



UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CHANGE THE WORLD FROM HERE

**Nonprofits Doing It All: An Examination of Nonprofit Social
Responsibility**

by

Kelly Rose Cousins

Kelly.cousins48@yahoo.com

Capstone Research Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Nonprofit Administration Degree
in the School of Management
directed by Dr. Marco Tavanti

San Francisco, California

Spring, 2020

Abstract

This research is an examination of how nonprofits can use their full organizational actor-hood to expand their impact, through Nonprofit Social Responsibility, which is defined as “anything an organization does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis.” Ultimately, the goal was to identify barriers that prevent nonprofits from participating in Nonprofit Social Responsibility programs, in the hopes of providing solutions to address these barriers and encourage Nonprofit Social Responsibility. The data collected utilized a mixed methodology, specifically designed to target a variety of different experiences and perspectives. Six expert interviews were completed, along with nineteen surveys from nonprofit professionals. The resulting data identified the most significant barriers as funding and time available, and revealed an interesting discrepancy implying that staff buy-in is also a significant factor. Due to the results of the data from both interviews and surveys, a five-step blueprint was created to help nonprofits who are interested in developing these types of programs. Additionally, this research has suggested several avenues for future study in this field, all implicated in the data, including nonprofit communication, the role of partnerships, and a nonprofit specific certification to measure impact. The final key takeaway is that a new title is needed for this field, as Nonprofit Social Responsibility is not the right fit.

Keywords: Nonprofit Social Responsibility

Acknowledgments

I owe my success in the Masters in Nonprofit Administration program to a great many people. First and foremost, I am so endlessly grateful to have had a great many incredible role models in my youth. These incredible women leaders showed me the true strength in nonprofits, and how impactful they can be in the world. At the University of San Francisco, I need to give specific thanks to my professors, who spent an incredible amount of time ensuring that we had all of the tools necessary to succeed in this field. And of course, I would not have been successful in this program if it were not for my amazing classmates. Each and every one of them has given me so much to learn from. I have been so proud to see them all grow, and to grow alongside them.

Finally, as cliché as it is, I need to thank my parents. My mother has been a voice of reason for every stressful moment, and my father has patiently listened to me talk out all of my problems and concerns. The hours of time both of them have poured into ensuring that I was able to succeed in this program is something I am endlessly grateful and fortunate to have had.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	Error! Bookmark not defined.	ii
List of Figures		iv
Section 1. Introduction		1
Section 2: Literature Review		2
Nonprofit Social Responsibility: What Is It		2
What Types of Nonprofit Social Responsibility Have Been Identified?.....		3
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.....		3
Environmentalism		4
Responsible Sourcing		4
Socially Responsible Investing		5
Responsible Partnerships		5
Are There Any Barriers to Nonprofit Social Responsibility.....		6
Aversion to Corporate Social Responsibility		6
Risk and Return		7
Lack of Certification		8
Mission Drift		8
Should More Nonprofits Consider Nonprofit Social Responsibility?.....		9
Expansion of the Mission	Error! Bookmark not defined.	0
Potential Marketing Benefits	Error! Bookmark not defined.	1
Increased Stability and Consistency	Error! Bookmark not defined.	1
Talent Acquisition	Error! Bookmark not defined.	1
Trust and Influence	Error! Bookmark not defined.	2
Existing Examples of Nonprofit Social Responsibility ...	Error! Bookmark not defined.	3
Staff Awareness	Error! Bookmark not defined.	3
Nonprofits as Activists	Error! Bookmark not defined.	4
Mission Statement as a Roadmap	Error! Bookmark not defined.	4
Nonprofit Social Responsibility In the Real World	Error! Bookmark not defined.	5

Conclusion of the Literature Review.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.	5
Section 3: Methods.....		17
Interview Methodology	Error! Bookmark not defined.	7
Interviewee Selection	Error! Bookmark not defined.	7
Interview Question Design	Error! Bookmark not defined.	8
Coding Measures		20
Survey Methodology.....		20
Survey Questions and Design		20
Survey Distribution		23
Limitations In The Interviews and Surveys		24
Section 4. Data Analysis		25
Interview Data Analysis.....		25
Survey Data Analysis.....		27
Section 5: Discussion and Recommendations		36
Research Question One: Types of Nonprofit Social Responsibility		36
Research Question Two: Barriers to Nonprofit Social Responsibility.....		37
Research Question Three: Resources and Recommendations.....		40
The Field of Nonprofit Social Responsibility		43
Section 6: Conclusions		455
List of References.....		48
Appendix		52
Author’s Bio		59

List of Tables

Table 1: Instances of Barriers Broken Out Through Interview	225
Table 2: Support for Nonprofit Social Responsibility.....	28
Table 3: Existing Nonprofit Social Responsibility Program Areas.....	29
Table 4: Interest in Type of NSR Program.....	29
Table 5: Measurement of Barriers Represented in Surveys.....	30
Table 6: Mean Score of The Value of Resources	31
Table 7: Barriers Depending on Type of Nonprofit.....	31
Table 8: Measure of Interest Depending on Staff Position	35

List of Figures

Figure 1: List of Interview Questions with Corresponding Interviewees	52
Figure 2: Nonprofit Social Responsibility Survey	53
Figure 3: “Setting Up Success for Full Mission Style Programs” Model	58
Figure 4: Full Transcripts of Interviews - Coded	58
Figure 5: Survey Data Breakdown.....	58

Section 1. Introduction

This research was developed as the result of an interesting discrepancy, that while for-profit companies are being held more and more accountable for their impact, both positive and negative, nonprofit organizations rarely receive such scrutiny. Instead, it is a sad fact that sometimes a nonprofit's positive work in the community "masks" any potentially negative impact. Think for example of a nonprofit food bank who invests in Walmart, whose underpaid workers then need the services of the food bank, or a racial justice organization, who purchases office supplies from a company who does not pay their foreign workers a living wage. In these cases, organizations are so focused on one thing, minimizing their expenses, that they inadvertently contribute to the issues they are trying to solve. This limits nonprofit, preventing them from fully maximizing their impact.

