

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

---

6-7-2023

# The Factors Contributing to the Resilience of Thailand's Social Welfare Nonprofit Organizations Since the Onset of the Country's Prolonged Political Crisis in 2005

Narttana Sakolvittayanon  
*Portland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open\\_access\\_etds](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds)



Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Public Administration Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

## Recommended Citation

Sakolvittayanon, Narttana, "The Factors Contributing to the Resilience of Thailand's Social Welfare Nonprofit Organizations Since the Onset of the Country's Prolonged Political Crisis in 2005" (2023). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 6409.  
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.3554>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

The Factors Contributing to the Resilience of Thailand's Social Welfare Nonprofit  
Organizations Since the Onset of the Country's Prolonged Political Crisis in 2005

by

Narttana Sakolvittayanon

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
Public Affairs and Policy

Dissertation Committee:  
Bruce Gilley, Chair  
Kevin Kecskes  
Grace Chikoto-Schultz  
Maura Kelly

Portland State University  
2023

© 2023 Narttana Sakolvittayanon

## Abstract

Since 2005, nonprofit organizations in Thailand, a transitive country, have experienced survival challenges due to social, economic, and political changes. This study aims to explore the organizational attributes of nonprofit organizations in Thailand that contribute to resilient capacity, which is an ability to survive and continue providing goods and services to fulfill missions when facing challenges. The research questions of this study are *what factors have affected the resilience of social welfare nonprofit organizations in Thailand since the onset of the country's prolonged political crisis in 2005? And to what extent do theories of nonprofit resilience in advanced liberal democracies explain or fail to explain cases like Thailand in the emerging context?* This study employed a qualitative multiple-case study, which involves documentary research, in-depth interviews, and surveys of leaders from 15 nonprofit organizations in Thailand. The case studies demonstrate that organizational attributes in achieving resilience are highly interrelated and context-dependent. Only nonprofit organizations with a specific set of organizational attributes as pre-conditions such as transformational and governance leaders, successfully implement strategies suggested in the existing literature. In addition, not all strategies for resilience developed in the context of advanced liberal democracies are applicable to Thailand's transitional context. In conclusion, this study suggests that context-specific pathways and strategies are the best way to understand nonprofit resilience.

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this dissertation to my dear family. Special feelings of gratitude to my parents, Tanee and Narttussana Sakolvittayanon, who always love, support, and inspire me. And to my beloved sister, Tananart Sakolvittayanon, who shares my happiness and tears.

## **Acknowledgments**

Completing a doctoral degree has been a long and challenging journey. I am so blessed to receive lots of support along the way. Therefore, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge those who assisted me. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor and chair committee member, Dr. Bruce Gilley, who always supported and guided me through my doctoral pursuit. I also would like to extend my sincere appreciation to my dissertation committee: Dr. Grace Chikoto-Schultz, Dr. Kevin Kecskes, Dr. Maura Kelly, and my former committee, Dr. Marcus Ingle, for devoting their invaluable time to motivate, comment, and advise me.

I am extremely grateful to the leaders of the nonprofit organizations in Thailand who shared their experiences and insights with me. My special thanks to Karen Popp, for encouraging me to pursue my doctoral degree at Portland State University. Many thanks to my seniors, classmates, and friends at Portland State University, especially Dr. Sirisak Laochankham and Thitisak Duadsuntia, for their valuable suggestions and support. Thanks should also go to Yanika Tinaphongs and Carla Edith Jimena for their great amount of assistance and willingness to check in with me. I also wish to thank Natanee Thawesaengskulthai for being the best Ph.D. buddy.

My heartfelt thanks to my family who continue to stand beside and support me through every step of my life. I am deeply indebted to my parents for providing me the opportunities to pursue my Ph.D. degree. I am thankful to my sister, Tananart Sakolvittayanon, for always being there for me. Without support from all of the above-mentioned people, I would not have been able to successfully complete my Ph.D. degree at Portland State University. Khob khun ka [Thank you].

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
List of Tables .....	vi
List of Abbreviations .....	vii
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Nonprofit Organizations in the Emerging Frame .....	1
1.2 Nonprofit Organizations in Thailand .....	3
1.2.1 History of the Nonprofit Sector in Thailand .....	5
1.2.2 Challenges of Nonprofit Organizations in Thailand .....	9
1.3 Purpose of the Study .....	11
1.4 Research Questions .....	13
1.5 Structure of the Dissertation .....	13
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review .....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Definition and Conceptualization of Resilience .....	15
2.2 Operationalization of Resilience .....	17
2.3 Explanations of Resilience.....	18
2.3.1 Open System Perspective .....	18
2.3.2 Benefits Theory .....	24
2.3.3 Resource Dependence Theory .....	28
2.3.4 Other Literature on Organizational Resilience .....	29
2.4 Conceptual Framework .....	35
<b>Chapter 3: Research Methodology .....</b>	<b>37</b>
3.1 Research Design .....	37
3.2 Case Selection .....	38
3.3 Data Collection .....	40
3.3.1 In-depth Interview .....	40
3.3.2 Survey .....	42
3.3.3 Documents .....	43
3.4 Data Analysis .....	43
3.5 Description of Case Organizations and Key Informants .....	46
<b>Chapter 4: Discussion of the Findings .....</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1 Challenges of Thai Nonprofits .....	52
4.1.1 Challenges due to Economic Changes.....	52
4.1.2 Challenges due to Social Issues .....	53
4.1.3 Challenges due to Political Changes .....	55
4.1.4 Challenges due to Information Technological Changes.....	56

4.2 Organizational Attributes Promoting Resilience.....	57
Attribute #1: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Implement Strategies to Gain Support from Their Environment .....	58
Attribute #2: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Have Sources of Revenue Consistent with the Types of Services They Provide and Their Beneficiaries .....	67
Attribute #3: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Manage Their Resource Dependencies on Other Organizations .....	70
Attribute #4: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Have Assets, Processes, and Leaders to Manage External Shocks .....	80
4.3 Summary of the Findings .....	90
4.4 Limitations and Future Research .....	93
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusion and Discussion .....</b>	<b>96</b>
5.1 Discussion .....	96
5.1.1 Open Systems .....	96
5.1.2 Benefits Theory .....	98
5.1.3 Resource Dependence .....	99
5.1.4 Organizational Resilience .....	101
5.2 Implications and Recommendations .....	104
5.3 Dissemination of Results .....	104
<b>References .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A. List of Keywords for Excluding Nonprofits in Other Categories from Social Service .....	122
Appendix B. Recruitment Letter .....	125
Appendix C. Recruitment Letter (in Thai) .....	126
Appendix D. Interview Guide .....	127
Appendix E. Interview Guide (in Thai) .....	129
Appendix F. Informed Consent Form .....	131
Appendix G. Informed Consent Form (in Thai) .....	135
Appendix H. Survey Form .....	138
Appendix I. Survey Form (in Thai) .....	140



## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Organizational Attributes Based on Theories .....	35
Table 2: Description of the Cases and Key Informants .....	47
Table 3: Case Organizations' Perceptions of Resilience Levels .....	51
Table 4: Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #1 .....	66
Table 5: Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #2 .....	69
Table 6: Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #3 .....	79
Table 7: Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #4 .....	90
Table 8: Comparison Between Main Claims of the Existing Literature and Findings Based on the Case Studies in Thailand .....	103

### **List of Abbreviations**

ADB	Asian Development Bank
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
NESDC	Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council
NSO	National Statistical Office of Thailand
PINGOs	Public Interest Non-Governmental Organizations
RDT	Resource Dependence Theory

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

Nonprofit organizations play an important role in the delivery of public services throughout the world. In developing countries, nonprofit organizations often fill in governance gaps. However, the context in developing countries often include challenges such as political instability, social conflict, and economic crisis that put the fate of nonprofit organizations at risk. This dissertation investigates the fate of nonprofit organizations in the case of Thailand, using this country as an example to test various theories of nonprofit resilience.

### **1.1 Nonprofit Organizations in the Emerging Frame**

Casey (2016) proposes six cultural frames as tools for understanding the nonprofit or third sector around the world: liberal, corporatist, social democratic, emerging, developing, and authoritarian. The emerging frame describes countries that have experienced a transition to democracy and embody strong economies. These countries include the post-socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, the post-military dictatorships of Central and South America, and the post-authoritarian regimes in Africa and Asia. Nonprofit organizations within this frame face challenges to survive due to the withdrawal of foreign funding, low level of donations and volunteering from citizens, and their complicated relationship with governments. When these political and economic transitions occur, foreign donors shift their funding to other countries with more instability and conflict. These nonprofits end up struggling to receive funding within their countries. They have difficulty attracting individual giving, as they face

concerns about corruption and rent-seeking. In addition, these nonprofits tend to have conflictual relationship with governments (Casey, 2016).

Bratton (1989) found that governments and nonprofit relationships in Africa are likely to be conflictual when a weak and defensive military government meets a nonprofit that promotes community mobilization in disputed territories. Although nonprofits contribute to economic and social advancement, which is a government's developmental goal, they are still met with a hostile reception from governments if nonprofits are viewed as threatening state security (Bratton, 1989). The new government institutions in the emerging frame often consider nonprofit organizations suspicious for two reasons (Casey, 2016). First, these nonprofit organizations can be regarded as antigovernment, as they can fuel backlash from the government (Casey, 2016). Second, the government worries that nonprofit organizations influence internal issues to serve the interests of external funders (Bratton, 1989; Casey, 2016). Chikoto-Schultz and Uzochukwu's (2016) study provides a good example of this complicated state-nonprofit relation. The Nigerian and Zimbabwean governments were suspicious of foreign-funded nonprofits, as they consider them appendages of their international donors. The governments restricted foreign-funded nonprofits from engaging in issues of governance (Chikoto-Schultz & Uzochukwu, 2016, p.163).

Batley and McLoughlin's (2009) study found that in fragile and conflict-affected states, government and non-state providers are often incapable and unwilling to achieve successful mutual engagement. Based on these case studies, governments in fragile and conflict-affected states, including most developing countries, severely lack the capacity to plan, coordinate, organize, regulate, and finance non-state sectors. This constraint is due

to a government's lack of information about the nonprofit sector and lack of the organizational capacity to form and maintain mutual relationships with non-state providers. In addition, these governments may be reluctant to shift themselves from the direct role of providers to the indirect roles of oversight and stewardship because the latter roles may be less politically prestigious, provide fewer patronage opportunities, and reduce employment in the public sector (Batley & McLoughlin, 2009). Bratton (1989) proposes that governments tend to impose strategies of control on nonprofits. These strategies include monitoring through regulating nonprofit registration, coordination through providing planning guidelines for nonprofits to follow, cooptation through establishing a superordinate agency to encapsulate voluntary sector activity, and dissolution with the forced closure of nonprofit organizations (Bratton, 1989). Likewise, non-state providers lack the necessary capacity to work with a government. They may also be unwilling to change themselves from independent actors to government agents (Batley & McLoughlin, 2009).

## **1.2 Nonprofit Organizations in Thailand**

The existing literature in the academic world is sparse on the nature of nonprofit organizations in Thailand. According to the National Statistical Office (NSO) of Thailand (2014), a nonprofit organization refers to an organization, foundation, association, union, or political party that is established with the following characteristics: (1) its duties and activities serve public interests, not a particular group's interests, (2) it is a self-governing organization that sets policies and makes decisions by its board members, (3) it does not

pursue profits nor distribute benefits to its members, and (4) it is not a government agency, although it can be founded and funded by the government.

The nonprofit sector does provide advantages for Thai society. The 2011 Asian Development Bank (ADB) report indicates that involvement in nonprofit organizations provides Thai people, especially the elderly, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and rural populations, opportunities to participate in public life (ADB, 2011). The political and economic participation of the poor and marginalized groups promotes sustainable and equitable development of the country (Bratton, 1989).

Nonprofit organizations also play an important role in supporting the country's economic development. From 2006 to 2012, the nonprofit sector in Thailand added an average of 0.75 percent to the country's total gross domestic product (GDP) (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council [NESDC], 2016). The actual percentage of nonprofit contributions to GDP could have been greater than the reported number; however, many nonprofit organizations sold their products at lower than market prices. Furthermore, nonprofit organizations significantly contribute to job creation within the economy because most activities of nonprofit organizations are labor-intensive (NESDC, 2016). The nonprofit sector in Thailand engaged an average of 4.6 percent of the population in work, both paid staff and volunteers, between 1997 and 2003 (NESDC, 2010).

The NSO's nonprofit organization surveys classify nonprofit organizations into seven categories: (1) social welfare organizations, (2) cremation welfare associations, (3) trade associations and chambers of commerce, (4) employer associations, labor unions, and state enterprise employee unions, (5) religious organizations, (6) political parties, and

(7) international organizations. This study focuses only on social welfare organizations. A social welfare organization is an organization that is established independently from government entities and has objectives to operate in the areas of social work and public support (NSO, 2014).

In 2012, there were 24,090 social welfare organizations in Thailand, which accounted for 31.4 percent of total nonprofit organizations (NSO, 2014). The NSO further divides social welfare organizations into the following categories according to their activities: (1) culture and recreation, (2) education and research, (3) health, (4) social services (social work), (5) environment, (6) development and housing, (7) civil rights and advocacy, (8) philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism promotion, (9) international activities, (10) activities related to religion, (11) business and professional associations and unions, and (12) unclassified (NSO, 2014).

This study examines social welfare organizations because they are highly affected by the decline of foreign funding. Social welfare organizations used to heavily rely on funding from parent organizations and other international organizations, accounting for 20.5 percent of their total revenue in 2001 (NSO, 2003; 2008). However, revenue from these sources gradually declined, accounting for only 6.7 percent of their total revenue in 2012 (NSO, 2014).

### ***1.2.1 History of the Nonprofit Sector in Thailand***

Thailand has a long tradition of religious philanthropy and community-based charitable services (ADB, 2011; Pongsapich, 1998). However, formal registration of nonprofit organizations only began in 1932, following a coup d'état that changed

Thailand's government from a monarchy to a democracy. One of the first formally established nonprofit organizations in Thailand was the Women's City Club, or the Samakhom Satri Thai Haeng Sayam. During the nationalistic period (World War II–1960) and during the military dictatorship (1960–1973), nonprofits were usually established for the betterment of their members through social and business networking, with some contributions for social development (Pongsapich, 1998). Another group of nonprofit organizations in this period was international organizations, such as the Rotary Club, Lions Club, YMCA, and Save the Children Federation (Chanya, 2007; Pongsapich, 1998).

On October 14<sup>th</sup>, 1973, student-led revolts took place. This event caused the Thai people to become more politically active. Many nonprofit organizations were informally established and referred to as 'Public Interest Non-Governmental Organizations' (PINGOs). PINGOs aimed to protect the interests of disadvantaged groups and distribute resources to the poor in rural areas (Pongsapich, 1998). Three years later, on October 6<sup>th</sup>, 1976, a military coup d'état overthrew the democratic government and ruled the country. The period between 1976 to 1980 is considered an era of stagnation for the nonprofit sector. During this period, Thailand, similar to other countries in the region, faced the threat of communism. The Thai government suspected nonprofit organizations of being communist and restricted their activities (Chanya, 2007). Many students and villagers were forced to flee into the forest. The only nonprofit organizations that were not affected were in the areas of children, women, the elderly, the disabled, and education because these organizations were founded and run by the elite groups of the country (Chanya, 2007; Pongsapich, 1998). For example, the Women's Cultural Club was established by



the Prime Minister's wife to promote social activities among members and provide welfare to the poor (Pongsapich, 1998).

After the fall of the Communist Party in 1980, the Thai government became more open-minded to the nonprofit sector. Therefore, many non-registered nonprofit organizations revived their operations and new organizations were established (Pongsapich, 1998). The period between 1985 to 1990 is considered a flourishing era for the nonprofit sector (Chanya, 2007). According to the Sixth National Development Plan (1987–1991), the government aimed to increase the participation of nonprofit organizations in rural development (NESDC, 1986; Pongsapich, 1998). In this period, the government emphasized the development of industry sectors for export to transform Thailand into a newly industrialized country. This policy caused significant environmental degradation (Chanya, 2007). Nonprofit organizations shifted their role from service delivery to organizing environmental protests and campaigns (ADB, 2011; Chanya, 2007).

Due to numerous infrastructure construction projects and a drastic increase in land price, the government and politicians faced allegations of corruption. This corruption scandal led to another military coup d'état in 1991. The prolongation of the military government caused nonprofit organizations, students, and citizens to organize social movements, which led to the Bloody May event of May 17-20, 1992 (Chanya, 2007). After this incident, Thailand had a long democratic period. Since 1992, nonprofit organizations in Thailand gained more support from international organizations. The focal areas of these nonprofit organizations included the environment, human rights, and health (NESDC, 2014).

In 1997, Thailand faced the Asian financial crisis. This crisis led to anti-capitalist and anti-globalization movements, as these issues were perceived to be causes of the crisis (Pongsapich et al., 2003). Nonprofit and international organizations resisted economic development by protesting the construction of large infrastructure projects (Pongsapich et al., 2003). From 1997 to 2005, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and news and media were highly active. Nonprofit organizations and individual citizens had organized to request the revision of the 1991 constitution. The new constitution was proposed in 1997, aiming to promote the rights and liberty of citizens and encourage public participation in ruling and monitoring the government (Chanya, 2007). Nonprofit organizations in this period monitored how the government executed policies. In addition, nonprofit organizations also shifted from working individually to working as networks. This shift provided them more power in pressuring the government to solve the problems in the poorer parts of Thai society, since poor people had been neglected in the past (Chanya, 2007).

Beginning in 2001 with the election of businessman Thaksin Shinawatra, Thailand entered into a prolonged period of political crisis. An anti-Thaksin protest movement began in 2005. He was overthrown by a military coup in 2006, and then a successor party led by his sister was overthrown in a second coup in 2014 (*Thailand profile – timeline*, 2018). After the 2014 coup, the Thai military led the government. Semi-free elections were held in 2019, leading to a military-led government. Throughout this period of political crisis, Thai society has remained in conflict and nonprofit organizations have faced high levels of uncertainty about their operations.

### ***1.2.2 Challenges of Nonprofit Organizations in Thailand***

Alongside the apparent challenges of operating in the context of prolonged political crisis and instability since 2006, Thai nonprofits face other challenges relating to social and economic factors. In the past two decades, Thailand has transitioned from being a developing country to an emerging country based on Casey's (2016) cultural frames. This transition has caused significant social, economic, and political changes.

During this transition, the nonprofit sector in Thailand has been weakened because of three main reasons. First, they have faced the decline of foreign funding. In 2011, the World Bank changed Thailand's classification from a lower-middle-income economy to an upper-middle-income economy (Walker, 2011). The country's economic success led to the withdrawal of international development assistance and grants (Chhina et al., 2014). Funding from institutional giving, including funding from international organizations, was the largest source of revenue for social welfare organizations in Thailand in 2001. However, by 2012, it gradually declined to the fourth among the five sources of funding (NSO, 2003, 2008, & 2014).

Second, Thai nonprofits have received limited support from the Thai government due to their role, government policies, and political instability. With the economic growth in Thailand, nonprofits have shifted their role from service delivery development to environmental protests and campaigns. As a result, the government of Thailand suspects that these nonprofit organizations carry out political work that opposes the government (ADB, 2011). According to Najam (2000) and Young (2000), the relationship between Thai nonprofits with the government is on the basis of confrontation, or adversary. The

government exerts its coercive powers to control nonprofits, while nonprofits retaliate with policy defiance and opposition. In addition, from 2001 to 2014, the government of Thailand increasingly financed projects at the community level (Chhina et al., 2014). This government policy lessened the role of nonprofits as a bridging actor between the government and the community (Tangpianpant, 2010). Political instability is another factor that weakened the nonprofit sector. During the political crises (2005–2010), Thai nonprofits, including citizen advocates, professional associations, and labor unions, were disbanded (DAI, n.d.). Data from NSO demonstrates that the revenue of social welfare organization from government funding drastically declined during the coup period from 19.5 percent of their total revenues in 2001 (NSO, 2003), to 5.1 percent in 2006 (NSO, 2008).

Third, Thai nonprofits have experienced challenges in attaining donations from the public. Thailand has sustained strong economic growth during the last two decades. As the economy has developed, there has been a larger middle class in Thailand and more local business corporations. Therefore, Thai people and corporations now have a greater capacity to make charitable donations. In addition, Thai households have fewer dependents, so they have more disposable income, which could boost charitable donations (Phaholyothin, 2017). However, it is difficult for nonprofits to obtain Thai charitable giving. Thai people lack sufficient knowledge and understanding of social issues and do not trust recipient organizations (Chhina et al., 2014). The smaller and lesser known nonprofit organizations in Thailand especially face high mistrust from the public. These nonprofit organizations have limited monitoring systems for transparency and accountability, a low level of result measurement, and sometimes experience

scandals involving inappropriate use of money donations. Therefore, the public has been anxious about how donations are actually used (Phaholyothin, 2017). As a result, Thai people mostly donate to religious institutions and organizations affiliated with the Royal Family or under Royal Patronage. In general, characteristics of Thai charitable giving have been characterized as ad hoc and unstructured (Chhina et al., 2014). Therefore, it is challenging for Thai nonprofit organizations to obtain donations from the public.

Finally, grant-making organizations in Thailand are not strong enough to provide a smooth transition for nonprofit organizations when their environment changes. In fact, there are not many grant-making bodies operating in Thailand at all. As a result, many nonprofits rely on volunteers for day-to-day operations and non-grant funding sources within the country to fund projects (ADB, 2011). As a consequence of all the above-mentioned factors, the overall nonprofit sector has become less active (Chhina et al., 2014).

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The nonprofit sector is valuable to Thai society in terms of rural development, economy, and social wellbeing of citizens. Therefore, it is important that the sector is sustainable. However, as mentioned above, Thai nonprofits have faced significant challenges due to social, economic, and political changes. To be sustainable, these nonprofits need to build resilience by developing the capacity to continue delivering their services to fulfill their missions in the face of crises.

There are studies on characteristics and processes that contribute to the resilient capacity of nonprofit organizations. However, most of these studies are conducted on

nonprofit organizations in the United States (Fyffe, 2014; Kimberlin et al., 2011; Witmer & Mellinger, 2016). Koronis and Ponis (2018) raise concerns about whether resilient capacities developed in Western culture could also be implemented in Asian culture. The United States belongs to the liberal frame. It has a limited government and a strong nonprofit sector. Unlike nonprofits in the emerging frame, nonprofits in the liberal frame tend to have access to large funding from the government, private philanthropy, and earned income from entrepreneurial activities. They also have a high level of volunteerism. There is high trust in nonprofit organizations (Casey, 2016). A Civic Engagement and Volunteering Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) found that in 2019, nearly 30 percent of the population, or 77.9 million people, in the United States volunteered for an organization or association. This volunteering rate has remained stable over the past two decades (Schlachter, 2021).

Similarly, Salamon et al. (2004) found that nonprofits in developed countries rely more on government support, while nonprofits in developing and transitional countries, such as the Philippines, Mexico, Kenya, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, and Peru, depend more heavily on fees and charges. Indeed, on average, government support is accounted to be 48 percent of total nonprofit revenue in developed countries, compared to only 22 percent in developing ones. On the contrary, nonprofits in developing and transitional countries gain about 61 percent of their revenue from fees and charges, compared to only 45 percent for developed countries. In addition, volunteering tends to be higher in developed countries than in developing ones (Salamon et al., 2004). Therefore, studies of nonprofit resilience in the United States and other developed countries may not be applicable to nonprofit organizations in Thailand or in other emerging countries.

Limited research has empirically examined how nonprofit organizations can survive and thrive when facing social, economic, and political changes during a country's transition from a developing to an emerging frame. To address this gap, this study aims to explore organizational characteristics and strategies that contribute to the resilient capacity of nonprofit organizations in Thailand when facing challenges during the country's transition from a developing to an emerging frame.

