they finally, you know, you do the proper paperwork. Now, we actually exist, you know.

The "old guard" was unconcerned about whether the organization officially existed. To them, everything was just fine. Evan explains:

> Our treasurer at the time…. was talking the idea [of securing legal recognition of the league as a nonprofit] down. He didn't want to do it. I forced him into it… I was driving most of it and I've been reporting back, "Hey we're here and we are in this part of the process." So from the paperwork perspective I did it, but the reality is that this [new] Board continued to push it through."

He goes on to describe the significant time investment involved in resolving the issues:

> It's really time. If it were a couple of dollars here and there I wouldn't even know about it, but it's really time. It took an inordinate amount of time.

Finding Time- Working Day and Night: Most of our founders, such as Claire of Community Gardens (who owns and runs a restaurant) and Lee of Animal Rescue (who owns and operates a graphics arts company) are otherwise fully employed. For them, founding ad running the nonprofit is another job of sorts; one for which they are not paid. John, founder of Law Enforcement, was employed as an officer in the companion organization at the time Law Enforcement was launched. He describes his volunteer work with Law Enforcement: "Well my role first was the executive director. I was the driving force about structuring it, getting the organization, making sure that we had everything that we needed to be compliant with any type of tax, federal, or oversight, anything that we had to do."

Fundraising and Event Planning: John of Law Enforcement details the work associated with Law Enforcement's fundraising efforts, including events:

> Well every event that you put on requires hours of additional time to go out and prepare. Some of the events are on weekends and holidays. So after work, you are acquiring the logistics, the supplies, and making sure brochures, flyers, and publications are put out. So there is a lot of work that goes on behind the scenes to keep the participation. The comedy show, we usually sell that out with the venue that we book every year. The golf tournament is sold out immediately upon the date being set and those flyers going out.

> The picnic, the venue that we have can support up to six hundred people. So we usually average somewhere between three and four hundred.

Creating Structure and Process: After achieving a surprising success with their ad hoc operations, Louisa describes the process by which Youth Philanthropy took shape as an organization, the learning curve, the work involved and necessary adjustments:

> I think we had, and I do not remember the numbers, I want to say we raised close to $15,000 the first year. We were blown away. Everybody kept saying to us "We cannot wait to come back next year and do this. We cannot wait to come back." [Laughter.] We [Louisa and founder Leslie] looked at each other and went "Oh, no. Now we have to keep doing this." That is really where the hard work came in, because now you have to get your 501(c)(3). You know, the first year you can get away with doing it as an event, now if you want to keep going and doing this, you need attorneys involved in getting a 501(c)(3), getting the accountant involved in making sure we were filing taxes correctly, putting a charter together because now we needed by-laws, we needed all the things that are involved. We needed a board to be able to be considered a 501(c)(3). Even changing money that we donated the first year, because we were not a 501(c)(3) we could not necessarily donate the second year, because we had to make sure who we were giving the money to was a legitimate 501(c)(3) …. now we had to learn the laws that go behind accepting money of donations and distributing money as well.

Taking Classes (and Recruiting Talent): Lee of Animal Rescue explains how she's constantly looking to learn more and to identify those from whom she can learn or can persuade to work with Animal Rescue:

> [T]he second person I have [on the board], I took a grant writing class and this young lady—she's in her late 20s. She's been involved in a couple other charities, so she knows way more than I do, and she's a grant writer. So, I grabbed her.

Jack of All Trades: Daniel of Community Development explains how difficult it is to do everything required to just get started:

> There are certain things that have to get done. I am not a fundraiser. I have no background in fundraising. I raised my own salary even to this day. [Community Development] really doesn't have staff. We have a lot of volunteers and have people that work at the end of the day right now. I am responsible for funding the entire budget, not just my salary. I do it all, but eventually would like to have staff. You need someone who has done it, this focuses on that. You have to have an attitude. You want to say it's a pioneering attitude. If you have people in this sort of thing [saying] "that's not really

> what I do, I am not comfortable," it can be very difficult. You have to be willing to step back out of your comfort zone and just do what needs to be done.

With so much to learn and do, Daniel recognizes that most nonprofits, like other businesses, won't make it. This understanding comes in part from his own experience starting and operating a construction business. He explains:

> In the very, very beginning, we basically had to do everything. I was involved in every aspect of it… I contributed financially to it … and I definitely contributed time where it was needed. There is no pay for board members…The whole first year that I was president I put a lot of time I wouldn't say a lot of money, but where it was needed… The beginning can be really hard with a nonprofit getting through the initial start. If you can get through that unscathed you are pretty much on your way. Most non-profits die. I was the board president and the founding president and so my first job was based on to build a board and the board members together get your 501(c)(3), go get your insurance, get your by-laws, act of constitution and your vision mission seeking. You have to go to all this. It took us about six months I think just to get through the initial junk in order to even operate, then you have to get the board together that can learn not everyone knows this is how you run a board meeting. This is minutes, this is agenda, this is how we keep records, and this is the filings we have to do at the end of the year. People think that nonprofits, because they don't pay taxes, they don't file taxes. They file taxes. You audit yourself every year. It's a lot. There's more to it than people think going in.

Finding Support: Given all that needs to be accomplished and the variety of expertise and skill needed for tackling associated tasks, the maverick is unlikely to launch a new organization; it "takes a village." Experiences such as those detailed above help our founders to reach out knowing they cannot fashion solutions to challenges they face without the help of others. Recognizing how difficult the work can be to tackle alone and inspired by the founders' passion and energy, others are drawn in. Darla, a friend of Lee's, explains how and why she stepped forward to help Lee:

> It's not because she's a friend. It's because I like to be around people who have drive, are passionate in what they believe. They go to great lengths to achieve that. They really know what their purpose is. So that's actually the only people for whom I work as well. Like the last two companies I worked with, the entrepreneurs…. Real entrepreneurs are crazy about what they do. They love it. They just need help figuring out maybe how to get to it because they're so into it. They're true... No matter what else you don't like about them, it's real, and it's true, and they're genuine to their purpose. If [Lee] was just my

> friend, I wouldn't do it. I know her because she's my friend, and it makes it more valuable that I get to do this, plus spend time with my friend. That's great! But if she was disorganized and not focused, I wouldn't do it just because she was my friend. I wouldn't be able to take it. I'm not interested in that.

The role of the “team” that rallies around the founders not only provides the manpower for getting work done, but helps the founders put their passion or the organization’s mission in perspective in order to fashion an organization that will support their vision. In virtually every instance, relationship and trust are prioritized over skill, consistent with the experience of the for-profit entrepreneurs studied by Ruef.

Summary and Discussion

The entrepreneurial teams studied have shared volumes about how their respective organizations were formed, shaped, and maintained, speaking to those lingering questions identified by academic scholars. When thinking about how the theoretical perspectives and these data speak to each other, it occurred to those helping me design the study that borrowing from an oft-used legal conceptualization of crime makes sense.

Means, Motive, Opportunity?

The legal conceptualization of means, motive and opportunity accounts for structural, agency and contextual influences. Thus, I suggest conceptualizing emergence as a function of *means* (e.g., economic capital, human capital, social capital and political capital), *motive* (individual ignition and driver), and *opportunity* (context). In sum, the data support the following propositions.

Means: The emerging nonprofit teams studied call on significant personal relational reserves (family, friends, co-workers, clients) to mobilize the resources needed to attempt to launch an entrepreneurial endeavor. Our founders’ need or desire to assemble resources for a mission or purpose is universal among our NPO founders and highly supportive of resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977). The data reveal that while some resources are self-produced, most are aggregated or appropriated through exchange relationships. By contrast, at this early stage only a few of our nonprofits have successfully garnered material resources through foundational or government patronage, though most expressed a desire to do so.

Revisiting Dorado's lingering question, "Will we find patterns and processes at work in emerging nonprofits similar to for-profit start-ups?" (Dorado 2006), my data answer "Yes." Like their for-profit brethren described by Ruef (2003, 2010) our NPO founding teams are: (1) homogeneous, meaning they share similar demographic characteristics as well as other entrepreneurial experiences or exposure; (2) built on the backs of existing relationships among spouses, partners and kin for volunteer identification; (3) tend to organize in intimate and virtual space; and (4) prioritize the well-being of the team and those they serve over adherence to a business plan or conceived mission. The results are consistent with and supportive of entrepreneurial activity as relational demography. However, the data do reveal an anomaly of sorts: our nonprofit entrepreneurs are far more educated and likely to be white, educated, married and identify with a traditional religion than the general population or the for-profit entrepreneurial population. So, while the nonprofit teams are each largely homogenous, we do not see the demographic diversity across teams that is in evidence among for-profit start-ups. It would appear that nonprofit (as compared with for-profit) formation largely is the work of the privileged majority. The team members do, however, resemble the general nonprofit volunteer population. Perhaps we should think of them as "super-volunteers," those who are educated enough to recognize or identify flaws or gaps in our current delivery system for needed services. As a result, each is in a position to attempt to fix such flaws or fill such gaps by virtue of their education and are economically privileged enough not to be dependent on income from their work on behalf of the nonprofit.

On the other hand, perhaps those others across the demographic spectrum who start for-profit ventures do so principally to earn a living by it and, rightly or wrongly, presume they cannot do so using the nonprofit form. We surmise that this may be attributable to lack of education about, or exposure to the nonprofit form by those who chose the for-profit form. Future research might inquire about how or why a particular business form or structure is chosen over another and if consideration is even given to the nonprofit form.

Consistent with the "do it yourself" approach observed by Herrmann (2011), my work suggests that connections to family, friends and community (rather than money) are key to an enterprise start and the launching process is organic, one without a business plan in sight**.** It builds on Herrmann's work by demonstrating that this is true beyond the lone arts organization he studied. The work to start a nonprofit is undertaken largely by persons who are otherwise gainfully employed and does not (and would not appear to be intended to) substitute for other employment. The work of the emerging nonprofit takes place after hours or amidst other paid work which it is not intended to replace. Only one person among the forty founding team members we interviewed was a paid employee of the new nonprofit and he was very quick to point out that he is expected to raise his own salary. Thus, my findings are inconsistent with those of Carman and Nesbit (2013) who observed that founders were motivated to start a nonprofit as a means of making a living. Not one of my respondents expressed such intent, nor did I find evidence of developing paid work as a motivation for establishing any organization. In fact, most of the respondents expressed the opposite: that it was of utmost importance that no one involved in the administration of the organization be seen as profiting from its operations.

I wonder then whether entrepreneurial incubators which are growing in popularity can nurture and provide access to the very resources entrepreneurs are actually using to bring their enterprises to life. On the other hand, the incubators may offer structural and administrative support with which many emerging organizations, including those we observed, struggle with constantly.

Motive: Each founding story originates from a profoundly personal experience that takes shape as it is shared with or observed by others, and the founders are then encouraged by others to assemble organizational support for the vision and associated work. While somewhat counterintuitive, this motivation appears to have organizational origins, providing support for institutional theories of emergence. First, our entrepreneurs are immersed in and working to navigate the further development of establishing a specialty niche (Light 2005) among existing organizations in a particular substantive area of service, for example, animal care and rescue. Second, the origins of these organizations confirm "the primary role of shared social processes" (Walsh and Bartunek 2011) which give birth to new organizations and validate the thinking of those who see new organization formation from a creationist perspective, that is, a collaborative and creative (rather than planned) process. It calls into question entrepreneurial education curricula with a dominant focus on business planning or which focus on the individual as entrepreneur without reference to his or her entourage.

It is worth noting that the majority of our organizations do not have their origins in other dead or dying organizations and are not operated for-profit in contrast to those studied by Walsh and Bartunek (2011). The fact that our findings are nevertheless congruent with theirs suggests that other organizations, in general, play a critical role in the birth of new organizations and supports the work of institutional theorists.

Opportunity (and Opportunistic): These entrepreneurs are not individual mavericks; most have deep entrepreneurial experience or exposure and are knowledgeable about their communities and the work of other nonprofits working in the field of their respective endeavors. In some way, each explored serving the vision or need through existing organizations before deciding to form the NPO, doing so only when they did not find a "home" for the associated work. Thus, nonprofits arise to fill gaps in service provided by the existing nonprofit community. That said, the emerging NPOs appear to be welcomed by the nonprofit community as informal organizational partners, though they are not always denominated as such. Those informal partners are companion government agencies, churches, schools, and nonprofits which share manpower, resources, and opportunities that they cannot fully utilize.

The organizations are responding to gaps in services provided by government, nonprofit community and for-profit market Salamon (1987) as well as to personal frustrations born of programmatic and other existing organizational challenges (Young 1983). Thus, we again find significant support for institutional theories of emergence, observing a close connection between virtually all of our start-ups and other institutions, whether for-profit (for example, small businesses), nonprofit (affiliated churches) or governmental (for example, social service and law enforcement agencies), consistent with the finding of other researchers (Marquis, Davis, and Glynn 2013).

The work of launching a nonprofit is not easy. Even with developed organizational forms and practices (Meyer and Rowan 1977) I contest the notion that it takes no more than "a little entrepreneurial energy" to launch. It is time-consuming and often frustrating. Those involved in the endeavor must acquire new knowledge and skills (or identify persons with such knowledge or skills) to help build the fledgling organization. Some form of voluntary action generally precedes the establishment of the formal organization with little evidence of business planning or goal setting. Even the single organization in our study that started with a plan acknowledged launching its work before the planning process was complete. Our emerging NPOs, following the lead of those that comprise them, are opportunistic and responsive to client and community needs, even if it means altering or expanding the original mission or vision or shifting priorities and focus.

Finally, while not anticipated, our results validate theories of vocational anticipatory socialization. My data support other research suggesting that individual vocations are influenced by prior socialization (Shumate, Atouba, Cooper, and Pilny 2014). It would appear that nonprofit entrepreneurs are no exception. These founders and their supporters are the children and grandchildren of entrepreneurs or have direct entrepreneurial experience organizing and operating for-profit ventures, some of which they run alongside the nonprofit.

As noted above, there is evidence of the use of social capital omnipresent in the process of organization establishment. One wonders if that role continues as the ongoing work of the organization unfolds (in contrast to the work of organizational establishment) which I hope to explore in future papers. As these emerging organizations mature, will we see evidence of systems, norms and customs developing? How and when are they introduced if at all? Is the appearance of systems, norms and customs any indication of probable longevity or growth? Might we find evidence of Weber's routinization of charisma in this context as founders make way for others to assume leadership roles?

Of course, my study is not without its limitations and leaves many questions as referenced above unanswered. I acknowledge that my findings are based on limited engagement with a small, purposive sample of only eight organizations and cannot be widely generalized beyond these data. As with most qualitative studies, there is the possibility of injecting the personal biases of the researcher in the collection and interpretation of the data as well as the presentation of results. Finally, these findings do provide insight into the processes at work in individual organizational emergence, in contrast to field level organizational-type emergence.