This study of Nonprofit Social Responsibility, or "anything an organization does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis," will hopefully inspire nonprofits to see new opportunities to maximize and expand their impact in unique ways. The specific purpose of this research was to identify barriers preventing nonprofits from participating in Nonprofit Social Responsibility Programs, and ultimately to look for possible solutions for nonprofit who want to introduce these types of programs. In so doing, nonprofits would be able to move forward more intentionally and strategically, to ensure that all of their actions as an organization are in alignment with their mission and values.

The following research will begin with an extensive literature review, which attempted to bring together as much research as possible on the burgeoning field of Nonprofit Social Responsibility. This is followed by an explanation of the methods utilized to collect both the interview and survey data that was studied. Following this is a data analysis section, reporting on the findings from the interviews and surveys. The subsequent discussion section details the findings from the data, and suggest implications based on those findings, including a model developed to support nonprofits who are interested in developing Nonprofit Social Responsibility programs. Finally, in the conclusion section, key takeaways are presented alongside opportunities for future research and suggestions for the field. The remaining pages of this report are given over to a list of references utilized in the paper, and a complete appendix, including all documents referenced throughout the paper.

Section 2: Literature Review

Nonprofit Social Responsibility: What is it?

Consumers have high expectations. They have demands of the companies they buy from, the media they consume, and the products they share with their circles. Consumers care about what the companies they support are doing, and that they are responsible actors on a global stage. Motivated by consumer demand and driven by profits, more and more companies have adopted policies of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). A generally accepted definition of CSR is “the act of incorporating environmental and social concerns into a company’s business. These programs center around the idea that businesses can make the world a better place.” (Edmondson, 2019). Alternatively, CSR is an initiative “that dictated company priorities with regard to social, economic, environmental, and governance impacts...” (Haffar, 2019). Social Responsibility is an important element of organization actor-hood as an organization’s global impact grows larger and larger. Today, over 90% of the world’s largest companies have CSR or sustainability programs, and consistently report ethical progress to their customers (Haffar, 2019). But for-profit companies are not the only organizational actors out there. Nonprofits and government agencies are being called on more and more to show as much responsibility for their communities.

After seeing this consistent trend in corporations, this researcher was left questioning whether other types of organizations are feeling the pressure to be socially responsible beyond for-profit. Nonprofits specifically are an interesting case study. Nonprofits inherently have a social mission baked into their work, so the question of whether or not they are involved in social responsibility beyond those core missions is a subject of interest, especially when one considers the responsibility of organizations to consider all of their actions, not just the ones that relate directly to their mission (Pope, 2018, pg. 1303). A new term, Nonprofit Social Responsibility (NSR) has recently joined the current body of literature. While still a rare term, there is a growing body of research on this topic. This new term functions to cover the same ground as CSR but from a different sector.

More often than not, Nonprofits are already making a lot of strides to be responsible citizens. Their model is built not on profit maximization, but on the seeking out of positive impact on their communities. Nearly 100% of nonprofits have a mission statement with a “charitable purpose,” while many, roughly 80% have additional “values documents” (Pope, 2018, pg. 1309). These documents together define an organization’s purpose and direct their actions in a positive social direction. Even with this, nonprofits are being asked by their supporters to own responsibility for their amplified actor-hood (Pope, 2018, pg. 1310). What this essentially means is supporters more and more want the nonprofits they support to bear responsibility for their impact,

both positive and negative, and to take actions to try to minimize any negative effects of their actions.

For the purposes of this research, NSR is defined as “anything an organization does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis.” Many nonprofits are already involved in policies like recycling, and reducing their power consumption. In fact, about two thirds of nonprofits are reporting on these actions to their supporters (Bloomquist). We are interested in assessing whether or not nonprofits are engaging in NSR types of activities, and what research currently exists relating to this emerging field.

What Types of Nonprofit Social Responsibility Have Been Identified?

Social responsibility initiatives go far beyond recycling, limiting printing, or trying not to drive as far. Research on various forms of CSR, OSR, and NSR have identified a variety of categories of social responsibility, including eco-efficiency, footprint reduction, supplier engagement, community initiatives, development of green product lines, sustainability disclosure, and employee engagement initiatives (Haffar, 2019). With all of these options, very few have been researched specifically in relation to NSR. Those that do exist rarely use the specific terms Nonprofit Social Responsibility, so much research is taken from general research.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. For many nonprofits, the incorporation of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) are seen as natural, and even baked into the business model. Additionally, some research has suggested that as social issues go, DEI is considered less important than things like environmental sustainability (Taylor, 2019, pg. 5). However research demonstrates that not all nonprofits are as transparent as would perhaps be preferred. Researchers Taylor et. al. determined that environmental nonprofits are interestingly the most likely to disclose their demographic information. Additionally, urban nonprofits are more likely to divulge demographic data than rural, larger organizations are more likely to disclose than smaller, and unsurprisingly, organizations with female or minority CEOs are more likely to disclose than their white male counterparts (Taylor, 2019, pg. 1). This has grown as a result of the increased push for nonprofits to report on their demographic data, starting in roughly 2014 (Taylor, 2019, pg. 4). According to this, transparency is an important element of diversity, because they allow organizations to “identify baselines, set targets, reveal accomplishments, and measure progress on achieving goals.” (Taylor, 2019, pg. 5). The study by Taylor et.al had many interesting findings, but the one most relevant to this study is this:

“This paper argues that diversity data collection and disclosure are vital and that environmental organizations should embrace these activities as essential

elements of their mission. But, as earlier discussions indicate, some environmental leaders have expressed discomfort with the idea that social issues belong in their organizational mission.” (Taylor, 2019, pg. 23)

Other research into DEI in nonprofits have often focused on fundraising. One study on Arts Museums looked at how a lack of diversity in giving populations means a lack of representation within those arts museums, perpetuating a cycle reflecting the values of only wealthy patrons (Jung, 2015, pg. 262). Nonprofit fundraising rarely takes into account diverse donor populations, but it is clear that this expansion of donor populations is often vital in terms of nonprofits’ sustainability (Jung, 2015, pg. 265). It is clear that more research is required to see the actual impact of DEI programs and transparency, across populations and organizations.

Environmentalism. There is fairly limited information about how nonprofits specifically incorporate environmental projects in their work. However, there is plenty of research in for profit companies. One study on green apparel companies demonstrated that often, collaboration and partnerships are effective ways of adopting environmental-friendly practices (Adhikari, 2020, pg. 21). This suggestion of partnership being an important resource is one that deserves further study, in nonprofits specifically. This same study also found that profit sharing can be successful in enhancing the experience, so truly having investment from all sides is valuable (Adhikari, 2020, pg. 21). Another study looked specifically at how hiring managers who are “environmentally sensitive” is an important step for many companies to enhance and expand their ECSR (Brucella, 2019, pg. 20). This may very well be a step that nonprofits can consider when making their hiring choices. Having someone in house pushing for these projects, i.e. staff investment, is a valuable expansion of these types of programs.

Responsible Sourcing. Responsible sourcing is not a commonly studied topic, however it does show up from time to time in research on for profit agencies. When it comes to common products, like food and clothes, consumers and stakeholders are often calling on producers to know how products they consume are made, calling for transparency in supply chains in the interest of “ensuring a sustainable future.” (Zarei, 2020, pg. 1). For the purposes of this study, “Responsible sourcing refers to the compliance of suppliers with environmental and social standards” (Zarei, 2020, pg. 1). Like the research on environmentalism, research on sustainable sourcing has a lot to do with coordination, collaboration, and event partnerships between buyers, sellers, and even external stakeholders (Zarei, 2020, pg. 1). Even in these situations, the cost of disclosure is the highest deterrent, because of the risk of disclosing unethical supply chains (Zarei, 2020, pg. 4). Interestingly, the study found that a reduction in transparency did not have an effect on social and environmental responsibility violations in supply chains, although the jury is still out on whether this is true of nonprofits (Zarei, 2020, pg. 4). This research did, however, find that both internal and

external audits are used, though sometimes they conflicted with transparency when it came to responsible sourcing (Zarei, 2020, pg. 17). With precious little information out there on responsible sourcing in for profits, and none to speak of about nonprofits, we are left without a good starting point to examine responsible sourcing in nonprofits.

Socially Responsible Investing. Most nonprofits have some amount of money which they invest. This is a common enough practice, as it provides all organizations with an element of stability, and for nonprofits it provides a valuable source of unrestricted income (Greco, 2020). However, for many nonprofits, investment decisions are handed over to investment companies, and limited control is retained by the nonprofit (Fritz, 2019, pg. 1). This is unfortunate, as there is an increasingly large investment field, known as Socially Responsible Investing (SRI), that is an impactful way for nonprofits to enhance their impact. SRI are investments made based on “ethical” screening. They can be described as “a set of approaches which include social or ethical goals or constraints in addition to more conventional financial criteria in decisions over whether to acquire, hold, or dispose of a particular asset.” (Signori, 2010, pg. 295). In layman's terms, SRI are the product when a nonprofit's Board of Directors instate a policy that regulates their investment decisions to ensure that they do not invest money in companies whose work has a negative impact. As of 2019, less than 0.01% of investments made were impact investments (Alijani, 2019, pg. 16). Sometimes these policies are focused specifically on making investments that further the nonprofit's mission, sometimes known as “mission-related investing”, while other times they are merely focused on avoiding investments in harmful companies (Signori, 2010, pg. 297). One study looked specifically at whether or not Italian Foundations are participating in SRI. This study sought to determine whether or not they were participating in SRI, if not, why, and whether they would be interested in participating in SRI (Signori, 2010). The results of this study suggest that while few organizations participate in SRI, most are interested (Signori, 2010). There has also been some research into how organizations who do not participate in SRI have been impacted when their investments have been made public. An important example of a failure to invest responsibly is seen in the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation which was roundly criticized for their investments in oil plants in Nigeria, responsible for pollution linked to respiratory disease and cancer. At the same time, the Gates Foundation has a series of programs trying to improve health outcomes throughout the African continent (Sachdev, 2014).