#### **1.4 Research Questions**

The research questions guiding this study are as follows: *What factors have affected the resilience of social welfare nonprofit organizations in Thailand since the onset of the country's prolonged political crisis in 2005? And to what extent do theories of nonprofit resilience in advanced liberal democracies explain or fail to explain the case of nonprofits that exist within an emerging context like Thailand?* To answer these questions, this research employs a conceptual framework of nonprofit resilience and a multiple-case study approach to examine the organizational characteristics of and the strategies employed by nonprofit organizations in Thailand to remain resilient during the country's transition from a developing to an emerging frame.

#### **1.5 Structure of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 above introduced nonprofit organizations in the emerging frame and in Thailand, followed by the purpose of the study and research questions. Chapter 2 provides a literature review and a conceptual framework. Chapter 3 explains the research design, case selection, data

collection, and data analysis. Chapter 4 presents the findings on factors that have affected the resilience of nonprofit organizations in Thailand. The final chapter, Chapter 5, contains a summary of the main findings, implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.



## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

As this dissertation asks about the factors that contribute to the resilience of nonprofit organizations in Thailand, there are two separate but related sets of literature relevant to the research questions. One area of research concerns the meaning and measurement of resilience as it pertains to nonprofit organizations. What does it mean to say that a nonprofit is resilient and how can we pursue a measurement tool that yields valid and reliable estimates of a resilience degree of nonprofit organizations? The second relevant literature concerns factors or explanatory variables that contribute to this resilience. Here, the literature relates to factors such as assets, legitimacy, and revenue streams.

### **2.1 Definition and Conceptualization of Resilience**

Resilience is perceived as a potential solution when an individual or organization faces challenges (Boin & van Eeten, 2013). Historically, resilience was studied in the field of psychology to investigate an individual's ability to positively cope with adverse situations (Martin-Breen & Anderies, 2011). In recent years, the interest in organizational resilience has steadily grown for both academics and practitioners (Boin & van Eeten, 2013; Duchek, 2020). However, there is a lack of consistent definitions and conceptualizations of resilience (Duchek, 2020; Hillmann & Guenther, 2021).

Duchek (2020) categorizes definitions of organizational resilience into three perspectives: resistance and recovery, adaptation, and anticipation. The first group of scholars defines resilience as an organization's ability to resist adversity and/or recover from crises and return to a normal state (e.g., Horne, 1997; Horne & Orr, 1998; van

Breda, 2016). The second group of scholars focuses on the advancement of organizational capacities so that an organization enhances its equilibrium after facing crises (e.g., Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2005; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Reinmoeller & van Baardwijk, 2005; Robb, 2000; Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2007). The last group of scholars includes the notion of anticipation in their definitions. For this group, resilience involves prediction and preparation for potential risks (e.g., Kendra & Wachtendorf, 2003; Ortiz-de-Mandojana & Bansal, 2016; Rerup, 2001; Somers, 2009).

According to Duchek (2020), conceptualization of organizational resilience, based on previous studies, can be grouped into three main categories: (1) resilience as an outcome, (2) resilience as a process, and (3) resilience capacities. Studies that treat resilience as an outcome focus on attributes that distinguish resilient organizations from less resilient ones. Studies based on a process perspective identify discrete elements of the resilience process. Capacity-based studies examine organizational ability that underlines resilience (Duchek, 2020). The conceptualization of organizational resilience can also be categorized based on whether resilience is constructed at the organizational or individual level. The studies that constructed resilience at the organizational level consider resilience as organizational capacities in response to crises and studies that focus on the individual level consider individual resilience as a vital component in achieving organizational resilience (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021).

The four core elements to be considered when examining resilience are context, disturbance, capacity, and reaction to disturbance (Department for International Development, 2011). Context refers to a social group, system, or institution whose resilience is being built. Disturbance depicts shocks or stresses that a group aims to be

resilient to. Capacity denotes the ability of a group or system to deal with shocks or stresses. Reaction to disturbance is the condition of a group or system after facing shocks or stresses, and it is divided into bounce back better, bounce back, recover but worse than before, and collapse (Department for International Development, 2011).

For this study, resilience refers to an organization's capacity to continue delivering its intended outputs, which are strategically aligned with its mission and intended outcomes, when the organization faces challenges. In the social welfare context, resilience refers to an organization's consistent delivery of social services.

## **2.2 Operationalization of Resilience**

Studies have developed tools for measuring organizational resilience. However, there is no consensus on how to conduct the measurement. In addition, these measurement tools and scales are not designed for nonprofit organizations (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021; Kantur & Say, 2015; Lee et al., 2013). To avoid pre-determined dimensions of resilience that may not be applicable to nonprofit organizations, this study assessed nonprofit organizations' resilience levels by developing a survey question and an interview question based on the definition of resilience. The survey question was as follows: "On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 represents 'no threat' and 10 represents 'high threat,' to what extent do you feel your organization's ability to conduct its primary mission in an enduring way has been threatened by any factor over the last 10 years?" And the interview question was as follows: "Did your organization have a higher or lower capacity to fulfill its mission after facing these challenges?" The survey question

explored an organization's ability to resist adversity, while the interview question examined an organization's capacity after facing challenges.

Levels of resilience can also be divided into high-, mid-, and low-levels (Fyffe, 2014). A high-level of resilience is the ability of an organization to thrive, achieve positive outcomes, and enhance equilibrium after facing crises. A mid-level of resilience refers to the ability of an organization to recover from crises and restore its operations to the equilibrium level. A low-level of resilience describes the inability of an organization to restore its operations to a normal state during and after crises, resulting in a lesser equilibrium (Fyffe, 2014). In this study, high-resilient organizations are the ones that respond to crises or challenges by increasing their outputs. Non-resilient organizations by contrast experience a disappearance of their outputs. In between are a range of levels of resilience in which the organization's outputs are reduced or remain the same.

## **2.3 Explanations of Resilience**

The literature on *open system perspective*, *benefits theory*, *resource dependence theory*, and *organizational resilience* are used as theoretical foundations to explore factors contributing to nonprofit resilience. Each stream of literature is described below.

### **2.3.1 Open System Perspective**

In the open system perspective, organizations are embedded in and depend on flows of materials, energy, and information from their environment (Scott & Davis, 2007). Based on the assumption of open systems, an organization as a system gains resources from the environment as its inputs to produce outputs. These outputs need to be

valued by the key resource controllers to trigger continuity of resource flows to the organization for organizational survival and growth (Bryson et al., 2001; Katz & Kahn, 2005). Nonprofit organizations are externally justified based on whether they address social needs, serve stakeholders' interests, and follow the law (Bryson et al., 2001). When an organization's actions are perceived as desirable, proper, and appropriate, the organization is considered legitimate and its existence is justified. Legitimate organizations are more likely to gain resources and support from stakeholders (Suchman, 1995).

Legitimacy is defined as the "appraisal of action in terms of shared and common values in the context of the involvement of the action in the social system" (Parsons, 1960, p. 175). Legitimacy provides a linkage between organizations and their environment (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Dowling and Pfeffer (1975) determined that there are three actions that organizations can take to ensure their continued legitimacy. First, the organization can adapt its goals, methods of operation, and outputs to conform to norms of the larger social system that the organizations belong to. Second, the organization can alter social norms through communication; however, this process is difficult. Third, the organization can identify its present values, methods of operation, and output with legitimate institutions or practices. For example, an organization can change its mission to identify itself with legitimate institutions or practices (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975).

Nonprofit organizations' missions can change over time to reflect the changing demographics and economic conditions, needs of staff and volunteers, and views of large donors (Oster, 1995). Donors consider the missions of nonprofit organizations in

deciding which to fund (Ebrahim, 2016). When a country transitions from a developing frame to an emerging frame, nonprofit organizations need to change their roles (Casey, 2016). For example, a lawyers' association changed from an organization dominated by loyal regime cadres, whose role was to ensure that the legal profession serves authorities, to an independent organization defending the rights of its members and enforcing the rule of law (Casey, 2016).

Accountability is a source of legitimacy (Considine & Ali Afzal, 2011).

Accountability refers to “the process of holding actors responsible for actions” (Fox & Brown, 1998). The basic questions for an accountability scheme are who should be held accountable, to whom, for what, and how (Ebrahim, 2016).

**Accountable to whom?** Nonprofits are expected to be accountable to various stakeholders (Ebrahim, 2003, 2016; Najam, 1996). Upwardly, they are accountable to their funders or patrons, such as foundations, and government, on “spending designated moneys for designated purposes” (Najam, 1996, p. 342). Downwardly, they are accountable to their clients, including communities or regions indirectly impacted by nonprofit programs. Internally, they are accountable to their missions and staff, including decision-makers and field-level implementers (Ebrahim, 2003, 2016; Najam, 1996).

The question of ‘to whom should nonprofits be accountable?’ is considered as a major cause of nonprofit vulnerability to external criticism and internal inefficiencies (Najam, 1996; Ebrahim, 2003). It is impossible for nonprofit to have equal accountability to all constituencies. Due to the asymmetric power of stakeholders, nonprofit organizations tend to satisfy the interests of the most powerful actors (Edwards & Hulme,

1995). For example, in service-providing nonprofit organizations, funders and patrons can require the organizations to satisfy their demands through grant contracts, reporting requirements, and formal evaluations, while clients have less voice in influencing the organizations' directions and activities. A key challenge is to increase downward accountability (Ebrahim, 2016).

**Accountability for what?** Nonprofits should be accountable in four main areas: finances, governance, performance, and mission (Ebrahim, 2016). First, nonprofit organizations need to be accountable for finances. They can promote accountability for finances through disclosure of financial statements, transparency in the use and oversight of funds, and protections for whistle-blowers who report mismanagement. In the United States, it is compulsory for nonprofit organizations to file an annual tax form, which includes disclosures on finances (Ebrahim, 2016).

Second, accountability for governance focuses on the role of the board of directors (Ebrahim, 2016). A nonprofit board has three fundamental duties, those of care, loyalty, and obedience (Renz, 2016). Duty of care requires board members to seek and consider adequate information in the process of making decisions. Duty of loyalty calls upon board members to place the organizational interests over their personal ones. Duty of obedience requires board members to adhere to organizational missions, laws, rules, and regulations (Renz, 2016). Boards are responsible for oversight of organizations' finances and compliance with the law (Ebrahim, 2016).

Third, nonprofits are expected to be accountable for their performance or what they deliver (Ebrahim, 2016). Performance-based accountability can be achieved through

performance measurement, evaluation, and impact assessment. Some funders also promote this type of accountability by rewarding organizations that have clear outputs and outcomes (Ebrahim, 2016). The Poh Tech Tung Foundation in Thailand gains trust and receives high funding from the local community by delivering visible and quantifiable results from its activities (Phaholyothin, 2017).

Lastly, nonprofits should be held accountable for their missions (Ebrahim, 2016). The organizations need to demonstrate progress towards accomplishing their missions. This type of accountability can be perceived as a long-term view of performance measurement (Ebrahim, 2016).

**Accountability how?** According to Ebrahim (2003, 2016), there are five main types of accountability mechanisms: (1) disclosure statements and reports, (2) performance assessment and evaluation, (3) participation, (4) self-regulation, and (5) adaptive learning. Disclosure statements and reports are one of the most commonly used tools for creating accountability (Ebrahim, 2016). The key to this type of accountability mechanism is transparency. Nonprofit organizations are expected to share their financial reports with funders, board members, staff, and regulators. To have quality financial reports, the organizations need to develop a strong financial culture, implement financial systems, and foster financial literacy (Bell & Ellis, 2016).

However, Haski-Leventhal and Foot's (2016) study on 50 random Australian nonprofits found no significant relationship between total household donations and nonprofit disclosure, including fiduciary, financial, and performance disclosure. The reason for no correlation may be that donors do not incorporate the disclosure



information into their donating decisions. Another possible reason is that donors do not recognize that information is available or do not understand the disclosure information (Haski-Leventhal & Foot, 2016). However, Gordon, Knock, and Neely (2009) did find that positive rating changes based on the IRS 990 data generated by charity watchdogs like the Charity Navigator positively influenced donor contributions.

Performance assessment and evaluation is another tool that nonprofit organizations can use to facilitate accountability (Ebrahim, 2003, 2016). Evaluations aim to assess whether nonprofit organizations have achieved their program goals and objectives (Ebrahim, 2016). Nonprofit organizations should have evaluation schemes to convince key stakeholders that they produce valuable results to receive future funding and support (Bryson et al., 2001; Ebrahim, 2016). However, evaluations can cause difficulties and impose high costs on nonprofit organizations, especially the small ones with limited staff and resources (Ebrahim, 2016).

Another way to get accountability from civic engagement is through increasing the opportunities for the public to participate in activities (Ebrahim, 2016). Participation is an ongoing process in nonprofit organizations rather than a tool. Participation is based on community involvement in nonprofit activities, from consultation, project implementation, and negotiation over project decisions to communities' own project initiatives (Ebrahim, 2016).

Self-regulation is one of the accountability tools that nonprofit organizations can use. Nonprofit organizations self-regulate by developing standards, certification, or codes of conduct and performance. These standards aim to create an image of the sector and establish norms around quality (Ebrahim, 2016).

Adaptive learning is another process mechanism, in which nonprofit organizations critically reflect and analyze themselves to make progress in achieving their missions. Adaptive learning focuses on internal accountability to the organizational mission rather than external accountability to funders (Ebrahim, 2016).

The open system perspective provides a better understanding of strategies that nonprofit organizations employ to become legitimate, so that they gain resources and support from stakeholders. For the purpose of this study, these strategies are considered as potential attributes that contribute to nonprofit resilience.

### ***2.3.2 Benefits Theory***

The benefits theory, developed by Young (2007), is a nonprofit revenue generation strategy. It connects a nonprofit's mission, its services, beneficiaries, and sources of financial support. The benefits theory sets a nonprofit's mission as a starting point of nonprofit finance. The mission is then used to determine the organization's services, beneficiaries, and sources of financial support. Therefore, nonprofit sources of funding depend on the types of goods and services the organization provides (Young, 2007). As nonprofit organizations in Thailand need to find new sources of funding to substitute the decline of foreign funding, the benefits theory provides a useful theoretical foundation to examine the most appropriate sources of funding for different nonprofit organizations.

The benefits theory classifies benefits that nonprofit organizations provide into four types: private benefits, group benefits, public benefits, and trade benefits (Young, 2007). Nonprofit organizations should design their financing strategies according to the

benefits they provide rather than seeking a panacea, such as turning into a social enterprise or drawing money from an endowment for short-term survival or mimicking what other organizations do. In addition, nonprofits need to consider feasibility, interaction, financial solvency and mission achievement, and risk management to have the right income mix (Young, 2007).

Private benefits accrue to individual clients and consumers of the nonprofit's goods and services (Young, 2007). These goods and services are private in nature, which means they are rival and excludable. Therefore, individuals who benefit from the organization's services are willing to pay. Nonprofit organizations that provide private benefits should charge fees for individuals who benefit from their services. Examples of private goods are education, healthcare, arts and culture, senior centers, and nursing homes (Young, 2007).

Group benefits accrue to an identifiable subgroup of society and are valued and supported by donors (Young, 2007). These goods and services produce positive externalities. Therefore, nonprofit organizations that generate group benefits should receive private contributions from interest groups and citizens who value their goods and services. Collective goods and services include improving the environment, helping specific ethnic groups, assisting patients and families suffering particular illnesses, and providing education for children with specific needs (Young, 2007).

Public benefits accrue to the public. These goods and services are public in nature, which means they are non-rival and non-excludable (Young, 2007). Nonprofit organizations that generate public benefits should gain revenue from government funding. Examples of public goods are environmental protection, public safety, social

services, research to prevent or treat diseases, advocacy for social justice, and public art (Young, 2007)

Trade benefits accrue to organizational partners that supply resources to nonprofit organizations. Both the nonprofit and partnering organization or individuals in terms of volunteers, gain mutual benefits (Young, 2007). Well-known nonprofit organizations can generate revenue by partnering with businesses or other nonprofit organizations (Weikart et al., 2013). For instance, the Mirror Foundation in Thailand, which has a mission in social development, including supporting homeless and children with illness (The Mirror Foundation, n.d.-a), provided trade benefits by partnering with laundry service and supply companies to initiate a campaign providing laundry products to homeless people (MGR Online, 2022). The Mirror Foundation also partners with many other companies (The Mirror Foundation, n.d.-b). Partnering with the Mirror Foundation helps boost companies' marketing, brand awareness, community engagement, and philanthropic objectives, while corporate partners provide resources in return.

The benefits theory has been successfully empirically tested in the U.S. Wilsker and Young's (2010) study demonstrates that expenditures on services that provide private benefits are associated with greater reliance on earned income, while expenditures on services that provide public benefits are associated with greater reliance on charitable sources (Wilsker and Young, 2010). In another study, Fischer et al. (2011) found that the proportion of revenue generated through earned income was the lowest for nonprofit organizations with services categorized as public, highest for those with private services, and midway for those classified as mixed. The more public a nonprofit's services, therefore, the more its revenue comes from donations (Fischer et al., 2011).

Guerrero (2016) took a step further by testing whether nonprofit organizations with revenue sources matching the nature of goods and services they provided experienced lower levels of financial risk during the two years following the September 11, 2001 attacks. Guerrero's (2016) study provides partial support to the benefits theory. On the one hand, human services nonprofits were more financially stable when they had a higher concentration of revenue from government sources. On the other hand, independent of the nature of their goods and services, nonprofit organizations in all subsectors, including human services, did not experience reduced financial risk from having higher percentages of contributions from the public, even while they all benefited from relying on earned income (Guerrero, 2016).

Focusing on a non-U.S. context, Aschari-Lincoln and Jäger (2016) quantitatively tested the benefits theory on international non-governmental organizations headquartered in Switzerland. The study demonstrated that the benefits theory is applicable to nonprofits outside of the U.S. context (Aschari-Lincoln & Jäger, 2016). In another non-U.S. empirical study, Cortis (2017), found that Australian nonprofit organizations providing services for children, families, youths, and Aboriginal people – forms of group or public benefits, had difficulties in attaining private income. The study's finding is consistent with the benefits theory in that nonprofit organizations' main activity affected sources of funding (Cortis, 2017).

The benefits theory proposes that nonprofit organizations should have sources of revenue consistent with their missions, types of goods and services, and beneficiaries. For purposes of this study, having revenue streams following the benefits theory is

considered as one of the potential attributes or factors that can promote nonprofit resilience.

### ***2.3.3 Resource Dependence Theory***

The resource dependence theory (RDT) proposes that organizations interact with others to obtain resources they need (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). These interactions create dependencies and power to control. Participants that have critical and scarce resources gain more control over the organization (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The theory is based on three key assumptions: (1) organizations are assumed to consist of internal and external coalitions, which are formed to influence and control behavior; (2) the environment is assumed to contain scarce and valued resources necessary for organizational survival; and (3) the organizations are assumed to work toward gaining control over resources that minimize their dependence on other organizations and maximize the dependence of other organizations on themselves (Ulrich & Barney, 1984).

According to Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), factors that facilitate control over an organization include, the importance of resources, the unavailability of alternative resources, and the discretion that participants give to an organization in terms of allocation, access, and use of critical resources. However, an organization may avoid being controlled by “restricting the flow of information about them and their activities, denying the legitimacy of demands upon them, diversifying their dependencies, and manipulating information to increase their own legitimacy” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p261).

Another approach that a nonprofit organization can employ to control its resource dependencies on other organizations is to generate revenue from commercial activities (Froelich, 1999). Ankinun's (2011) study supports this approach. The study found that nonprofit organizations in Thailand adopted earned income activities to establish independent supplies of resources and become less reliance on donors. The loss of international funding and local individual donations could cause nonprofit organizations to adopt earned income activities (Ankinun, 2011). Fyffe's (2014) study also supports RDT's assumptions that resilient nonprofit organizations employ strategies to manage their resource dependencies on other organizations. These strategies include diversifying revenue streams, generating commercial revenue, having individual donations as a main source of revenue, and continually seeking new funding sources by applying for federal funds (Fyffe, 2014).

According to RDT, nonprofit organizations manage their resource dependencies by diversifying revenue streams, generating commercial revenue, having individual donations as a key source of revenue, and applying for new funding sources. For this study, managing resource dependencies is considered a potential factor that can promote nonprofit resilience.

#### ***2.3.4 Other Literature on Organizational Resilience***

The studies below also capture Duchek's (2020) three perspectives of organizational resilience as resistance and recovery, adaptation, and anticipation. Fyffe (2014) categorizes factors contributing to organizational resilience into (1) assets, (2) processes, and (3) leadership. Assets refer to resources that promote organizational

success, including both tangible (facilities, financial resources, human resources, etc.) and intangible resources (social capital, trust, knowledge, skills, etc.). Processes refer to the series of actions and activities in which an organization engages to respond or manage external shocks. Leaders make decisions, acquire resources, and develop strategies that influence an organization's performance and manage its external conditions (Fyffe, 2014).

Fyffe (2014) studied attributes that were exhibited by resilient human services providers in Virginia during and after the great recession of 2007 – 2009. The study found seven key attributes that contribute to the organizational capacity to survive and thrive when facing an economic downturn, including positive disposition towards change; flexibility and adaptability; sufficient assets, resources, and infrastructure; intra and inter-organizational relationships; managing resource dependencies; shared identity, values, goals, and mission; and effective leadership (Fyffe, 2014).

Witmer and Mellinger (2016) studied organizational characteristics contributing to resilience of behavioral healthcare organizations in the Northeast region of the United States. These organizations successfully adapted to the funding changes. The study's findings demonstrate that these characteristics include commitment to the mission, improvisation, community reciprocity, servant and transformational leadership, hope and optimism, and fiscal transparency (Witmer and Mellinger, 2016).

Searing et al. (2021) studied 31 nonprofits experienced the Illinois state budget impasse and came up with the Nonprofit Resiliency Framework consist with Fyffe's (2014) assets, processes, and leadership factors noted above. The Nonprofit Resiliency Framework maps resiliency tactics into five functional categories based on the resource



utilized: financial, human resources, outreach programs and services, and management and leadership. In detail, tactics in the financial category include cashflow monitoring, a line of credit or reserves, new funding sources, reducing ancillary costs, revenue portfolio diversification, and liquidation of assets. Tactics in human resource category consist of addressing burnout, not paying staff, maintaining capacity, non-monetary staff rewarding, and reducing staff. Outreach tactics involve advocating, altering messaging, improving relations with external stakeholders, increasing fundraising, and relying on parent nonprofit. Programs and services category include increasing wait-lists, merging, protecting core services, and reducing service quantity or quality. Lastly, management and leadership tactics consist of leader as an example, personal debt, planning, relationship with the board, and strategic action with partners (Searing et al., 2021).

Young and Searing (2022) identify organizational slack and learning as key characteristics of resilient nonprofits. Slack resource refers to excess and available funds accumulated through annual operating surpluses that can be used during revenue shortfalls or in times of crisis (Calabrese & Ely, 2020). Organizational slack serves as shock absorbers and help reduce organizational financial vulnerability (Calabrese, 2013; Calabrese, 2018; Calabrese & Ely, 2020) or according to Hirschman (1970) as “lubricant that allows organizations... to rebound from loss or distress” (as cited in Young & Searing, 2022, p.36). Organizational slack can also be translated into various ways for building resilience, such as deploying new technologies, developing contingencies for covering payroll, and building external relationships and networks. On the other hand, capturing Duchek’s (2020) anticipatory resilience, organizational learning is when an organization anticipates potential risks, learns from its mistakes and experiences to

improve its operation, and explore new opportunities (Young & Searing, 2022).

**Transformational Leadership.** In general, leadership is defined as “the capacity of someone to direct and energize people to achieve goals” (Rainey, 2014, p. 337). According to Bass (1997), there are two main styles of leadership: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. On the one hand, transactional leaders reward subordinates for compliance, while punishing them for failure to comply. On the other hand, transformational leaders motivate followers to focus on organizational goals rather than their self-interests (Bass, 1997).