Conclusion

This qualitative study finds important similarities between the composition and experience of nonprofit founding teams and their for-profit counterparts as reported in the literature (Ruef, Aldrich, and Carter 2003; Ruef 2005; Ruef 2010) and characterized as relational demography. I observe a close connection between many of the start-ups studied here and other organizations, consistent with institutional theories as supported by the finding of other researchers (Marquis, Davis, and Glynn 2013; Walsh and Bartunek 2011). In two cases, for-profit businesses owned and operated by the nonprofit founder provide critical support for each of the new endeavors. My data validate the cautions of others (for example, Starr and Fondas 1992) that over-emphasis on an individual founder ignores critical processes associated with organizational emergence. On close examination, organization emergence appears to result from a creative, highly socialized, and iterative process (Alvarez and Barney 2007; Walsh and Bartunek 2011) and not as a consequence of business planning. The founding teams of such organizations appear to be motivated by a desire or need to gather resources in support of such endeavor consistent with resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977), principally relying on social capital to do so.

I believe that conceptualizing emergence as a product of means, motive and opportunity harmonizes existing theories that seek to explain how and why new organizations—whether for-profit or nonprofit—emerge. Future research which continues to explore the parallels between for-profit and nonprofit start-ups is likely to yield information that will help us better understand entrepreneurship in both domains and assist in developing pedagogy and policy that promote entrepreneurship. A focus on emergence as context may be key to that research.

References

Aldrich, Howard E., and Martin Ruef. 2006. *Organizations Evolving*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications: London.

Alvord, Sarah H., L. D. Brown, and Christine W. Letts. 2004." Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 40(3):260-82.

Alvarez, Sharon A., and Jay B. Barney. 2007. "Discovery and Creation: Alternative Theories of Entrepreneurial Action." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1(1-2):11-26.

Block, Stephen R., and Steven Rosenberg. 2002. "Toward an Understanding of Founder's Syndrome: An Assessment of Power and Privilege among Founders of Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 12(4):353-68.

Bolton, Elizabeth B., and Lynda M. Spence. 2006. "A Study of Founders of Community Based Nonprofit Organizations: Implications for Extension Leadership Educators." *Journal of Leadership Education* 5(3):66-78.

Campbell, David A. 2010. "Stand by Me: Organizational Foundings in the Aftermath of Disaster." *American Review of Public Administration* 40(3):351-69.

Cameron, Kim S., David A. Whetten, and Myung U. Kim. 1987. "Organizational Dysfunctions of Decline." *Academy of Management Journal* 30(1):126-38.

Carman, Joanne G., and Rebecca Nesbit. 2013. "Founding New Nonprofit Organizations: Syndrome or Symptom?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42(3):603-21.

Chikoto, Grace L., and Michael Halicki. 2013. "Contextual Factors and Negotiating Spaces: Exploring the Emergence of Nonprofit and Hybrid Voluntary Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 23(3):347-65.

Chiles, Todd H., Alan D. Meyer, and Thomas J. Hench. 2004. "Organizational Emergence: The Origin and Transformation of Branson, Missouri's Musical Theaters." *Organizational Science* 15(5):499-519.

Clark, Peter M., and James Q. Wilson. 1961. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6(2):129-66.

Cordes, Joseph J., C. Eugene Steuerle, and Eric Twombly. 2001. "Dimensions of Nonprofit Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Essay." Presented at the Public Policy and the Economics of Entrepreneurship Maxwell Policy Research Symposium, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY. Conference draft.

Denzin, Norman. 2006. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Dorado, Silvia. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values So Different Process of Creation, No?" *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 11(4):319-43.

Edwards, Bob, and Patrick F. Gillham. 2013. "Resource Mobilization Theory." Pp. 1-6 in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by D. Shaw, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans, and D. McAdam. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. (1958). Bureaucracy and Bureaucratization: A Trend Report and Bibliography. Current Sociology, 7(2): 99-164

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis 2015. *Unemployment Rate*. Retrieved February 22, 2016 (https://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/series/NJATLA2URN).

Freear, John, Jeffrey E. Sohl, and William E. Wetzel Jr. 1995. "Angels: Personal Investors in the Venture Capital Market." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 7(1):85-94.

Frumpkin, Peter, Carl Milofsky and Mark Hager. 2012. Unpublished commentary at the ARNOVA Fellows Seminar, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Gartner, William B. 1993. "Organizing the Voluntary Association." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 17(2):103-7.

Glaser, Barney G. 1992. *Emergence vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Hansmann, Henry. 1987. "Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization." Pp. 27-42 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Herrmann, Andrew F. 2011. "Narrative as an Organizing Process: Identity and Story in a New Nonprofit." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* 6(3):246-64.

Johnson, Victoria. 2007. "What is Organizational Imprinting? Cultural Entrepreneurship in the Founding of the Paris Opera." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(1):97-127.

Katz, Jerome, and William B. Gartner. 1988. "Properties of Emerging Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 13(3):429-41.

Kenny Stevens, Susan. 2005. "A Call Taken to Heart: The Entrepreneurial Behavior of Nonprofit Founders." *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader* 16(5): N.p.

Klepper, Steven, and Sally Sleeper. 2005. "Entry by spinoffs." *Management Science* 51(8):1291-1306.

Light, Paul C. 2005. "Searching for Social Entrepreneurs: Who They Might Be, Where They Might Be Found, What They Do." Paper prepared for the 34th annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, November 17-18, Washington, DC.

Liu, Gordan and Wai-Wai Ko. 2012. "Organizational Learning and Marketing Capability: A Study of the Charity Retailing Operations of British Social Enterprise." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(4):580-608.

Marquis, Christopher, Gerald F. Davis, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2013. "Golfing Alone? Corporations, Elites, and Nonprofit Growth in 100 American Communities." *Organization Science* 24(1):39-57.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212-41.

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(2):340-63.

Miller, Lynn E., and Karen A. Simmons. 1992. "Differences in Management Practices of Founding and Nonfounding Chief Executives of Human Service Organizations." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 16(4):31-40.

Mair, Johanna, Julie Battilana, and Julian Cardenas. 2012. "Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneuring Models." *Journal of Business Ethics* 111(3):353-73.

National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2012. http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/PubApps/profile1.php

Patel, Neil. 2015. "90% Of Startups Fail: Here's What You Need To Know About The 10%." Retrieved July 30, 2015 (http://www.forbes.com/sites/neilpatel/2015/01/16/90-of-startups-will-fail-heres-what-you-need-to-know-about-the-10/).

Ruef, Martin. 2010. *The Entrepreneurial Group: Social Identities, Relations and Collective Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ruef, Martin. 2005. "Origins of Organizations: The Entrepreneurial Process." *Research in the Sociology of Work* 15:63-100.

Ruef, Martin, Howard E. Aldrich, and Nancy M. Carter. 2003. "The Structure of Founding Teams: Homophily, Strong Ties, and Isolation among U.S. Entrepreneurs." *American Sociological Review* 68(2):195-222.

Salomon, Lester M. 1987. Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations." Pp. 99-117 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, W. Richard. 1992. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shumate, Michelle, Yannick Atouba, Katherine R. Cooper, and Andrew Pilny. 2014. "Two Paths Diverged: Examining the Antecedents to Social Entrepreneurship." *Management Communication Quarterly* 28(3) 404-21.

Simon, Herbert A. 1976. *Administrative Behavior*. 3rd ed. New York: MacMillan.

Starr, Jennifer A., and Nanette Fondas. 1992. "A Model of Entrepreneurial Socialization and Organization Formation." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 17(1):67-78.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations." Pp. 143-93 in *Handbook of Organizations*, edited by J. G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Strauss Anselm, and Juliet M. Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publications.

Strauss, Anselm. 1988. "The Articulation of Project Work: An Organizational Process." *The Sociological Quarterly* 29(2):163–78.

Sutton, Robert I. 1987. "The Process of Organization Death: Disbanding and Reconnecting." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 32(4):542-69.

Tolbert, Pamela S., Robert J. David, and Wesley D. Sine. 2011. "Studying Choice and Change: The Intersection of Institutional Theory and Entrepreneurial Research." *Organization Science* 22(5):1332-44.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2015. *State and County Quick Facts*. Retrieved February 22, 2016 (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/34/34001.html).

Walsh, Ian J., and Jean M. Bartunek. 2011. "Cheating the Fates: Organizational Foundings in the Wake of Demise." *Academy of Management Journal* 54(5):1017-44.

Wagner, Eric T. 2013. "Five Reasons 8 Out Of 10 Businesses Fail." *Forbes*. Retrieved July 30, 2015 (http://www.forbes.com/sites/ericwagner/2013/09/12/five-reasons-8-out-of-10-businesses-fail). Weber, Max, and Samuel Noah Eisenstadt. 1968. *On Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Weisbrod, Burton A. 1986. "Toward a Theory of the Voluntary Non-Profit Sector in a Three-Sector Economy." Pp. 21-44 in *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions: Studies in Structure and Policy*, edited by S. Rose-Ackerman. New York: Oxford University Press.

Westlund, Hans, and Roger Bolton. 2003. "Local Social Capital and Entrepreneurship." *Small Business Economics* 21(2):77-113.

Wuthnow, Robert.1995. *Learning to Care: Elementary Kindness in an Age of Indifference*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, Dennis R. 1983. *If Not for Profit, for What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Young, Dennis R. 2012. “Contract Failure Theory.” Pp. 154-7 in *The Nature of the Nonprofit Sector.* 2nd ed, edited by J. S. Ott and L. A. Dicke. Philadelphia, PA: Westview Press.

CHAPTER 4

Emerging Nonprofit Dynamics: Relationship as Manager, Iterative Development and the Routinization of Charisma

Abstract

This qualitative research examines the experiences of volunteers in the context of NPO emergence. Using a multiple case study design, I analyze data derived from forty qualitative interviews, including both founders and early participants, across eight *emerging* NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. Contrary to what the existing literature reveals about how volunteers are recruited, I previously reported findings which support the proposition that, *in this context*, social capital is the principal driver for identifying, recruiting and motivating volunteers for participation (Chapter 2). In this Chapter 4, I reveal how social capital also influences the manner in which those volunteers are tasked and managed; process their experiences; and iteratively influence organizational development and structures that help define mission and facilitate leadership transitions in service of these fledgling organizations. I use these data to probe and reconcile disconnects in the academic literature about how volunteers experience unstructured work as well as how social capital can be both a property of individuals and organizations, including insights into the transfusion between the two. I also examine how early participant contributions shape the new organization and to look for evidence of Weber's "routinization of charisma" (1947) which I argue is key to an organization surviving beyond the life or interest of its founder(s). These findings have important implications for nonprofit management policies, practices and curricula including how emerging NPO participants should

think about and plan for development of organizational structures and systems, including leadership succession, to facilitate organizational survival beyond the founder(s).

Keywords

Volunteer, nonprofit organization, NPO, social capital, founding, emergence, context, motivation, management, routinization of charisma, entrepreneurship, organizational maturity, organizational development.

In the twelve months ending September 30, 2015**,** 62.6 million persons or nearly 25% of the population, reported volunteering time in the United States (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). These volunteers are the backbone of the “third sector” of our economy comprised of nonprofit organizations (“NPOs”) which provide vital human services and education, facilitate association and philanthropy, preserve and enhance our culture and undertake critical scientific research among other activities for the public good. To deliver these offerings, NPOs count on that vast workforce of volunteers. Indeed, many nonprofits, especially those in the nascent stages, operate without any paid staff and rely exclusively on volunteers for their very existence. Thus, volunteer utilization and management is a critical task, if not *the* penultimate task of these organizations.

The burgeoning volunteer and giving literature captured by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) details both theoretical perspectives and empirical research which explore volunteering. Little is known however about the contemporaneous experience of volunteers involved in founding or working with emerging NPOs (Herrmann 2011). Building on the foundational research of Young (1985, 1983), nonprofit scholars are only beginning to examine the experience of new NPOs and the persons who choose to launch or affiliate with them as they are in the process of emergence (Kenny Stevens 2005; Bolton and Spence 2006; Herrmann 2011; Carman and Nesbitt 2013; Chikoto and Halicki 2013). I build on this research by examining the experience of voluntarism in the context of the emerging NPO, which, I suggest, differs in important ways from voluntarism in established organizations.

Research Questions

This study expands present research through a qualitative multiple case study of eight *emerging* NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. I use the multiple subjects to identify commonalities about the volunteer experience across these NPOs, and where I encounter differences, seek to understand why. I do so by analyzing primary data from forty qualitative interviews of volunteers, including both founders *and early participants* (a key feature of the study design which distinguishes it from others) enhanced by document review and participant observation. I use these data to: capture how volunteers experience their work; examine how early participant contributions serve to shape the organization; and look for evidence of the routinization of charisma which may provide for organizational survival beyond the life or interest of the founder(s).

I argue that social capital has a pronounced role in virtually every aspect of the life of the new NPO. In Chapter 2, I considered whether volunteers for emerging organizations resemble the general population of volunteers and their motivations. I asked how NPO founders and early participants identify and recruit participants in the budding endeavor and what motivates these persons to lend their assistance. I found support for my hypothesis that founders and early participants rely heavily on their own social capital in aid of an organization's launch (in addition to, or in lieu of their own human capital or monetary capital). I learned that these organizations are largely created and sustained by persons who leverage their social capital to enlist volunteer labor and secure other needed resources including, but not limited to money and expertise.

In Chapter 3, with reference to the literature on organizations and entrepreneurship, I examined what these nonprofit entrepreneurs and their for-profit counterparts might have in common, if anything, and what differentiates their experiences. I made the comparison for the purpose of shedding light on organizational emergence as context, that is, in an attempt to identify the generic features that can be said to characterize new organizations in the throes of their origin. I asked these research questions: "Through what process do founders construct new organizations?" (Aldrich and Ruef 2006) and, in comparison with for-profit startups, "Will we find similar processes at work in emerging nonprofits?" (Dorado 2006). I found support for the hypothesis that emerging nonprofit and for-profit organizations have much in common, notwithstanding their very different orientations, that is, mission versus money. However, I learned that unlike for-profit entrepreneurial endeavors, nonprofit start-ups appear largely to be the domain of educated, otherwise-employed, middle-aged Caucasians.

In this chapter, I look beyond the identification, recruitment and initial motivations of emerging NPO volunteers who join the enterprise, examining organizational dynamics to answer the following research questions. First, once onboard, how are the volunteers tasked and managed in support of these new organizations? Second, I inquire about how volunteers are impacted by their experience and how their participation might be working to shape the organization itself. Third, I query whether there is evidence of Weber's "routinization of charisma" (1947) in the life of the emerging NPO, looking for evidence of issue awareness and systems or process development that might suggest a path forward for the organization independent of its founder(s). I argue that emergence as context, once again, is critical to an understanding of these lived experiences and that this has important implications for nonprofit sector management practices and pedagogy.

Theoretical Orientation: Emergence as Context

While this is a grounded study in which I look for themes to emerge from the data (Strauss 1988; Glaser 1992) my research focus is guided by the academic literature on voluntarism and organizations generally as well as the more specific literature on charismatic leadership.

Sociologists emphasize the importance of social context and relationship in deciphering the decision to volunteer in contrast to psychological studies and general surveys which treat the decision as an individual attribute. Wuthnow (1995) presumes framework or context is key; that groups and/or structures at the origin influence the individual's decision to volunteer as does the affiliated organization. Musick and Wilson (2008) identify the contextual effects on individual volunteering as "one of the least understood issues in the field" (p. 229). Wilson (2000) cautions against looking at volunteering using the individual as the exclusive unit of analysis; that is, he warns that other social influences may be at work calling volunteers into action, and, especially relevant to the inquiry in this chapter, keeping them at work to shape and sustain the new organization. Responsive to Wilson's caution, I chose the organization as this study's unit of analysis and examine its experience through interviews with the various persons, virtually all volunteers, who are in the process of launching, supporting and shaping it.