Responsible Partnerships. One of the most common elements of CSR is when for profit organizations partner with nonprofit organizations. This can mean giving grants, volunteering, or joint projects, but in almost every case, this trade off involves for profits providing resources of some kind to a nonprofit, and then promoting that support among their stakeholders. While this is a great trend for nonprofits who need resources, there is some concern in the research about who nonprofits ought to partner with. The

idea of appropriate, or responsible partnerships has been around for a while, under a variety of names. Basically, this is the idea that nonprofits should thoughtfully consider who they partner with, so that they are not helping to promote an organization who runs counter to their mission. Visibly aligning with a company implies that a nonprofit is in alignment with the goals of that company, which would be harmful in situations where a company has performed irresponsibly or unethically (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 17). Additionally, the risks of partnering for nonprofits are higher than for profits, because nonprofits are more often than not the less powerful partner. As such, they are more likely to be pulled into programs that do not adhere to their best interests (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 16). Even with this information we know that “While institutions and markets can provide incentives for engaging in social and environmental-base missions, the social and environmental impact can be maximized by adopting and implementing a multi-stakeholder approach” (Alijani, 2019, pg. 16). With limited research, it is unclear how nonprofit might in fact be able to partner with other nonprofits for successful implementation of NSR projects, though this is a promising area of study.

Are There Any Barriers to Nonprofit Social Responsibility?

Social responsibility often seems like a no brainer for nonprofits, especially considering their ethical mission and reputation for social good. However, this is not at all the case. Research into NSR demonstrates that for many nonprofits, insurmountable barriers exist that make adding these programs impossible. The survey of Italian foundations mentioned earlier found that less than half consider ethical or social criteria when it comes to their investments (Signori, 2010, pg. 298). As a general rule, that extends to all forms of NSR. The existing research has suggested that there are several barriers that prevent nonprofits from becoming involved in NSR.

Aversion to Corporate Social Responsibility. NSR may be a relatively new idea, but as discussed earlier, CSR is not. The idea that businesses bear responsibility to society and the world at large is generally understood by most people, in fact it is often demanded by stakeholders (Pope, 2018, pg. 1301). While for most CSR has a largely positive connotation, that is not always true among nonprofits. According to Bloomquist “A lot of nonprofits tend to avoid the phrase ‘corporate social responsibility’ because it is believed to be associated with corporate terminology and suggests a stigma that is associated with running things like a business.” (Bloomquist). This idea of wanting to avoid any perceived connection with the world of business is not new among nonprofits. It is the extension of a desire to remain separate, and distinct from the profit-oriented world (Bloomquist). This stigma is likely the result of the reputation of for-profits as “greedy” or “selfish”, focused only on profit maximization at the complete disregard of negative impact (Bloomquist). For this reason, nonprofits may choose to avoid projects that are associated with CSR ideologies.

Nonprofits may also fear association with CSR due to its potential negative impact on profits and/or reputation. Some research has suggested specifically that building partnerships with for profit companies participating in CSR may cause a decrease in donations to nonprofits (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 23). This is the result of the idea that by buying from for profits who are participating in CSR initiatives, purchasers have already received the feeling of 'giving', or doing good. They are therefore less likely to give to nonprofits, thereby reducing overall donations (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 23). This is a hazard for nonprofits, and another reason why they may want to avoid NSR, to ensure that it does not stimulate a decrease in overall giving.

Risk and Return. While these are compelling reasons, there is more going on than simply an avoidance of association with CSR. Incorporating NSR initiatives in a nonprofit's daily functioning is also tied up in fears about risk and return. For Signori's study of what factors influence Italian Foundations to adopt SRI policies, the largest factor was risk reduction, the maintenance of profits in the pursuance of the mission (Signori, 2010, pg. 298). For these Foundations, there was across the board a perception that SRI have a higher risk, and a lower return (Signori, 2010, pg. 299). Therefore, risk reduction was ranked 8.48 of 10 in terms of importance, followed by 7.43, coherence with their own mission (Signori, 2010, pg. 298). For many nonprofits, there is an inherent tension about money, more so than in for profits. In for profit organizations, the development of profit is inherently good, vs. in nonprofits, in which the creation of profit is tied to a dichotomy between the creation of private value vs. societal value (Haffar, 2019). For nonprofits who have a mission, it is generally accepted that any profits reaped by the agency should be put towards that mission, as the mission is the ultimate goal of the nonprofit. All else is secondary, and would require a trade off with the pursuance of the mission (Haffar, 2019). What this really means is that for nonprofits, any money not spent directly on the pursuance of the mission is seen as at best unnecessary, and at worst a failure. Some nonprofits certainly pursue more active, both/and paths when it comes to their operation, but the majority of nonprofits are defensive, adhering to either/or systems, i.e. it is the mission or nothing (Haffar, 2019). Returning to the Italian Foundations discussed earlier, the single most dependent factor in determining participation in SRI was a comfort and confidence with the level of risk and return in these investments, as this would imply that adopting an SRI policy would not limit the funds coming into the Foundation, and thus not provide a barrier to performing their mission (Signori, 2010, pg. 299). Nonprofits appear unwilling to participate in NSR initiatives if those initiatives run the risk of decreasing funds available for mission achievement (Church, 2019, pg. 122).

More on the either/or attitude referenced earlier needs to be considered. For many companies, for profits and nonprofits alike a 'win' in one area is like wiping out a 'failure' in another area (Haffar, 2019). So, in for profit entities, donating to an environmental nonprofit would essentially 'wipe out' some of the for-profit's carbon

footprint. For nonprofits, the ultimate win is the pursuance of the mission, ergo failures in other areas, like environmental degradation, purchasing from irresponsible vendors, even investing in “bad” companies can all be wiped out and excused as long as there is success in the mission category. This explains why so many companies report a culture of “good news only.” (Haffar, 2019). Nonprofits and for profits alike participate in impression management, and this is made easier because most things are self-reported (Haffar, 2019). Promoting anything beyond the mission is likely seen as a trade off by nonprofit staff (Lichtenstein, 2004 pg. 28). Additionally, consistency in reporting and image is tough for many nonprofits, suggesting another reason why many nonprofits may not choose to muddle their brand with reporting on NSR programs that do not relate to their mission (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 26).