Bass (1985) suggested that transactional leadership tends to appear in mechanistic organizations because it is suitable in well-structured environments, while transformational leadership is favored in organic organizations where a structure is flexible. In addition, it is expected that if an organization’s purpose is to maximize profits, management will be transactional. However, if an organization’s purpose is to contribute to quality of life, management will be transformational (Bass, 1985).

Transformational leadership consists of four components, which are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1997). Idealized influence or charisma is when leaders act as role models to followers, which generates pride, loyalty, confidence, and purpose alignment. The inspirational motivation component requires leaders to articulate a vision of the future, encourage followers, and provide meaning for their work. Intellectual stimulation refers to leaders that encourage followers to be innovative by questioning old assumptions and stimulating new perspectives. Individualized consideration occurs when

leaders listen attentively to followers to help them further their needs, abilities, and aspirations (Bass, 1997).

Valero et al.'s (2015) study found that transformational leadership builds resilient public and nonprofit organizations, which can better respond and adapt to crises in the Asian context. The study used data from a survey of 112 individuals working in public and nonprofit organizations in South Korea. The study suggested that training managers to have transformational leadership style, such as being innovative, caring, visionary, and inspirational, can help organizations to be resilient (Valero et al., 2015). Witmer and Mellinger (2016) also found that transformational leadership contributes to the resilience of nonprofit organizations. The study by Ankinun (2011) proposes that transformational leadership is the most important factor in pushing nonprofit organizations towards the adoption of earned income activities. Akinun's (2011) research used three nonprofit organizations in Thailand as case studies. The study demonstrated that transformational leaders apply charisma and provide inspiration to their followers in accepting business activities in their organizations (Ankinun, 2011).

**Governance leadership.** Leadership in governance aims to foster collaboration and build resilience and adaptive capacity (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011). For fostering collaboration, leaders use skills of activation, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing to bring together individuals, groups, and organizations with diverse talents to address mutual concerns. Leadership shifts from one person to another at different times (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011). Nonprofit organizations collaborate with multiple organizations and stakeholders from public, private, and nonprofit sectors to address a

common and shared problems, such as housing, livelihood, and access to basic services (ADB, 2011; Bingham, 2011). Searing et al.'s (2021) study demonstrated that re-energizing existing relationships with media, legislators, community members, and previous service recipients promotes nonprofit resilience. Similarly, Fyffe's (2014) study found that nonprofits heavily relied on their networks to help them survive during recession. These nonprofits engaged in partnership and collaboration to gain human capital and financial resources. To form networks and promote successful collaboration, governance leaders are needed (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011).

For building resilience and adaptive capacity, in traditional leadership, a leader is considered the catalyst for organizational change by moving an organization in new directions (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011). The leader convinces followers to sacrifice their self-interests and adopt their leader's vision and goals for the sake of the organization. And the leader responds to a crisis by becoming more rigid and exerting more control to recover from a challenge or disaster. This response makes the organization become more rigid and less adaptive. In contrast, network governance focuses on long-term resilience rather than recovery. Resilience comes from handling problems over time, which fosters trust, relationships, and collaboration, which leads to system sustainability (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011). Similar to Young & Searing's (2022) concept of organizational learning, governance leadership applies the adaptive management concept, i.e. learning by doing, which allows organizations to continuously learn and adapt. Participants in the network learn based on shared experience, bring their own expertise, and rely on trust and collaboration to try different approaches. Unlike the role of leaders in traditional government who tell people what to do, the role of leaders in network governance is to

help followers recognize their own vision and then learn how to move in that direction (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011).

To summarize, based on the literature on resilience, nonprofit organizations can achieve resilience by having tangible and intangible assets, processes to manage external shocks, and transformational and governance leaders. For the purpose of this study, organizational assets, processes, and leadership are considered as potential attributes that promote nonprofit resilience.

## 2.4 Conceptual Framework

Drawing from the four preceding theoretical theories discussed above, Table 1 present a conceptual framework summarizing key organizational factors that can contribute to nonprofit resilience. This conceptual framework was used to develop interview questions and guide data analysis, including serving as a coding scheme.

**Table 1**

*Organizational Attributes Based on Theories*

<b>Theories</b>	<b>Organizational Attributes</b>
Open systems	Organizations implement strategies to be legitimate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing mission to respond changing social needs</li> <li>• Disclosure statements and reports</li> <li>• Evaluations and performance assessments</li> <li>• Industry self-regulation</li> <li>• Public participation</li> <li>• Adaptive learning</li> </ul>
Benefits theory	Organizations have sources of revenue consistent with the types of goods and services the organizations provide to their beneficiaries.

Theories	Organizational Attributes
Resource Dependence	Organizations manage their resource dependencies on other organizations by diversifying revenue streams, generating commercial revenue, having individual donations as a main source of revenue, and applying for new funding sources.
Other factors from the literature	Organizations have sufficient human and financial assets, processes of being flexible and adaptive, and transformational and governance leaders to respond or manage external shocks.

### **Chapter 3: Research Methodology**

This chapter presents the qualitative multiple-case study research design adopted in this study, including reasons for using this design. The chapter then details case selection processes and a description of the methods used to collect and analyze the data in the case studies. The chapter concludes with a description of case organizations and key informants. As such, the chapter consists of five sections: research design, case selection, data collection, data analysis, and description of case organizations and key informants.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This research employs a qualitative multiple-case study to explore organizational characteristics and strategies that contribute to the resilient capacity of nonprofit organizations in Thailand. Recall, resilience capacity is an organization's capacity to continue delivering its intended outputs, which are strategically aligned with its mission and intended outcomes, when the organization faces challenges. Case studies enable researchers to understand complex social phenomena by focusing in-depth on a case (Yin, 2018). A case study method is appropriate for this research based on Yin's (2018) three conditions in selecting research methods. First, the overarching research question of this study asks a 'how' question: how do nonprofit organizations achieve resilience? Second, the researcher does not have control over the behavioral events. Third, this research focuses on contemporary events, so obtaining data from persons involved in the events is possible. In addition, a multiple-case study design has the advantage of being

more robust than a single-case design, in that the evidence from multiple cases is more compelling (Yin, 2018).

### **3.2 Case Selection**

Cases for this study were drawn from two lists: one, the notification of the Ministry of Finance on income tax and value-added tax (issue no. 2), subject: specifying organizations, public charity organizations, clinics, and educational institutions (The Revenue Department, 2019) and two, the notification of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, subject: the list of civil society organizations according to the Social Welfare Promotion Act, B.E. 2546. (issue no. 1-22). The 969 organizations under the Ministry of Finance's notification are exempt from corporate income tax (The Revenue Department, 2014, 2019). In addition, donations made to these organizations can be tax deducted (The Revenue Department, 2014). The 2,091 organizations were registered with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security as nonprofit organizations before December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009.

This research chose to focus on social welfare organizations because (1) they provide much-needed social services in Thailand, (2) are the second-largest group of nonprofit organizations (NSO, 2014), and (3) because Young's benefits theory adopted in this study was mainly designed for organizations with a social service (Young, 2007). Social services, as a category, can be further divided into three main subcategories: (1) those providing services to people in need, including children, women, the elderly, the disabled, crime victims, and drug users, (2) those helping people recover from disasters and providing shelter to the homeless and refugees, and (3) those providing services to



increase people's income and reduce living expenses, as well as providing job training and distributing food and clothing (Chanya, 2007; NSO, 2014). As this research concentrates only on nonprofit organizations that provide social services, nonprofit organizations in other categories were removed from the initial list by using keywords in Appendix A, leaving a sample frame of N social services nonprofits.

In addition, this research excluded private foundations, including individual, family, and corporate foundations, from the sample. Unlike public charities that source funding from the public, private foundations source their principal funding from a single source, such as an individual, a family, or a corporation (Candid Learning, 2018). In Thailand, high net-worth business families primarily made their philanthropic efforts through family foundations and corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities of family business (Chhina et al., 2014). Moreover, private foundations usually use their money to fund other nonprofit organizations (Candid Learning, 2018). After removing private foundations and nonprofit organizations that are not in the social services category, 278 organizations remained.

This research's sample also excluded nonprofit organizations affiliated with the Royal Family or under Royal Patronage. Charitable giving in Thailand is generally characterized by Thai people mostly donating to organizations affiliated with the Royal Family or under Royal Patronage (Chhina et al., 2014). Therefore, nonprofit organizations under Royal Patronage are less likely to experience challenges to survive. Removing these nonprofits left 210 organizations on the list.

The study then perused these organizations' websites to check their services and year of establishment to verify and confirm their field of service and age. Only nonprofit

organizations that provided social services were selected for the sample. As this research studies factors that contributed to the resilience of nonprofit organizations since 2005, nonprofit organizations established after 2005 were excluded from the sample. All of the above selection criteria yielded 26 social services nonprofits, which are the focus of this study.

This study sought to collect data from all 26 social services nonprofits that met the selection criteria. In March 2019, recruitment letters were sent via email to the executive directors of nonprofit organizations in the final list, asking them to participate in the study. As this research sought to gain information about organizational assets and strategies, leaders of nonprofit organizations were the best people to provide this information. The recruitment letter can be found in Appendix B (English version) and Appendix C (Thai version). In total, 18 participants from 15 nonprofit organizations chose to participate.

### **3.3 Data Collection**

The study involves primary and secondary data to attain triangulation. Primary data comes from in-depth interviews and surveys with nonprofit organizations' leaders, while secondary data comes from documentary research. The details of each method is illustrated below.

#### ***3.3.1 In-depth Interview***

This research gathered data from in-depth interviews with 18 leaders from 15 social services nonprofit organizations. In general, interviews help explore and obtain in-

depth information on interviewees' perspectives and experiences (Seidman, 2013) that interviewees regarding the strategies they adopted to achieve organizational resilience. The interviews were semi-structured; specifically, questions were designed to be open-ended to avoid leading interviewees towards any particular response and to give them an opportunity to shape a conversation with little influence from the interviewer (Seidman, 2013). Additional clarification and probing questions were constructed in some interview questions in case interviewees did not initially understand the purpose of a main question or did not provide a complete response. The interview guide is divided into five parts: (1) introductory remarks, (2) background and context, (3) resilience and financial stability, (4) organizational activities, and (5) reflections and wrap-up (see Appendix D for English version and Appendix E for Thai version).

Before every interview, informed consent was sought, including permission to record an interview from the participants (see Appendix F for English version and Appendix G for Thai version). Then, interviewees were asked to review and sign the informed consent form. The interviews were conducted in Thai language because the interviewees are fluent in Thai, except the last organization which was conducted in English. This process lasts from March to May 2019. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face in Thailand, except for one interview that was conducted via phone. Interviews were held at a participants' office or a coffee shop. Each interview lasted from 60 to 90 minutes. The interviews were audiotaped and detailed notes were taken during interviews and then transcribed. Interview records and transcripts were stored as computer files with password protection.

**Positionality.** The researcher's identity and background of working in the nonprofit sector in Thailand provided her advantages in conducting this research. First, the researcher has personal networks that provided access to nonprofit organizations in Thailand. Second, the researcher spoke and used the same language as the interviewees; therefore removing any language barriers. Third, the researcher's Thai background enabled her to be familiar with the context of the nonprofit sector in Thailand.

### **3.3.2 Survey**

This research employed a survey for additional coverage, which referred to using different methods to gain different strengths and add the range of results for the project as a whole (Morgan, 2014). A survey approach has an advantage of comparing measurements (Wolf et al., 2016), which is useful for this research. While interview data provides in-depth description of each organization, the survey enables comparison between organizations. The survey is used for comparing characteristics of different nonprofits, including resilience level, leadership turnover rate, evaluation from stakeholders, and revenue sources. As some nonprofits do not have a financial report available, the questionnaire on revenue sources enabled the research to get a picture of each nonprofit's revenue sources relative to the others. The survey consisted of 8 questions (see Appendix H for English version and Appendix I for Thai version). After each interview, the researcher asked the participant to fill out the survey.

### **3.3.3 Documents**

The use of documentary research refers to analyzing documents that have information related to the topic of the study (Mogalakwe, 2006). This research gathered documents going back 10 years to analyze organizations' finances and strategies. The documents reviewed included financial reports, annual reports, government reports, academic books, articles, and news and media on nonprofit organizations in Thailand. These documents were obtained from organizational websites, the National Statistical Office, and the Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. Document review allows for triangulation of data by combining data drawn from different sources (Flick, 2004). As a result, the data is not biased by the availability or willingness of interviews.

## **3.4 Data Analysis**

This study employs thematic analysis, which is “a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.79) by following Braun and Clarke's step-by-step guide. This guide suggests six phases of analysis process, as follows:

### ***Phase 1: Familiarizing Yourself with Your Data***

The researcher got familiar with the data though transcribing audio recordings of all interviews into written transcripts. In addition, the researcher read through every transcript, took notes, and marked ideas for coding.

## ***Phase 2: Generating Initial Codes***

The researcher coded interview transcripts for theoretically important themes identified in the conceptual framework and for emerging themes in the data. Emerging themes come from repetition of an issue, dramatic incident, and contradictory with other passages (Seidman, 2013). Individual passages were coded in as many themes as they fit into. According to Seidman (2013), coding should be done first on a paper before transferring the work to the computer because the mediums of screen and paper affects the message the reader retrieves. When reading on the screen, viewers can miss issues that would be evident on a paper copy (Seidman, 2013). Therefore, the researcher read, marked, and labeled the passages on paper copies of the documents and the transcribed interviews and then transferred the work to NVivo, which is a qualitative data analysis software.

The researcher chose to use NVivo because it is compatible with text in Thai language. The researcher highlighted the text in NVivo. These coded passages are stored in Nodes (Jackson & Bazeley, 2019). The researcher first created Nodes without sorting them into different levels and reorganized them later. NVivo has the benefits of increasing the efficiency in organizing and coding data. The benefits of NVivo include helping designate the original location of the coded passage in the transcript and allowing the researcher to simply code and un-code the data and change the name of a Node (Jackson & Bazeley, 2019). When a researcher edits text, merge, or split Nodes in NVivo, coded passages are not lost (Jackson & Bazeley, 2019).

### ***Phase 3: Searching for Themes***

The researcher sorted and grouped different Nodes into potential themes and sub-themes by using NVivo software. NVivo makes it easy to organize Nodes in a hierarchical system with categories, subcategories, and sub-subcategories, in addition, the researcher can change the location of the Nodes in a hierarchy (Jackson & Bazeley, 2019). Suh, Kagan, and Strumpf, (2009) recommend that translation takes place during the categorization of the codes to have constant comparisons between meanings in two languages so that, explicit and implicit meanings of the findings are not lost. In this study, the researcher translated the initial coding from Thai into English during this phase.

### ***Phase 4: Reviewing Themes***

The researcher reviewed and refined themes at two levels. First, the researcher reviewed the data extracts within each theme to ensure that they fit together. If not, the extracts were either moved to a new theme or discarded from the analysis. Using NVivo makes it easy to move the data extracts to a new theme or un-code data. Second, the researcher reviewed whether the themes accurately represented the data. After reviewing and refining, the researcher came up with the final main themes, which follow the conceptual framework.

### ***Phase 5: Defining and Naming Themes***

The researcher assigned a name to each theme based on the organizational attributes in the conceptual framework. The researcher also wrote a detailed analysis for each theme, which is how the data answers the research question.

### ***Phase 6: Producing the Report***

The researcher wrote a thematic analysis by making an argument in relation to the research question and using the interview quotes to exemplify the themes. To ensure the confidentiality of the interviewees, pseudonyms were used and identifying details were deleted when writing the report. All quotes incorporated in this study have no direct attribution to any name, position, or specific organization. The findings demonstrate organizational attributes that contributed to resilience for the 15 nonprofits in this study.

### **3.5 Description of Case Organizations and Key Informants**

This study has 18 key informants from 15 nonprofit organizations. All case organizations provide social services and were established more than 10 years ago. Most nonprofit organizations in Thailand do not have their annual reports or financial reports publicly available. Therefore, this research uses numbers of staff and volunteers instead of total revenue to estimate an organization's size. This study includes various sizes of organizations from small to large, between 6 to 514 staff. Please see Table 2 for more details of case organizations and key informants.



**Table 2***Description of the Cases and Key Informants*

<b>Org.</b>	<b>Key informants' Positions</b>	<b>Scope of work</b>	<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>No. of staff</b>	<b>No. of volunteers</b>
1	Assistant director	Support disadvantaged children	1. Government funding 2. International organizations' funding	12	5
2	Head of media and foreign relation	Support disadvantaged children	1. Individual donations within the country 2. Individual donations from abroad	48	Varies
3	Deputy director	Support children and families in needed	1. International organizations fund (main) 2. Individual donations within the country	50	80+
4	President	Support disabled people	1. Government funding (70%) 2. Individual donations within the country (30%)	70-80	Only help fundraising
5	Project manager	Provide emergency support services to children	1. Individual donations within the country (main) 2. International organizations' funds	19	Varies
	Project manager				
	Head of communication				
6	Secretary pro tem	Support disadvantaged children	1. Individual donations within the country (80%)	100+	Varies

<b>Org.</b>	<b>Key informants' Positions</b>	<b>Scope of work</b>	<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>No. of staff</b>	<b>No. of volunteers</b>
			2. Individual donations from abroad (20%)		
7	Secretary	Provide services to children and people in slum areas	1. Individual donations from abroad 2. International organizations' funds	90	100+
8	Program director	Assist abused women	1. International organizations' funds (95%) 2. Donations from within the country (5%)	6	Only help organizing events
9	Secretary	Support people with HIV and AIDs and promote women and youth empowerment	1. International organizations' funds (70%) 2. Individual donations within the country	270	Based on projects
10	Director	Support disadvantaged children	1. Individual donations from abroad 2. Individual donations within the country 3. Corporate philanthropy	30	Varies
11	Project manager	Support disadvantaged children	1. Individual donations within the country (main) 2. Organizations' funds within the country	29	60+

<b>Org.</b>	<b>Key informants' Positions</b>	<b>Scope of work</b>	<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>No. of staff</b>	<b>No. of volunteers</b>
12	Founder	Innovative programs to solve social problems	1. Individual donations within the country (90%) 2. Organizations' funds within the country	100+	Varies (5,000+ per year)
	Communications specialist				
13	President	Support disadvantaged children	1. Corporate philanthropy (70%) 2. Individual donations within the country (30%)	-	15
14	Director	Support disadvantaged children	1. Individual donations within the country (60%) 2. Corporate philanthropy (20%) 3. International organizations' funds 4. Organizations' funds within the country	514	Based on projects
15	Director	Support people with HIV and AIDs	1. Individual donations from abroad (95%) 2. Individual donations within the country	10	Varies (1 to 15 per year)

To reiterate, this study determined the level of nonprofit resilience based on an organization's answers these two following questions: one, "On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 represents 'no threat' and 10 represents 'high threat', to what extent do you feel your organization's ability to conduct its primary mission in an enduring way has been threatened by any factor over the last 10 years?" (a survey question) and two, "Did your organization have a higher or lower capacity to fulfill its mission after facing these challenges?" (an interview question).

Data obtained from the survey and interview are consistent. Case organizations that reported low threat on their ability to conduct primary missions, indicated that they have a higher capacity to fulfill their mission after facing challenges and vice versa. However, there were two case organizations whose survey and interview data are inconsistent. Organization #5 and Organization #14 reported high threat, but they mentioned that their organizations have higher and the same capacity to fulfill their missions after facing challenges, respectively. Based on the interview data, these two organizations received less funding after facing challenges, which threatened their ability to conduct missions. However, they managed to attain higher and the same capacity to fulfill their missions afterward. Therefore, this study categorized Organization #5 and Organization #14 as a high- and mid-level of resilience.

In summary, as shown in Table 3, there are seven high-resilient, three mid-resilient, and five low-resilient organizations. Consistent with Yin (2018), this study predicts contrasting results (a theoretical replication) across subgroups and predicts similar results (a literal replication) within each subgroup because there are at least two cases within each subgroup.

**Table 3***Case Organizations' Perceptions of Resilience Level*

<b>Levels of Resilience based on Case Organizations' Perceptions</b>	<b>Organization no.</b>	<b>Answer to the survey question:</b> "On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 represents 'no threat' and 10 represents 'high threat', to what extent do you feel your organization's ability to conduct its primary mission in an enduring way has been threatened by any factor over the last 10 years?"	<b>Answer to the interview question:</b> "Did your organization have a higher or lower capacity to fulfill its mission after facing these challenges?"
High	1	4	Higher
	4	5.5	Higher
	5	6.67	Higher
	6	3	Higher
	11	2	Higher
	12	2	Higher
	15	3.5	Higher
Mid	9	6	Same
	10	6	Same
	14	7	Same
Low	2	7.5	Lower
	3	8	Lower
	7	10	Lower
	8	7	Lower
	13	7	Lower

*Note.* Organization #5 and Organization #12's survey response is an average of the key informants' answers.

## **Chapter 4: Discussion of the Findings**

This chapter begins with challenges that the nonprofits faced in the past 10 years. The chapter then presents an analysis of the findings as they relate to the conceptual framework. The findings are organized according to the four main organizational attributes that are presented in the conceptual framework. Finally, this chapter addresses the study's limitations and suggests future research directions.

### **4.1 Challenges of Thai Nonprofits**

Consistent with ADB (2011), Chhina et al. (2014), and Phaholyothin (2017), the interview data demonstrates that the challenges Thai nonprofits faced in the past 10 years are due to economic, social, political, and technological changes. Detailed challenges are elaborated in the following sections.

#### ***4.1.1 Challenges due to Economic Changes***

The country's economic success led to a decline in international development assistance and grants (Chhina et al., 2014). Three nonprofit organizations, #8, #9, and #14, revealed that they faced challenges when Thailand became an upper-middle income country, as international organizations withdrew their fundings to these organizations. Organization #14 was accustomed to relying on international funding as its main source of revenue. The withdrawal of foreign funding highly affected the organization's finances. According to Organization #14, "in the past, we received 30 [percent of our revenue] from within the country and 70 [percent] from international [sources], including from the US and England. However, when the World Bank announced that we had

become a middle-upper income [country], these funds were gone. Then, we had to find funding by ourselves, which did not cover the decline of foreign funds.” Similarly, Organization #8 stated that “since Thailand has become an upper-middle income country, there are only few sources of funding left for providing direct service. Therefore, [the organization] has to receive donations within the country, which has high competition.”

Another challenge that the organizations faced was the economic recession. Similar to the U.S. nonprofits discussed in Fyffe (2014), four nonprofits, Organizations #6, #7, #8, and #9, considered economic recession as their organization's key challenges. Organizations #6, #7, and #11 indicated that they received less money from individual donations during the economic recession. The recession also causes the decline in organization grants. Organization #8 mentioned that “when the global economy recedes, our funders get affected, as the government of those countries reduce support to civil society organizations, [which are our funders].”

#### ***4.1.2 Challenges due to Social Issues***

Nonprofits in Thailand faced difficulties in obtaining individual donations, as Thai people do not trust recipient organizations (Chhina et al., 2014; Phaholyothin, 2017). Consistent with the literature, Organization #10 and Organization #14 faced challenges due to negative perceptions of Thai people towards the nonprofit sector. According to Organization #10, historically, Thai nonprofits were entirely run by volunteers, hence, Thais have a perception that nonprofits should be operated by volunteers with no overhead cost. Organization #10 added that, when a nonprofit has overhead costs, “Thais are not confident that their donations will reach children [service

recipients], so they may decide not to donate”. Additionally, Thai people perceived nonprofits as protestors and activists, as the director of Organization #14 said that “Although, we are NGO, we do not campaign for rights or protest the government, or disagree with politicians, . . . People still generalize us to be in this group”. As a result of this perception, Organization #14 received criticism and found it challenging to get public support.