As detailed in Chapter 2, Wilson and Musick (1997) refer to two forms of volunteering: “informal” or “helping” such as assistance any person might offer to family, as distinguished from “formal” such as assistance rendered to organizations. They found that social capital (operationalized as informal social interaction and number of children in the household) was positively related to formal volunteering (Wilson and Musick 1997:700). However, in the general volunteer population, their assertion that, “most formal volunteers are persuaded to volunteer by family members, coworkers, or fellow worshipers” was unsubstantiated (Wilson and Musick 1997:708). In essence, they found that while persons volunteering in formal organizations are identified as having social capital, they are not participating in response to its direct call or ask. In other words, their participation was not the result of a social-capital related invitation.

Based on my personal experience founding and working with emerging NPOs, I believe the opposite to be true in the context of emergence: that new NPO volunteers in fact “are persuaded to volunteer by family members, coworkers, or fellow worshipers” and, in this study, set out to test that proposition. The findings reported in Chapter 2 support this argument. There, I found the process through which volunteers are identified, recruited and motivated more closely resembles “informal helping” than “formal volunteering.” In this chapter, I again treat organizational emergence as a specific context in which to explore how the life of a new organization. I examine how work is tasked, managed, experienced and processed consistent with my theory that there is an ongoing role for social capital and relationship in this aspect of organizational life as well. Indeed, I argue that the prevalence of social capital may play an important role in influencing whether an organization ultimately survives, differentiating those that do (and thus are spared from the "liability of newness" (Brüderl, Preisendörfer, and Ziegler 1992)) from those that do not.

In attempting to empirically test and build on this existing research, I develop and analyze data to explore both context (Musick and Wilson 2008) and motivation (Handy and Mook 2011), issues that prominent nonprofit scholars deem worthy of further study. I examine context by looking at the volunteer experience during organizational emergence**.** First, I ask whether the means for tasking and managing volunteers in the emerging NPO differs from that of established NPOs as described in the literature. Second, I wonder whether the volunteer's experience and processing of the work differs from those in established organizations as well. As an extension of the Chapter 2's findings. I argue that tasking and managing volunteers also is largely a function of social capital. I observe that emerging NPO volunteers help when and how they wish and are given wide latitude in doing so based on a pre-existing relationship of trust with the founder(s) or leader(s). In the context of emergence, founders are virtually synonymous with the organization.

Another Role for Social Capital? Relationship as Manager, Experiential Lens and Motivator

While the organizational blueprint is still on the drawing board, the accumulation of trust in support of the new NPO in the form of social capital would appear to be among the most valuable resources needed in the process of establishing the organization. Putnam describes the concept of social capital concisely when he says "social networks provide the channel through which we recruit one another for good deeds, and social networks foster norms of reciprocity that encourage attention to others welfare" (1995:67).

Taking guidance from Lin (1999) and Ostrom and Ahn (2009) who have studied the history and usage of social capital across disciplines, I refer to social capital as that attribute of individuals and their relationships that enhance their ability to solve collective action problems. As such, social capital becomes embedded in individual relationships as trust. Think of it as an investment in social relations with expected returns, not unlike an investment using monetary capital intended to produce interest or profit. Lin's definition of social capital refers to resources that are (1) "embedded in a social structure," (2) which are "accessed and/or mobilized," (3) in "purposive action" for both "instrumental" and "expressive" outcomes (pp. 33-34). Social capital is utilized for an *instrumental* outcome when it is tapped to cause something to happen. Social capital is utilized toward an *expressive* outcome when the goal is to maintain or extend relationships and ties for future utilization or support.

As detailed in Chapter Two, many scholars, including Lin, Cook, and Burt (2001) have attempted to define the boundaries of social capital tracing its origin as a sociological construct back to Marx ([1847] 1933). They borrow and build on his notion of capital (that is, surplus value from investment) to distinguish social capital from human capital (that is the skill and energy which is found in and exhibited solely by the individual.) Emphasizing the need for a shared perspective for empirical research to be meaningful, they observe that social capital is a term generally (over) employed and used with no real consistency thereby losing theoretical specification. Still a relatively new concept, there are two developing scholarly schools of thought on social capital. The first school, whose adherents include Bourdieu, Coleman, Granovettter, and Lin among others, views social capital as the property of the individual. The second school, represented by Putnam, views social capital as the property of collectives, that is, organizations, communities, cities and nations (Portes 1998). Is it possible for these positions to be reconciled; for social capital to be the property of both individuals and groups, for social capital to be transferred from individuals to groups and vice-versa? If so, how might such a transfer take place? What does it look like? The qualitative nature of this study permits me to look for such possible interactions.

The concept of trust (Paxton 1999) is critical to understanding the dynamics of social capital which is not transactional in nature and most often does not involve an immediate exchange. As an illustration, a colleague may offer to share information with me about a job which she knows to be important to me, without expecting that I have like information (or other value) to provide at that moment to her. In fact, she may never want or need such information. In these exchanges, there is a general expectation of trust, that requests which can be accommodated will be accommodated in time. The concept is easily illustrated between individuals, but is it possible for social capital to exist between or be transferred from an individual to an organization? What might that trust look like? This study explores the life of the new nonprofit to look for how social capital is accessed and extended to aid in our understanding of the dynamics of individual organizational emergence.

Brüderl, Preisendörfer, and Ziegler (1992) suggest that understanding how social capital operates in the development of the emerging organization could augment other findings about new organizations and how "(1) individual characteristics of founders; (2) attributes, structural characteristics and strategies of the new business itself; and (3) conditions characterizing the environment of the new firm" are related to organizational survival (pp. 227, 239). They consider human capital and organizational ecology theories as possible explanations for why some firms fail while others persist. Based on interviews of 1,849 business founders in Munich and Upper Bavaria, they find strong support for their propositions that organizational survival is associated with founders endowed with more general human capital (measured by years of education and work experience) and specific human capital (measured by self-employment, specific industry and leadership experience). Examining organizational ecology as a possible explanatory force for differential survival, they also find support for two propositions: 1) that follower businesses (those that imitate others) enjoy more success than newcomer businesses and 2) that larger businesses fare better that smaller ones. Also they find lower failure rates among businesses characterized as “specialist”, “innovative”, or targeted at a “national market” (pp. 236-37). They identify no association between type of industry and survival and, contrary to expectations, found that independent firms had better survival rates than those affiliated with other firms and that highly competitive industries do not expereince higher failure rates. (p. 238). I use these findings to see if they might offer explanations (independent of social capital) for the differential development of the nonprofits I observe in my study.

Because emerging NPOs often lack the resources that established NPOs may have, I posit that these new NPOs are highly dependent on social capital, including relationship building and networking, not only to recruit, identify and motivate volunteers as detailed in Chapter 2, but also to train, manage and retain volunteers who are their workforce. I argue that this is because emerging NPOs do not have sufficient human capital (for example, employees), institutional capital (for example, systems and operations) or financial capital (for example, money and property) at their disposal to accomplish these critical tasks.

In Chapter 2, I presented data which suggest that emerging NPO volunteers (virtually the entire initial workforce of these emerging organizations) are differently identified, recruited and motivated than volunteers generally as reported by the literature. I argue that emergence as context is key to understanding this phenomenon. Across the eight cases, I found volunteers were similarly identified, recruited and motivated. The data supported the assertion that social capital plays a critical role in orchestrating their participation. In this chapter I ask, once onboard, will there be a continuing role for social capital in how volunteers are trained, tasked, managed and retained? Does relationship impact how they process their experience? Will the similarities among the fledgling organizations persist?

What is Known about How Volunteers Experience and Process Their Work

Work done by Taylor, Mallinson, and Bloch (2008) utilized a comparative case analysis that examined how two established NPOs handled volunteers. At first glance, a no-kill cat shelter and a gay rights activist group might not have much in common, but as the researchers delved into the material, they found striking similarities. Most notably, they found similarity among the demographics of those who volunteered. Those volunteers, like the general volunteer population, were largely white, well-educated, middle-class females. The researchers compared an unstructured volunteer experience with one that was consistent and clearly defined. They reported that volunteers with an unstructured experience found it to be ultimately “unsatisfying and ill-directed” (p. 405). Conversely, they found that volunteers of the no kill cat shelter “enjoy the sense of fulfillment that completing a predefined and structured set of tasks entails” (ibid.). They conclude that,

> Not only does it seem that a well-defined labor process provides clear expectations that are satisfying to volunteers, but routinization may also lower the possible chances for conflict or confrontation, which may also contribute to a more satisfying volunteer experience. (p. 405)

Based on this work, one might be tempted to conclude that unstructured volunteer activity is universally unappealing and unfulfilling. I observe, however, that both organizations studied were well-established; each NPO had existed for over a decade. By contrast, Herrmann (2011) observed that volunteers at a new arts organization were recruited using personal relationships and networks. Once onboard, the volunteers were not trained or managed, but allowed to make whatever contribution they saw fit, that is, they were encouraged to "do it yourself" ("DIY") (p. 251). Based on my personal experiences, his description aptly captures the unstructured, even chaotic nature of what it is like to volunteer for an emerging NPO. Herrmann found that the volunteers thrived and became increasingly connected to the organization as they built or deepened personal relationships they associated with it. Because his observations were made in a single organization, Herrmann cautioned about the generalizability of the study and further warned that volunteers who enjoy creative chaos may be unique to arts organizations such as the one he studied.

How might one account for the difference in experiences of unstructured volunteering as observed both by Herrmann (emerging arts organization) and Taylor, Mallinson, and Bloch (mature advocacy group)? Is it a difference of organizational type, structure, competency or the assignment of responsibility rather than task assignment? I submit it is a difference of context: emerging versus established organization.

Would a qualitative multi-case study of emerging NPOs replicate the findings of Taylor, Mallinson, and Bloch (2008), or those of Herrmann (2011)? Could it be that the attractiveness of unstructured work looks and feels different in an emerging organization as compared to an established one? Empirically, will the emerging volunteer experience described by Herrmann be typical of other emerging organizations? I hypothesized that the experience of volunteers in the emerging organizations studied would be similar to those described by Herrmann, notwithstanding their different missions, goals, geographic location, and so on. I propose that a difference of context explains how an unstructured volunteer experience can be satisfying and outright energizing in an emerging organization while being highly frustrating and discouraging in an established organization where expectations, relationships and structures are different.

Organizational Development and the Routinization of Charisma

Assuming emerging organization volunteers are energized by inspirational relationships with founders and leaders which introduced them to the organization such as those observed by Herrmann (2011), can such relationships endure? Are they impacted by the increasing numbers of participants? How do such organizations integrate those with only tangential or perhaps no direct relationship to the founder(s), and if so, how? Is the exciting and satisfying unstructured experience of these early participants sustainable as an operational structure? Stinchcombe (1965) posits that emerging organizations suffer from a "liability of newness." Others suggest that new organizations also are susceptible to a "liability of smallness" (Brüderl and Schussler 1990). I argue that the failure to transition from relationship as manager to more generalized values, norms and structures may offer an explanation for organizational demise based on newness and or smallness. Again, without more generalized values, norms and structures accessible to and capable of being understood and followed by others, broad based participation may be discouraged. In order to survive, mature and grow, I argue that the emerging nonprofit organization must find a way to routinize the very charisma that gave it life, that is, to develop systems and processes that serve mission in order to live beyond the glamour of newness and the energy associated with a dynamic founder.

Max Weber (1947) studied emergence, continuity and change associated with organizations. He introduced the concept of the routinization of charisma to describe the process through which the prophetic teachings and ideology of the charismatic religious leader are institutionalized through the development of structures to support such teachings and ideology in order for them to outlive that individual. Scholars such as Jermier (1993) encourage a reexamination of Weber's work on charisma out of a "need for additional imaginative theories, critical reconceptualizations and exploratory research to supplement more integrative projects" (p. 218), such as the present one.

One debate in the literature concerns whether Weber intended to limit application of the construct of charisma to the religious or spiritual realm (Wasielewski 1985). Whether consistent with Weber's original intent or not, scholars are beginning to see utility in the concept in a variety of contexts, from social movements to corporate power transitions. Weber's articulation of this process has been borrowed by scholars to examine phenomena such as the perpetuation of terrorism (Hofmann 2015); the continuation of the family business (Saxena 2015); the survival of political movements (Gurov and Zankina 2013); the development of therapeutic community movements (Manning 2013); the teaching of jazz as an art form (Wilf 2014); as well as the transition from corporate founder to an institutionally chosen chief executive officer (Petit 2012; Shah and Mulla 2013).

Others question whether Weber's use of the concept of charisma refers to an individual psychological characteristic of the leader or whether it is more sociological in nature. Those who view the concept of charisma as sociological argue that the power of the leader does not rest within the individual, but in the power to connect with followers (Milosevic and Bass 2014). Friedland (1964:21-22) well articulates the sociological construct:

> It is only when the message conveyed by charismatics to social groups is relevant and meaningful within the social context that authority emerges… [W]hile there are plenty of people with messages, these must be relevant to social groups before they begin to be received and become the basis for action.

While the debate continues, scholars such as Friedland and Wasielewski have set the stage for more recent scholarship to explore charisma and its sociological routinization. Bryman (1993) sought to refocus our attention on the attributes he believes Weber identified as relevant to charisma and the possibility of its routinization (or loss). According to Bryman, Weber's notion that the charismatic must possess the vision or mission to attract a following and for those followers to develop a steadfast commitment is decidedly social structural. (p. 291). For charisma to be routinized, Bryman argues there must be the "development of structure, roles and positions that serve the charismatic leader and codified beliefs that are accessible to others without direct access to leader" (p. 294). Finally, Bryman highlights Weber's idea that charisma has a fragile and temporal quality to it, so that without systems, roles and structures that codify associated beliefs, charisma may be lost (p. 299).

By examining how emerging organization volunteers are tasked and managed, how they experience the work undertaken, and whether constituents are thinking about and planning for a future beyond the founder(s), I hope to offer an explanation for why volunteers might experience unstructured work so differently in new organizations, what role of social capital plays in that experience, and whether the Weberian concept of charisma, including its routinization, helps us understand the phenomenon of the organizational liabilities of "newness" and "smallness." I believe it can help us think, not just about the developing NPO, but the transitions that other new organizations of all types may confront. In the next section, I introduce the methodology of this study which explores these issues in more detail.

Methods

This research builds on and expands existing research through a qualitative study of eight emerging NPOs in a single county in New Jersey. It uses the literatures on established organizations and emerging for-profit organizations as a proxy for purposes of comparison. I use multiple subjects to identify commonalities about the volunteer experience across the organizations; when differences are identified, I seek to understand why. I use data derived from in-depth qualitative interviews with forty individuals (including both volunteer founders and early supporters) enhanced by participant observation (for example, at organizational events and organization participation in public events) and document review (for example, websites, press, and IRS filings) to explore context and motivation. I employ these methods to further explore the notion that volunteer experience in emerging NPOs has contextual determinants, which surveys or interviews of individual volunteers (separate from the organizations they serve) are not structured to ascertain. My approach is responsive to concerns expressed in the literatures of both voluntarism (Wilson 2000) and entrepreneurship (Starr and Fondas 1992) that there is an overemphasis on founders in the limited research which explores emergence. Thus, I study the organization as the principal unit of analysis and do so by including early volunteer participants in addition to founders as interview subjects.