Lack of Certification. Even if a nonprofit were confident in a social responsibility program’s ability to not affect their financial outcomes, and able to overlook the potential association with for profit professionalization/reputation that nonprofits avoid, the fact of the matter is that most nonprofits do not have a solid foundation on which to build socially responsible programs. There are no metrics designed for nonprofits to measure NSR programs, and there are no tools in place to expand NSR within existing organizations. For profits can use programs like BrightFunds, or CAUSECAST (Butler). They can also measure against United Nations metrics and indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals, through the Global Reporting Initiative, the ISO 26000 Standards, ISO 14000 standards of Environmental Management, or the Carbon Disclosure Project (Pope, 2018, pg. 1306-1309). For some organizations, they can even receive certifications, such as Fair Trade or B-Corp status (Lee, 2019). For nonprofits, no such organized metrics currently exist. Nonprofits struggle to report on impact of what they are doing already, without introducing programs beyond their missions (Haffar, 2019). Returning to the Italian Foundations that we discussed earlier, the lack of information on SRI sparked a lack of trust among Foundations, because it was seen as an unknown, something no one had done before (Signori, pg. 294). This lack of education about what programs are out there, and how to measure them is a well documented barrier to nonprofit participation in NSR. Not understanding how these NSR programs operate, or how to implement them is a natural barrier that prevents nonprofits from being able to easily adopt new programs, especially when they are already overworked trying to wrangle programs in the direct line of their missions (Signori, 2010, pg. 297).

Mission Drift. It is impossible to adopt something that no one has thought about, in for profits as well as in nonprofits. Decision making in all organizations, whether it be sustainability-related, profit-related, even mission related, is based largely on underlying logic, things that are “known” without being directly thought about or discussed (Haffar, 2019). In nonprofits, this means that the mission is the underlying logic that guides decisions, but only to a point. Nonprofits may fear that by participating

in NSR, they are inadvertently giving over to mission drift, because they would be diverting focus away from the mission. When we discussed appropriate partnerships earlier, it was mentioned that nonprofits are often the less powerful members in partnerships with for profits. Entering into these relationships, nonprofits are vulnerable to pressure from other entities without the same underlying logic as theirs (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 17). NSR can be associated primarily with mission, but it need not be, introducing an element of uncertainty for nonprofits. With so much pressure on the work they are already doing, stretching to address more social and environmental needs may become overwhelming for nonprofit staff.

For most nonprofits, the responsibility, and rationale behind all actions is to the mission first and foremost. This is why so many nonprofits think of investments, programs, etc. in terms of returns first, because with higher returns, the mission can be better carried out (Signori, 2010, pg. 294). According to Signori, "When asked why they do not invest in a socially responsible way, 10 foundations (out of 25) pointed out that their mission is to guarantee the consistency of their endowment and they were not, therefore, in a position to apply other investment criteria." (Signori, pg. 298). Pursuing other social and environmental aims puts the mission at risk, it is as simple as that. Most people who work in nonprofits choose to do so for the love of the mission, so it is no surprise that this is their priority to the detriment of all else.

There are a lot of things acting as barriers to nonprofits becoming involved in NSR. It is sometimes associated with negative for-profit implications, there is a fear of reduced return to the nonprofit and a general lack of education of how to go about adopting Nonprofit Social Responsibility initiatives. Nonprofits tend to have an either/or attitude, likely as a result of desired brand consistency, and of course, there is the responsibility to the mission first and foremost. In short, many barriers exist to nonprofits becoming NSR actors. However, there are a lot of compelling reasons for nonprofits to consider adopting more NSR programs.

Should More Nonprofits Consider Nonprofit Social Responsibility?

There is a wealth of research into the positive impact of CSR on the companies who participate in it. Increases in sales and customer loyalty are just the tip of the iceberg (Nurn, 2010, pg. 360). However, there is very little research into the benefits of NSR for nonprofits. Some research suggests that benefits of engaging in CSR style activities, and reporting them to supporters may lead to increased volunteerism, positive workplace environment, increases in media coverage, reduced costs, and better public image (Waters, 2014, pg. 3). However, with relatively little research specifically on nonprofits, much of what is known must be extrapolated from research done on for profit companies. The evidence compellingly implies that there are concrete benefits to being involved in social and environmental programs. Even in for profits, however, CSR efforts can positively impact stakeholder attitudes, grow the organization's legitimacy

and reputation, increase purchase intentions among consumers, and elevate stakeholder loyalty (Waters, 2014, pg. 3). Some of this research could also apply to nonprofit social responsibility as well.

Expansion of the Mission. Nonprofits are constantly trying to maximize the impact of their mission (Signori, 2010, pg. 297). There is some research to suggest that impact can be achieved, and even enhanced, when NSR programs are adopted alongside the nonprofit's mission related programs. Nonprofits are more and more feeling the pressure from their stakeholders to maintain and expand their social license (Haffar, 2019). Those who support nonprofits, in short, want to see them take responsibility for all of their actions, not just to focus solely on their mission statements. Nonprofits, unlike for profits, are more motivated by intrinsic ethical values (Haffar, 2019). They are not concerned with profit maximization, a damning assertion leveled at for profits. Being aware of NSR and using it as a tool to enhance mission, it would appear, is possible among for profits. This can be done through choosing to purchase local products that support your community's economy, or investing in a business whose products align with a nonprofit's mission. This is even before you consider the impact of NSR beyond mission, like a healthcare nonprofit who invests in green energy, a decision that may ultimately be in the best health interest of their clients (Fritz, 2019, pg. 2). Across the board it would appear, NSR has the potential not to divert mission impact, but to enhance it.