Another challenge that Thai nonprofits have faced emanates from the perception towards their service recipients. Thai people have bias and discrimination towards migrant workers and migrant children from the neighboring countries (Chuprajong, 2010). In the past, Organization #1 provided service to Thai rural children who migrated to live in urban areas; however, as Thailand gets more developed, there are fewer Thai people who migrate, while there are more immigrants from neighboring countries. Therefore, the organization changed its target group to focus on immigrants from neighboring countries. Similarly, Organization #8 changed their target groups from Thai people to foreign immigrants. Both of these organizations pointed out that Thai people prefer to support nonprofits that provide services to Thais over those helping foreign immigrants. As Organization #1 mentioned, [individual] donors “think that no! not Burmese children, children of migrant workers, or Laotian children, it’s better to help Thai children”. As a result, Organization #1 and Organization #8 found it difficult to get support from Thai people.



#### ***4.1.3 Challenges due to Political Changes***

Five nonprofits, Organizations #3, #7, #8, #9, and #15, pointed out that the perception of the Thai government as undemocratic, unstable, and unsupportive imposes a high challenge on them. It difficult for nonprofits to work with the Thai government or obtain government grants. Consistent with Bratton (1989), the undemocratic Thai government does not listen to nonprofits' voice. As a result, the government issued laws and policies that impede nonprofit operations. Organization #3 mentioned that, "As the government came from appointment, they do not have to care for or listen to us."

Organization #3 also added that "we hope that we have democracy, so the government will listen, as they come from election". Similarly, according to Organization #8,

In this past four years, the military government only listened to ministries and bureaucrats, but not to the nonprofit sector. . . . Currently, when a ministry would like to change a law, there is no public participation. If public participation occurs, you cannot really change the content. The problem is due to political situation that destructively impacts our movement as a nonprofit organization.

The instability of Thai government adversely affected Organization #9's funding sources and Organization #15's alignment with the government's mission. For example, the government established funds for nonprofits, but when a new government comes to power, these funds could be canceled. As Organization #15's Secretary told that, "Organization #9 got a digital fund. . . . However, with a new government this fund may not continue." Likewise, Organization #15 found it difficult to align with the Thai government as the government frequently changed, as its director mentioned that "The government changes all the time and its focus groups change, and also its goals. So, for one year, this is the government and we go align and sometimes it crosses each other."

Thai government is unsupportive to the nonprofit sector. Consistent with Najam (2000) and Young (2000) on confrontation or adversary relationship between the government and the nonprofit sector, the Thai government plays a role as a regulator and exerts its coercive powers on nonprofits, while providing very few grants. The survey data demonstrates that on a scale of 1 to 10, all nonprofits, except Organization #4, rated government support for their organizations over the past 10 years to be lower than 6, while rating social and corporations' support higher. This result implies that the nonprofits rarely got support from the government. Consistently, the deputy director of Organization #3 illustrated that “the government comes to examine nonprofits; however, it has never given money.” Organization #3 also added that “No government grants, so currently, nonprofits face a tough situation because we must work [provide service] and also finding money”.

#### ***4.1.4 Challenges due to Information Technological Changes***

Technological disruption is one of the key challenges that Organization #2, Organization #5, and Organization #14 faced. Organization #14 explained that “In this past two years, there has been high technological disruption. It may look like nonprofits do not get impacted, but actually they do.” According to Organization #2, Organization #5, and Organization #14, technology impacted the methods that nonprofits use to communicate with their stakeholders, including donors and clients. Organization #5 revealed that technology has changed how its clients contacted the organization, as its project manager mentioned that,

About 10 years ago, of course, most people used phones. Therefore, children [the organization's clients] accessed us via phones. However, currently, if you look at the statistics of incoming calls, it is lower. Children would like to contact [us] via other channels. . . . Now, children do not use phones. They use chat or other methods instead.

Additionally, technology has changed payment methods. For instance, Organization #14 reported, "Our financial system in the past did not have internet banking. Payment and money transfer now are different from the past. In the past, we signed a check to pay, but now we don't use a check. Currently, everything is turning into electronics." The change to online payment affects how individuals donate to nonprofits. According to Organization #2 and Organization #5, nowadays people rarely donate through donation boxes, which generated high revenue for nonprofits in the past.

In sum, technological disruption impacted how nonprofits communicated with their stakeholders, including donors and clients. Communication methods that nonprofits used in the past, including phone calls and published reports, become less effective. Currently, people prefer to communicate and receive information via social media. Moreover, donation methods that nonprofits used in the past, such as donation boxes, do not work in the new technological environment in which online payments are more common.

## **4.2 Organizational Attributes Promoting Resilience**

This section provides a cross-case analysis of assets and strategies exhibited by the nonprofit organizations. The findings are organized according to the four main organizational attributes or factors presented in the conceptual framework (see page 35).

As noted in Chapter 2, the four attributes are as follows: (1) implementing strategies to be

legitimate, (2) having sources of revenue consistent with the types of goods and services the organizations provide to their beneficiaries, (3) managing resource dependencies on other organization, and (4) having assets, processes, and leaders to manage external shocks.

***Attribute #1: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Implement Strategies to Gain Support from Their Environment.***

Nonprofit organizations are considered to exist within open systems (Bryson et al., 2001) because they gain resources from the environment to carry out their missions. According to the interviews and documentary research, high-resilient nonprofit organizations invested in public relations and promoted their legitimacy by disclosing their statements and reports, having evaluations and performance assessments, and encouraging public participation. These strategies enable nonprofit organizations to receive resources from their environment.

**Public Relations.** Marketing and fundraising are closely related to the nonprofit level of household donations (Haski-Leventhal & Foot, 2016). The findings in this study are consistent with Haski-Leventhal and Foot (2016). The founder of Organization #12 suggested to other nonprofit organizations that “being well-known is very important because no one donates to people that they do not know.” Organization #6, Organization #11, and Organization #15, which are highly resilient organizations, indicated that they had strong public relations, and they also received most of their revenue from individual donations. Organization #6 has a policy that the organization should get support from

Thai people; therefore, the organization actively worked on public relations; as the interviewee mentioned that,

Committee of Organization #6 believes that Thai people must know Thai problems. Thai people must know children's problems in their country. Therefore, Thai people must support [nonprofit organizations]. . . . This committee's policy makes us diligently communicate with Thai people about children's problems.

The secretary pro tem of Organization #6 explained that "Whatever work I have done, whatever that shows results, we publicize [it] immediately." She also added that "We have media that come to work with us, therefore, we do not work in silence." As a result, Organization #6 is well-known to the public, which enabled the organization to receive 100 percent of its revenue from Thai people in the beginning. The secretary pro tem of Organization #6 also made a suggestion to other nonprofit organizations that "We must let the society know what our children's problems are. Whatever province you are in, you just communicate with that province about the problems" so that you get individual donations.

Organization #11 stated that it seriously worked on public relations to raise awareness about the organization. As a result, according to the organization's evaluation report, the organization received more than 80 percent its revenue from Thai people's donations. According to the organization,

When we separated from [the organization's name], . . . [the committee's name] planned an issue of public relations that every day we were on newspaper or radio, at least once a day so that people knew us. . . . People knew us through our work and public relations.

The project manager of Organization #11 also mentioned that a part of her job responsibilities was to publicize the organization's work. As she said that,

We do not only work, but also publicize. We divide it into three areas. One is to publicize through students' visits. The second one is through media. There are TV programs that come to follow and interview the organization. Another one is to publicize on Facebook, publicize on LINE [application] about our work, lessons learned from work, and lessons learned from [project's name #1] and [project's name #2].

Organization #15 is another organization that actively worked on public relations. Its director elaborated that its staff spent time working on public relations to reach out to potential donors by "having a website so that people can find us. [Our] Facebook and website use multiple languages. [We] make newsletters just like PR, communication materials, social events, those kinds of things."

On the contrary, two mid-resilient and three low-resilient organizations mentioned that they lacked public relations. These nonprofit organizations stay in a vicious cycle in that because they lack public relations, most people do not know them, therefore, it is difficult for them to fundraise. Consequently, these nonprofit organizations do not have money to hire staff to work on public relations. As a result, they are unable to invest in public relations, and the cycle goes on and on.

Organization #7 rarely invested in public relations. According to the interviewee, "we do not have any mainstream media, we only use social media." Organization #7 indicated that it received a very low amount of donations from within the country. Organization #8 is another organization that lacked public relations, as a result, the organization was not well-known and ended up having difficulties with fundraising. As the interviewee stated that,

This [public relations] issue is challenging for us because we still cannot hire staff to specifically take care of public relations. [We] depend on collaboration, Facebook, something like this. [We] may have some media that is interested in

making a specific documentary [about our work]. Some people follow [us], but very few. Many people do not even know that Organization #8 exists.

Similarly, Organization #13 mentioned that the organization “has never paid for marketing costs, only word-of-mouth and personal connections”. As a result, the organization had difficulties raising funds to complete its projects; as indicated by the interviewee that “there are projects that we cannot work on because of no fundraising.”

Lacking public relations skills makes it difficult for the case organizations to get individual donations, even though they had many successful field cases. Organization #9 stated that,

We work a lot, but [we have] poor communications. It’s very hard for staff who work in the field to write case stories. . . . Not because there is no story, there are a lot of stories. However, staff does not have tools to integrate them [cases] into stories. When writing it [a story], it does not come out like when others do it that can make people stun. . . . Whatever clips that people watch that go viral, we don’t have that.

Organization #14 faced the similar problem. As the interviewee mentioned that,

What we would like to do next is [public relations]. Although we have many successful cases in more than 70 areas, we still lack potential in public relations to publicize [these cases] to the public. . . . It is expensive to hire people in these careers. When people come from an advertising agency, do I have money to hire them? When experts in digital marketing come, I do not have money to hire them.

**Disclosure Statements and Reports.** Disclosure statements and reports are tools for facilitating accountability (Ebrahim, 2016). Nonprofit organizations in Thailand are required by the Ministerial Regulation on Registering, Operations, and Registration of Public Charitable Organizations B.E. 2545 to report their operations to registrars. By the end of March every year, nonprofit organizations must submit operational reports, income-expense accounts, balance sheets, and committee meeting reports. In addition,

according to the Notification of the Ministry of Finance on Income Tax and Value Added Tax (No. 531), public charitable organizations, which are qualified for tax-exempt status and deductible charitable contributions, are required to submit the organizations' information to the revenue department. Within 150 days after the end of the accounting period, public charitable organizations must submit their annual reports, balance sheets, and income-expense accounts.

This study found that disclosure statements and reports support individual donations. Although nonprofit organizations in Thailand are not required to disclose their finances to the public, Organizations #2, #9, #14, and #15 provided financial reports on their websites. These organizations had individual donations as their main source of revenue. Organization #14 highlighted the importance of disclosure, that "Transparency must be high; otherwise, it [the nonprofit organization] cannot survive. Think of ourselves that we would not donate if we are not confident with the system." Organization #14 disclosed organizational expenses, including the detail of projects' costs, to the public. The director of Organization #14 indicated that, "Donors check and monitor all the time. If they cannot check how much money you have used today, how much a project costs, you will not survive."

In addition, disclosure statements and reports promote institutional giving. Case nonprofit organizations indicate that their financial transparency determines whether they will get future funds. According to the interviews, funders, including both domestic and international organizations, required their fund recipients to disclose their financial data. In addition, some funders sent their auditors to assess the nonprofit organizations' finances. Organization #1 had been continuously receiving funding from [the



government's foundation's name] for almost 10 years. According to the interviewee, "we have efficiency and have never had any problem. We have reputation for good management. [The government's foundation's name] sent auditors, and there was no problem." Similarly, Organization #4 mentioned that "We are evaluated by funders. If we do not meet standards, they will not fund us. Therefore, we must follow our funders' standards." Likewise, the project manager of Organization #5 stated that "[The funder's name] has their own auditors. However, we sent all documents to them. They will check whether they approve this payment or not."

**Performance Assessments and Evaluations.** Consistent with Ebrahim (2003, 2016), performance assessment and evaluation is another tool that nonprofit organizations in Thailand use to facilitate their accountability. Case nonprofit organizations employed both external and internal evaluations. The survey results from the organizations indicate that almost all of the organizations in this study, except Organization #2, received regular performance evaluations from their funding stakeholders; their funders evaluated the organizations' performance to ensure that they meet the funders' standards. Organization #5 mentioned that "Funders check both outcomes and finances. . . . For work, if [they] think that it is not effective enough, they will ask us to revise." Organization #8 shared that "For the projects that we receive grants, funders will send experts to evaluate us." According to Ebrahim (2016), evaluations and performance assessments are important to nonprofit organizations because they affect future funding. The interview with Organization #4 supports this statement; according to the interviewee, "We are evaluated by funders. If we do not meet

their standard, they will not support us, therefore, we must keep it according to our funders' standards.”

Internal evaluations are practiced by case organizations whereby nonprofit staff assess progress towards the organizations' goals and missions. For example, Organization #12 mentioned that “We have project evaluations in each year. When a project is done, staff will report how does the project operate, are the results satisfied, is there any problem?” Another example is Organization #14. Its director shared that,

The plan includes indicators. For example, if this plan is to improve children's nutrition. We will set a target that good nutrition means 100 children must have these heights and weights and how much nutrition number and literate number must be increased. In the first year, we will create a baseline. After one year past, we will be able to tell the progress. . . . When the project completes, we claim what we have solved from the beginning.

Internal evaluations affect individual donations. As the project manager of Organization #11 indicated that, “all of our donors . . . check how well we support children's development and numbers of children that we support”.

**Participation.** Nonprofit organizations can promote public participation to gain accountability (Ebrahim, 2016). According to Ebrahim (2016), participation can take the form of public involvement in actual project-related activities. Case nonprofit organizations, which have individual donations as their main source of revenue, tended to see the importance of public participation. Organization #14 perceived that donors had changed. They do not want to only donate, but also would like to participate in organizations' activities. According to Organization #14,

People's generations change the pattern of giving and areas of interests, including lifestyles. In the past, people donated without thinking that much. [They] donated

to make merits [a Buddhist practice that brings good results] and feel pleasure. However, when the new generation donates, they would like to participate more, such as getting hands-on, helping painting, and so on. Therefore, the organization must change. It cannot only receive people's donations and go to work. It must plan how to invite people in so that they have experience in helping others.

Organization #2, Organization #11, and Organization #13 indicated that participation supports donations to the nonprofit organizations. Participation makes donors feel confident about how the nonprofit organizations use their money.

Organization #2 described that,

For business entrepreneurs to support you, they must participate in management. They must be informed in the meeting about how you will use their money. If we would like to give lots of money to someone, are we supposed to know what your meeting is about, how will you use our money, and should we have a right to make decisions?

Similarly, Organization #11 mentioned that,

The work of this nonprofit organization lets people and others participate. Having participation leads to being examined. First, they [people] come to visit to check whether you work or not. If you really work, they would donate. If you do not work, they would donate only one time and disappear. This is a cross-check. I call it a participation principle. Donors must participate in the organization's operations so they can see how we operate.

In addition, participation enables donors to have a sense of project ownership, as the president of Organization #13 stated that "I think that when our donors get to meet us and share comments . . . they feel that they own projects. As a result, people would like to contribute more." The interviewee also gave recommendations to other nonprofit organizations in improving their resilient capacity that they should let donors participate in project planning and brainstorming, "because everyone would like to be valued. They do not want to be just money."

In summary, nonprofit organizations that implement strategies to communicate and build accountability with donors and funders are more likely to continue receiving donations and funding than the organizations that do not. These strategies include public relations, disclosure statements, performance assessment, and participation. Please see Table 4 for summary of the nonprofits demonstrating Attribute #1.

**Table 4**

*Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #1: Resilient Nonprofit*

*Organizations Implement Strategies to Gain Support from Their Environment*

<b>Levels of Resilience</b>	<b>Org. #</b>	<b>Public Relations</b>	<b>Disclosure Statements and Reports</b>	<b>Performance Assessments and Evaluations</b>	<b>Participation</b>
High	1		/	/	
	4		/	/	
	5		/	/	
	6	/		/	
	11	/		/	/
	12	/		/	
	15	/	/	/	
Mid	9		/	/	
	10			/	
	14		/	/	/
Low	2		/		/
	3			/	
	7			/	
	8			/	
	13			/	/

***Attribute #2: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Have Sources of Revenue Consistent with the Types of Services They Provide and Their Beneficiaries.***

As noted earlier, as Thailand became an upper-middle-income country, international organizations withdrew their funding from nonprofit organizations in Thailand (Chhina et al., 2014). To continue their operations, these nonprofit organizations needed to obtain revenue from within the country to replace the declining foreign funding. Sources of revenue within the country include the Thai government's funding, corporate philanthropy, and Thai people's donations.

As noted in Table 2, all the nonprofit organizations in this research provide social services, such as supporting disadvantaged children, disabled people, abused women, and people with HIV and AIDs. Their programs serve people in need thus creating positive externalities on some interest groups (Young, 2007) that would like to see people in need have a better standard of living. Therefore, according to Young's (2007) benefits theory, because of the group and public benefits the Thai nonprofits in this study produce, they should receive private contributions from interest groups and citizens who value their goods and services, as well as government funding. Data from the case studies is consistent with the benefits theory. First, almost all of the case nonprofit organizations, except two organizations, had individual donations as their main sources of revenue. The two case nonprofit organizations providing services to immigrants, Organizations #1 and #8, indicated that it was difficult for them to receive individual donations from Thai people. As noted by Organization #1,

Our target groups are very disadvantaged groups, marginalized groups, migrant workers, and children in the slum around here. City people or rich people rarely

know them or think that helping these children will not benefit the Thai society. An attitude like this also occurs.

Organization #1 received most of its revenue from [the government's foundation's name] and international organizations, which is still consistent with Young's (2007) theory, but in terms of viewing services to immigrants as a public benefit. Therefore, Organization #1 was still a high-resilient organization, although it rarely got individual donations. A similar situation occurred with Organization #8. According to its program director stated that,

If we advertise that we support migrant women and children, it is very challenging. Why do we have to support Burmese children? They will say that there are Thai children who are still struggled.

Organization #8 found it difficult to get domestic donations to replace the decline of foreign funding. As a result, Organization #8 had fewer financial resources overtime, which may explain its low level of resilience. Donation behavior towards in-groups and out-groups (Herzenstein & Posavac, 2019) can explain this phenomenon. Thai donors may likely perceive Thai charity recipients as in-group members, whereas recipients of charity, who are migrants, as out-group members. In addition, while Young's (2007) theory is still applicable, context matters, as seen with how the negative perceptions toward immigrants limits individual donations to organizations serving immigrants.

In summary, resilient nonprofit organizations have sources of revenue consistent with the types of services they provide and their beneficiaries. Nonprofit organizations that provide social services should have individual and institutional donations as their sources of revenue. Furthermore, if the benefits accrue to a group that citizens do not value (group benefit), nonprofit organizations should obtain revenue from institutions

instead (in response to the public benefit). Please see Table 5 for summary of the nonprofits demonstrating Attribute #2.

**Table 5**

*Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #2: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Have Sources of Revenue Consistent with the Types of Services They Provide and Their Beneficiaries*

<b>Levels of Resilience</b>	<b>Org. #</b>	<b>Sources of revenue consistent with their missions, types of goods and services, and beneficiaries</b>
High	1	
	4	/
	5	/
	6	/
	11	/
	12	/
	15	/
Mid	9	/
	10	/
	14	/
Low	2	/
	3	/
	7	/
	8	
	13	/

***Attribute #3: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Manage Their Resource Dependencies on Other Organizations.***

Consistent with Ankinun (2011), Froelich (1999), and Fyffe (2014), the resilient nonprofit organizations in this study appear to be managing their resource dependencies on other organizations in several ways including diversifying revenue streams, generating commercial revenue, and applying for new funding sources. For instance, Organizations #6 and #12, which are high-resilient nonprofit organizations, advised that in order to improve their resilient capacity, Thai nonprofits should not rely heavily on the government's or any foundation's funds. The secretary pro tem of Organization #6 recommended other nonprofit organizations "not to find only one organization that supports us." In addition, she elaborates that,

We have to be self-reliant, do not depend on others, and do not depend on the government. Because if [we] depend on others, no matter who they are, we must work very hard, sometimes we have to follow what they want, despite that our factors are different from theirs. Trying to be self-reliant refers to having our own income and working on activities that enable self-standing.

Similarly, the founder of Organization #12 suggested other nonprofit organizations to be self-reliance as stated that,

Self-reliance is a very important issue. Therefore, it is inevitable for an executive, that would like to run an organization in the long-term, to think about having this strategy. Right now, almost all [nonprofit organizations] are attached to the [government's foundation's name]. If the [government's foundation's name] falls, more than 80 percent of Thai civil society will die.

As discussed in the literature review, strategies that nonprofit organizations can use to manage their resource dependencies on other organizations include generating earned income, relying on individual donations, and seeking new funding sources. In addition to these revenue strategies, the interviewees also noted that nonprofit



organizations can lessen their dependencies on other organizations by reducing operational costs.

**Generating Earned Income.** Ankinun (2011), Froelich (1999), and Fyffe (2014) also proposed that nonprofit organizations can control their resource dependencies by generating revenue from commercial activities. Nine organizations mentioned that they have earned income. Seven of these successfully generated earned income, while two, which are low-resilient organizations, faced problems operating their commercial activities.

Organization #1, Organization #10, Organization #11, and Organization #12 generated earned income by selling donated items. Organization #1 indicated that individual and corporate donations were not lessened; donations just changed their form from monetary to in-kind donations. Therefore, Organization #1 converted these in-kind donations into cash. According to the assistant director of Organization #1,

Donations within the country that come from individual donors are less in a monetary form, but are more in in-kind, such as rice, dried food, milk, toys, and second-hand cloth. We change these things into cash. . . . Corporations also change their form of donations. For example, [a company's name], . . . donates [its] products to us every year. . . . The company also allows us to sell them at a low price to convert them into money to buy lunch and school supplies for children.

Similarly, Organization #10 said that “when we get in-kind donations, such as recycled paper, we categorize and sell them.” According to Organization #12, “another source of income comes from our work on the project that categorizes [used] items and cloth to sell. Then, this revenue is used to cover the organization’s expenses.” Another case organization that generated revenue by selling both donated items is Organization

#11. The project manager mentioned that “For donated cloth that [our] children do not use, we ask permission to convert them into capital.” Furthermore, Organization #11 produced and sold its own products to supplement its revenue from individual donations.

As the interviewee stated that,

[We] try to produce our own products . . . by braiding bracelets, poultry farming, mushroom farming. . . . Currently, we do not expect donations to be all of our budget. We think that it must be a mix between a nonprofit organization and the private sector, which is called social enterprises, SE.

Organization #4, Organization #6, and Organization #13 generated their commercial revenue by producing and selling products. Organization #4, which is a high-resilient organization, gained income from its commercial activities to support the organization. The interviewee mentioned that,

We try to focus on our occupational training centers to let them function as social enterprises in order to have another source of revenue for the organization. All of the occupational training centers must perform as social enterprises. For example, the agricultural food occupational training centers. . . . When [we] process agricultural products, we open a business to sell these products online. . . . [We] obtain income from occupational training to support the nonprofit organization.

During the Hamburger crisis, Organization #6’s donations declined. However, the organization still had money to operate because it generated earned income. According to Organization #6,

2550 [2006] is the year that the Hamburger crisis occurred. It came from foreign countries, but it impacted us. . . . It affected our donors. However, we had already prepared. . . . We taught children furniture production, food-processing, arts, and Batik, which we have had since the beginning. However, we started taking it seriously during the Hamburger crisis. Then, our friends, who are millionaires, came to support us. Instead of supporting through monetary donations, they come to support by buying our children’s products.

The president of Organization #13 considered the organization to be sustainable because it relied on earned income. As she mentioned,

I think my organization is quite sustainable because it is a semi-social business. . . . As it does not rely only on donations, it can continue operating when donations stop coming in. I consider it to have more freedom than other nonprofit organizations because they have to wait for monetary donations. However, my organization does not have to wait for the government's [funding].

On the contrary, Organization #3 and Organization #7, which are low-resilient organizations, indicated that they faced challenges in generating earned income.