I study contemporary foundings, that is, NPOs with an IRS Rule Date between 2010 and 2012, using the Rule Date as an imperfect proxy for formal organizational founding.[1] I examine emerging NPOs to minimize the possibility of lost founders, faulty memory or reconstruction of

[1] My experience bears out the imperfect nature of the proxy, having unmasked a number of organizations that appear to be in the process of emerging by reference to their IRS Rule date, but with respect to their operations are quite mature organizations with a significantly longer history of organizational existence.

historical events, as well as to minimize the problem of success bias (Ruef, Aldrich, and Carter 2003); that is, I examine NPOs with the possibility of both success and failure.

Sampling

I selected cases from the universe of emerging organizations in a single county (also a U.S. Census Bureau Core Based Statistical Area) during a three-year period. This controls, albeit imperfectly, for other contexts such as time, location, economic and political influences in order to study the specific context of emergence. My review of National Center of Charitable Statistics (NCCS) data for this county revealed 99 public charity organizations with a Rule Date falling between 2010 and 2012 (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2013). I utilized Guidestar, NCCS and IRS databases to identify persons associated with such organizations to approach for possible interviews. For example, Guidestar identifies organizations by zip code, shows each organization's officers and directors by name, and appends the organization's IRS filings which contain critical information about organizational structure, resources, operations and plans.

Recognizing that the population was not sufficiently large to ensure a statistically representative sample as would be possible with a broadly administered survey instrument, I purposively selected organizations to permit comparison across organizations formed with different missions and designed to engage in different activities, specifically seeking to obtain representation from among the predominant organization activity types[2] discovered in the county.

[2]These are organizational activity types identified by each nonprofit in its IRS applications for tax exempt status.

Table 1. Population of Organizations in Subject County by IRS Type

Organizational Type of Emerging NPOs	**Number Each Type in Population**
religious	17
human services	16
health	13
sports	8
education	7
animal protection	6
culture	6
community development	5
volunteer promotion/philanthropy	4
environmental	4
other types- aggregate ($n \geq 3$)	13
Total	99

Through purposive selection, I also sought to maximize differences among the NPOs in order to be able to more confidently attribute identified similarities to emergence. I used publically available information on the demographics of the populations of all zip codes in the county where an NPO was formed during the designated time frame. Using that information, I selected organizations from communities with different socio-economic bases. I endeavored to include organizations from communities with racially diverse populations as well as those with racially homogeneous compositions. I included NPOs organized in communities with different median household incomes. I also looked at where the NPOs were geographically situated in the county to include those formed in urban, rural and suburban communities. Finally, I chose both organizations which serve the community in which they are formed and others which do not. Table 2 summarizes my sample cases.

Table 2. Summary of Participating Organizations by Activity Type, Mission and Founding Story

Organization Pseudonym	Activity Type	Mission and Vision	Founding Story
Pet Food Bank	Animal Protection & Human Welfare	To keep pets in their homes by providing supplemental food, litter and other basic necessities to persons with demonstrated financial need.	Co-founders shared recognition of importance that the comfort of a pet can provide during the death of a family member. Started NPO to keep owners and pets together.
Youth Philanthropy	Philanthropy	To facilitate the collective efforts of children to work in support of charities in their communities through raising money, by performing age-appropriate chores.	When founder could not find volunteer opportunities for her kids, she organized them to raise money for a local charity. NPO formed when others wanted to participate in the work.
Animal Rescue	Agricultural Program & Animal Rescue	To provide for the well-being of abused and abandoned animals, particularly farm animals, on a privately owned farm.	Founder and her mother started taking in stray and wounded animals that no one else would.
Community Gardens	Nutrition Education & Agricultural Program	To develop urban gardens and educate the public on the nutritional benefits of adding fresh, homegrown produce to their diets to help combat diseases such as diabetes.	Founder, a restauranteur, volunteered with NPOs, schools and churches to develop healthy eating programs and community gardens. NPO formed when she identified others who wanted to participate in her work.
Human Trafficking	Education & Human Services	To support and advocate for victims and survivors of sex trafficking, forced labor, and domestic servitude.	Founders are social workers and counselors who have worked with populations at risk of being human trafficking victims. NPO formed after their collaboration on a government task force.
Christian Development	Christianity & Urban Community Development	To bring hope through programs and services to meet the physical, spiritual, and social development needs of individuals and families in need to develop community.	Founders are pastor and wife of new inner city church. NPO is the companion organization designed to be able to attract resources beyond the church community.
Youth Baseball	Baseball & Softball	To cultivate the ideals of good sportsmanship, honesty, loyalty, courage and respect for authority in the children and community to develop better citizens.	Founder discovered that longstanding organization had lost its 501(c) (3) status due to administrative neglect. Recognizing it would be challenging to repair those issues a new NPO was formed to support existing league.
Law Enforcement	Mutual Benefit: Fraternities & Sororities	To support members by providing their families college scholarships and monetary assistance for a tragic event or terminal illness.	Founders are officers of a longstanding law enforcement agency social committee. NPO formed to gather and hold resources in a more formal and organized manner.

Starting with NPOs which had referenced a website or e-mail address on the initial 990 filed with the IRS, I began by contacting directors and officers with names appearing there in order to identify founders and early participants for interviews. Non-responses were first followed up in the same format and then by U.S. mail, recognizing that e-mail may be considered spam and not reach its intended target. I approached twelve organizations seeking interviews. Two organizations did not respond at all to the outreach described in this paragraph; one initially agreed to participate, but after consultation with its full board declined to participate citing over-commitment; a fourth initially agreed to interviews and then, due to material personnel changes, was unable to follow through on the commitment.

Data Collection

I began by interviewing one person affiliated with each of the eight organizations which responded to my outreach. I continued both by reaching out to other persons affiliated with the organizations as identified from public records and by contacting persons to whom interviewees referred me. I continued until I had at least forty interviews among the eight organizations. These interviews were intended to explore how and why persons come to form a nonprofit or participate in the early life of the nonprofit. Like Wuthnow (1995), I employed questions that are largely open-ended and designed so that respondents will be free to tell the story of the organizational emergence, his or her role in it. I used a semi-structured guided interview format employing a script to elicit the same type of information across subjects to facilitate comparison. (See Appendix A. p.182).

Preceding each interview, the subject was asked to provide written consent to the interview pursuant to IRB approval sought for this study (See Appendix B. p. 186). I conducted the majority of the interviews myself. The remaining interviews were conducted by an MBA graduate student employed in the nonprofit sector. With experience as a nonprofit and for-profit organization founder, I had a high level of confidence that I could direct the interviews in such a way that critical information would be elicited from each respondent. I did not anticipate, and largely, did not encounter, difficulty with access. Based on personal experience I have found that those involved in nonprofit formation are passionate about the undertaking and are eager to speak about it. This proved to be true in the conduct of my study as well**.** After each interview, my colleague or I asked the subject to complete a face sheet to obtain identifying and demographic information which I then coded and maintained separate from the interview to protect confidentiality (See Appendix C. p. 186).

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed so that I could code them using an inductive approach to allow the data to speak to the theories discussed herein. My colleague or I transcribed the first few interviews as a way of becoming familiar with the content to aid in the development of a coding scheme as well as to inform the conduct of the remaining interviews. Thereafter, I utilized a transcription services company for the remaining interviews. All persons assisting with these tasks were asked to and did execute a confidentiality agreement (See Appendix D. p. 187). Once the transcriptions were received, I reviewed them while listening to the audio recordings as a means of checking the transcripts for accuracy.

In preparation for the interviews, I reviewed public documents as background to obtain information about the respondent as well as the emerging organization. These included documents created by the organization including legal documents, websites, and social media. I also reviewed documents written by third parties about the subject organization or respondent, including also traditional and social media.

My colleague and I engaged in limited participant observation to obtain information about the founders, early participants and organizations. While it not realistic to be able to sociologically infiltrate the eight organizations, we learned about them through attendance at public events, such as, information sessions, public meetings, fundraising events and the like.

Data Analysis

Given the limited research on nonprofit organizational emergence at the level of the individual organization as detailed above, the multiple case study method which I use is particularly helpful in exploring organizational emergence. As in the study of learning activities (Liu and Ko 2012), case studies have been employed to understand dynamic processes. As Yin (2009) suggests, the multiple case study approach enables social scientists to examine real-life events in such a way as to permit them to generalize beyond what a single case study would permit. By using replication logic, the multiple case study helps in theory building when similar themes arise across the data generated from multiple cases or where similarities are anticipated, then diverge. Modifying a research approach suggested by Light (2005) who observed a lack of empirical work in this domain, my objective was to build careful records on each organization and its respective founder(s) and other participants. In order to infer patterns, my colleague and I developed codes while engaged in our initial data review. Examples of coded variables for founders and /or early participants included demographic information (for example age, gender, education, race, and income) as well as experiences and associations. Examples of coded variables for emerging organizations relevant to the analysis in this chapter included identified organizational challenges and strengths, the existence of participant reflections on leadership (and the potential for transition), the existence and observance of governance structures, and actual leadership transition. I used NVIVO 10 to organize and analyze data for analysis.

The stories of organizations are complex because they are the result of collaborations among individuals and other organizations as well as interaction with the physical, social, political and economic environment. Thus, to enhance the validity of the stories of organizational emergence, I triangulated the data using different sources and methods to compare and contrast the stories as told by documents, interviews and observations (Denzin 2006).

Results

For purposes of confidentiality, I refer to each individual respondent by an assigned pseudonym as set forth in Table 3 (Appendix E. p. 188). I refer to each NPO studied by its organizational pseudonym (also appearing in Table 3) derived from its predominant activity as set forth in Table 2 above.

By examining how emerging NPOs task and manage their volunteers, I find additional support for the proposition that volunteer participation and experience is similar across emerging NPOs, notwithstanding their different missions and activities. Also, such experience is different from that of volunteers in established NPOs as reported by the literature. I detail findings that such volunteers are not so much “trained,” “engaged” or “managed,” as they might be in an established organization, but rather trusted and enabled to make contributions that serve or shape the organization. Thus, they are retained (or not) through interpersonal relationships and social capital and their own continual assessment of the volunteer experience through these relational frames. I attribute this to the ongoing central roles of social capital and relationship at work in emerging organizations. The data provide validation for the theories of Stinchcombe and others that there is an important relationship between organizational maturity and survival as well as organization size.

My data show that the emerging organizations studied differ quite a bit in awareness of and efforts to develop common values, norms and structures -independent of personal relationship- capable of supporting each organization's survival and growth beyond the life or interest of the founder(s), that is, different experiences with the "routinization of charisma." It sets up the possibility for following the onward fortunes of these organizations to empirically examine in future whether this differential experience with the "routinization of charisma" may indeed be an indicator of organizational survival.

Engagement and Management- The Just Do It Approach: Do What It Takes and Do It Yourself

The majority of our interviewees either did not have prior volunteer experiences with any organization or, if they had prior volunteer experience, did *not* have similar translatable nonprofit-based training or experience.

- **No Organizational Training**

Not one of our volunteers indicated they had received any training from the emerging NPO for which he or she volunteers. Most indicated a belief that some prior personal experience or paid work experience prepared them for what they were doing on behalf of the new NPO. For example, virtually all our Youth Baseball respondents indicated that they had played ball themselves as youth or in school and that that prepared them to be a present day coach. Human Trafficking volunteers, most of whom are or were professionally employed as social workers reference that education and work as preparation for what they do on behalf of the organization.

Only a few respondents with previous experience volunteering with larger, mature NPOs such as the Boy Scouts, the Make-A-Wish Foundation, or Court Appointed Special Advocates

("CASA") shared that they received in-depth training from those organizations. Thus, it would appear that having the resources to provide training for volunteers is another way in which more established organizations differ from new organizations. While the exception, an illustration of how prior volunteer work and training has proved helpful for some in their present work with their new organization is provided by Evan of Youth Baseball. He spoke about his experience with the Boy Scouts,

> I learned both from Scouts and prior to taking the leadership position here that there seems to be a right way and a wrong way to do things. I was watching a lot of what I thought to be the wrong way [with Youth Baseball before re-organization]. I couldn't figure out why money was working the way it was, why we charged things the way we did, and it didn't make a lot of sense.

Based on his prior experience and training, Evan was able to identify a problem and had a sense of how to address it. Similarly, Cara of Animal Rescue shared how she has been able to apply what she learned from her prior volunteer experience with another nonprofit to benefit the emerging organization,

> I've learned a lot through [name of mature organization] functions what sort of certifications or licenses we'll need for things like the Chinese auction and that sort of thing. And, I've learned a lot about how to motivate volunteers and rope people in before they realize they've been roped in.

The majority of respondents however, much like the volunteers Herrmann (2011) observed, shared stories of how they were learning "on the job" in service of the emerging NPOs as discussed in the section which follows.

- **Learn By Doing**

Most indicated that they were “learning by doing” on behalf of the organizations, that is, identifying things that needed to be done and then figuring out how to do them even if it meant acquiring a new skill. Claire, founder of Community Gardens, referred to it as “on the job training.” Sarah of Pet Food Bank shared that “I actually learned how to bake while doing it [fundraising with her daughter Sandra on behalf of Pet Food Bank.]”

So how do these new NPOs operate and manage their personally networked volunteers? Brenda of Human Trafficking put it succinctly, “So, it is like, people do not understand… when you are not funded, you have to do that yourself.” In fact, we find evidence of Herrmann’s (2011) “DIY” approach across the organizations studied. DIY describes how nonprofit founders approach the work to be done and resources needed, but they also use that philosophy to manage others who want to help. Tim, a Pet Food Bank volunteer and spouse of one of the founders, characterizes the work he contributes in five succinct words, “whatever needs to be done.” So what does that entail? Jess, another founder, elaborates,

> They [the husband volunteers] do a lot of the heavy stuff. My husband is a landscape trimmer, and has run all over [XXX] County and even outside of [XXX] County to pick up big loads of food when someone has a big donation. We try to make sure we don’t say no [to any offers]. So my husband would go with his big truck. They also check bins, and we also have cash cans, so there’s a route that they do, [Tim] and [Adam], where they check the cans and the bins on a regular basis. Oh my goodness what else do they do? So much. My husband checks our PO Box once a week, he makes deposits, when I can’t get out. He works on the road so he has a lot of flexibility. So he’ll do deposits.

Pet Food Bank’s DIY management approach allows flexibility for volunteers to lend a hand when they are available to do so and in a way that plays to their interests and abilities. Most often contributions are sandwiched in between a busy personal and work-life. After Pet Food Bank’s

Melissa offered her services as volunteer, both founders Jess and Lauren were “ok” with Melissa taking charge of food packing, one critical component of the food distribution process. Melissa’s work schedule allowed her the time and availability to do this. Lauren shared,

> …she is off from work on Thursdays so she said that’s the day, ‘I’m going to do packing,’ so we said that’s great… she started packing probably 6 months ago and we’ve totally turned that over to her and that’s her thing.