In many ways, NSR can be a way to extend the impact of a nonprofit's mission. Evidence suggest that "communicating effectiveness through social impact reporting can strengthen and support a mission statement." (Bloomquist). For consumers and stakeholders, spending, investing, or even donating money is like voting for the kind of world we want (Ethical Markets Media, 2005). Purchasing something from a company is as good as a vote of support for what they are doing. Purchasing from a company who is acting counter to someone's best interest makes no sense, at year nonprofits do this all the time. This is a sad fact of life, but one that can be addressed through thoughtful consideration of actions. For nonprofits, the rationale behind decision making is often that they should seek out "the best possible balance of good consequences over bad consequences for all the parties affected" (Signori, 2010, pg. 294). In terms of this definition, minimizing bad consequences is just as important as maximizing good consequences. Nonprofits more than for profits are driven by ethical values, therefore it is natural that the possibility of social good is extended even further by their programs (Waters, 2014, pg. 13). While it is true that the mission is first and foremost the duty of the nonprofit, both legally and ethically, there is a question of where that social good ends, and nonprofits stop trying to achieve positive impact. Programs like SRI policies are a good tool in terms of strengthening the effectiveness of a nonprofits mission and actions, because they don't allow for nonprofits to "stop worrying about their mission" (Signori, 2010, pg. 296). In this way, a nonprofit's ethical actions can extend beyond

their programs, and sometimes even beyond their mission, something that stakeholders consistently want to see.

Potential Marketing Benefits. One specific study has implied that nonprofits can achieve marketing benefits from being socially responsible, beyond their mission. Dr. Richard Waters et. al. examined this phenomenon with a series of nonprofits from three distinct sectors, dealing with agriculture, arts and culture, and sexual health (Waters, 2014, pg. 1). This team found that, while nonprofits often choose to downplay activities related to CSR, they could benefit from the increase in positive reputation that these actions could bring them (Waters, 2014, pg. 13). This is supported by evidence from the for-profit world, in which customers who identify with corporations are even more likely to give to those companies than to donate to corporate supported nonprofits (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 20). Across the board, evidence implies that participating in social responsibility initiatives is good for reputation, and therefore good for marketing.

Increased Stability and Consistency. All of this considered, we know that reducing risk and increasing return is a high priority for most nonprofits. Some research has suggested that certain Organizational Social Responsibility (OSR) programs actually increase profits and contribute to cost savings. TriplePundit, an organization who reports on the sustainability of businesses, says “NGOs... can benefit from increased cost savings as a result of reporting metrics from social impact and sustainability efforts” (Bloomquist). This may be because NSR programs have been suggested to help give nonprofits a marketing boost (Waters, 2014, pg. 1). It may also be that frankly, the socially responsible sector is currently thriving. SRI consistently outperform their competitors on financial benchmarks according to some (Ethical Markets Media, 2005) Admittedly there are studies suggesting that SRI are less effective than investments that are not screened, but from what we could tell, those studies are in the minority. In terms of stability, SRI are more consistent as well. They follow normal patterns for investments, and certainly do not appear to have a negative impact on performance (Ethical Markets Media, 2005). This can be important, because being financially independent and stable can make all the difference in allowing nonprofits to pursue their mission autonomously, and remain true to their own mission and values, instead of their donors (Signogi, 2010, pg. 295).

Talent Acquisition. Employees are stakeholders too, and incorporating issues beyond the mission can help nonprofits draw in talent that helps them to achieve their mission. Few people care about only one thing in their lives, so diversifying values means that more people with more skills will be drawn to a nonprofit’s values, as well as their mission (Bloomquist). As discussed earlier, NSR initiatives can spark positive word of mouth, which among key publics builds up a positive perception, and can lead to more applicants for jobs, but also more volunteers and supporters (Bloomquist). Triplepundit has affirmed this through asserting that through NSR visibility, nonprofits can attract more prestigious talent, as well as donors, due to positive reputation and

credibility (Bloomquist). Having this extended job pool means that nonprofits have the capacity to hire not just whoever is available, but people who have the skills they need to be effective (Ethical Media Market, 2005). Having a larger pool of talented staff is a constant struggle for nonprofits. As such, any chance nonprofits have to bring in new talent should at least be considered.

Trust and Influence. There is a lot of distrust out there for any kind of organization. While nonprofits wield more trust than for profit organizations, they certainly do not have a 100% approval rating from the general public (Coffman, 2015). In light of that, anything nonprofits can do to increase trust is in their best interest. Social impact reporting builds credibility, and with credibility comes trust. This trust comes as the result of transparency and accountability, which nonprofits already struggle with (Bloomquist). In order to give trust, people need to be able to believe in organizations. It is hard to believe in someone when you have not seen the facts (Ethical Media Markets, 2005). For nonprofits, being transparent in all of their reporting is essential, as they are under even more scrutiny than most for profits. It therefore stands to reason that those who rely on nonprofit reports of their actions to determine their support would want to see all the actions a nonprofit is taking, not just the obvious ones. Beyond that, nonprofits are regularly asking their for-profit partners to take steps and actions beyond what they are used to in the name of social good. How can these requests be taken seriously if nonprofits are unwilling to walk the walk, and make changes that are equally different and difficult (Bloomquist)? It is important that nonprofits understand and leverage the trust that is placed in them, because it is a resource that they can use to further their mission.