Organization #3 had problems in operating its commercial activities due to the lack of business skills. According to Organization #3,

We are interested in social enterprise; however, we still severely lack expertise in this area. For example, [the project's name] in the Southern part [of Thailand], we made bags and other products. [We also] have an organic farm. . . . However, we are still amateur in business thinking. Sometimes, [we] estimate expenses too low and our management is still not that good. As a result, income from selling agricultural products is not high enough.

Organization #7 generated earned income from rental properties and selling agricultural products aiming to compensate for a decline of donations from abroad. However, its revenue from rental properties was not high and its earned income from selling agricultural products was not stable due to fluctuated prices. As a result, Organization #7 had to canceled many projects due to a lack of sufficient funding. According to Organization #7,

[We] use our savings to invest by buying townhouses, then rent them to generate income. . . . We get about 200,000 Baht per month. However, this is not enough because teachers' salaries cost a million Baht per month. . . . We also try to do agriculture. . . . In the past when prices [of agricultural products] are good, we got more than a million Baht. Now, now we get less than 100,000 Baht because prices drop drastically. . . . Revenue has declined partly because of our income comes from agriculture and its prices drop.

**Relying on Individual Donations.** Fyffe (2014) found that having individual donations as a revenue source helps nonprofits manage their resource dependencies on

other organizations and get through the recession. Following the literature, Organization #5, Organization #10, and Organization #15, which are a mid- and high-resilient organizations, revealed that having individual donations as their main source of revenue contributed to the resilience of their organizations. Based on the interview data, revenue from individual donations are more stable than revenue from institutional giving because individual donations are usually given to nonprofit organizations in the long-term, while a corporation or government's grants are provided to the organization in the short-term. As the director of Organization #10 mentioned,

They [Corporate funding] are not stable. . . . We experienced getting funding this year, then no funding to us again in the past 10 years. The problem occurs like this. However, for individuals, if we have a good relationship with them, they donate a small amount of money, such as 500 or 300 Baht, to us this month. In another two months, they may donate to us again.

Organization #15 mentioned that its capacity to fulfill the mission after facing challenges was quite stable because its revenue came from individual donations. It is easier for a nonprofit organization to find a replacement for discontinued donation from an average individual donor than a discontinued institutional grant, which tend to be larger in size.

The interviewee explained that,

I think that we are quite stable because we do not depend on a few big grants. So, for example, if you have a project for one or two years for a lot of million Baht, that time you can pay all the salary and other stuff. But after that, it collapses, right? Our main basis is a lot of individual people so if one of them stops, it is easy to replace. So, that means it's quite stable even if the government changes their goals, even if other projects will stop, we still have our donor bases.

Organization #5 switched from relying on grants to depend on individual donations because it is more stable. In the past two months, Organization #5 started using an online donation platform aiming to get individual donations. The head of

communication of Organization #5 stated that “we must find other sources [of funding] that are more stable, that do not tie with only few people, or with few corporations, or with few organizations.” The project manager of Organization #5 added that,

Grants that we received in the past are a one-time deal. It’s like we wrote a proposal, then they gave according to what we wrote. . . . After we finish the project, we will never get it again. It turns out that there is no strategy on how we can continue to have capital flow in. . . . Having money that flows in monthly and stably has not occurred yet but we are beginning to make it happen.

**Seeking New Funding Sources.** According to Fyffe (2014), another strategy that resilient nonprofit organizations can use to manage their resource dependencies is continually seeking new funding sources. Five case organizations indicated that they sought new funding sources. However, only three of them successfully obtained new funding sources, while the other two organizations did not. Organization #10, a mid-resilient organization, and Organizations #6 and #11 which are high-resilient organizations, successfully sought new funding sources. Organization #6 applied for grants from organizations abroad to stabilize its total revenue because revenue from individual donations within Thailand fluctuated. Although individual revenue is considered to be more stable than institutional grants, it still fluctuates. According to Organization #6,

During the economic crisis, . . . donations declined. When donations started to decrease, . . . I thought that we should work with organizations abroad. After attending meetings with foreign organizations, they were interested. So, I tried it [sending a grant proposal]. We then received about two-millions Baht from abroad.

Organization #6 had skills in writing proposals and translating them into a foreign language. The secretary pro tem of Organization #6 mentioned that “I started looking for

funding, writing proposals, then letting our foreign affairs division translate and send to organizations abroad.” As a result, the organization received funding abroad, which enabled the organization to continue serving its clients during the financial crisis.

Organization #10 sought individual donations in Thailand to lessen its dependence on donations overseas. In the past, Organization #10 got about 80 to 90% of its revenue from individual donations from abroad because its founder had connections, which in and of itself reflects high revenue concentration and therefore high dependency on a single stream of funding. However, the director of Organization #10 had concerns that “these donors are individuals. When they get old, they will have less income. If they pass away, our fundraising overseas will be gone.” Therefore, Organization #10 sought support in Thailand as its new source of revenue to diversify their portfolio, hence reducing their resource dependency on any single source.

Organization #11 sought to obtain grants from corporations and private foundations to compensate for the decline of its revenue from individual donations caused by the economic crisis. As the interviewee pointed out;

Most of the money for four projects that I’m working on in the past six years comes from philanthropy. Since the economic crisis, we use projects like this to propose [to private foundations]. . . . This is a part that enables the organization to operate. Organization #11 adapts in these things. Therefore, Organization #11 still survive.

On the other hand, Organization #8 and Organization #9, which are a low- and a mid-resilient organization respectively, lacked the essential skills to generate revenue from new sources. Organization #8 would like to get new grants from international organizations to replace the decline of its current funding; however, the organization did not make it because it lacks English language skills in writing grant proposals.

Organization #8 stated that “English fluency is equated to competency [in grant-writing]. Some organizations, that have sufficient funding, can afford foreigners to help them write. . . . Therefore, in the past we have never received [the grant’s name].” In addition, Organization #8 revealed that the organization could not receive some international grants because Organization #8 did not have savings to invest in a project. The interviewee stated that “we have to invest 10 percent [of the total amount of the grant]. They [the funders] assume that we must have reserve funding. Therefore, it is a pairing between international organizations and local organizations.” What is also interesting is the importance of savings and reserves as forms of organizational slack that is essential to managing resilience (Calabrese, 2013; Young & Searing, 2022). Here we see how a lack in this type of slack can prevent organizations from taking advantage of opportunities that could help strengthen their resilience.

Organization #9 sought new funding sources to lessen its dependence on a single grant. About 70 percent of its revenue came from a single foundation. The secretary of Organization #9 revealed that “everyone assesses it [our income] to have high risk because it can end anytime.” To address this challenge, the organization tried to get new sources of revenue, including individual donations and corporate grants. According to the interviewee, Organization #9 established the Integrated Marketing Communication office two years ago to raise funds from individual donors. However, it did not effectively raise funding because it lacked public relations skills. Organization #9 also obtained corporate grants as its new source of revenue. However, Organization #9 ended up making loss from receiving corporate grants due to its poor negotiation skills. According to Organization #9,

We are not good in negotiations. . . . Sometimes, [corporations] ask us to work in the sites that they choose, without paying us salaries. They just keep pressing and pressing. . . . In the end, NGOs take a loss. . . . It is because NGOs do not know how to negotiate. We, either I or the fundraising staff, lack this [skill]. If you would like to work with corporations, you must be good in negotiations. Their negotiation skills are advanced, while our negotiation skill is not.

**Reducing Operational Costs.** Three high-resilient nonprofit organizations mentioned that reducing operational costs helped them lessen their dependencies on other organizations. Organization #6 and Organization #11 decided to purchase land to grow their own food to reduce food costs associated with serving their clients. However, note that in order for this approach to work, the cost of producing one's own food supplies must outweigh the cost associated with purchasing food supplies from other sources. Organization #12, on the other hand, used donated stuff, from small things like book and Stationery to large stuff like computers and furniture, to save its operational costs. As their operations did not fully rely on monetary funding, when crises came, they were resilient and still operated well. As Organization #6 said,

We started restoring our land since 2529 [1986]. . . . I make fish ponds, grow chicken, . . . We use these to cook. Therefore, the cost of food is reduced. Our income is low, but we can lessen the cost of food. . . . During the crisis, donations drop, but we have free food, which is equal to hidden income. . . . A crisis is not like a crisis for us.

Similarly, Organization #11 mentioned that,

When the economic crisis happened, there is not enough money. It had stated since 2550 [2007]. . . . However, Organization #11 has a good project. . . . In 2004, we used a part of donations to buy land. . . . Then we built [a project's name], which is a place that sends food to all projects. . . . [We] do agriculture to support the organization.

Likewise, reducing operational costs helps Organization #12 to continue functioning even though it had a low amount of funding. Organization #12's founder discussed that,



You have to interpret the issue of operational cost. Production requires inputs. People always think of it as monetary funding. That's right, of course, if you can find it. Organization #12 receives a very low amount of money if you compare to its size, but we have capability to significantly reduce cost. For example, almost all the stuff that you see here comes from donations. . . . This means you can reduce the cost of operation.

In summary, resilient nonprofit organizations successfully manage their resource dependencies on other organizations through generating earned income, relying on individual donations, seeking new funding sources, and reducing operational costs. Please see Table 6 for summary of the nonprofits demonstrating Attribute #3. However, implementing these strategies alone does not signify resilience. A nonprofit organization needs to successfully implement these strategies in order to achieve resilience. Each strategy requires a particular set of skills. Therefore, a nonprofit organization should understand its required skills before implementing the strategies.

**Table 6**

*Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #3: Resilient Nonprofit*

*Organizations Manage Their Resource Dependencies on Other Organizations*

<b>Levels of Resilience</b>	<b>Org. #</b>	<b>Generating Earned Income</b>	<b>Relying on Individual Donations</b>	<b>Seeking New Funding Sources</b>	<b>Reducing Operational Costs</b>
High	1	/			
	4	/			
	5		/		
	6	/	/	/	/
	11	/	/	/	/
	12	/	/		/
	15		/		

Levels of Resilience	Org. #	Generating Earned Income	Relying on Individual Donations	Seeking New Funding Sources	Reducing Operational Costs
Mid	9				
	10	/	/	/	
	14		/		
Low	2		/		
	3				
	7		/		
	8				
	13	/			

***Attribute #4: Resilient Nonprofit Organizations Have Assets, Processes, and Leaders to Manage External Shocks.***

The findings are consistent with the conceptual framework that assets, processes, and leaders contribute to nonprofit organization's resilience. Based on publicly available and internal documents and interviews, assets that promote resilience of nonprofit organizations included savings and volunteers. Processes that the case nonprofit organizations mentioned as a factor that builds resilience are flexibility and adaptability. Finally, transformational and governance leadership are essential to achieve resilience.

**Savings.** Organizational slack is considered as a key characteristic of resilient nonprofits (Young & Searing, 2022), in that it serves as shock absorbers and help maintain program output in the presence of crises (Calabrese, 2018; Calabrese & Ely, 2020). Case organizations indicate that savings considerably enhanced their resilience.

Organization #3, Organization #11, and Organization #14 noted that they could continue serving their clients when they faced crises because they had savings. For Organization #3, although it faced financial deficits, the organization could still operate because of its savings. The deputy director stated that,

We have to use money from our savings for operation. For example, at Mae Sot district, we got [the grant's name] last year. However, in the second half of that year, it was money from the organization that supported it.

Organization #11, a high-resilient organization, stated that the organization has a large amount of savings. Therefore, Organization #11 could continue operating when it faced financial crises. According to Organization #11,

We faced the financial crisis in B.E. 2539 (1996). However, we did not have a problem because we had savings. . . . After B.E. 2550 (2007), we have faced financial crises due to fewer donations. . . . We estimate that if in the future there are no donations at all, we can continue operating for about 9 years based on our savings.

Similarly, Organization #14, a mid-resilient organization, mentioned that “we have savings at a level that can support children in case the organization faces crises.”

**Volunteers.** Using volunteers in service toward the attainment of organizational goals is one of the distinctive features of the nonprofit sector (Brudney, 2016).

Volunteers promote nonprofit cost-effectiveness. With a relatively small investment of funds and work of paid staff, volunteers have a capacity to increase the level and quality of services the nonprofit provides to the public (Brudney, 2016). Consistent with Brudney (2016), the interviews demonstrate that using volunteers promotes organizations' resilience. Having volunteers enables nonprofit organizations to provide services, even when they lacked financial resources. Organization #12, which is a high-

resilient nonprofit organization, considers using volunteers as a key that makes its projects and organization successful. The interviewee stated that “Organization #12 has a very low amount of funding, compared to its size. However, we had a high capability in reducing operational costs” through a reliance on volunteers to reduce its operational costs. The organization advertises volunteer positions for all of its projects on the recruitment website. According to the founder of Organization #12 without volunteers, the organization would not be able to work on its projects, as he mentioned that,

Try to imagine if you only hire full-time staff. Let me give you an example. When I worked on a used books project, there was a foundation that used to do this project before. . . . However, it turned out that . . . [the foundation’s name] stopped working on it. . . . The manager said that the project needed to be canceled because the operational costs in managing used books are more expensive than buying new books.

Using volunteers also helps Organization #8, which faced financial deficits and had a low amount of funding to be able to operate thus limiting the organization’s ability to hire paid researchers or technicians as full-time staff, so it relied on volunteers.

According to the program director,

It [Funding] is not enough to support [the organization]. In the past, we used to hire 10 staff. We cannot hire full-time staff because it will be a monetary commitment. It uses lots of capital to hire staff. . . . [We] use volunteers, such as researchers for a project. None of the research sections will maintain full-time staff.

When we organize an event, there are people that come to work on a project. . . . They can be students who come to take photos, film videos, something like this. . . . They are volunteers. We do not have funding to hire technicians.

While a reliance on volunteers can help reduce operational costs for the organizations in this study, recruiting, training, retaining, and managing volunteers are not cost-less activities; managing volunteers comes with hidden costs (Brudney, 2016). To

successfully employ volunteers, a nonprofit needs to have an effective volunteer program (Brudney, 2016). Meaning, a failure to attract, manage, and retain dedicated volunteers could also serve to undermine these organizations' resiliency.

**Flexibility and Adaptability.** Following Fyffe (2014) and Witmer and Mellinger (2016), the interview data demonstrates that flexibility and adaptability significantly contribute to the resilience of the organizations. In this study, the secretary pro tem of Organization #6, a high-resilient nonprofit organization, gave a recommendation to other nonprofit organizations that to improve the resilient capacity, "attitudes and perspectives of staff and project managers must be flexible to be able to adapt on time." Organization #14 considers adaptability as an essential factor that assists the organization in tackling challenges. The director of Organization #14 gave a metaphor that "You wake up and water a tree every day. One day, that tree is on fire, but you still work like normal: wake up and water the tree. You do not recognize what's going on. Eventually, the tree will die." Similarly, Organization #11, which is a high-resilient nonprofit organization, highlighted the importance of adaptation. As the interviewee stated that, "If staff changes, the organization will survive." The interviewee also described that its staff had adapted over time through training and working with student volunteers. According to the interviewee,

Lots of students come to visit [us] and, as I told you, in the past, students would ask us what we work on, and what the job is like? Now, there is no question like this. They ask, "What are your strategies for growth?", "What would you like to work on in the future?", "What services do you expect children to get?" Students have changed. We cannot answer as we did in the past that we only support children. No. They [These new questions] make our old staff change.

Emphasizing the value of volunteers, Organization #12, a high-resilient nonprofit organization was able to adapt because of the new ideas that their volunteers brought to the organization. According to the communication specialist “Volunteers and student interns make the organization’s ambiance not only have old generations with old perspectives, but also have new generations. We provide an opportunity for them to support us and brainstorm ideas to initiate projects.”

Organization #7 is another case organization that highlighted the significance of adaptation, as its secretary proposed that “The organization must adapt all the time. Adapting to situations is important.” Although Organization #7, a low-resilient nonprofit, adapted itself by replacing the decline in donations with revenue from commercial activities, it did not generate enough revenue to compensate the decline. As a result, the organization provided less service to its clients.

Organization #3, which has a low level of resilience, indicated that it rarely adapted to changes. The deputy director of Organization #3 mentioned that “the issue that I’m kind of worried about is the headquarters in Bangkok, as we rarely change.” The interviewee also added that,

We quite slightly changed. As the organization has been established for a long time, most staff have worked here for a long time, which makes it difficult to adapt. For example, we would like to use volunteers in operations. However, we still cannot do it because it is difficult for [our] staff to adapt. They cannot adapt to work with new people. . . . Everyone is afraid that [our clients’] secrets will be revealed, which could be unethical.

**Adapting to Information Technologies.** Information technologies change donor behaviors in terms of creating new channels for donations and accessing information

(Bretos et al., 2020). Therefore, nonprofit organizations must adapt to technology to survive and thrive in the digital era. Organization #5, a high-resilient organization, highlighted the importance of adapting to technology. Its head of communication recommended other nonprofit organizations in improving their resilience that “the world is changing; therefore, you must adapt to access your people on both sides [donors and clients]. People’s behavior has changed.” In the past, Organization #5 had a hotline as their main contact point. However, presently due to technological changes, children who are the organization’s target group, prefer to communicate via social media than calling the organization. Therefore, Organization #5 created the communication department to provide service through social media. According to Organization #5’s project manager,

We created this [communication] department to increase our potential in operations and access to our children, to access the new generation children. Because now children do not use phone. They use chat or other methods instead. Therefore, we must have this department to increase our potential in operations and access to our children.

In addition, Organization #5 changed its approach in obtaining donations. The interviewee mentioned that “In the past, we may call potential donors and ask them to donate or put donation boxes. But now, it does not happen anymore. Donations are through a monthly subscription.”

Organization #14, a mid-resilient organization, is another that tried to adapt itself in response to technology disruption that changed its donors’ behaviors. Organization #14 illustrated that with technological disruption, donors would like to have information instantaneously. Therefore, the organization had to adapt itself to promptly provide a report to donors. The interviewee gave an example that,

In the past, we used to send a report from the field via paper, which took a very long time to reach the headquarter, the director, departments, and donors. We have shortened the process by using a mobile phone. Therefore, staff in the field can directly send it [a report] here. We try to cut it [the process] short. The main reason that we changed is that we must rely on funding within the country. Understanding donors and their lifestyles made us change. Then, our working processes in the field need to speed up to fulfill this.

However, Organization #14 faced challenges in adapting because it is difficult for the organization to train its staff or recruit new staff who are experts in technology. As the director said that, “Let think of our staff that works in frontiers. . . . To make them use a mobile phone and understand a new system is a challenge.” In addition, the director gave reasons that make it difficult for Organization #14 to have staff with digital competencies that,

As our nonprofit organization’s work does not need technology-based people, we need people who have a mindset in working with children. That means people who love children must also be competent in technology. . . . In addition, we are not a business that can give high payment as a motivation to work. Therefore, there are many challenges in changing procedures because we are unable to train our staff or recruit new staff on time.

As a result, Organization #14’s working procedures were still delayed and did not match with donors.

Organization #2 is another case organization that adapted due to technology disruption. Organization #2’s revenue from donation boxes, which is its main source of income, drastically kept declining. Therefore, the organization has created donations online in the past two years. As the interviewee mentioned “We discussed that a trend has changed. Right now, everything must be convenient because everything is on the phone. Therefore, nonprofit organizations have to collaborate with commercial banks to create



QR code.” In addition, Organization #2 used technology to communicate with its supporters and donors. According to the interviewee,

We must change our communication with supporters and donors, so they get a clear picture. For example, in the past we thanked them through letters. However later, we have had a video version by letting children say thank you for supporting them since they were in kindergarten. Using this media touches feeling. The nonprofit organization got good feedback.

The interviewee also mentioned that the organization got higher donations and good feedback from adapting to technology. However, the technology trend was still in transition so Organization #2’s donations did not significantly increase. Organization #2 also gave a recommendation to other nonprofit organizations in improving their resilient capacity that “[they] should try to prepare themselves towards the trend that everyone donates through their phones and prepare their staff to know how to use [it]”.

**Transformational Leadership.** Valero et al. (2015) propose that transformational leadership contributes to the resilience of nonprofit organizations through transforming organizations from the status quo into innovative organizations that are better equipped to respond and adapt to challenges. Four elements of transformational leadership are (1) idealized influence, which means acting as a role model to followers, (2) inspirational motivation, which refers to articulating a vision, encouraging followers, and providing meaning for their work, (3) intellectual stimulation, which entails encouraging followers to be innovative and stimulating new perspectives, and (4) individualized consideration, which means listening attentively to followers (Bass, 1997). Based on the interviews, two of these elements appear to promote the resilience of the nonprofit organizations in this study. The interview data demonstrates that inspirational

motivation and intellectual stimulation support the adaptation of case organizations. The inspirational motivation of Organization #2's leaders enabled the organization to adapt itself towards a digital trend. The interviewee mentioned that the organization's leaders articulated the vision of a digital organization and encourages the staff to prepare for the digital trend. Therefore, Organization #2 initiated digital marketing and an online donation platform.

Intellectual stimulation is another element of transformational leadership that support an organization's resilience by encouraging followers to be innovative and stimulating new perspectives. Organization #14's leaders possess a characteristic of intellectual stimulation, which promotes the organization's adaptation. According to the interviewee, "The leaders stressed that staff at every level must develop themselves all the time. [The organization] allocates budget for capacity building and promoting internal knowledge exchange." Organization #14's director also mentioned that "if you [staff] do not have a characteristic of self-developing all the time to keep up with the changes and to learn new methods, the organization will not survive."

**Governance Leadership.** According to Denhardt and Denhardt (2011), governance leadership are needed for forming networks and promoting successful collaboration. These networks and collaborations support nonprofit to achieve resilience when facing challenges (Fyffe, 2014). Following the literature, Organization #14, a mid-resilient organization, considered building networks and collaboration within and between organizations as one of the leaders' duties. As the director mentioned that, as a leader, "I try to engage with the team so they talk together in order to build cross-

collaboration, instead of having silos working separately. Cross-collaboration is needed to maximize work.” The director also added that “our work need partners. We cannot work alone. To have broader impact, we need partnership.” Therefore, Organization #14 collaborated with the government and nonprofits to work on projects.

Furthermore, governance leaders build resilience capacity by helping followers recognize their own vision and learn how to move in that direction (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2011). Consistent with the literature review, findings from the interviews demonstrate that governance leaders facilitate organizations’ adaptation, which leads to resilience. Organization #1, and Organization #6, high resilient organizations, indicated that when the organizations faced challenges, their leaders asked staff to brainstorm and make decisions together regarding how to deal with the challenges and which directions the organizations should go. For example, the secretary pro tem of Organization #6 stated that as an organization, “we work together, perceive problem together, and solve problems together. When it is successful, staff will get encouraged.”

In summary, resilient nonprofit organizations have savings and volunteers, flexible and adaptive processes, and transformational and governance leaders. Having savings and volunteers does not signify a level of resilience; however, it ensures that nonprofit organizations will not collapse. Savings and volunteers enable nonprofit organizations to continue functioning even when they have a low amount of funding. High-resilient nonprofit organizations are flexible and successfully adapt to the shifting context, including technological disruptions, while low-resilient organizations rarely adapt. Transformational and governance leadership support nonprofit organizations to adapt. Please see Table 7 for summary of the nonprofits demonstrating Attribute #4.