Another early Pet Food Bank volunteer became engaged through contact with the pet store where Melissa works. It wasn’t the customer Sarah, but her daughter Sandra, who initially sought to volunteer. “She’s a little 8-year old dynamo… and her mom, they are very well off financially, and her mom has instilled in both of the girls that you need to give back.” Lauren shared her initial concern that they could not possibly incorporate the help of an eight-year-old. Yet unlike established organizations that are likely to turn away the help of a minor out of concern for potential liability (such as those established organizations that in fact turned away the help offered by Youth Philanthropy’s founder Leslie’s children) they found a way by simply accepting the help Sandra offered and was capable of executing. Thus, Sandra wrote Christmas cards to thank supporters and served as a one-girl fundraising committee by making and selling baked goods and sock puppets to raise money for Pet Food Bank. Once again, the volunteer was encouraged to work when able to do so and to do what fit her skill set.

Kevin, a volunteer for Youth Baseball alluded to the idea that everything can get done within their collective networks and the DIY nature of volunteer engagement and utilization when unexpected issues arise,

> It certainly makes things work for the better when something comes up, somebody can always say, ‘Look, I know this person. I can take care of it.’ You are always going to say, ‘Okay, great, it’s yours. Do it…We take as much help as we can get. Somebody says, “Hey, I can,” they are doing it.

Brad was quick to praise Youth Baseball founder Evan and his DIY leadership style which sets the tone for volunteer utilization and, ultimately, retention. Evan offered a quick vignette which shows how DIY works in practice and enhances volunteer engagement as well as their experience and retention,

> I remember playing Memorial Day and we had a parade and it was a big deal. There was barbeque. I said, 'One year we're going to do this.' I called over to the high school and they sent the band over and they played the National Anthem. We had people walking around and it was fun. People liked it. The next year, this woman's oldest child joined the league. She said, 'I know that this is kind of odd, but would you mind if I sang the National Anthem for opening day?' I said, 'If you want to volunteer to sing the National Anthem that would be great.' She said, 'I don't want you to think that I can't sing. I sung at Monmouth College and I sung at Lakewood BlueClaws Stadium. Do you want me to send you a tape?' I said, 'You don't know me from apples. If you're willing to stand on the mound with a microphone and sing without any background music, I don't care what you sound like. You've either got to be the ballsiest women in the world or you really can sing, and I'm banking on the second one.'

There was no tape, no "audition." Taking a risk and trusting in the competence of the individual who offers to help can lead to volunteer retention. This woman not only continued to sing for opening day, but went on to volunteer for Youth Baseball in other capacities. Taking the initial risk to form a nonprofit seems to be only the beginning of a series of risks the entrepreneurs may be willing to take in managing the organization.

Daniel of Christian Development shared his management philosophy developed from the way he was raised and his experience as the owner of a for profit construction business. "The truth of it is, everything is on the up and up and legal, but in our mind, we had the attitude of a hustler, we just did it, we figured it out and just did it." We saw that Daniel translated this approach for use in the nonprofit setting. He explains that if volunteers are hesitant to jump in because the work doesn't fit their personality type or their strong suit, he uses relationship to push the volunteers beyond themselves, to embrace the "pioneering" approach,

> 'I am not good with kids.' 'Well guess what? There are just 5 of us we're doing this and you're coming and you're gonna learn how to be good with kids'… or when we fix up houses, 'I am not in construction.' 'Well come on, I can show you how to put up dry wall in 10 minutes.' You just do it. It's about convincing people that it's' worth the discomfort in the end. Everything we do we have people step outside of their comfort zone and do things they think they can't do. He insists they 'just do it.'

Daniel went on to explain his own personal struggle in learning to grow out of his comfort zone. He spoke to us about starting from square one with no prior experience to take on fundraising and raising an entire budget. "You have to have… a pioneering attitude. You have to be willing to step back out of your comfort zone and just do what needs to be done." This DIY mentality of the individual volunteer contributes to the DIY nature of the NPO itself. We observe that when a pioneering attitude is held by the founder and leaders, it is contagious and the emerging NPO comes to embrace that attitude as its principal means of getting things done. Without the structures and processes that more mature organizations possess, NPOs get their work done by leveraging relationship, much like they did to identify and recruit volunteers in the first instance.

- **Shaping the Organization**

These new organizations are nimble, responding to and adapting as both need and opportunity are presented, even if that requires a shift in organizational focus or resource allocation. In the New Jersey county where the subject organizations are found, a natural disaster, Hurricane Sandy, barreled through the area in October 2012 wreaking havoc throughout. The storm displaced thousands of people, including residents of the county in which our emerging NPOs principally operate. The resulting need forced many of our emerging NPOs to refocus their day-to-day work. Pastor Sam of Christian Development explained that while not formed to provide disaster assistance, “When Sandy happened, both [the church] and Christian Development...we started receiving disaster relief teams.” In the context of Hurricane Sandy, Daniel offered a broader scope to the DIY theory and the shifting nature of an emerging NPO.

> We don’t pigeon hole ourselves into one specific area. Whatever the felt need of the community is, that is what we do. We’re getting better at being more agile to react to the problems as they change in the community… I know we have to be singular in our philosophy, but not in our activity. One of the things that helps us survive is to continually and willingly bend and change and do what needs to be done … Right before Sandy hit I wouldn’t have said we were a disaster relief, but a disaster hit and a disaster happened. I am not gonna go to somebody’s house and talk about anything else. They [unsuccessful NPOs] are too single minded in their activity – a perfect example is people send us clothes. We don’t do clothes. [People] just think, ‘you work with the poor you must need clothes.’ They have this whole thing set up for collecting clothes, boxing clothes, sending clothes but no one is asking for clothes. So if you’re fulfilling needs that aren’t needs, then you are not doing anything.

Pet Food Bank also adapted and changed to conditions after Hurricane Sandy. One of its volunteers, Melissa, took it upon herself to check with shelters to determine if they might be in need of pet food and other supplies. Lauren continued,

> She played a huge role in contacting shelters that were quickly set up in churches and schools. She was our contact person. She would say ‘I called these 8 townships; they all have a shelter space for people. They can use stuff.’

Founder Lauren told us that Pet Food Bank extended itself to help those who technically didn’t financially qualify for their program,

> There were people that probably had plenty in their bank accounts who suddenly didn’t have a house. So we were like, of course we’re going to ease your burden in one little area while you try to buy clothes for your family.

When extreme hardships fell on two clients, Pet Food Bank monetarily supported them and furnished information about a job at the local humane society, though providing that kind of support is outside of their domain. Lauren expressed a desire to include even more services in response to unmet need. “We want to try to provide as many ancillary services as we possibly can, beyond the food,” she said. “Our goal is to help with food and litter, but we would like it to go beyond that if we can.” She went on to identify one of those services may include connecting the constituents with pet friendly landlords. Both Pet Food Bank founders of admitted that if those ancillary services would require digging into their own, personal funds, they would,

> If somebody needs something and you know it’s not convenient to access the funds or for some reason it doesn't conform, then we’ll just reach in our pocket and just make things happen that way.

The organizations shift focus, not only in response to need, but also to opportunity. When a veterinarian who wished to remain anonymous offered to provide two complimentary spay and neuters per week, Pet Food Bank started quietly offering them to their clients, shifting some energy and focus as opportunity presented itself. One of its founders, Jessica, told us that she now considers offering this new service to be was one of the NPO’s greatest accomplishments, “We are extremely proud of incorporating that spay and neuter [service]; it really makes a difference.”

- **The Exception**

As in Chapter Two, Law Enforcement stands out as the exception. When work needs to be tasked and managed, the organization looks exclusively to the ranks of the law enforcement officers in the companion organization and “volunteers” them. When asked how Law Enforcement staffs its many fundraising events, Fred replied “You, you, you and you report there on that day." Once again, we see reliance on the paramilitary culture of the established companion organization for tasking and managing the "volunteers." Viewed another way, however, one might argue that even this is evidence of a use of social capital, that is, relationships built in the companion organization are called on to accomplish collective action on behalf of the new organization.

Having observed the DIY, opportunistic spirit of the new NPOs in action, I ask how those who join in the work experience and process the interaction. In the next section, I report on the second set of research questions and share findings on the volunteer experience, assessment and retention.

Experience, Process and Impact

When asked to jump in, do volunteers find satisfaction in the work undertaken, assigned and managed as it is in an ad hoc fashion? Does it align with the conclusions of Taylor, Mallinson, and Bloch (2008) based on their observations that the unstructured experience of volunteers at the gay rights activist organization was dissatisfying while the structured experience at no-kill cat shelter was rewarding?

For volunteers working with emerging NPOs, not knowing what will happen or where the organization might be going next does *not* evoke feelings of frustration or discontent; rather the new NPO volunteers describe a contagious excitement. Jack of Community Gardens put those feelings into words when he contrasted his experience with Community Gardens to his experience with the other established organization boards on which he serves,

> Unlike any other board that I'm on, there seems to be a kind of fun sense of not knowing where we're all going next, but we're all going to go there and do

> it, and kind of follow [Claire's] lead. And, then help her make it even better. So, she kind of comes out with an idea and I kind of feel like we lift her up on our shoulders.

The intense involvement seems to profoundly impact many of those who elect to help and influences their decision to stay involved and, for many, deepen the involvement. It would appear to inspire in them additional commitments of personal time and energy, elicit suggestions for enhancing organizational impact and persuades them to extend invitations to others to join in. This seems to be the case whether they are asked (or offer) to complete a task (such as helping to weed a garden for Community Gardens) or responsibility (such as raising money for Pet Food Bank). Ron, an early volunteer for Human Trafficking, acknowledged that career advancement was on his mind when he initially sought to volunteer, but that his motivation was not static; it has evolved based on his experience with the organization and relationships he has built in it and because of it,

> Well, at first, I think it [his involvement with Human Trafficking] was more related to my paid employment. We are required to do volunteer work in the local community. So I think that is the thing that really pushed me into this work. But as time has gone on, I have seen more and more that this is a huge need in our local community. So that has become a big motivating factor for me, just based on human suffering, social injustice, those types of things. But then as I have begun to get students involved here at the college, I have also noticed that there is a large degree of interest among the academic community, among the students themselves, to hear more about this issue, to work to address it, and that has been a big motivating factor for me, as well. So paid employment was motivation. Certainly, you know, the social justice issue and then the third one being the interest of the academic community and the students themselves.

In Ron's case, his involvement with Human Trafficking was enhanced by introducing it to his own workplace. He has helped build relationships and structures in his workplace that support

Human Trafficking's mission. This included helping students organize an extra-curricular club to raise awareness about the issue.

Pam of Pet Food Bank articulates how the volunteer experience really feels different in the emerging organization when compared to an established one even when, on the surface, it would appear that the task or approach is the same. When asked to speak about the nature of her involvement, she had this to say, about why she volunteers for Pet Food Bank,

> [I do it] just to be supportive to help them out. To help take some of the load off because I did realize that it was just the two of them… I can kind of join in and help them and be support, and try to help them figure out whatever problems they need solved. So usually I'll ask [Lauren], what do you need, or she'll ask me.

Then she made an explicit comparison of that experience to those she had with more established organizations,

> I find that a lot of organizations have a really hard time asking you for favors. I don't know why. I offered myself to [a local established animal organization]. They're like well, just come whenever. We had fostered cats [for them]. They're really busy, and I understand that they're just swamped with so many things. So if they want a volunteer to come in, just come in. It's hard to come in and say, I'm here. Use me, and for people to say, okay. I need you to do this, this, and this. I think when I talked to [Lauren] she kind of had an idea. This is what we need help with. And so I felt like, okay. I can do something here instead of being in the way [like at the other organization] because that's the worst, trying to feel like you're in the way when there's an organization that's running itself pretty well, but you can't kind of wiggle yourself in.

Carl of Community Garden explains that relationship keeps him connected to the organization. He explains,

> I'm happy to help [Community Gardens] with my expertise if I can because from what I've seen, it really does do good things …. I'm fairly skeptical and jaded when it comes to that stuff. I think, from a personal perspective, the whole non-profit status is oftentimes used in a way to benefit individuals who

> take salary. I would be the first one to remove myself from an organization if I saw that to be the case. I think I probably stayed with this one like I have, not only because I know everybody, but it is run on a small scale, the way I think it should be. I think a lot of times it's just total bullshit and I think this one has done well.

Also recognizing the capacity for impact out of chaos, Darla attributes that the excitement and potential for impact created by Animal Rescue's founder Lee as the reason she remains connected,

> I'm part of it because…I believe what she [Lee, the founder] has, has value to touch a lot of people's lives. [Lee] knows [Animal Rescue] has the value to help animals, but I think animals help people.

In sum, the emerging NPO volunteers experience unstructured and unplanned work as stimulating. It appears to both deepen their existing connections to others involved in the endeavor, including the founder, as well as the organization itself. In turn, it motivates them to draw others in to become involved with the organization. In this early phase, we see little sign of fatigue and frustration. Unstructured work appears be motivating and energizing. Challenges are anticipated and viewed as just another hurdle to be overcome. Thus, while unstructured work may be frustrating and dissatisfying to those volunteering for an established organization, such as those studied by Taylor, Mallinson and Bloch (2008), the emerging NPO volunteers appear energized by the potential opportunities to create value from opportunity, even if it means deviating from whatever was planned or stretching beyond apparent capacity. The experience of the volunteers in this study closely resemble those of the new arts organization volunteers Herrmann (2011) studied, notwithstanding different missions and activities. Based on the data, I think it fair to conclude that emergence as context is critical; what is frustrating in the large established organization is life-giving for and serves to shape the new NPO. That said, new organizations, if they survive, become those established organizations. How does that transition begin to take shape? In the next section, I report on the third set of research questions which explore evidence of transition.

Routinization of Charisma

The work of Weber and the leadership literature both recognize that no founder is immortal and that for the work of any individual to survive his or her lifetime or interest, there must be a transition or what Weber has coined “routinization of charisma” (1947). Given that the organizations are still relatively new, we look to see if the participants, founders and supporters alike are looking after the organization’s future, one that need not revolve around the founder(s). Here the organizations depart from that similar look and feel I have reported thus far. By comparing and contrasting the organizations, I see that some already have made strides toward planning for a future that need not include the founder(s); some are thinking about whether that is possible and investigating what might need to be done for such a transition; while for others, a future beyond the founder(s) does not appear to be on the radar and my interviews revealed no evidence of thinking or conversation around that possibility.

I have examined the data for evidence of: 1) conversations about organizational life beyond the founder; 2) governance or other organizational structures or procedures being used or developed; and 3) nonfounder leadership in evidence or expressions of openness to same. Based on the evidence which now follows, I place the organizations on a “routinization continuum” from low to high as summarized in Table 6 below (p. 164-65).

As an illustration of an organization rated low on the routinizing continuum, Pet Food Bank founders and adherents admit to having a three-person board (one person in addition to the two founders) only which meets infrequently and has no committees. These three persons shoulder the majority of the work as well as decision-making. When a prior board member pushed for additional funding and other activities, the founders and that individual parted ways because they already had too much on their plates rather than working through that suggestion as part of the organization's agenda. Community Gardens is similarly positioned. A board member describes why she works with Community Gardens.