Along with trust comes influence, and nonprofits, due to their relatively high trust ratings, tend to wield a great deal of influence among their supporters. By being seen as activist, and trusted ones at that, nonprofits have the power to exert influence (Ethical Media Markets, 2005). By adopting policies like SRI, nonprofits have the potential ability to affect all of their stakeholders, including not just employees but donors, volunteers, beneficiaries, even foundations, grant makers, and policy makers (Signori, 2010, pg. 296, Bloomquist). In the case of some investment decisions, nonprofits have actually been able to leverage their investments to change the behavior of the companies they invest in (Ethical Media Markets, 2005). While this has happened, it is uncommon, and nonprofits have historically not leveraged this power. When it comes to partnerships, most of a nonprofit's focus is on gaining funding, but the relationship can go the other way as well. Nonprofits are in a position to influence the behavior of their partners, because they bring something important to the partnership table; trust (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 16). For consumers, contributing to organizations who are visibly working on their social responsibility feels like doing good, and they are therefore more likely to contribute. Customers feel good about helping a for profit to become a better social actor. Partnering with nonprofits is one very important way for

for-profits to achieve that goal of enhancing their social responsibility, while equally allowing nonprofits a chance to influence their behavior further (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 16).

Not only are there benefits to nonprofits adopting NSR programs, but there are distinct consequences when nonprofits are discovered as having taken unethical actions. Nonprofits, after all, have an impact on the world, and stakeholders are holding them responsible for wielding that impact responsibly (Bloomquist). This is certainly the case in terms of scandals like the Harvard student protests of their investment in fossil fuels (Associated Press, 2020), or the Comic Relief concert for gender justice that sold T-shirts which had been made in a sweatshop (Murphy, 2019). When it comes specifically to partnerships, nonprofits should be very careful who they select to partner with. For instance, a for profit's tarnished reputation could essentially 'rub off' on a nonprofit (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 29). Or, on the flip side of that equation, there is some research suggesting that when for profits with a poor record of CSR attempt to change their ways by affiliating themselves with nonprofits, consumers see this as an opportunity to rehabilitate the for profit. This is a stronger motivation to give to the for profit, and can draw donations away from the for profit instead of towards them (Lichtenstein, 2004, pg. 28). Either way, partnering with an unethical for profit can have a negative impact on either donations or reputation for nonprofits. As discussed earlier, there are a number of barriers to nonprofits participating in NSR, but it must be stated that at a certain point, doing so can actually have negative consequences on organizations as a whole.

Existing Examples of Nonprofit Social Responsibility

While it is certainly not the standard, some nonprofits are beginning to adopt socially responsible programs, policies, and workplaces. This is not a simple proposition. As we have seen, it involves behavioral shift, education, and commitment. By piecing together what little research is out there on NSR alongside research around CSR and OSR, and bearing in mind the unique position that nonprofits occupy, it is possible to see a few trends that appear to be consistent when it comes to the development of NSR in a nonprofit.

Staff Awareness. For most nonprofit staff, NSR is not a consideration of daily life and work, if they have even heard of social responsibility on an organizational level. A survey of nonprofit employees recently found that only a third of nonprofit staff felt that their nonprofit had a "well implemented ethics and compliance program" (Bloomquist). This is surprisingly low, considering the ethical nature of nonprofits. Some companies have even reported a lack of communication internally about what is going on with sustainability (Haffar, 2019). This is problematic, as without transparency about these programs, how can they thrive? Nonprofit staff often appear to be left in the dark about NSR related steps that their organization might be taking, implying quite a bit

about internal communications within most nonprofits. Without knowing what is going on in their organizations, staff will struggle to conform to these policies, and certainly prohibits word of mouth promotion of these activities.

Transparency applies not just internally, but externally as well, and nonprofits are left with a question of how they should be disclosing when they participate in NSR? We know that transparency in reporting is a key factor in making nonprofits successful, and that this extends to NSR as well (Bloomquist). Transparency essentially acts as a building block for trust (Bloomquist). As stated earlier, about two thirds of nonprofits are taking socially responsible steps on a small scale, like recycling, but relatively few share those steps in their annual reports, web pages, or blogs, which is how most organizations disclose these activities (Haffar, 2019). Requirements on nonprofits to disclose are clearly interpreted as concerning only their mission (Signori, 2010, pg. 298). However, it is clear from CSR reporting that nonprofits could well benefit from reporting on their NSR in informal ways, like their website and blogs, where they are not the sole focus of the report.

Nonprofits as Activists. The demand by stakeholders for nonprofits to take more responsible steps has put the pressure on nonprofit leaders to determine their organization's level of activism. The relationship between nonprofits and social movements is complicated (Haber, 2019, pg. 952). Often, activism is what acts as a starting spark for nonprofits when activists see a problem in society (Haber, 2019, pg. 951). Nonprofits have a tendency to then grow in ways that enhance an individual's ability to promote their own ideologies, and share ideas (Haber, 2019, pg. 291). Extending past this, it is possible that one of the most important steps in adopting new programs is having someone to champion them. This is especially true as leadership in nonprofits is often a manifestation of the moralistic pursuits of the agency. They provide a tangible representation of the otherwise ethereal organizational goals (Pope, 2018, pg. 1306). When it comes to NSR, having leadership that is activist in nature, that is willing to engage with these other goals is essential.

Mission Statements as a Roadmaps. Another step that can help nonprofits to enhance, or even spark their NSR, is to develop a roadmap. Nonprofits often struggle with direction, so having a mission statement helps direct them. Many organizations are now building out their documentation, to add values statements, vision statements, and even strategic plans that define their actor-hood (Pope, 2018, pg. 1301). These documents help generate an outline of the nonprofit as an actor, It gives them a role through which to engage with their work and impact on a wider scale. Additionally, having a defined statement of core values is able to direct actions beyond the mission. Anything outside of that value definition is easy to identify (Pope, 2018, pg. 1301). Additional documents like codes of ethics and responsibility reports are equally useful. They define the four major dimensions of CSR, or in this case NSR, being economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities (Pope, 2018, pg. 1304). These

documents can also highlight areas of expansion, what more an organization can be doing (Pope, 2018, pg. 1305). All of these documents allow nonprofits to act fully and responsibly at all levels.