**Table 7**

*Summary of the Nonprofits Demonstrating Attribute #4: Resilient Nonprofit*

*Organizations Have Assets, Processes, and Leaders to Manage External Shocks*

Levels of Resilience	Org. #	Assets		Processes		Leaders	
		Savings	Volunteers	Flexibility and Adaptability	Adapting to Information Technologies	Transformational Leadership	Governance Leadership
High	1						/
	4						
	5				/		
	6			/			/
	11	/		/			
	12		/	/			
	15						
Mid	9						
	10						
	14	/		/		/	/
Low	2				/	/	
	3	/					
	7			/			
	8		/				
	13						

### 4.3 Summary of the Findings

The existing literature on nonprofit organizations considers four main pathways to resilience, namely the pathways through open systems, benefits, resource dependence and organizational. While often treated as distinct, in fact this dissertation finds that these

pathways are highly interrelated. The literature review and the findings from the study are concluded as follows:

The first organizational attribute in the conceptual framework drawn from open system perspective suggests that nonprofit organizations should implement strategies to be legitimate in order to gain support from their environment. These strategies include public relations, disclosure statements, performance assessment, and participation. The findings are consistent with the literature that case organizations implementing these strategies were more likely to be perceived as legitimate and gain support than the organizations that did not. Public relations, public disclosure statements, and public participation support nonprofit organizations to gain individual donations. In addition, financial statements and performance assessment are used to determine nonprofit organizations' future grants.

The second organizational attribute in the conceptual framework drawn from the benefits theory suggests that nonprofit organizations should have sources of revenue consistent with the types of services they provide and their beneficiaries. The findings are consistent with the literature that organizations, providing social services, had individual donations as their main sources of revenue. However, there are exceptional cases where Thai people's perceptions of those being served by the nonprofits, in this case, immigrants, did not yield the expected individual donations from Thai people, even though, the organizations provided social services that produce public and group benefits consistent with Young's (2007) theory. This suggests that nonprofits serving immigrant populations may need to take strategic efforts to educate the Thai population about the importance and value of their work. In other words, nonprofits serving immigrants may

need to make a case for why services to immigrants are a public and group benefit that is worthy of financial support from the Thai people. Donation behavior towards in-groups and out-groups (Herzenstein & Posavac, 2019) can explain this phenomenon because these exceptional case organizations provided services to migrants. Therefore, nonprofit organizations providing similar services may need to have different revenue streams depending on their target clients.

The third organizational attribute in the conceptual framework drawn from resource dependence theory (Pfeiffer & Salancik, 2003) suggests that nonprofit organizations should manage their resource dependencies on other organizations through generating earned income (Ankinun, 2011; Froelich, 1999; Fyffe, 2014), relying on individual donations, and seeking new funding sources (Fyffe, 2014). The findings are consistent with Fyffe (2014) that resilient organizations successfully managed their resource dependencies. However, to successfully implement these strategies, a nonprofit organization needs to have a particular set of skills. To effectively generate earned income, a nonprofit organization needs to have business skills. To obtain individual donations, a nonprofit organization must excel in public relations. To successfully attain new funding sources, a nonprofit organization needs to have grant-writing and negotiation skills.

The fourth organizational attribute in the conceptual framework drawn from literature on organizational resilience suggests that nonprofit organizations should have assets, processes, and leaders to manage external shocks. The findings are consistent with the literature that resilient organizations had assets including savings and volunteers, successfully adapted, and were led by transformational and governance leaders. Having

savings and volunteers is a significant organizational attribute. It prevents nonprofit organizations from collapsing and enables them to continue functioning even when they have a low amount of funding. High-resilient nonprofit organizations are flexible and successfully adapt to changing situations. However, to successfully adapt, nonprofit organizations need transformational and governance leaders.

Finally, this dissertation reinforces some findings from Ankinun (2011), Froelich (1999), and Fyffe (2014). However, the study of the Thai cases demonstrates that each strategy is not applicable to all nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit organizations should choose strategies that are compatible with their stakeholders (donors, clients, and staff) and their skills in order to achieve resilience.

#### **4.4 Limitations and Future Research**

Three main limitations of this research and recommendations for future research are discussed as the following. First, generalization of this study's findings to other nonprofit organizations in Thailand is limited by the sample's size, type, and geographic location. This study's sample is limited to 15 nonprofit organizations in Thailand, all in the social services field. Other types of nonprofit organizations and in other countries might significantly differ from the case organizations. What is even more different is the political context in Thailand that has been unstable, creating a volatile environment within which nonprofits must operate in. Nonprofits in Thailand have come to the realization that they cannot rely on government funding to support their programs. In addition, the social environment is one where donations from Thai people is uncommon, meaning, Thai nonprofits may need to continue to educate the public about their work

and why it is important to Thai society. Nonetheless, the results in this study might bear resemblance to nonprofits' experiences in similar politically unstable countries in the developing world, where government support might also be scarce. Therefore, future research should replicate this study elsewhere or with other types of nonprofit organizations to compare the results with this study. In addition, researchers may test this study's findings with a larger sample of nonprofit organizations.

Second, interviewees may provide invalid or incomplete information. Participants may give distorted responses to avoid risking improper disclosure or to manage their self-image or their organizations' image (Fowler Jr. & Cosenza, 2009; Gorden, 1998). Moreover, participants may not accurately recall events and past decisions or strategies employed and end up reconstructing an image of the past through selective omission, distortion, and fictionalization (Gorden, 1998). To address this problem, the researcher ensured participants the confidentiality of the interview data and expressed empathy during the interview to overcome the effects of possible ego threat. The researcher also asked probe questions to help recall participants' memory. In addition, this study employs document review to triangulate the interview data.

Third, this research is not a longitudinal study. Therefore, it does not investigate nonprofit resilience process in a time dimension. Organizational capacities that underline each stage of the resilience process, including anticipation, coping, and adaptation, are left to be unknown. Future research can overcome this limitation by applying Duchek's (2020) framework to study organizational capacities in each stage of the resilience process and the interaction of these three stages in practice. In addition, due to being a cross-sectional study and the limitation of secondary data, this study uses interview data



to determine the level of resilience. To increase accuracy, future research can determine the level of resilience by comparing a nonprofit organization's fund-raising performance, number of memberships, number of clients served, and projects completed before and after the organization faced challenges.

## **Chapter 5: Conclusion and Discussion**

This chapter provides discussion, theoretical contributions, and practical implications. The chapter highlights this study's contributions to the literature on nonprofit resilience during the country's transition from a developing to an emerging frame. Then, the chapter illustrates practical implications for nonprofit managers, funders, and policy makers. In addition, the chapter demonstrates a plan in disseminating the study's results.

### **5.1 Discussion**

There is an extensive literature (e.g., Fyffe, 2014; Witmer & Mellinger, 2016; Searing et al., 2021) on nonprofit organizations in the developed countries and how they are coping in the face of various challenges to achieve organizational resilience. Much of this literature is relevant and valid in the context of developing countries with rapidly changing external environments. However, the key finding of this dissertation is that several factors are absent or underappreciated in the literature. This dissertation suggests that the choice of strategies is highly interrelated and context-dependent. The Thai cases because of their unique context provides insights into nonprofit resilience that have practical applications and theoretical implications for nonprofits around the world.

#### ***5.1.1 Open Systems***

The findings in this study on the relationship between accountability and individual donations are different from Haski-Leventhal and Foot's (2016) and Becker's (2018) studies. Haski-Leventhal and Foot's (2016) study on nonprofit organizations in

Australia found no significant relationship between total household donations and nonprofit disclosure, including fiduciary, financial, and performance disclosure. Donors do not incorporate the disclosure information into their decisions to donate (Haski-Leventhal & Foot, 2016). Similarly, Becker (2018) found that nonprofit voluntary accountability does not relate to donation behavior. Nonprofit organizations that comply with financial and quality standards beyond legal requirements do not obtain more donations than those that only follow the minimum standards (Becker, 2018).

Both Haski-Leventhal and Foot's (2016) and Becker's (2018) studies propose the need for future studies on nonprofit organizations in other countries to identify potentially different findings. This dissertation fills out this research gap. The findings in this study demonstrate that voluntary accountability achieved through financial disclosure and performance assessment, beyond legal requirements, supports individual donations. This can be explained by the contextual differences between Thailand and countries in a liberal frame. Unlike nonprofit organizations in the liberal frame that generally receive high trust (Casey, 2016), Thai people do not trust recipient organizations (Chhina et al., 2014). Therefore, people need disclosure to ensure nonprofit transparency. For instance, Organization #14 had a financial system and disclosure beyond legal requirements because its donors always check and monitor how the organization uses their contributions, and donors will not donate to an organization that they do not trust. Organization #11 and Organization #14 indicated that internal performance evaluations support individual donations. Organization #14 always sent its internal performance evaluation reports to its current donors. Individual donors incorporate information on

nonprofit performance, including quality of service and numbers of clients, into donation decisions.

Consequently, in an open system that is context-specific, it is not surprising that the nonprofits in this study must rely on demonstrating accountability in order to gain trust from the Thai people to support their programs.

### ***5.1.2 Benefits Theory***

The findings in this dissertation partially support the benefits theory that nonprofit sources of revenue depend on the types of goods and services an organization provides. However, the cases of Organization #1 and Organization #8 challenge the benefits theory. According to the benefits theory, Organization #1 and Organization #8 should have private contributions from citizens as their main source of revenue because they provided service to disadvantaged children and abused women, which generates group benefits and public benefits as well to some degree. Conversely, Organization #1 and Organization #8 found it difficult to obtain individual donations from Thai people, as they provided services to immigrants. This phenomenon implies that Thai donors prefer to donate to Thai service recipients rather than migrant service recipients and/or that they do not see the public or public benefit of providing services to immigrant populations. In other words, it's not that the public or group benefit is absent, it could be that the Thai people do not see the benefits in that way, meaning, it is incumbent upon the nonprofits to demonstrate and educate the public about the nature of the benefit.

The absence of donations to nonprofits serving immigrants is in some ways consistent with Herzenstein and Posavac's (2019) experiments demonstrating that when

individuals feel personal financial scarcity, they are likely to donate towards local charities rather than international charities, regardless of the importance of the charity and neediness of the beneficiary. In this case, the nonprofits are serving foreigners. Nonprofit organizations providing services to foreign recipients in low- and middle-income countries may find it more challenging to get private contributions because donors in these countries may intensify their perception of financial scarcity. Therefore, nonprofit organizations should consider in-group and out-group effects in proposing nonprofit financial strategies.

### ***5.1.3 Resource Dependence***

This dissertation found that nonprofit strategies in managing resource dependencies on other organizations, including individual donations, earned income, and seeking new funding sources, are highly context-dependent.

**Individual donations.** The findings in this dissertation contrast with Guerrero's (2016) study. Guerrero (2016) found that relying on individual donations does not reduce the financial risk of nonprofit organizations that provide public goods and services. Guerrero (2016) explained that individual donations are characterized as an unpredictable and highly volatile revenue source. However, this dissertation found that having individual donations as a main source of revenue contributes to nonprofit resilience. Organization #5, Organization #10, and Organization #15 demonstrate that revenue from individual donations is more stable than revenue from institutional donations. A corporation or government's grants are usually a one-time deal and it is easier for a

nonprofit organization to find a replacement for discontinued donation from a regular individual donor than a discontinued institutional grant.

**Earned income.** Although earned income strategy can promote nonprofit resilience, this strategy gets criticized for undermining a nonprofit mission. Weisbrod (1998, 2004) proposes that nonprofit organizations face a trade-off between the survival of the organization and the mission orientation. However, the study by Vaceková et al. (2017) argues that the assumption of a moral dilemma is less applicable to the (post-) transitive countries. In the case of the Czech Republic and Slovakia, nonprofit organizations emancipated themselves from the previously paternalistic state by having financial independence. Therefore, nonprofit commercialization enables nonprofit organizations to gain autonomy from the government and are empowered to independently define their missions (Vaceková et al., 2020).

The findings in this dissertation are consistent with the Czech Republic and Slovakia case. For instance, with the case of Organization #6, the study found that the organization chose to be self-reliant by generating earned income because it would like to work on its own initiated projects rather than following the government's directives on projects. Therefore, adopting earned income enables nonprofit organizations in Thailand to gain autonomy from the government in pursuing their missions and achieve resilience.

**Seeking new funding sources.** The findings in this dissertation differ from a study by Fyffe (2014), which found that resilient nonprofit organizations in the United States applied for and managed federal funds to manage their resource dependencies on

other organizations. However, the case study in Thailand demonstrates that resilient nonprofit organizations sought new funding sources, including individual donations and institutional grants, but not government funding. Unlike nonprofits in the United States, Thai nonprofits are less dependent on government funding due to Thai political environment. In details, this study found two reasons that nonprofit organizations in Thailand did not seek federal funds as their new funding sources. First, there are not many government grants available for nonprofit organizations to apply for. Organization #3, Organization #9, and Organization #15 raised this concern and proposed that the government should provide more government grants to support the nonprofit sector, as happens in other countries. Second, the instability of the government affects the continuity of funds. Since 2005, the Thai government has frequently changed. According to the interview, the new government may discontinue the funds that the previous government initiated. Therefore, the government instability lessens the availability of government funds.

#### ***5.1.4 Organizational Resilience***

The findings in this dissertation further the existing literature by demonstrating the relationship between organizational attributes or factors. Most of the existing literature on nonprofit resilience (e.g., Fyffe, 2014; Witmer & Mellinger, 2016; Searing et al., 2021) often treated each organizational attribute as distinct, while this dissertation demonstrates that these attributes are highly interrelated and pre-conditions of one another. This study found that transformational and governance leadership supports an organization's ability to adapt. Organization #2's transformational leaders enable the

organization to adapt itself towards a digital trend by articulating a vision that the organization must prepare for the digital trend.

In addition, this dissertation found that public relations, public disclosure statements, and public participation are essential for nonprofit organizations to gain individual donations, while nonprofit organizations need to have business skills to effectively generate earned income. Moreover, to successfully attain new funding sources, nonprofit organizations need to have grant-writing and negotiation skills. The findings in this dissertation argue that not every nonprofit organization can successfully implement strategies that are suggested in the existing literature when such skills are missing or absent. Only nonprofit organizations with a specific set of skills and activities successfully implement strategies suggested in the existing literature. While there is no one-size-fits-all solution for nonprofit organizations in achieving resilience, nonprofits in Thailand will need to invest in developing the necessary skills needed to build not only resilient organizations but organizational professionalism.

In conclusion, this dissertation reinforces some findings from other scholars on organizational attributes that contribute to nonprofit resilience. While not very prominent in the literature, this dissertation also suggests that context-specific pathways and strategies are the best way to understand nonprofit resilience. The discussion is summarized in Table 8.



**Table 8**

*Comparison Between Main Claims of the Existing Literature and Findings Based on the Case Studies in Thailand*

<b>Theories</b>	<b>Main Claims of the Existing Literature</b>	<b>Findings Based on the Case Studies in Thailand</b>
Open systems	Nonprofit organizations that comply with financial and quality standards beyond legal requirements do not obtain more donations.	Financial disclosure and performance assessment beyond legal requirements support individual donations.
Benefits theory	Nonprofit organizations, which provide social services, should receive private contributions from citizens.	Nonprofit organizations, which provide services to immigrants, have found it difficult to obtain individual donations from Thai people. While the theory is still applicable, there is a need for nonprofits serving immigrants to demonstrate the public and group benefit that they produce by serving immigrants.
Resource Dependence	Nonprofit organizations manage their resource dependencies by diversifying revenue streams, generating commercial revenue, having individual donations as a main source of revenue, and applying for federal funds.	Resilient nonprofit organizations generated earned income, relied on individual donations, and sought new funding sources, including individual donations and institutional grants, but not government funding. Reduce operational cost by relying on donations and volunteers.
Organizational resilience	Nonprofit organizations have sufficient human and financial assets, processes of being flexible and adaptive, and transformational and governance leaders to respond or manage external shocks.	Assets, processes, and leaders are essential, interrelated, and pre-conditions of one another in responding or managing external shocks.

## **5.2 Implications and Recommendations**

This study provides both theoretical and practical value. From a theoretical perspective, this study tests the explanatory capacities of existing theories and concepts developed based on the Western context on nonprofit organizations, in the emerging frame. In addition, this study proposes a comprehensive framework of factors that contribute to the resilience of nonprofit organizations during the country's transition period. Future research could test this framework overtime and on a larger sample of nonprofit organizations, including those in other emerging countries.

From a practical perspective, this study explains organizational factors and strategies that contribute to nonprofit resilience when facing severe environmental changes. Nonprofit organizations in Thailand should be able to apply the results of this study to develop managerial strategies that can help them become more resilient to social, economic, and political changes. In addition, this study should be beneficial to nonprofit organizations in other transitioning countries in preparing themselves to be resilient to forthcoming environmental changes. Moreover, foreign donors can apply the results of this study to assist their funding recipients, particularly nonprofit organizations in transitioning countries, to remain resilient during the country's transition period. Foreign donors should ensure that these nonprofit organizations can continue working and serving society after the withdrawal of foreign funding sources.

## **5.3 Dissemination of Results**

The researcher will write a one-page executive summary with best practices based on the results of this study in Thai language. This executive summary aims to be used as

a tool for nonprofits in Thailand to develop managerial strategies that promote their organizational resilience to social, economic, and political changes. The executive summary will be disseminated through email to stakeholders in Thailand, including the participating nonprofits, other relevant nonprofits, and government agencies providing grants to nonprofits, including the Thai Health Promotion Foundation (ThaiHealth). Additionally, the full dissertation is available on ProQuest and Portland State University library website.

## References

- Acar, M., Guo, C., & Yang, K. (2012). Accountability in voluntary partnerships: To whom and for what? *Public Organization Review*, 12(2), 157-174.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-011-0169-0>
- Ankinun, P. (2011). *Social entrepreneurship: An integrated framework for earned income opportunities adoption by nonprofit organizations in Thailand* (Publication No. 10.14457) [Doctoral dissertation, National Institute of Development Administration]. NIDA Wisdom Repository.  
<https://repository.nida.ac.th/handle/662723737/848>
- Aschari-Lincoln, J., & Jäger, U. P. (2016). Analysis of determinants of revenue sources for international NGOs: Influence of beneficiaries and organizational characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(3), 612-629.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015595721>
- Asian Development Bank. (2011). *Civil Society Briefs: Thailand*.  
<http://www.adb.org/publications/civil-society-briefs-thailand>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130>
- Batley, R., & McLoughlin, C. (2009). *State capacity and non-state service provision in fragile and conflict-affected states*. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre. <https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/EIRS3.pdf>

- Becker, A. (2018). An experimental study of voluntary nonprofit accountability and effects on public trust, reputation, perceived quality, and donation behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(3), 562-582.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764018756200>
- Bell, J., & Ellis, S. (2016). Financial leadership in nonprofit organizations. In D. O. Renz & R. D. Herman (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 477-487). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bingham, L. B. (2011). Collaborative governance. In M. Bevir (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp. 237-251). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Boin, A., & van Eeten, M. J. G. (2013). The resilient organization. *Public Management Review*, 15(3), 429-445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.769856>
- Bratton, M. (1989). The politics of government-NGO relations in Africa. *World Development*, 17(4), 569-587. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(89\)90263-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(89)90263-5)
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bretos, I., Díaz-Foncela, M., & Marcuello, C. (2020). Why Do Donors Donate? In I. Garcia-Rodriguez & M. E. Romero-Merino (Eds.), *Financing nonprofit organizations* (pp. 11-22). Routledge.
- Brudney, J. L. (2016). Designing and managing volunteer programs. In D. O. Renz (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management*. (pp. 688-733). John Wiley & Sons.

- Bryson, J. M., Gibbons, M. J., & Shaye, G. (2001). Enterprise schemes for nonprofit survival, growth, and effectiveness. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 11(3), 271-288. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.11303>
- Calabrese, T. (2013). Running on empty: The operating reserves of US nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(3), 281-302. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21064>
- Calabrese, T. D. (2018). Do operating reserves stabilize spending by nonprofit organizations? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 28(3), 295-311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21282>
- Calabrese, T.D. & Ely, T.L. (2020). Nonprofit profits: Slack, surplus, and reserves. In I. Garcia-Rodriguez & M. E. Romero-Merino (Eds.), *Financing nonprofit organizations* (pp.161-172). Routledge.
- Candid Learning. (2018). *What is the difference between a private foundation and a public charity?* [https://grantspace.org/resources/knowledge-base/private-foundations-vs-public-charities/?\\_ga=2.205813971.1952283895.1551298532-1806560006.1551298532](https://grantspace.org/resources/knowledge-base/private-foundations-vs-public-charities/?_ga=2.205813971.1952283895.1551298532-1806560006.1551298532)
- Casey, J. (2016). Comparing nonprofit sectors around the world: What do we know and how do we know it? *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, 6(3), 187-223. <https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-2016-V6-I3-7583>
- Chanya, S. (2007). พัฒนาการและบทบาทขององค์กรพัฒนาเอกชนไทย [Development and roles of Thai non-governmental organizations]. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 3(1), 85-116. <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JEM/article/view/31978>

- Chhina, S., Petersik, W., Loh, J., & Evans, D. (2014). *From charity to change: Social investment in selected Southeast Asian countries*. (No. 9789810930653).  
Lien Centre for Social Innovation, Singapore Management University.  
[https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lien\\_reports/11](https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lien_reports/11)
- Chikoto-Schultz, G. & Uzochukwu, K. (2016). Governing Civil Society in Nigeria and Zimbabwe: A Question of Policy Process and Non-State Actors' Involvement. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 7(2), 137-170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2015-0051>
- Chuprajong, S. (2010). ก้าวข้ามอคติ: ชีวิตแรงงานข้ามชาติกับการอยู่ร่วมในสังคมไทย [Step through biases: Life of migrant workers and coexistence in the Thai society]. Green Print.
- Cohen, S., & Eimicke, W. (2011). Contracting out. In M. Bevir (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp. 237-251). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Considine, M., & Ali Afzal, K. (2011). Legitimacy. In M. Bevir (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp. 369-385). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Cortis, N. (2017). Access to Philanthropic and Commercial Income Among Nonprofit Community Service Organisations. *Voluntas*, 28(2), 798-821.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-016-9715-2>
- DAI. (n.d.). *Thailand – Sapan*. <https://www.dai.com/our-work/projects/thailand-sapan>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2011). Leadership. In M. Bevir (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp. 419-435). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Department for International Development. (2011). *Defining disaster resilience: A DFID approach paper*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/defining-disaster-resilience-a-dfid-approach-paper>

- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1), 122-136.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215-246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Ebrahim, A. (2003). Accountability in practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. *World Development*, 31(5), 813-829. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(03\)00014-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00014-7)
- Ebrahim, A. (2016). The many faces of nonprofit accountability. In D.O. Renz & R.D. Herman (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 102-123). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (1995). NGO performance and accountability in the post-cold war world. *Journal of International Development*, 7(6), 849-856.
- Fischer, R. L., Wilsker, A., & Young, D. R. (2011). Exploring the revenue mix of nonprofit organizations: Does it relate to publicness? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(4), 662-681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010363921>
- Flick, U. (2004). Triangulation in qualitative research. In U. Flick, E. von Kardoff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A companion to qualitative research* (pp. 178-183). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fowler, F. J., Jr., & Cosenza, C. (2009). Design and evaluation of survey questions. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 375-412). SAGE Publications Ltd.  
<https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483348858>



- Fox, J. A., & Brown, L. D. (Eds.). (1998). *The struggle for accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and grassroots movements*. The MIT Press.
- Froelich, K. A. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 28(3), 246-268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764099283002>
- Fyffe, S. D. (2014). *An exploration of resilient nonprofit organizations: How human services providers in Virginia survived and thrived the Great Recession of 2007-2009* (Publication No. 10595299) [Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Gorden, R. L. (1998). *Basic interviewing skills*. Waveland Press.
- Gordon, T. P., Knock, C. L., & Neely, D. G. (2009). The role of rating agencies in the market for charitable contributions: An empirical test. *Journal of accounting and public policy*, 28(6), 469-484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2009.08.001>
- Guerrero, S. (2016). *Event risk: Three essays exploring nonprofit organizations' finances after the September 11 attacks* (Publication No. 10244737) [Doctoral dissertation, The University at Albany, State University of New York]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Haski-Leventhal, D., & Foot, C. (2016). The relationship between disclosure and household donations to nonprofit organizations in Australia. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(5), 992–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016628673>
- Herzenstein, M., & Posavac, S. S. (2019). When charity begins at home: How personal financial scarcity drives preference for donating locally at the expense of global