> I always joke and say if [Claire] told me to walk naked down [the] Avenue I would probably do it because I would know she had her reasons. So, I would definitely say it's because of [Claire's] leadership. She was always somebody in business that I respected and admired. I knew that kind of being around here would inspire me and teach me things about business, just being in her presence.

Another echoes that sentiment, referring to the founder's vision and mission, not the organization at all,

> And I think that that represented exactly what [Claire] envisions the mission to be or [Claire's] mission is. And all of us are there to support her. I mean that is really what I see is we are all there to just support and help her achieve her goal. Like I said, I would do anything for her. I think she is amazing.

While acknowledging the influence of the founder, another board member Jack, acknowledges that in order for Community Gardens to be sustained, it will need to move beyond where it is and how it operates,

> [I]if there's a challenge coming, it would be to identify the goals. It was very much like [Claire] wants to do fun projects, but we have to create a non-profit to make that legit. So, those projects can really run the gamut.

Thus, even though Community Gardens is legally structured as a nonprofit with shared governance, Jack's comment betrays that in reality, it operates largely to support the individual founder's aspirations. He acknowledges that more is needed if it were to be able to function as an ongoing concern beyond the founder and to maximize its potential. For these organizations, if the founder(s) want to and can do it (or at least endorse it), it gets done. Otherwise, it does not.

An example of an organization I observed to be moving from low to high on the continuum is Animal Rescue. While the founder dominates the organization's business, she has: been open to a board member's suggestion that she explore how other organizations transition leadership from a founder; made a cross-country visit to another organization which has successfully made that transition; and attended a conference on organizational development. The founder and the board continue to be in conversations around this topic. Darla, the board member, shows awareness of the challenge and a willingness to help tackle it. She discusses steps they are taking, together with the founder, to attempt to address it,

> [T]he value… is created by Lee herself, so you can't replicate a person into a business that easily. Building a brand that people recognize bigger than her, I think, is going to be the biggest challenge because people love her, so then they love going there. If you've been there, she's out there four hours petting and loving animals, so that a pig and a turkey hang out together. Like, how do you create that sustaining, long-term that you can create an environment? You have to get people who also love animals, and can get a turkey and goat and a horse to all sit down for coffee. That's not simple. It's not easy, but you go there, and people love that. I think that's where as you bring programs in that's what's unique! So you could sell it right now, but how are you going to sell that in 20 years when she's not the body? So I think the biggest challenge that I foresee is to be able to figure out how to scale that into a real business. I mean. Brands do it all of the time. I just don't think it's that easy because of what she does to make it. I see that as the biggest issue going forward.

Others involved in Animal Rescue, not only recognize the issue, but credit Darla for taking on a leadership role in working to try to separate the organization from the persona of the founder and exploring whether (and if so how) routinization might be possible. Cara explains,

> [Darla] is her CFO I want to say. [Darla] is very good with like numbers and she's very focused. She's more of like a corporate mindset kind of a thing. What are our goals…because [Lee] just looks at the animals and whatever we can do to help the animals. Deana is more of like a big picture. What do we want to accomplish this year? ... [Lee] will get it done however she's got to get it done. If it's through her own personal funds, if it's through the [Animal Rescue] organization, whereas [Darla's] like no, we're going to make [Animal Rescue] viable and this is…thinking in a business sense, this is how we're going to do it.

In the case of Animal Rescue, there is evidence of others pushing back on the founder trying to be all things to all people, do all things and solve all problems. It opens up the possibility of developing other leadership, norms and structures. The exchange between founder Lee and Darla is what I describe as a moment of "trust transfer". Rather than permitting founder Lee to simply solve an identified problem with personal resources, she is trusting in the organization (systems and structures) to find a solution and is asking founder Lee to accept this. I submit that it is through this iterative process that routinization occurs and that the social capital embedded in the relationship between Lee and Darla is transferred to the organization.

An organization which I identified as falling in the middle of the routinizing continuum is Youth Philanthropy. The founder Leslie still dominates the day to day life of the organization and operates with only a small board of three (including the founder) which meets infrequently to "give her feedback only." Yet, she has created a structure for the organization so that much of the day to day activity is managed by other geographically-dispersed local volunteers. For example, while she may attend and help structure kick-off events to launch the giving season in other towns or states, the responsibility for recruiting and managing the leadership for and the work of dividing youth participants into teams is done locally by others. Because of the structure developed, she envisions that one day an executive director could be employed to take on her duties and manage the overall organization.

Founder Leslie, is aware of the central role she plays and acknowledges that “even though I am not great at giving up control, I do try to delegate.” She watches and assesses participant experience and motivation. She recognizes that, ultimately, the organization cannot be sustained (let alone grown) if a participant’s relationship and motivation is focused solely on her.

> [M]y personal kind of immediate challenge is how we are going to reach more kids down here. Because, I feel very strongly that I do not want anyone to be part of it as a team leader or as a kid who does not want to be. And, I do not want them to do it because they like me. I want them to do [Youth Philanthropy] because they want to. And, this year I saw like two of the older groups of kids, the, and my friend happened to be the team leaders. It was not a fun experience for them, and I do not want them to come back next year. So, I really do, and then I had some kids on my team, who I said to the parents, ‘You know what? You do not live around here. How about you getting teams?’ And, they said yes, and those were my teams who like had the most fun and did it, and they lived kind of all over. So, that is my personal goal as far as that goes.”
>
> And, then my challenge and goal is to figure out where I want [Youth Philanthropy’s], like how big do I want it to be. At what point am I going to make that decision. Do I just kind of close it down or stay quid pro or do I say, you know what, I am going to pull someone on as a paid staff, which changes the whole organization, you know.

While Leslie is beginning to acknowledge and personally struggle with issues of routinization and has developed some structures that facilitate delegation, there is not yet recognition that this is an organizational problem and that perhaps others should be brought into the conversation in a more meaningful way. This is reflected in her language (for example, “I want” not “we want”; “my personal…challenge” instead of “Youth Philanthropy’s challenge” or “our challenge”). Others recognize that Leslie has built a solid foundation for Youth Philanthropy, but more will be needed for the organization to be sustained and still refers to the operation by reference to the founder. Trisha says this, “I just think she is going to need help eventually if it continues to grow.”

Illustrative of an organization moving from middle to high on the continuum is Christian Development, the only one of our organizations with paid staff. While the founders are very much in evidence as leaders and volunteers, the day to day work is managed by the employed executive director who also serves as the organization’s president. The organization delivers much of its services with the assistance of partner churches who pay Christian Development to supervise youth volunteers on mission trips. Thus, structures have been developed to bring in people and resources that are not wholly dependent on the founders. Conversations are ongoing about mobilizing resources to bring on other paid staff. One of the founders, Sam, demonstrates his keen awareness of the issue, how difficult it is to tackle and the delicate balance to move the organization forward so that it moves beyond him,

> It is always which comes first, the chicken or the egg? So we need supporters and we need staff or volunteers in order to do any kind of program. But in order to get staff and supporters, you need to be doing a program. Do you follow me? In other words, if I say ‘Okay guys, help me do….’ Well, what are we doing? I am not doing anything yet because I need people. All right, well come back to me when you are doing something. Well, I cannot go do something by myself, like a tutoring program of 100 kids if I am by myself. I need a team. So that has been a big challenge of trying to balance. Kind of like building a plane in flight. While it is flying, you are putting it together. That is kind of how it has been. It is kind of crazy. It is a big challenge. You get people excited about what we are doing, and while we are not yet, we are not formal and going on all full cylinders yet. You get what I am saying? So it has been a balancing. It has been very hard.

An organization I place at the high end of the continuum is Youth Baseball. It operates with both a formal governance structure as well as through committees so that both power and responsibility for organizational activity is dispersed. The founder Evan well articulates the organizational structure, perhaps the only respondent from any organization able to do so. He is one of only a few to acknowledge that the governance structure is observed in any material way,

> There are ten Directors. There's a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, plus six other Directors. The Membership then is made up of those people that make six meetings. That number fluctuates. We've had as many as forty voting members or as little as two. The Board of Directors are responsible for financial decisions. If we're going to buy that golf cart that you were out in, that's a motion made and voted on by the entire membership. And then the Board makes the determinations as to how much money is going to be spent. That's the yin and yang to distribute the power as much as you can. That's the corporate structure.

Entire organizational functions are managed by persons other than the founder. There is a Baseball Director, a Travel Program Director, and a Snack Stand Director; all volunteers. The board meets on a regular schedule and makes organizational decisions. Board members must earn the right to serve. Evan explains,

> The way our bylaws are set up is that you need to make six meetings before you can get voting rights. Once you have voting rights in the organization, then you're eligible for a Board position. We have ten Board positions and they're split. You elect five every year. They are two-year seats, half and half. The odd number positions go on the odd year and the even number on the even year to try to provide some continuity across the Board. Sometimes the seats go unchallenged, but we don't have an empty seat.

While it may never desire to, or be in a position to employ staff, these structures make it possible for the founder to step aside and have someone else take on the reigns of leadership. The founder, Evan, who all Youth Baseball participants credit with the founding, is quick to point out that neither the founding was nor the operation of Youth Baseball is a one-man show. Asked about Youth Baseball's strengths, without hesitation he credits the team for the legal reorganization,

> [Our strengths are] [t]he ten people that sit up here. Without them, we wouldn't have launched. Without them, if I were to listen to our prior treasurer, we just keep going [as an entity which lost its tax-exempt status]. [Then] we can't get insurance, because we don't have a business entity. We pay taxes because we don't have a business entity. We wouldn't have launched.

Youth Baseball is the organization which has and observes the most structure and incorporates, in a meaningful way, the most people in leadership roles. Roles are defined in such a way that makes leadership transition possible. Youth Baseball is similar to the other organizations in that early participants were identified, recruited, tasked and managed via social capital. Subsequently, however, they are being persuaded by the founder to recognize the organization's norms, values, structures, policies and procedures as legitimate and to give transfer allegiance from individual relationship to the organization. This is another illustration of the trust transfer that I believe facilitates social capital of individuals becoming social capital of the organization. The organization can lose that trust as well (just as the precursor organization to Youth Baseball did) by failing to observe policies and procedures.

Table 6 below provides more detail about each organization's placement on the routinizing continuum.

Table 6. Observations of the Routinization of Charisma

Organization Pseudonym	**Level of Routinization**	**Observations**
Pet Food Bank	Low	• No conversation about organizational life beyond founders • Little evidence of governance or other internal organizational structures being observed or developed • No nonfounder leadership in evidence or openness to same
Community Gardens	Low	• No conversation about organizational life beyond founder • Little evidence of governance structures being observed or developed • No nonfounder leadership in evidence or openness to same
Animal Rescue	Low→Middle	• Beginnings of conversations and investigation of organizational life beyond founder • Some evidence of governance or other internal organizational structures being observed and developed • Some evidence of openness to nonfounder leadership
Law Enforcement	Middle	• Conversations and investigation of organizational life beyond founders • Some evidence of governance and other internal structures being observed or developed • Evidence of openness to nonfounder leadership, including some actual leadership transition
Youth Philanthropy	Middle	• Self-awareness of founder of limitations • Some evidence of governance or other internal organizational structures being observed or developed • Some nonfounder leadership in evidence in affiliated subsidiaries and parallel organizations
Human Trafficking	Middle	• Some conversations and investigation of organizational life beyond founders • Solid evidence of governance or other internal organizational structures being observed or developed • Evidence of openness to nonfounder leadership, including some actual leadership transition
Christian Development	Middle→High	• Solid conversations and investigation of organizational life beyond founders • Solid evidence of governance or other internal organizational structures being observed or developed • Some nonfounder leadership in evidence, including employment of staff
Youth Baseball	High	• Solid conversations and investigation of organizational life beyond founder • Solid evidence of governance and other internal organizational structures being observed or developed • Some nonfounder leadership in evidence

This continuum of the routinization of charisma from low to high, suggests a relationship between both organizational maturity as well as size, and evidence of the routinization of charisma. [3] I also observe that there also appears to be a relationship between size of the organization as loosely measured by the number of active participants and evidence of the routinization of charisma. This is consistent with more recent sociological theory on the routinization of charisma which suggests that the "power" to define a future for the organization beyond the founder really rests with the followers, rather than the founder(s); that as the number of participants grow, one can expect to see evidence of the development and use of governmental and other internal structures needed to sustain the organization.

These findings are consistent with those of Brüderl, Preisendörfer, and Ziegler (1992) based on organizational ecology theories which identify smallness as a liability. Also consistent with those results is my finding that imitator or follower organizations (those who are duplicating types of organizations relatively relevant) such as Youth Baseball (sports league), Christian Development (church service group) and Law Enforcement (police benevolent society) have made more progress toward routinization which I associate with better chances of survival. Given that virtually all of our organizations have a close relationship with another established organization (whether for profit, governmental or nonprofit), it is not possible for me to assess whether such affiliation may or may not be associated with better chances for survival.

Finally, I also considered whether human capital differentials might explain the progress toward routinization. Applying the measures used by Brüderl, Preisendörfer, and Ziegler (1992) to assess the stock of human capital (education, age, prior work history and entrepreneurial experience or exposure) and considering the general homogeneity of our NPO entrepreneurial

[3] Recall that in Chapter 2, I noted that both Youth Baseball and Law Enforcement have operations that are more mature notwithstanding that their IRS Rule Date is in the subject 2010-2012 time frame: Youth Baseball as a result of a new incorporation of a prior organization that lost its charitable status for failure to observe corporate formalities, filings and fee payments. and reporting and Law Enforcement which incorporated a longstanding program of a companion organizations.

actors (as discussed in Chapter 3 and as shown generally in Appendix E: Individual Respondents with Select Demographic Information by Organization), I am not persuaded that a difference in human capital (except as it is expressed in number of participants) offers a credible explanation of the difference observed in routinization.

Discussion

The data shared from this study reveal that emerging organization volunteers are principally tasked and managed through interpersonal relationships and they continually assess their experience through that relational frame. I attribute this to the heightened role of social capital at work in emerging organizations which calls, even compels, people not only respond to initial invitations to volunteer, but also to continuously recommit to the work as it is tasked and managed principally through relationship. Founders and leaders attract and task volunteers for instrumental purposes and volunteers comply as an expression of the value of the relationship. Because at the core of these relationships is the trust associated with social capital, the volunteers are largely permitted to define their roles and the particular tasks they choose to undertake.

In the nascent stage, NPOs may change (or alternatively resist changing) in order to accommodate, fit or develop an organizational identity. I see evidence of Herrmann's (2011) DIY theory at work within each NPO. Christian Development learned to embrace whatever supporters chose to bring it (such as clothes) consistent with its mission. Similarly, Pet Food Bank expanded its reach and mission by adding spay and neuter services. Youth Baseball showed us that by expanding its services, such as selling food from a golf cart field to field, it could generate more revenue for the NPO. These enhancements may have been imagined, but are unplanned, occurring as a result of being presented with an exciting opportunity or compelling need. This is consistent with the macro theories posited by Weisbrod (1986) and Salamon (1987) I discussed in Chapter 3.