- concerns. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 73, 123-135.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2019.06.002>
- Hillmann, J., & Guenther, E. (2021). Organizational resilience: A valuable construct for management research? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, 7-44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12239>
- Horne, J. F. (1997). The coming age of organizational resilience. *Business Forum*, 22, 24-28.  
<https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A20853564/GPS?u=s1185784&sid=GPS&xid=b0137f88>
- Horne, J. F., & Orr, J. E. (1998). Assessing behaviors that create resilient organizations. *Employment Relations Today*, 24(4), 29-39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.3910240405>
- Jackson, K., & Bazeley, P. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Kantur, D., & Say, A. (2015). Measuring organizational resilience: A scale development. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance*, 4(3), 456-472.  
<https://doi.org/10.17261/Pressacademia.2015313066>
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (2005). Organizations and the system concept. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott., & Y.S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 480-490). Wadsworth.
- Kendra, J. M., & Wachtendorf, T. (2003). Elements of resilience after the World Trade Center disaster: Reconstituting New York City's emergency operations centre. *Disasters*, 27(1), 37-53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7717.00218>

- Kimberlin, S. E., Schwartz, S. L., & Austin, M. J. (2011). Growth and resilience of pioneering nonprofit human service organizations: A cross-case analysis of organizational histories. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 8, 4-28.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15433710903272820>
- Koronis, E., & Ponis, S. (2018), Better than before: The resilient organization in crisis mode. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 39(1), 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-10-2016-0124>
- Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a tool to measure and compare organizations' resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 14(1), 29-41.  
[https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)nh.1527-6996.00000075](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)nh.1527-6996.00000075)
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Beck, T. E. (2005). Adaptive fit versus robust transformation: How organizations respond to environmental change. *Journal of Management*, 31(5), 738–757. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279367>
- Lengnick-Hall, C., Beck, T., & Lengnick-Hall, M. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243-255.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- Martin-Breen, P., & Anderies, J. M. (2011). *Resilience: A literature review*. The Institute of Development Studies.  
<https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/3692>
- MGR Online. (2022). "ไอ.พี. วัน ชกผลิตภัณฑ์ไฮยีน เสริมทัพ OTTERI-มูลนิธิกระจกเงา เดิมความสุข สร้างรอยยิ้ม เสริมสุขอนามัยให้คนไร้บ้าน ได้มีเสื้อผ้าสะอาด ปลอดภัย ในงาน "วันซักผ้าและอาบน้ำแห่งชาติ" ครั้งแรกในไทย!". [I.P. One donated hygiene products, together with OTTERI-Mirror Foundation, to

promote happiness, create smiles, and support hygiene for homeless people to have clean and safe clothes on “National Laundry and Shower Day” for the first time in Thailand!] <https://mgronline.com/business/detail/9650000059736>

Mogalakwe, M. (2006). The use of documentary research methods in social research. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 221-230.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/afrisocirevi.10.1.221>

Morgan, D. L. (2014). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Najam, A. (1996). NGO accountability: A conceptual framework. *Development Policy Review*, 14, 339 – 353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.1996.tb00112.x>

Najam, A. (2000). The four-C’s of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10(4), 375-396. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/10.1002/nml.10403>

National Statistical Office. (2003). *The 2002 nonprofit organization survey*.  
[http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Pages/survey/Economics/National%20Accounts/Non\\_Profit\\_Organization.aspx](http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Pages/survey/Economics/National%20Accounts/Non_Profit_Organization.aspx)

National Statistical Office. (2008). *The 2007 nonprofit organization survey*.  
[http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Survey/economics/National%20Accounts/The%20non\\_Profit%20Organization%20Survey%202007/6.Full%20Report.pdf](http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Survey/economics/National%20Accounts/The%20non_Profit%20Organization%20Survey%202007/6.Full%20Report.pdf)

National Statistical Office. (2014). *The 2013 nonprofit organization survey*.  
[http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Survey/economics/National%20Accounts/The%20non\\_Profit%20Organization%20Survey%202013/6.Full%20Report.pdf](http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014en/Survey/economics/National%20Accounts/The%20non_Profit%20Organization%20Survey%202013/6.Full%20Report.pdf)

- Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. (1986). *The sixth national economic and social development plan (1987–1991)*.  
[https://www.nesdc.go.th/nestdb\\_en/ewt\\_w3c/ewt\\_dl\\_link.php?filename=development\\_issue&nid=3781](https://www.nesdc.go.th/nestdb_en/ewt_w3c/ewt_dl_link.php?filename=development_issue&nid=3781)
- Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. (2010). *Nonprofit institutions satellite account of Thailand, 2006-2008 edition*.  
<https://ccss.jhu.edu/publications-findings/?did=316>
- Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. (2014). *การสร้างความเข้มแข็งแก่หุ้นส่วนการพัฒนา: องค์กรปกครองส่วนท้องถิ่นและองค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไร* [Strengthening development partners: Local governments and nonprofit organizations].  
[https://www.nesdc.go.th/article\\_attach/conference\\_book\\_2557.pdf](https://www.nesdc.go.th/article_attach/conference_book_2557.pdf)
- Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. (2016). *Nonprofit institutions satellite account of Thailand, 2012*. <https://ccss.jhu.edu/publications-findings/?did=481>
- Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., & Bansal, P. (2016). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(8), 1615-1631. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2410>
- Oster, S.M. (1995). *Strategic management for nonprofit organizations*. Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. The Free Press.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford University Press.

- Phaholyothin, N. (2017). Moving beyond charity to philanthropy? The case of charitable giving in Thailand. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 10(2), 185-203. <https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-2017.2-4>
- Pongsapich, A. (1998). The nonprofit sector in Thailand. In H. K. Anheier & L. M. Salamon (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector in the developing world* (pp. 294-347). Manchester University Press.
- Pongsapich, A., Saingam, C., Saibua, C., Kataleeradabhan, N., Wongsathapornpat, S., Chinnawong, P., Buntaotook, J., Wichaidit, S., Singsuksee, T., Kittiwiat, K., Phisanrojjanarat, J., & Pungluang, P. (2003). องค์การสาธารณประโยชน์ในประเทศไทย [Nonprofit organizations in Thailand]. Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute. <http://cuir.car.chula.ac.th/handle/123456789/704>
- Rainey, H. G. (2014). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Reinmoeller, P., & van Baardwijk, N. (2005). The link between diversity and resilience. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 46(4), 61-65. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/1999/11/e1f321a3bb.pdf>
- Renz, D.O. (2016). Leadership, governance, and the work of the board. In D.O. Renz & R.D. Herman (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 127-166). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rerup, C. (2001). Houston, we have a problem: Anticipation and improvisation as sources of organizational resilience. *Comportamento Organizacional E Gestao*, 7(1), 27-44

Robb, D. (2000). Building resilient organizations. *OD Practitioner*, 32(3), 27–32.

<https://learninginaction.com/PDF/ResilientRobb.pdf>

Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & List, R. (2004). Global civil society: An overview.

In L. M. Salamon & S. W. Sokolowski (Eds.), *Global civil society: Dimensions of the nonprofit sector* (Vol. 2). Kumarian Press.

Schlachter, L.H. (2021). *Key findings from the 2019 current population survey: Civic engagement and volunteering supplement*. AmeriCorps, Office of Research and Evaluation.

[https://www.americorps.gov/sites/default/files/document/2019%20CPS%20CEV%20findings%20report%20CLEAN\\_10Dec2021\\_508.pdf](https://www.americorps.gov/sites/default/files/document/2019%20CPS%20CEV%20findings%20report%20CLEAN_10Dec2021_508.pdf)

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives*. Pearson Education.

Searing, E. A., Wiley, K. K., & Young, S. L. (2021). Resiliency tactics during financial crisis: The nonprofit resiliency framework. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 32(2), 179-196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21478>

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Teachers College Press.

Sidor, M., & Abdelhafez, D. (2021). NGO-Public Administration Relationships in Tackling the Homelessness Problem in the Czech Republic and Poland. *Administrative Sciences*, 11(1), 1-15.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11010024>

- Somers, S. (2009). Measuring resilience potential: An adaptive strategy for organizational crisis planning. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17(1), 12-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2009.00558.x>
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331>
- Suh, E. E., Kagan, S., & Strumpf, N. (2009). Cultural competence in qualitative interview methods with Asian immigrants. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 20(2), 194-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659608330059>
- Tangpianpant, P. (2010). *Thaksin populism and beyond: A study of Thaksin's pro-poor populist policies in Thailand* [Bachelor of Arts thesis, Wesleyan University]. Wesleyan University Digital Collections. <https://doi.org/10.14418/wes01.1.1811>
- Thailand profile – timeline*. (2018). BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-15641745>
- The Mirror Foundation. (n.d.-a). *About The Mirror Foundation*. [http://mirror.or.th/autopagev4/show\\_article.php?auto\\_id=40](http://mirror.or.th/autopagev4/show_article.php?auto_id=40)
- The Mirror Foundation. (n.d.-b). *The Mirror Foundation*. <http://web.mirror.or.th/>
- The Revenue Department. (2014). มูลนิธิหรือสมาคมที่ได้รับการยกเว้นภาษี [Foundations or associations that get tax exemption]. <http://www.rd.go.th/publish/44187.0.html>
- The Revenue Department. (2019). ประกาศกระทรวงการคลัง ว่าด้วยภาษีเงินได้และภาษีมูลค่าเพิ่ม (ฉบับที่ ๒) [The Ministry of Finance notification on income tax and value-added tax (Issue no. 2)]. <https://www.rd.go.th/publish/2644.0.html>



- Ulrich, D., & Barney, J. B. (1984). Perspectives in organizations: Resource dependence, efficiency, and population. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 471-481.  
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4279680>
- Vaceková, G., Svidroňová, M. M., Pláček, M., & Nemec, J. (2020). Business practices in nonprofit funding. In I. Garcia-Rodriguez & M. E. Romero-Merino (Eds.), *Financing nonprofit organizations* (pp.161-172). Routledge.
- Vaceková, G., Valentinov, V., & Nemec, J. (2017). Rethinking nonprofit commercialization: The case of the Czech Republic. *Voluntas*, 28, 2103-2123.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-016-9772-6>
- Valero, J. N., Jung, K., & Andrew, S. A. (2015). Does transformational leadership build resilient public and nonprofit organizations? *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 24(1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-04-2014-0060>
- van Breda, A. D. (2016). Building resilient human service organizations. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 40(1), 62-73.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2015.1093571>
- Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (Eds.). (2007). Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. *Proceedings of the 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Canada*, 3418-3422.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.2007.4414160>
- Walker, A. (2011, August 15). *Thailand: An upper-middle income economy*. New Mandala. <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2011/08/15/thailand-an-upper-middle-income-economy/>

- Weikart, L., Chen, G., & Sermier, E. (2013). *Budgeting & financial management for nonprofit organizations: Using money to drive mission success*. CQ Press.
- Weisbrod, B. A. (1998). The nonprofit mission and its funding: Growing links between nonprofits and the rest of the economy. In B. A. Weisbrod (Ed.), *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 1–22). Cambridge University Press.
- Weisbrod, B. A. (2004). The pitfalls of profits. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 2(3), 40-47. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1850719>
- Wilsker, A. L., & Young, D. R. (2010). How does program composition affect the revenues of nonprofit organizations?: Investigating a benefits theory of nonprofit finance. *Public Finance Review*, 38(2), 193-216.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1091142110369238>
- Witmer, H., & Mellinger, M. S. (2016). Organizational resilience: Nonprofit organizations' response to change. *Work*, 54(2), 255-265.  
<https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-162303>
- Wolf, C., Joye, D., Smith, T. W., & Fu, Y. (2016). *The Sage Handbook of Survey Methodology*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Young, D. R. (2000). Alternative models of government-nonprofit sector relations: Theoretical and international perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 149–172. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/10.1177/0899764000291009>

Young, D. R. (2007). *Financing nonprofits: Putting theory into practice*. Altamira Press.

Young, D. R., & Searing, E. A. M. (2022). *Resilience and the management of Nonprofit Organizations: A new paradigm*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

**Appendix A: List of Keywords for Excluding Nonprofits in Other Categories from  
Social Service**

<b>Categories</b>	<b>Keywords</b>
Culture and recreation	วัฒนธรรม (culture) ศิลปะ (art) พิพิธภัณฑ์ (museum) พระบรมราชานุสรณ์ (monument) สโมสร/ ชมรม (club) ดนตรี (music) กีฬา (sport) มูลนิธิสโมสรไลออนส์ (Lions Clubs International Foundation) โรตารี (Rotary club)
Education and research	การศึกษา (education) วิจัย (research) โรงเรียน (school) มหาวิทยาลัย (university) วิทยาลัย (college) เรียน/ ศึกษา (study) วิทยาศาสตร์ (science)
Health	สุขภาพ (health) โรงพยาบาล (hospital) การแพทย์ (medical) อนามัย (sanitation) โรค (disease) ออทิสติก (Autistic) เอดส์ (AIDS) ผู้ป่วย (patient) สาธารณสุข (public health) พยาบาล (nurse) มะเร็ง (cancer) แพทย์ (doctor) ทันตแพทยศาสตร์ (dentistry)
Environment	สิ่งแวดล้อม (environment)

	ป่า (forest) ธรรมชาติ (natural) พฤษภ (plant) สวน (park) สัตว์ (animal) ช้าง (elephant)
Development and housing	พัฒนา (development) ที่อยู่อาศัย (housing) ชุมชน (community) ออมทรัพย์ (savings)
Civil rights and advocacy	กฎหมาย (law)
Philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism promotion	อาสาสมัคร (volunteer) กองทุน (fund) ศูนย์ประสานงาน (coordination center)
Activities related to religion	ศาสนา (religion) พุทธ (Buddhism) อิสลาม (Islam) คริสต์เตียน (Christian) คาทอลิก (Catholic) ธรรม (Dhamma) วัด (temple) พระ/ พระสงฆ์/ หลวงพ่อ/ หลวงปู่ (monk) นักบุญ/ เซนต์ (saint) แม่ชี (nun)
Business and professional associations and unions	ธุรกิจ (business) การค้า (trade) สมาคม (association) สมาคมแม่บ้าน (wives association) วิสาหกิจ (enterprise) ทหาร (military) ตำรวจ (police) แรงงาน (labor) ข้าราชการ (government official) นักหนังสือพิมพ์ (news reporter)

	ธนาคาร (bank) เกษตรกร (farmer)
Others	สภา (council) คณะกรรมการ (board) สหกรณ์ (cooperative) โครงการ (project) เครือข่าย (network) วิสาหกิจชุมชน (community enterprise) กลุ่มสมาชิก (member group) กลุ่ม (group) ศูนย์บริการ (service center) อนุรักษ์ (conserve) รางวัล (award) ป้องกันและปราบปราม (control) น่านฟ้า (airspace) ฆาปนกิจ (cremation) ผู้บริโภค (consumer) ศิษย์เก่า (alumni) สื่อ (media) เกษตร (agriculture)

## **Appendix B: Recruitment Letter**

Dear the Executive Director of [Organization's name],

My name is Narttana Sakolvittayanon. I am a Ph.D. candidate in Public Affairs and Policy at Hatfield School of Government, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University, Oregon, the United States of America. As a part of my dissertation, I am conducting a research study titled *The Factors Contributing to the Resilience of Nonprofit Organizations in Social Welfare in Thailand since 2005*. The purpose of this study is to explore characteristics and strategies of resilient nonprofit organizations when facing significant social, economic, and political changes during Thailand's transition from a developing to an emerging country.

This research employs a multiple case study by interviewing the executive directors of twenty nonprofit organizations in Thailand regarding strategies they adopted to achieve organizational resilience. The findings of this study aim to help nonprofit managers and professionals to understand factors contributing to nonprofit resilience and develop managerial strategies to become more resilient to social, economic, and political changes.

Currently, I am recruiting target participants to interview in my study. The interview will take about 60 to 90 minutes. Therefore, I would like to ask your organization to participate in this research. If you are interested in and would like to discuss more in detail, please contact me at narttana@pdx.edu or 061-342-4099.

Yours Sincerely,

Narttana Sakolvittayanon  
Ph.D. candidate in Public Affairs and Policy  
Portland State University

## Appendix C: Recruitment Letter (in Thai)

เรียน ผู้อำนวยการมูลนิธิ [ชื่อองค์กร]

ข้าพเจ้า นางสาวนารถนา สกลวิทยานนท์ นักศึกษาปริญญาเอก สาขากิจการและนโยบายสาธารณะ ภาควิชาการปกครองมาร์คโอแฮทฟิลด์ วิทยาลัยกิจการสาธารณะ มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์ (Portland State University) รัฐออริกอน (Oregon) ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา ข้าพเจ้ากำลังศึกษาวิจัย ในหัวข้อเรื่อง ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อความอยู่รอดขององค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรในภาคสวัสดิการสังคมในประเทศไทย ตั้งแต่ปี พ.ศ. 2548 วัตถุประสงค์ของการศึกษานี้คือ ค้นหาคุณสมบัติและยุทธศาสตร์ที่ทำให้องค์กรกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ เมื่อเผชิญความเปลี่ยนแปลงทางสังคม เศรษฐกิจ และการเมือง ในช่วงการเปลี่ยนแปลงของประเทศไทย งานวิจัยนี้ทำการศึกษาโดยการสัมภาษณ์ ผู้อำนวยการของ 20 องค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรในประเทศไทย เกี่ยวกับยุทธศาสตร์ที่ใช้เพื่อให้องค์กรกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติเมื่อเผชิญความเปลี่ยนแปลง ผลของการศึกษานี้มุ่งเน้นที่จะช่วยผู้อำนวยการขององค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไร และผู้เชี่ยวชาญ ให้มีความเข้าใจปัจจัยที่ส่งผลกระทบต่อการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติขององค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไร และสามารถพัฒนายุทธศาสตร์เพื่อให้องค์กรกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ หลังเผชิญความเปลี่ยนแปลงทางสังคม เศรษฐกิจ และการเมืองได้มากขึ้น

ขณะนี้ข้าพเจ้ากำลังเชิญกลุ่มเป้าหมายเพื่อเข้าร่วมการให้สัมภาษณ์ในงานศึกษาของข้าพเจ้า การให้สัมภาษณ์จะใช้เวลาประมาณ 60 – 90 นาที ดังนั้นข้าพเจ้าขอความกรุณาองค์กรของท่านในการเข้าร่วมในงานศึกษานี้ หากท่านสามารถให้สัมภาษณ์ในงานศึกษานี้ ท่านสามารถนัดวัน เวลา และสถานที่ที่สะดวกในการให้สัมภาษณ์ ผ่านทางอีเมล [narttana@pdx.edu](mailto:narttana@pdx.edu) และจะเป็นประโยชน์อย่างมากหากท่านสามารถให้รายงานประจำปีขององค์กรก่อนการสัมภาษณ์

ถ้าท่านมีคำถามเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับรายละเอียด สามารถติดต่อข้าพเจ้าได้ที่ [narttana@pdx.edu](mailto:narttana@pdx.edu) หรือ 061-342-4099

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

นางสาวนารถนา สกลวิทยานนท์

นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาเอก สาขากิจการสาธารณะและนโยบายสาธารณะ

มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์



## **Appendix D: Interview Guide**

### **Interview Guide**

#### **Part I: Introductory remarks**

I will begin an interview by introducing name, background, research objective, and definition of organizational resilience in this research. Then, I will ask a participant to introduce himself/herself by first name, position, job responsibilities, and duration that he/she has worked in the organization. After that, I will explain the informed consent to the participants, ask them to review and sign the form, and ask for permission to record an interview. I will ask open-ended questions and hand out survey for a participant to fill out the end of the interview.

#### **Part II: Background and context:**

- What are main services that your organization provides? Has your organization's mission or scope of work been changed in the past 10 years?
- What were the key challenges that your organizations faced in the past 10 years?

#### **Part III: Resilience and financial stability:**

- Did your organization have a higher or lower capacity to fulfill its mission after facing these challenges?  
Probe: Did your organization have higher or lower financial and human resources after facing these challenges?  
Probe: Currently, how many full-time staff and volunteers does your organization have?
- Do you feel your organization currently has good financial health?  
Probe: On average over the past 10 years, what has been the year to year change in your organization's total revenues and expenses?  
Probe: Does your organization have enough money to work towards its mission?  
Probe: Is your organization's revenue stable or fluctuated?  
Probe: What is your organization's financial goal?  
Probe: Does your organization currently fulfill that goal?

#### **Part IV: Organizational activities:**

- How did your organization address the challenges that you mentioned?

Probe: What were the key factors driving your organization to use those strategies?

Probe: What were factors that assist your organizations in tackling these challenges?

Probe: What were barriers for your organization in tackling these challenges?

Probe: Who was involved in the decision-making processes in addressing these organization's challenges?

Probe: What were desired and undesirable outcomes from the strategies that your organization used to tackle these challenges?

- As an organizational leader, are there any specific actions that you took to address your organization's challenges?
- Does your organization change its internal structure to address the challenges?  
Probe: Does your organization's structure become more formalized, centralized or more flexible when facing the challenges?
- Does your organization collaborate with other nonprofit organizations, or government agencies, or business corporations, or universities? If so, how does this collaboration support your organization? How does your organization manage this collaboration relationship?
- Does your organization do anything to enhance its reputation and build relationships with community? If so, what approaches do you use?
- Does your organization has financial monitoring systems and performance assessments? If so, how does your organization monitor finance and assess performance?
- Have your organization's revenue streams changed in the past 10 years? How has your organization managed to obtain revenue?
- How would you describe the similarities and differences of the challenges faced by your organizations and nonprofit organizations in other sectors in Thailand or in the social welfare sector in other Asian countries?

#### **Part V: Reflections and wrap-up:**

- Looking back from where you are now, in what ways do you think your organization did well in achieving an organizational resilience capacity? In what ways would you do differently?
- What are two to three recommendations for other nonprofit organizations in improving their resilient capacity?