While the NPOs studied have dramatically different founding stories, there is marked similarity in the way each tasks, manages and retains volunteers. The identities of these budding NPOs are neither static nor stagnant, but are being forged one relationship at a time. While each NPO has developed mission statements and objectives, their focus appears to be ever shifting as a response to what talents and services volunteers offer and to opportunities/needs that confront each NPO. This is the nature of the DIY theory, for as Herrmann (2011) observes, it is not really doing it yourself, but rather “a cooperative, communicative organizational endeavor” (p. 252). None of the organizations I studied is enabling or encouraging volunteers to go rogue, but rather is opportunistically advancing the organization by using volunteers’ given talents and interests. Simultaneously the NPOs are challenging volunteers to thrust themselves out of their comfort zones in order to both contribute to and help define the mission. Thus, the organization’s lived mission is ever-changing. It can include something that was never previously contemplated, such as natural disaster relief, which can enhance or compliment a pre-existing component of the organization. The change can be transient such as in response to a natural disaster (Christian Development’s hosting of relief teams as a result of Hurricane Sandy) or more permanent such as the incorporation of a proffered resource (for example, Pet Food Bank’s spay and neuter service). It plays out as a game of “negotiated space,” though not necessarily among macro forces as suggested by Chikoto and Halicki (2013). Instead, as discussed in Chapter 3, it is a way of utilizing, maintaining and deepening relationship, that is building and sustaining social capital. Having identified a space or niche, these nonprofit are finding ways to both maximize impact and define the organization by taking advantage of available resources whether in the form of people, services, money or space thus providing validation for those who would advance resource mobilization (McCarthy and Zald 1977) as a theory for emergence as well.

For most organizations though, there is a recognition by participants that “relationship tasking” cannot continue indefinitely if there is any expectation that the organization should outlive the interest or life of its founder(s) and leaders. The fledgling NPOs exhibit varying levels of evidence of the routinization of charisma. Some show evidence in thought, conversation and action that organization and structure will need to be put in place for it to be possible for the organization to survive the life or interest of its founder(s). Others are actively investigating avenues for transition. Some are laying the foundation for a structure that may help transition leadership. Still others already have such structures in place and have actually made leadership transitions. Yet there remain organizations which show no real evidence of any awareness or concern about whether there will be life after the founder(s) and perhaps, no desire or need for same. It gives one reason to think about “organizational failure” however, in a different light. If an organization is founded for the purpose of supporting the work and vision of an individual, does the organization “fail” when it has accomplished its purpose? If the individual no longer needs or wants the organizational support, perhaps due to death, disability or waning interest, perhaps it has succeeded by serving its intended purpose and should not be deemed a failure.

Of course, this research is limited to a small number of NPOs by design and by the qualitative nature of its design is subject to concerns about researcher subjectivity. Future research which more broadly surveys new organizations about plans or structures to facilitate leadership transition could deepen these findings and provide an invaluable resource to emerging nonprofits.

Conclusion

My research suggests that emerging NPOs are employing (and may need to be guided to further develop) different approaches to volunteer training, utilization, management and retention than more mature organizations. Their challenges and needs differ from more mature organizations as well. In that respect, context matters and nonprofit scholars and managers would do well to consider emergence as a context in crafting theories, pedagogy and policy that recognize the critical roles that social capital plays in emerging organizations. One size does not fit all. In particular, my research suggests that consultations with and coaching for nonprofits about the need to routinize charisma is critical. Encouraging the development and observance of formal structures that open up the possibility for leadership transitions in this context may help these fledgling organizations increase their likelihood of survival beyond the founder and avoid the liability of "newness" and "smallness" to which Stinchcombe (1965) and others suggest they may fall victim. Further research on techniques employed by new nonprofits to make this critical transition could be enormously helpful to countless other organizations facing the challenge of the future.

References

Aldrich, Howard E., and Martin Ruef. 2006. *Organizations Evolving*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications: London.

Bekkers, René, and Pamela Wiepking. 2011. "A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(5):924-73.

Bolton, Elizabeth B., and Lynda M. Spence. 2006. "A Study of Founders of Community Based Nonprofit Organizations: Implications for Extension Leadership Educators." *Journal of Leadership Education* 5(3):66-78.

Brüderl, Josef, and Rudolf Schussler. 1990. "Organizational Mortality: The Liabilities of Newness and Adolescence." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5(3):530-47.

Brüderl, Josef, Peter Preisendörfer, and Rolf Ziegler. 1992. "Survival Chances of Newly Founded Business Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 57(2):227-42.

Bryman, Alan. 1993. "Charismatic Leadership in Business Organizations: Some Neglected Issues." *The Leadership Quarterly* 4(3-4):289-304.

Carman, Joanne G., and Rebecca Nesbit. 2013. "Founding New Nonprofit Organizations: Syndrome or Symptom?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42(3):603-21.

Chikoto, Grace L., and Michael Halicki. 2013. "Contextual Factors and Negotiating Spaces: Exploring the Emergence of Nonprofit and Hybrid Voluntary Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 23(3):347-65.

Denzin, Norman. 2006. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Dorado, Silvia. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values So Different Process of Creation, No?" *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 11(4):319-43.

Friedland, William H. 1964. "For a Sociological Concept of Charisma." *Social Forces* 43(1):18-26.

Glaser, Barney G. 1992. *Emergence vs. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Gurov, Boris, and Emilia Zankina. 2013. "Populism and the Construction of Political Charisma: Post-Transition Politics in Bulgaria." *Problems of Post-Communism* 60(1):3-17.

Handy, Femida, and Laurie Mook. 2011. "Volunteering and Volunteers: Benefit-Cost Analyses." *Research on Social Work Practice* 21(4):412-20.

Herrmann, Andrew F. 2011. “Narrative as an Organizing Process: Identity and Story in a New Nonprofit." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* 6(3):246-64.

Hofmann, David C. 2015. “Quantifying and Qualifying Charisma: A Theoretical Framework for Measuring the Presence of Charismatic Authority in Terrorist Groups.” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 38(9):710-33.

Jermier, John M. 1993. “Introduction--Charismatic Leadership: Neo-Weberian Perspectives.” *Leadership Quarterly* 4(3/4):217-233.

Kenny Stevens, Susan. 2005. “A Call Taken to Heart: The Entrepreneurial Behavior of Nonprofit Founders.” *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader* 16(5): N.p.

Light, Paul C. 2005. “Searching for Social Entrepreneurs: Who They Might Be, Where They Might Be Found, What They Do.” Paper prepared for the 34th annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, November 17-18, Washington, DC.

Lin, Nan. 1999. “Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. *Connections* 22(1):28-51.

Lin, Nan, Karen S. Cook, and Ronald S. Burt. 2001. *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Liu, Gordon and Wai-Wai Ko. 2012. “Organizational Learning and Marketing Capability Development: A Study of the Charity Retailing Operations of British Social Enterprise.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(4):580-608.

Manning, Nick. 2013. *The Therapeutic Community Movement: Charisma and Routinization*. Routledge.

Marx, Karl. [1847] 1933. *Wage, Labour and Capital*. New York. International Publishers Co.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.” *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212-41.

Milosevic, Ivana, and A. Erin Bass. 2014. “Revisiting Weber’s Charismatic Leadership: Learning from the Past and Looking to the Future.” *Journal of Management History* 20(2):224-40.

Musick, Marc A., and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2012. Number of Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1999-2009. Retrieved May 23, 2016 (http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/PubApps/profile1.php).

Ostrom, Elinor, and T. K. Ahn. 2009. “The Meaning of Social Capital and its Link to Collective Action.” Pp. 17-35 in *Handbook on Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science, and Economics*, edited by G. T. Svendsen and G. L. Svendsen. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Paxton, Pamela. 1999. “Is Social Capital Declining in the United States? A Multiple Indicator Assessment.” *American Journal of Sociology* 105(1):88-127.

Petit, Valerie. (2012). “Like a Phoenix from the Ashes. A Weberian Analysis of the Charismatic CEO Routinization.” *European Management Journal* 30(6):510-22.

Portes, Alejandro. (1998). “Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.” *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24: 1-24.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital.” *Journal of Democracy* 6(1):65-78. Ruef, Martin, Howard E. Aldrich, and Nancy M. Carter. 2003. “The Structure of Founding Teams: Homophily, Strong Ties, and Isolation among U.S. Entrepreneurs.” *American Sociological Review* 68(2):195-222.

Salomon, Lester M. 1987. Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations.” Pp. 99-117 in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by W. W. Powell. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Saxena, Stuti. 2015. "Routinization of Charisma in Family-Run Firms." *Social Science Research Network*. Retrieved July 5, 2016 (http://ssrn.com/abstract=2699490).

Shah, Tanvi, and Zubin. R. Mulla. 2013. “Leader Motives, Impression Management, and Charisma A Comparison of Steve Jobs and Bill Gates.” *Management and Labour Studies*, 38(3):155-84.

Starr, Jennifer A., and Nanette Fondas. 1992. “A Model of Entrepreneurial Socialization and Organization Formation.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 17(1):67-78.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. “Social Structure and Organizations.” Pp. 143-93 in *Handbook of Organizations*, edited by J. G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Strauss, Anselm. 1988. “The Articulation of Project Work: An Organizational Process.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 29(2):163-78.

Taylor, Tiffany, Christine Mallinson, and Katrina Bloch. 2008. “‘Looking for a Few Good Women’: Volunteerism as an Interaction in Two Organizations.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37(3):389-410.

United States National Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. *Volunteering in the United States, 2015*. Report USDL-16-0363. Last Retrieved July 7, 2016 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm).

Wasielewski, Patricia L. 1985. “The Emotional Basis of Charisma.” *Symbolic Interaction* 8(2):207-22.

Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Economic and Social Organization,* translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Weisbrod, Burton A. 1986. “Toward a Theory of the Voluntary Non-Profit Sector in a Three-Sector Economy.” Pp. 21-44 in *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions: Studies in Structure and Policy*, edited by S. Rose-Ackerman. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilf, Eitan Y. 2014. *School for Cool: The Academic Jazz Program and the Paradox of Institutionalized Creativity*. Chicago: Univerisity of Chicago Press.

Wilson, John. 2000. “Volunteering.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215-40.

Wilson, John, and Marc Musick. 1997. “Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work.” *American Sociological Review* 62(5):694-713.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1995. *Learning to Care: Elementary Kindness in an Age of Indifference.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4th Edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Young, Dennis R. 1983. *If Not for Profit, for What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Young, Dennis R. 1985. *Casebook of Management for Non-Profit Organizations: Entrepreneurship and Organizational Change in the Human Services*. New York: Hawthorne Press.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The three empirical chapters of this dissertation each investigate different aspects of individual nonprofit organization emergence. All three papers demonstrate that emergence as context matters: that new organizations are collaborative, the work of entrepreneurial teams and not the individual maverick; and that the process is neither elegant nor executed pursuant to a well-conceived blue print or business plan. Rather, organizational foundings are messy and iterative, developing by virtue of the team's stock of social capital which facilitates access to opportunities and resources.

In the introductory (Chapter 1) I position this research by detailing the importance of the nonprofit "third sector" of our economy and its history. I argue and show how nonprofits ("NPOs") are increasingly important as a driver of the United States' economy and function as keepers of both community and societal welfare. As such, they are worthy of further study.

In the first empirical paper (Chapter 2) "Beyond the Founder: Exploring the Use of Social Capital in Emerging Nonprofit Organizations to Identify, Recruit and Motivate Volunteers," I review the literature of voluntarism and organizations, including that on founders, leaders and volunteers of NPOs. Consistent with suggestions in the literature I argue that context is an important determinant in understanding the life of a nonprofit and that there are important differences in the characteristics of these fledgling organizations and their more established nonprofits. Perhaps the most important is the critical role social capital--the accumulation of legitimacy and trust across social interaction—plays in how participants are identified, recruited and motivated throughout the process of establishing an NPO. This process routinely relies on a continuous infusion of volunteer labor, charitable gifts and goodwill for sustenance which their social capital helps to deliver. In fact, volunteers typically constitute the entire workforce of the new NPO.

My data suggest that emergence as context is fertile ground for further study and that there may be other important differences between emerging and established organizations. Discovering and fully appreciating these differences should influence how we train and advise nonprofit practitioners in context, fashion policy, and formulate regulation applicable to these organizations, including whether we even devote limited societal resources to encourage new organizations (and if so which ones and how) or rather use those resources to buttress established organizations doing important work. As an illustration, there are some who would discourage efforts to form new nonprofits based on the argument that the sector is already under pressure with access to limited and shrinking resources. They maintain that new nonprofits likely to fail and thus only squander such resources. My research suggests that these new organizations are reaching and involving people who are disenfranchised by existing nonprofits in some way and are bringing in new resources that would otherwise sit on the sidelines; that the pie grows and more are served as a result of these efforts even if they succumb to the liability of newness or smallness as discussed in Chapter 4. Thus, it may be wise to make information about two to start and manage a new nonprofit more available. One way this could be done is through societal support of nonprofit centers to provide education and access to the expertise needed to begin at little or no cost.

The second paper (Chapter 3) "Nonprofit Entrepreneurship: A Qualitative Study of Emerging Organizations" showed that emerging nonprofit organizations share important characteristics with their for-profit counterparts as reported in the entrepreneurship, management and organizations literatures. Similar to their for-profit brethren, my data show that new nonprofits are the work of entrepreneurial teams: 1) homogenous groups comprised of 2) spouses and kin which 3) organize in intimate or virtual space and 4) prioritize social and psychological well-being over mission (the for-profit counterpart of material gain). These data provide strong support for using relational demography as a framework for understanding all entrepreneurship—whether of the for-profit or nonprofit variety. The data contribute to the growing evidence that organizational founding is not the work of the individual maverick striking out on his or her own, but rather the work of persons who have and are prepared to leverage their own social capital in support of the endeavor and eagerly invite others to do the same.

I observe a close connection between many of the start-ups studied here and other organizations, consistent with institutional theories as supported by existing research. In two cases, for-profit businesses owned and operated by the nonprofit founder provide critical support for each of the new endeavors. My data validate the cautions of those who observe that over-emphasis on the individual founder(s) ignores critical processes associated with organizational emergence. On close examination, organization emergence appears to result from a creative, highly socialized, and iterative process and not as a consequence of business planning. The founding teams of such organizations appear to be motivated by a desire or need to gather and deploy resources in support of such an endeavor (consistent with resource mobilization theory), principally relying on social capital to do so.

Conceptualizing emergence as a product of means, motive and opportunity integrates existing theories that seek to explain how and why new organizations—whether for-profit or nonprofit—emerge. It accounts for structural (such as economic, human, social and political capital), agency (such as individual ignition and driver) and contextual influences (such as context). Future research which continues to explore the parallels between for-profit and nonprofit start-ups is likely to yield information that will help us better understand entrepreneurship in both domains and assist in developing pedagogy and policy that promote entrepreneurship. A focus on emergence as context may be key to that research. Once we acknowledge that organizations behave differently in the process of emergence and study that behavior, researchers may help identify that which characterizes successful organizations from those which perish. Such information can be used to promote and encourage the adoption of practices associated with success and inform both teaching or policy formation. My research suggests that simply teaching about and promoting best practices of established organizations which operate differently from those just getting started may not aid in organizational development.