## Appendix E: Interview Guide (in Thai)

### คำถามสัมภาษณ์

#### ส่วนที่ 1: บทนำ

ข้าพเจ้าขอเริ่มต้นการสัมภาษณ์ด้วยการแนะนำชื่อ ประวัติ วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย และความหมายของความสามารถในการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติขององค์กรในบริบทของงานวิจัยนี้ ต่อจากนั้นข้าพเจ้าจะขอให้ผู้ให้ข้อมูลแนะนำตัวเองโดยเริ่มต้นจากชื่อ ตำแหน่ง หน้าที่ความรับผิดชอบของงาน และระยะเวลาที่ผู้ให้ข้อมูลทำงานกับองค์กร หลังจากนั้นข้าพเจ้าจะอธิบายหนังสือยินยอมให้สัมภาษณ์ต่อผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัย และขอให้ผู้ให้ข้อมูลอ่านและลงลายมือชื่อในหนังสือดังกล่าว และขออนุญาตสัมภาษณ์และบันทึกการสัมภาษณ์ ในตอนท้าย จะมีแบบสำรวจให้ผู้ให้ข้อมูลกรอก

#### ส่วนที่ 2: ความเป็นมาและบริบท

1. องค์กรของท่านให้บริการอะไร องค์กรของท่านเคยเปลี่ยนวัตถุประสงค์ขององค์กรหรือขอบเขตงานที่ทำภายในระยะเวลา 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาหรือไม่
2. อะไรคือสิ่งที่ท้าทายที่สำคัญที่องค์กรของท่านเผชิญในระยะเวลา 10 ปีที่ผ่านมา

#### ส่วนที่ 3: ความสามารถในการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ และความมั่นคงทางการเงิน

3. องค์กรของท่านมีความสามารถในการบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์เพิ่มขึ้นหรือลดลงหลังจากประสบความท้าทายเหล่านี้  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: องค์กรของท่านมีทรัพยากรทางการเงินและทรัพยากรบุคคลเพิ่มขึ้นหรือลดลงหลังจากประสบความท้าทายเหล่านี้  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: ในขณะนี้องค์กรของท่านมีพนักงานประจำและอาสาสมัครจำนวนกี่คน
4. ท่านมีความคิดเห็นอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับสถานะทางการเงินขององค์กรในขณะนี้  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: โดยเฉลี่ยในระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมารายได้โดยรวมและรายจ่ายขององค์กรของท่านเปลี่ยนแปลงอย่างไรบ้างในแต่ละปี  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: ตอนนี้องค์กรของท่านมีเงินมากพอที่จะทำงานเพื่อบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์หรือไม่  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: ตอนนี้องค์กรของท่านมีรายได้ที่แน่นอนหรือไม่  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: อะไรคือเป้าหมายทางการเงินขององค์กรของท่าน  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: ขณะนี้องค์กรของท่านบรรลุเป้าหมายนั้นหรือไม่

#### ส่วนที่ 4: กิจกรรมองค์กร

5. องค์กรของท่านจัดการกับความท้าทายที่ท่านกล่าวมาอย่างไร  
คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: อะไรคือปัจจัยหลักที่ทำให้องค์กรของท่านใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าว

คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: อะไรคือปัจจัยที่ช่วยองค์กรของท่านในการจัดการความท้าทายเหล่านั้น

คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: อะไรคืออุปสรรคสำหรับองค์กรท่านในการจัดการความท้าทายเหล่านั้น

คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: ใครมีส่วนร่วมในกระบวนการตัดสินใจในการจัดการความท้าทายเหล่านั้น

คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: อะไรคือผลลัพธ์ที่ปรารถนาและไม่ปรารถนาจากการใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวในการจัดการความท้าทายเหล่านั้น

6. ในฐานะผู้นำองค์กร ท่านมีส่วนร่วมในการจัดการความท้าทายขององค์กรของท่านอย่างไรบ้าง

7. องค์กรของท่านมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงโครงสร้างภายในเพื่อที่จะจัดการความท้าทายเหล่านั้นหรือไม่

คำถามกระตุ้นความคิด: โครงสร้างองค์กรของท่านได้เปลี่ยนแปลงให้เป็นทางการมากขึ้น ให้รวมการจัดการสู่ศูนย์กลาง หรือให้มีความยืดหยุ่นมากขึ้นเมื่อเผชิญความท้าทายเหล่านั้นหรือไม่

8. องค์กรของท่านได้มีความร่วมมือกับองค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรอื่น หรือหน่วยงานรัฐ หรือองค์กรเอกชน หรือมหาวิทยาลัยหรือไม่ ถ้ามีความร่วมมือนั้นสนับสนุนองค์กรท่านอย่างไร องค์กรของท่านจัดการกับความสัมพันธ์ในความร่วมมือนี้ได้อย่างไร

9. องค์กรของท่านได้มีการทำสิ่งใดเพื่อเพิ่มชื่อเสียงหรือสร้างความสัมพันธ์กับชุมชนหรือไม่ ถ้ามีท่านใช้วิธีการใด

10. องค์กรของท่านมีระบบการจัดการทางการเงินและการประเมินประสิทธิผลหรือไม่ ถ้ามีองค์กรของท่านมีการจัดการทางการเงินและการประเมินประสิทธิผลอย่างไรบ้าง

11. แหล่งที่มาของรายได้ขององค์กรมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงในระยะเวลา 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาหรือไม่ องค์กรของท่านมีการจัดการอย่างไรเพื่อที่จะหารายได้

12. ท่านจะอธิบายความเหมือนและความต่างของความท้าทายที่องค์กรของท่านและองค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรในภาคส่วนอื่นของประเทศไทย หรือในภาคสวัสดิการสังคมในประเทศอื่นในเอเชียได้อย่างไร

#### ส่วน 5: บทสะท้อนและบทสรุป

13. ท่านคิดว่าอะไรคือสิ่งที่องค์กรของท่านทำได้ดีเพื่อให้องค์กรสามารถกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ และอะไรที่ท่านคิดว่าจะทำให้แตกต่าง

14. ท่านจะให้คำแนะนำอะไร 2-3 ข้อ สำหรับองค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรเพื่อให้องค์กรของพวกเขาเพิ่มความสามารถในการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ

## **Appendix F: Informed Consent Form**

The Portland State University  
Consent to Participate in Research

The Factors Contributing to the Resilience of Nonprofit Organizations in Social Welfare  
in Thailand since 2005

[Date]

### *Introduction*

You are being asked to participate in a research study that is being done by Narttana Sakolvittayanon, a Ph.D. Candidate in Public Affairs and Policy, Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, College of Urban and Public Affairs, at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, the United States of America. This research is studying characteristics and strategies of resilient nonprofit organizations in Thailand during the country's transition from a developing to an emerging frame.

You are being asked to participate in this study because of your experience in and knowledge of your organization's characteristics.

This form will explain the research study, and will also explain the possible risks as well as the possible benefits to you. We encourage you to talk with your family and friends before you decide to take part in this research study. If you have any questions, please ask the study investigator.

If you agree to participate, the following things will happen:

You will be asked to participate in in-depth interview with the researcher. Interview will occur either by telephone or at a private location agree upon you and the researcher. With your consent, the interview will be recorded. An interview transcript will be used for doctoral dissertation and educational purposes, including publication in scholarly journals.

*How long will I be in this study?*

Participation in this study will take up to 90 minutes.

*What are the risks or side effects of being in this study?*

There are risks of inconvenience and possible loss of privacy and confidentiality associated with participating in a research study.

This study will not include or report any personal information. Therefore, the risk of participating in this study is minimal.

For more information about risks and discomforts, please ask the investigator.

*What are the benefits to being in this study?*

Participation in this study may not provide direct benefit to you. Overall, this study aims to provide audience a better understanding of organizational factors that lead to resilience. Nonprofit organizations may apply the results of this study to develop managerial strategies to become more resilient to social, economic, and political changes.

*How will my information be kept confidential?*

We will take measures to protect the security of all your personal information, but we cannot guarantee confidentiality of all study data.

The researcher will keep the record of this study private and will use pseudonyms rather than your name on study record. The researcher will also remove any other information that would make it possible to identify you, any other person, or organizations that you mention during the interview. Research record, interview notes, and transcribe information will be stored as password-protected files in the researcher's laptop. Only Dr. Bruce Gilley (the researcher's dissertation advisor) and the researcher will have access to these records. All records and interview notes will be destroyed after three years after completion of the study.

***Information contained in your study records is used by study staff. The Portland State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) that oversees human subject research and/or other entities may be permitted to access your records, and there may be times when we are required by law to share your information. It is the investigator's legal obligation to report child abuse, child neglect, elder abuse, harm to self or others or any life-threatening situation to the appropriate authorities, and; therefore, your confidentiality will not be maintained.***

Your name will not be used in any published reports about this study.

*Will I be paid for taking part in this study?*

There will be no compensation provided for your participation in this study.

*Can I stop being in the study once I begin?*

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to choose not to participate or to withdraw your participation at any point in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

*Whom can I call with questions or complaints about this study?*

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints at any time about the research study, Narttana Sakolvittayanon, or her associates will be glad to answer them at 1-971-222-8545 (U.S.A.) or +66-861-342-4099 (Thailand) or narttana@pdx.edu.

If you need to contact someone after business hours or on weekends, please call 1-971-222-8545 (U.S.A.) or +66-861-342-4099 (Thailand) and ask for Narttana Sakolvittayanon.

*Whom can I call with questions about my rights as a research participant?*

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may call the PSU Office for Research Integrity at (503) 725-2227 or 1(877) 480-4400. The ORI is the office that supports the PSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is a group of people from PSU and the community who provide independent oversight of safety and ethical issues related to research involving human participants. For more information, you may also access the IRB website at <https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/research/integrity>.

## CONSENT

You are making a decision whether to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided (or the information was read to you). By signing this consent form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights as a research participant.

You have had an opportunity to ask questions and all questions have been answered to your satisfaction. By signing this consent form, you agree to participate in this study. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you.

---

Name of Adult Subject (print)

---

Signature of Adult Subject

---

Date

*INVESTIGATOR SIGNATURE*

This research study has been explained to the participant and all of his/her questions have been answered. The participant understands the information described in this consent form and freely consents to participate.

\_\_\_\_NarttanaSakolvittayanon\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Investigator/ Research Team Member (type or print)



## Appendix G: Informed Consent Form (in Thai)

มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์  
หนังสือให้ความยินยอมเพื่อเข้าร่วมงานวิจัย

ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติขององค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรในภาคสวัสดิการสังคมในประเทศไทย ตั้งแต่ปี พ.ศ. 2548  
[วันที่]

### คำนำ

ท่านได้รับเชิญเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์ที่ดำเนินการสัมภาษณ์โดย นางสาวนารถนา สกลวิทยานนท์ นักศึกษาปริญญาเอก สาขากิจการและนโยบายสาธารณะ ภาควิชาการปกครองมาร์คโอแฮฟฟิลด์ วิทยาลัยกิจการเมืองและกิจการสาธารณะ มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์ (Portland State University) รัฐออริกอน (Oregon) ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา  
งานวิจัยนี้ศึกษาคุณสมบัติและยุทธศาสตร์ของการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติขององค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรในประเทศไทย ในระหว่างช่วงที่มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงของประเทศไทย จากประเทศกำลังพัฒนาสู่ประเทศเกิดใหม่

ท่านจะถูกถามเพื่อเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้ เพราะประสบการณ์และความรู้ของท่านเกี่ยวกับคุณสมบัติขององค์กรของท่าน

หนังสือนี้จะอธิบายการศึกษางานวิจัยและจะยังอธิบายความเสี่ยงที่อาจเกิดขึ้นได้ รวมถึงผลประโยชน์ที่ท่านอาจได้รับ เราส่งเสริมให้ท่านพูดกับครอบครัวและเพื่อนของท่านก่อนที่ท่านจะตัดสินใจเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของงานวิจัยนี้ ถ้าท่านมีคำถามใดๆ โปรดถามผู้ทำการวิจัย

ถ้าท่านตกลงที่จะเข้าร่วมสิ่งต่างๆดังต่อไปนี้เกิดขึ้น

ท่านจะถูกถามเพื่อเข้าร่วมในการสัมภาษณ์เชิงลึกกับผู้ทำวิจัย

การสัมภาษณ์อาจเกิดขึ้นทางโทรศัพท์ หรือ ณ สถานที่ส่วนตัว ที่ตกลงกันระหว่างท่านและผู้ทำวิจัย จากความยินยอมของท่านการสัมภาษณ์จะถูกบันทึกไว้ บทสัมภาษณ์จะถูกใช้เพื่อทำวิทยานิพนธ์และเพื่อประโยชน์ทางการศึกษา รวมถึงการตีพิมพ์ในวารสารทางวิชาการ

การศึกษานี้ใช้เวลานานเท่าไร

การให้ความร่วมมือในการศึกษานี้อาจใช้เวลาถึง 90 นาที

อะไรที่อาจจะเป็นความเสี่ยงหรือผลข้างเคียงของการให้ความร่วมมือในการศึกษานี้

ความเสี่ยงได้แก่ อาจเกิดความไม่สะดวกสบาย และการสูญเสียความเป็นส่วนตัวที่อาจเกิดขึ้นได้ อันเนื่องจากการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้

การศึกษานี้จะไม่รวมถึงหรือรายงานข้อมูลส่วนตัวใดๆ ดังนั้นความเสี่ยงของการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้จึงมีน้อยมาก

ผู้ทำวิจัยจะพยายามลดความไม่สะดวกสบายที่อาจเกิดขึ้นได้ ท่านสามารถเลือกเวลาในการถูกสัมภาษณ์ในช่วงที่ท่านมีเวลาและสะดวก ผู้ทำวิจัยมีความยินดีที่จะสัมภาษณ์ในสถานที่ทำงานหรือนอกสถานที่ทำงาน หรือในวันหยุด ท่านสามารถหยุดหรือปฏิเสธการเข้าร่วมของท่าน ณ เวลาใด ๆ ระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์ ถ้าท่านรู้สึกไม่สะดวกใจที่จะเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์

สำหรับข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับความเสี่ยงและความรู้สึกไม่สะดวกสบาย โปรดถามผู้ทำวิจัย

อะไรคือผลประโยชน์ของการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้

การเข้าร่วมในการศึกษานี้อาจจะไม่ให้ประโยชน์โดยตรงกับท่าน การศึกษานี้มุ่งเน้นที่จะให้ผู้สนใจเข้าใจมากขึ้นเกี่ยวกับปัจจัยขององค์กรที่นำไปสู่การกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ องค์กรไม่แสวงหากำไรอาจประยุกต์ใช้ผลการศึกษานี้ เพื่อพัฒนายุทธศาสตร์ในการจัดการเพื่อการกลับคืนสู่ภาวะปกติ ในภาวะการเปลี่ยนแปลงของสังคม เศรษฐกิจ และการเมือง

ข้อมูลของท่านจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับได้อย่างไร

เราจะใช้มาตรการเพื่อจะปกป้องความปลอดภัยของข้อมูลส่วนตัวของท่านทุกอย่าง แต่เราไม่สามารถรับประกันความลับของข้อมูลการศึกษานี้ทั้งหมดได้

ผู้ทำวิจัยจะเก็บการบันทึกการศึกษานี้เป็นการส่วนตัวและจะใช้นามแฝง แทนชื่อของท่านในการบันทึกการศึกษา ผู้ทำวิจัยยังจะนำข้อมูลอื่นๆที่จะทำให้ระบุถึงตัวตนของท่าน บุคคลใดๆหรือองค์กรที่ท่านกล่าวถึงระหว่างการสัมภาษณ์ออก การบันทึกงานวิจัย การบันทึกการสัมภาษณ์ และข้อมูลถอดบันทึกจากเครื่องอัดเสียง จะถูกเก็บในรูปแบบของแฟ้มข้อมูลอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ที่มีรหัสป้องกันในเครื่องของผู้ทำวิจัย เครื่องบันทึกเสียงและคอมพิวเตอร์พกพาจะถูกเก็บรักษาไว้ในตู้ที่มีกุญแจ ณ บ้านพักของนักวิจัย เฉพาะดร.บรูซ กิลล์ และผู้ทำวิจัยจะสามารถเข้าถึงการบันทึกเหล่านี้ได้ การบันทึกและการจัดการสัมภาษณ์ทุกอย่างจะถูกทำลายหลังจากจบการศึกษานี้ 3 ปี

ข้อมูลที่ถูกบรรจุในบันทึกการศึกษานี้ของท่านถูกใช้โดยเจ้าหน้าที่ผู้ทำการศึกษา องค์กรคณะกรรมการตรวจสอบแห่งมหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์ (The Portland State University Institutional Review Board: IRB) ที่คอยควบคุมการวิจัยเรื่องเกี่ยวกับมนุษย์และ/หรือหน่วยงานอื่นอาจจะได้รับอนุญาตให้เข้าถึงการบันทึกของท่าน และอาจมีบางครั้งที่กฎหมายกำหนดให้เราต้องให้ข้อมูลของท่าน สิ่งนี้เป็นข้อบังคับทางกฎหมายที่ผู้ทำวิจัยต้องรายงาน การละเมิดเด็ก การละเมิดผู้ใหญ่ การละเมิดผู้สูงอายุ การทำร้ายตัวเองหรือผู้อื่น หรือสถานการณ์ใดที่อาจเป็นอันตรายถึงชีวิตแก่เจ้าหน้าที่ที่เหมาะสม ดังนั้นความลับของท่านจะไม่ถูกเก็บไว้อีกต่อไป

ชื่อของท่านจะไม่ถูกใช้ในการตีพิมพ์รายงานใดๆเกี่ยวกับการศึกษานี้

ท่านจะได้รับค่าตอบแทนในการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้หรือไม่

ไม่มีค่าตอบแทนสำหรับการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้

ท่านสามารถหยุดการเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้ได้หรือไม่ เมื่อท่านเข้าร่วมแล้ว

การเข้าร่วมของท่านในการศึกษานี้เป็นไปโดยความสมัครใจทั้งหมด ท่านมีสิทธิเลือกที่จะเข้าร่วม หรือถอนการเข้าร่วมของท่านตลอดการศึกษานี้โดยไม่มีการลงโทษ หรือการสูญเสียผลประโยชน์ที่ท่านควรได้รับ

ท่านสามารถโทรถามหรือคิดเขียนการศึกษานี้ได้ที่ใคร

ถ้าท่านมีคำถาม ความกังวลหรือข้อใดเขียนใดๆ ณ เวลาใดๆเกี่ยวกับการศึกษาวิจัยนี้ นารตนา สกลวิทยานนท์ หรือผู้เกี่ยวข้องยินดีที่จะ  
ตอบคำถามเหล่านี้ที่ 1-971-222-8545 (ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา) หรือ +66-861-342-4099 (ประเทศไทย) หรือ nartana@pdx.edu

ถ้าท่านต้องการที่จะติดต่อใครหลังเวลาทำการ หรือในวันหยุดท่านสามารถติดต่อ เบอร์โทร 1-971-222-8545 (ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา) หรือ  
+66-861-342-4099 (ประเทศไทย) และถามหา นารตนา สกลวิทยานนท์

*ข้าพเจ้าสามารถโทรถามคำถามเกี่ยวกับสิทธิของข้าพเจ้าในฐานะผู้ร่วมงานวิจัยได้จากใคร*

ถ้าท่านมีคำถามถึงสิทธิของท่านในฐานะผู้ร่วมงานวิจัย ท่านสามารถโทรไปยังสำนักงานความมั่นคงทางงานวิจัยแห่งมหาวิทยาลัยรัฐ  
พอร์ตแลนด์ (The PSU Office for Research Integrity) ที่ 1(503) 725-2227 หรือ 1(877) 480-4400 สำนักงานความมั่นคงทางงานวิจัยแห่ง  
มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์คือสำนักงานที่สนับสนุนองค์การคณะกรรมการตรวจสอบแห่งมหาวิทยาลัยรัฐพอร์ตแลนด์และจากชุมชนที่  
เป็นกลางในการดูแลความปลอดภัยและประเด็นด้านเชื้อชาติที่เกี่ยวกับงานวิจัยรวมถึงการเข้าร่วมของมนุษย์ สำหรับข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมท่าน  
อาจเข้าไปดูได้ที่เว็บไซต์ <https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/research/integrity>

#### ความยินยอม

ท่านกำลังตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมการศึกษานี้ การลงลายมือชื่อของท่านด้านล่างจะหมายความว่าท่านได้อ่านข้อมูลที่ได้อ่านไว้แล้ว (หรือข้อมูล  
ดังกล่าวนี้ได้รับการอ่านให้ท่านฟัง) การลงชื่อในหนังสือให้ความยินยอมนี้ ท่านไม่ได้สละสิทธิทางกฎหมายใดๆในฐานะผู้ร่วมงาน  
งานวิจัย

ท่านมีโอกาที่จะถามคำถามและคำถามทุกคำถามได้ถูกตอบจนท่านพึงพอใจแล้ว การลงลายมือชื่อในหนังสือให้ความยินยอมนี้ ท่านตกลง  
ที่จะเข้าร่วมในการศึกษานี้ จะมีการมอบสำเนาหนังสือให้ความยินยอมนี้แก่ท่าน

---

ชื่อของผู้ร่วมงานวิจัยที่บรรณคดีภาวะแล้ว (เขียน)

---

ลายมือชื่อของผู้ร่วมงานวิจัยที่บรรณคดีภาวะแล้ว

---

วันที่

#### ลายมือชื่อผู้ทำวิจัย

การศึกษางานวิจัยนี้ได้รับการอธิบายให้แก่ผู้เข้าร่วมและได้มีการตอบคำถามทุกคำถามที่ผู้เข้าร่วมถามแล้ว ผู้ร่วมงานวิจัยเข้าใจข้อมูลที่  
ได้อธิบายในหนังสือให้ความยินยอมนี้ และยินดีที่จะเข้าร่วมงานวิจัย

\_\_\_\_\_ นารตนา สกลวิทยานนท์ \_\_\_\_\_

ชื่อของผู้ทำวิจัย/ ชื่อกลุ่มสมาชิกทำวิจัย (พิมพ์หรือเขียน)

## Appendix H: Survey Form

### Survey:

- A.** On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 represents ‘no threat’ and 10 represents ‘high threat’ to what extent do you feel your organization’s ability to conduct its primary mission in an enduring way has been threatened by any factor over the last 10 years?

No threat								High threat	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- B.** Does your organization have a strategic plan?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

- C.** How would you describe the level of turnover in your organization’s senior leadership over the last 10 years on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is very low and 10 is very high?

Very low								Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- D.** Does your organization receive regular evaluations of its performance from stakeholders?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

- E.** How would you describe the sources of revenue of your organization over the last 10 years on a scale of 1 to 10 if 1 is no change in sources and 10 is significant change in sources?

No change								Significant change	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**F.** On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is very low and 10 is very high, how would you rate the social support for your organization over the past 10 years?

Very low									Very high
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**G.** On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is very low and 10 is very high, how would you rate the government support for your organization over the past 10 years?

Very low									Very high
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**H.** On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is very low and 10 is very high, how would you rate the support from business corporations for your organization over the past 10 years?

Very low									Very high
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you a key informant for participating this interview.

## Appendix I: Survey Form (in Thai)

### แบบสำรวจ

ก. บนมาตรวัด 1-10 โดย 1 หมายถึง “ไม่มีภัยคุกคาม” และ 10 หมายถึง “ภัยคุกคามสูง” ท่านรู้สึกว่าคุณสมบัติในการบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์หลักอย่างยั่งยืนขององค์กรของท่านถูกคุกคามโดยปัจจัยใดปัจจัยหนึ่งในระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาในระดับใด

ไม่มีภัยคุกคาม								ภัยคุกคามสูง	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ข. องค์กรของท่านมีแผนยุทธศาสตร์หรือไม่

- ☐ ใช่  
☐ ไม่ใช่

ค. ท่านคิดว่าอัตราการเปลี่ยนแปลงผู้บริหารระดับสูงในองค์กรของท่านเกิดขึ้นบ่อยแค่ไหนในระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมา โดยมาตรวัด 1-10 โดย 1 คือต่ำมากและ 10 คือสูงมาก

ต่ำมาก								สูงมาก	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ง. องค์กรของท่านมีการวัดผลการทำงานจากผู้มีส่วนร่วมหรือไม่

- ☐ ใช่  
☐ ไม่ใช่

จ. ขอให้ท่านอธิบายแหล่งรายได้ขององค์กรของท่าน โดยมีมาตรวัด 1-10 โดย 1 คือไม่มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงในแหล่งรายได้ และ 10 คือแหล่งรายได้มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงอย่างมาก ในระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมา

ไม่มีการเปลี่ยนแปลง								มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงอย่างมาก	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ฉ. บนมাত্রวัด 1-10 โดยมี 1 คือต่ำมากและ 10 คือสูงมาก ท่านจะประเมินระดับการได้รับการสนับสนุนองค์กรของท่าน จากภาคสังคมใน  
ระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาอย่างไร

ต่ำมาก									สูงมาก
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ช. บนมাত্রวัด 1-10 โดยมี 1 คือต่ำมากและ 10 คือสูงมาก ท่านจะประเมินระดับการได้รับการสนับสนุนองค์กรของท่าน จากภาครัฐใน  
ระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาอย่างไร

ต่ำมาก									สูงมาก
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ซ. บนมাত্রวัด 1-10 โดยมี 1 คือต่ำมากและ 10 คือสูงมาก ท่านจะประเมินระดับการได้รับการสนับสนุนองค์กรของท่าน จากภาคธุรกิจ  
ระยะ 10 ปีที่ผ่านมาอย่างไร

ต่ำมาก									สูงมาก
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ขอขอบท่านผู้ให้ข้อมูลสำหรับความร่วมมือในการให้สัมภาษณ์นี้