The final paper (Chapter 4) "Emerging Nonprofit Dynamics: Relationship as Manager, Iterative Imprinting and the Routinization of Charisma" reveals another role for social capital in the new organization's operations, that is how work is tasked and managed. This finding demonstrates just how pronounced the role of social capital is in the new organization. It addresses disconnects in the voluntarism literature by shedding light on how disorganized work in an unstructured environment can be creative and life-giving in the process of organizational emergence but frustrating and unsatisfying when encountered in work for a mature organization. It examines micro processes which may help us understand why new organizations are susceptible to the liability of "newness" and "smallness" identified in the literature as associated with organizational failure.

Using the Weberian concept of the routinization of charisma, the data reveal that progress toward leadership transition and the development of policies and structures to encourage and support such transitions is different across these organizations. I examine how each organization's efforts are associated with this important work; work that I argue is critical to the possibility of leadership transition and an organizational life not necessarily centered on the NPO founder(s). I identified moments of "trust transfer" that I believe are the mechanism by which social capital of the individual (founders and followers alike) is transfused into the organization offering a possible explanation for a lingering question in the literature, that is, how social capital can be both individual and organizational property. These "trust transfers" are interactions among founders and others in which persons are encouraged to let the organization policies, structures and actors solve problems and not to resort to the use of personal reserves for doing so.

While I used theory and the existing academic literature to guide my research design, my approach is more aligned with that of the grounded theory and its associated methodology, I have been open to letting the systematic analysis of the data inform my further theoretical development, recognizing that data collection and theory building are likely to proceed go hand in hand. Notwithstanding, and based on my review of the literature, I worked with (and my data support) these dominant themes found in the academic literature which connect the three empirical papers.

<u>Macro Level:</u> Nonprofits Emerge as a Result of *Systemic Influences*: The work of Salamon and others tell us that there is likely a relationship among government, the market economy and nonprofits and that the emergence of nonprofits is a result of failure, that is, nonprofits are called forth to provide a service or advocate for a real need where neither the economy or government are meeting such need. The data show that when would be entrepreneurs identify gaps in service or opportunities, nonprofit initiatives are formed and shaped by them. That a government task force formed address issues of human trafficking brought together the persons who would go on to found Human Trafficking is illustrative of this point. Through participation in the task force, the founders observed that government did not have the programs or structures to address critical aspects of this growing social problem.

<u>Contextual Level</u>: Nonprofits Emerge from O*rganizational Tension*. I anticipated and found support for the proposition that organizations give birth to other organizations. I expected that founders and early adherents choose to found nonprofits when existing nonprofits fail to provide support for the ideas and visions of the prospective nonprofit founder or when persons believe that an independent organization will be a better steward of the work. An illustration is the experience of Law Enforcement. Its founders separately incorporated the activities of a law enforcement agency's social committee in order to perpetuate its existence and expand its operations as well as to maximize its legitimacy and participant accountability.

Meso Level: Nonprofits Emerge as A Result of *Social Capital Deployment* and Shared Group Processes. Without access to networks characterized by trust and association, nonprofits do not emerge. Nonprofits are the work of groups, not individuals. Fundamentally, social capital rather than financial capital is used to corral resources and access expertise. Every one of the nonprofits studied show heavy reliance on social capital.

Micro Level: Nonprofits Emerge as an Expression of *Interpersonal Experiences.* At this level, I document how nonprofit formation is a profoundly personal experience, that is, that nonprofit founders and early participants form organizations as a means of self-expression, that is to create value; expand or construct social networks; in response to an invitation; or support or solidify existing relationships of trust among a group. Had Claire of Community Gardens not encountered persons at her restaurant wanting to support (in a substantial way) the volunteer work she was doing in the community, she may have been content to simply continue her work on a different scale without the benefit of the nonprofit she founded to support it. Further, the data reveal that these entrepreneurs have been socialized to take on such roles. Most have experience starting a for-profit business or have been exposed to entrepreneurship through family.

While I believe this study provides important contributions to the identified literatures, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that the results are based on a small, purposively drawn sample. Additional research is needed to determine whether the results might be generalized. I also acknowledge that using the IRS Rule date as the proxy for organizational origin is an imperfect one since some organizations, especially those the product of legal re-organization or those that are derivative of another organization may have been operating long before the IRS Rule Date as was the case of Youth Baseball and Law Enforcement. This too makes the comparisons less than ideal. Finally, I acknowledge that this study, like all qualitative research in which the researcher is closely and deeply engaged with her subjects, is subject to potential bias in the collection of data as well as the interpretation and presentation of the results.

In summary, this study provides insight into how volunteers are identified, recruited and motivated by new nonprofits. It offers additional insights that are helpful for mediating among competing theories of organizational emergence and understanding new organization failure as a foundation for onward theory development which accounts for role of social capital. I use the term “mediating” because there are aspects of most theories (resource dependency, institutionalism, relational demography, shared social processes, human capital, organizational ecology, and such) that are compelling, but insufficient standing alone.

By studying what organizational founders are attempting and doing, on a practical level, I believe these results give real world guidance to others engaged in or contemplating establishing a nonprofit, including the importance of strong reserves of social capital for deployment, particularly in a relatively depressed economic region. Such information has the potential to be useful to local and state government, institutions, and businesses seeking to collaborate to bolster regional economies. It also has implications for what we teach about nonprofit organizations and their management, in particular that emergence as context matters. Indeed, one size does not fit all.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Emerging Nonprofit Interview Script   Subject: Interview ______________

1. I'd like to know a little bit about you and your background.
    a. Where are you from?
    b. What did your parents or guardians do for a living?
    c. Was either of your parents or other family members involved in philanthropy, charitable organizations, or volunteering?

2. Tell me about the kinds of work (paid or unpaid) you have done/are doing.

3. Before your involvement with Organization X did you have experience with charitable groups or organizations or volunteering in general?
    a. Training?
    b. Tell me a little about these experiences.

4. Have you ever been involved in founding another organization?
    a. Tell me about your experiences with that organization.
    b. To what extent, and how, did your previous experience help you in founding Organization X?

5. Now I'd like to know a little bit about the formation of Organization X.
    a. Can you tell me the story of how Organization X came to be formed? (Probe for when and when and how did the idea for Organization X came to be.)
    b. What led *you* to become involved in forming Organization X?
    c. How would you describe your motivation for founding Organization X?
    d. What was your role in the formation of Organization X?
    e. What role did others play in forming Organization X?
    f. Org X is incorporated with 501 (c) (3) status. Why?
    g. How did you know/learn to do that?

6. What kinds of activities have you participated in connection with founding Organization X?
    a. What kinds of personal resources (time, money, etc.) have you made available in the process of founding Organization X?

b. To what extent have you or the other founders used personal connections in founding Organization X? (probe for getting others in leadership roles, volunteering, fund raising)

7. Were others involved in founding Organization X?

a. Who are they?
b. What role did they play?

8. Are persons now involved in Organization X?

a. How did you (and/or others recruit persons to become involved in Organization X? (Probe for recruitment of officers, board members, donors or volunteers)

9. Now I'd like to know a little about Organization X.

a. What is its official mission? (ask for mission statement)
b. What are its goals?
c. Can you tell me a little about the organization of Organization X? (Board of Directors, org chart).
d. What are the major activities and services of Organization X?
e. Where can it be found? (office, virtual space, etc.)
f. Where does its work take place?

10. Does Organization X have any organizational partners?

a. Could you tell me about the relationship? (probe for who does what for whom; why it was formed, etc.)

11. All organizations face challenges in getting off the ground and continuing to provide services.

a. What are the major challenges organization X has faced getting off the ground?
b. And continues to face (probe for funding, participation, recruitment and retention of volunteers)

12. Not all organizations manage to "launch."

a. What would you consider to be Organization X's strengths?
b. And accomplishments?

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with me that my questions may not have covered?

APPENDIX B
STUDY CONSENT FORM

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Principal Investigator: Karen Reardon, MA, JD, Doctoral Candidate in Sociology,

University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Renee Anspach, Associate Professors of

Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study

Karen Reardon, together with her faculty advisor Dr. Renee Anspach invite you to participate in a research study about how and why nonprofit organizations emerge and the resources people employ to aid in their launch. The study is funded by in part by the University of Michigan Center for Nonprofit and Public Management.

Description of Subject Involvement

If you agree to be part of the research study, you will be asked to submit to a recorded interview of approximately 1 hour in duration conducted by Karen Reardon.

Benefits

There is no direct benefit from being in this study however because the published findings may inform you about how and why persons are working to establish nonprofit organizations such knowledge may assist you in your further work.

Compensation

No compensation is provided for participation in this study.

Confidentiality

We plan to publish the results of this study, but will not include any information that would identify you. There are some reasons why people other than the researchers may need to see information you provided as part of the study including the organizations responsible for making sure the research is done safely and properly, including the University of Michigan, government offices or study sponsors. Such persons will be asked to keep the information confidential.

Storage and future use of data

The data you provide will be stored in the principal investigator's office, on her personal computers (including flash or thumb drives) and in space allocated to her on the University's computer system. The researchers may retain the data for a period of ten (10) years to permit follow-up with you in future on the subject matter addressed in the interview. At or before that time, the researchers will dispose of the individual data provided by your interview by shredding any non-public paper copies of interview notes, transcriptions or recordings and deleting such individual information maintained in computer files. Should the data be made available to other researchers for other studies following the completion of this research study, such data will not contain information that could identify you.

Voluntary nature of the study

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Even if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. You may decline to answer any question posed for any reason. If you decide to withdraw from the study, please do so by writing to the principal investigator.

Contact information

If you have questions about this research you may contact Karen A. Reardon by e-mail at reardonk@umich.edu or by phone at 312-315-7211 and/or her faculty advisor, Renee Anspach (ranspach@umich.edu..

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact the University of Michigan Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board, 540 E Liberty St., Ste 202, Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2210, (734) 936-0933 or toll free, (866) 936-0933**.** irbhsbs@umich.edu.

Consent

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in the study and give consent for your interview to be tape-recorded. You will be given a copy of this document for your records and one copy will be kept with the study records. Be sure that questions you have about the study have been answered and that you understand what you are being asked to do. You may contact the researcher if you think of a question later.

I agree to participate in the study.

____

Printed Name

______________________________________   ____________________

Signature   Date

I agree to be re-contacted in future for follow-up but understand that if contacted, I may decline further participation at that time.

____

Printed Name

______________________________________   ____________________

Signature   Date

APPENDIX C
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION EXIT SHEET

Emerging Nonprofit Project
Karen A. Reardon
Interview Exit Form

Code: ____________

1. Gender: male female other
2. Race/ethnicity? ____
3. Age? _____________________
4. Education? _________________
5. Religion? _____________________ Active? Yes No
6. Political affiliation? ____
7. Social class: Belong to? ____

   Identify with? ____
8. Annual household income? ____
9. Household assets? ____
10. Marital Status? ____
11. Children? Number? Ages? ____

APPENDIX D
CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

Confidentiality Agreement

Principal Investigator: Karen Reardon, MA, JD, Doctoral Candidate in Sociology, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Renee Anspach, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Provision of Services in Connection with a Research Study

The undersigned has agreed to provide research and/or transcription services for a fee or for academic credit in connection with a study being conducted by Karen Reardon, together with her faculty advisors Dr. Renee Anspach and Dr. David Harding, about how and why nonprofit organizations emerge and the resources people employ in their launch. The study is funded by in part by the University of Michigan Center for Nonprofit and Public Management.

The following information has been or will be provided to study participants:

> **"Confidentiality**
>
> We plan to publish the results of this study, but will not include any information that would identify you. There are some reasons why people other than the researchers may need to see information you provided as part of the study including the organizations responsible for making sure the research is done safely and properly, including the University of Michigan, government offices or study sponsors. Such persons will be asked to keep the information confidential."

Further, in order to protect information shared with you in connection with the services you will provide, you are asked to transmit your work and other communications regarding the study only through secure networks.

By signing this document and consistent with the representations made to study participants,

you agree to keep confidential any and all information shared with you about this research project and that you have asked any questions pertinent to this representation signing this document and providing any such services.

I agree to keep confidential all information provided to me in connection with this study.

______________________________ Research Assistant or Transcriptionist

Printed Name (Circle applicable role(s))

______________________________________ ____________________

Signature Date

APPENDIX E
TABLE 3

Table 3. Individual Respondents with Select Demographic Information by Organization

Organizational Affiliation Pseudonym	Person Pseudonym	Founder	Sex	Age	Education	Employer	Marital Status
Animal Rescue	Lee	Yes	F	40-49	College	Self	Divorced
	Lilly	No	F	40-49	Some college	Govt	Married
	Darla	No	F	40-49	College +	Other: For-profit	Single
	Cara	No	F	30-39	College	Other: For-profit	Married
Christian Development	Daniel	No	M	30-39	Some college	Self & NPO	Married
	Sam	Yes	M	40-49	College +	Other: NPO	Married
	Jane	No	F	30-39	High school	Other: NPO	Married
	Maria	Yes	F	40-49	High school	Other: For-profit	Married
Community Garden	Claire	Yes	F	50 +	College +	Self	Widowed
	Julie	No	F	40-49	College +	Govt	Married
	Bill	No	M	50 +	College	Self	Married
	Mimi	No	F	40-49	College +	Govt	Widowed
	Carl	No	M	50 +	College +	Self	Divorced
	Jack	No	M	50 +	College	Other: For-profit	Single
	Lila	No	F	40-49	College	Self	Single
Human Trafficking	Brenda	Yes	F	30-39	College +	Govt	Divorced
	Tessa	Yes	F	50 +	College +	Retired-Govt	Divorced
	Ron	No	M	30-39	College +	Govt	Married
	Jenny	Yes	F	50 +	College	Other: NPO	Partnership
	Grace	No	F	40-49	College	Govt	Married
	Cliff	No	M	40-49	College +	Self	Married
Law Enforcement	Richard	No	M	40-49	College +	Govt	Married
	Fred	Yes	M	30-39	College	Govt	Married
	Bev	No	F	30-39	College	Govt	Married
	Joyce	No	F	40-49	College	Govt	Married
	John	Yes	M	40-49	College	Retired-Govt/Self	Married
Pet Food Bank	Lauren	Yes	F	40-49	College +	Other: For-profit	Married
	Jess	Yes	F	40-49	Some college	Other: NPO	Married
	Melissa	No	F	30-39	College	Other: For-profit	Married
	Tim	No	M	50 +	High school	Unemployed	Married
	Sarah	No	F	40-49	College +	Homemaker	Married
	Pam	No	F	40-49	College +	Govt	Married
Youth Baseball	Stan	No	M	40-49	College	Other: NPO	Married
	Kevin	No	M	50 +	Some college	Other: For-profit	Married
	Brad	No	M	30-39	College	Self	Married
	Evan	Yes	M	40-49	College +	Govt	Married
Youth Philanthropy	Leslie	Yes	F	40-49	College +	Homemaker	Married
	Louisa	No	F	40-49	College	Other: NPO	Married
	Ashley	No	F	40-49	College +	Govt	Married
	Trisha	No	F	40-49	College +	Govt	Married