Nonprofit Social Responsibility in the Real World. Nonprofits are certainly not participating in NSR at the same rates that for profit companies are participating in CSR, but it is not unheard of. With enough pressure from stakeholders to take actions like professionalization and specification, the proper management and execution of resources is now a topic of growth for nonprofits (Pope, 2018, pg. 1302). While it is true that there are still significantly more companies displaying statements of core values, and devoting part of those documents to CSR, this is a growing trend in nonprofits (Pope, 2018, pg. 1309). The adoption of documents defining and enhancing nonprofit values has seen consistent growth, from roughly 0% in 1990 to around 25% in 2011 (Pope, 2018, pg. 1306). The list of nonprofits who are expanding their responsibility is growing. When studying SRI in Italian Foundations, Signori et. al. demonstrated that once these ideas were introduced, they were often greeted positively, with most Foundations wanting to become involved (Signori, 2010, pg. 298). There are even now new policies for nonprofits to begin measuring themselves against, such as the Code of Ethics and Conduct for NGOs of the World Association of Non-governmental Organizations (Pope, 2018, pg. 1306). This test is neither well known, nor well understood, but its mere existence is an encouraging sign. One last interesting trend that needs to be addressed in reference to the growth of NSR is that one study found that it is younger investors who are more likely to participate in SRI (Schrotgens, 2017 pg. 2658). This may suggest that younger staff in nonprofits could be a driving force for new NSR policies and programs. This is supported by research by other studies (Van Der Heijden, 2006, pg. 98).

It cannot be overlooked that nonprofits are already overworked, and asking them to take on more obligations within their communities and nations is a stressor (Pope, 2018, pg. 1306). As such, their hesitance to launch themselves into the added work of NSR is not surprising. However, it must also be stated that “CSR efforts seem to be a more natural fit for nonprofits than for profits since we’re more concerned with improving the community for everyone.” (Waters, 2014, pg. 9). Knowing all of this, and based on the research discussed here, there are plenty of opportunities for nonprofits to pursue NSR style projects.

Conclusion of the Literature Review:

After having performed this literature, it became abundantly clear that the field of Nonprofit Social Responsibility is in need of a great deal of attention. Future research is in a position to go in a variety of directions. However, for the purposes of this research, I sought to generate the project that had the chance to do the most possible good in this field. As such, I elected to look specifically at barriers to Nonprofit Social

Responsibility. The purpose of my research was to identify these barriers, in the hopes of identifying solutions that would support nonprofits in addressing them. In order to do this, I utilized three research questions, to help structure my inquiry: One, are nonprofits currently doing things to contribute to social and environmental good, beyond their mission? Two, if they are not participating in anything beyond their mission, what is preventing them? And three, what are the potential solutions to support incorporating more social good beyond a nonprofit's mission? These three questions were selected after taking into account the information gathered during the literature review process, and examining it for themes, and for opportunities. Finally, after taking as much as I could from the existing literature, the next step was to develop my research methodology.

Section 3: Methods

This section will provide information concerning the two methods of data collection, being interviews and surveys. It will clarify how this data was collected, and why it was collected in this manner. All decisions were made based on my three research questions: One, are nonprofits currently doing things to contribute to social and environmental good, beyond their mission? Two, if they are not participating in anything beyond their mission, what is preventing them? And three, what are the potential solutions to support incorporating more social good beyond a nonprofit's mission?

Interview Methodology

While only three "expert interviews" were required for this assignment, I felt that it was in the best interest of the subject matter to collect as many perspectives as possible, especially considering how new and disparate a field it is. Having more perspectives in this case could only mean more ideas to include. While originally the goal was to interview eight "experts," that number was tightened to six, as a result primarily of environmental factors, specifically the COVID-19 Pandemic. I was concerned that with so much change going on in people's day to day lives, it was not an appropriate time to ask people to participate in this research, being largely un-related to what most people were focusing their energies on. All of the interviews used were conducted either before, or within the first two weeks of the Shelter-in-Place order in the Bay Area. All but one had been set up before the Shelter-in-Place order was implemented.

Interviewee Selection. In order to better frame the understanding of the subject of Nonprofit Social Responsibility, six interviews were conducted with "experts" who had experience relevant to the field. The interview subjects were chosen first through purposive sampling, based on personal contacts. Four interviewees were selected this way. The last two interviews were collected based on snowball sampling, as a result of the final question in the interview, "is there anyone else you think I should speak to about this?" While the names and identifiable individual information of the interviewees have been omitted to protect their privacy, the following is a breakdown of why each interviewee was selected.

Interviewee One. This gentleman was the Executive Director of a social justice nonprofit, which was structured essentially as a fiscally sponsored project within an institution of higher education. He was selected to be interviewed after being suggested by another interviewee. His expertise was ideal due to his unique position within a fiscally sponsored project, as well as the unique advocacy bent to his work, trying to support others in pursuing social justice projects. I also knew that the organization he works for already participated in NSR.

Interviewee Two. This woman was interviewed after being suggested by a contact at the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. She is the Executive Director of a nonprofit advocacy firm, focused on supporting nonprofits in advocating for themselves. She, like Interviewee One was selected for her advocacy work, but also for her experience in having worked with many different nonprofits throughout the state of California.

Interviewee Three. This interviewee no longer works with nonprofits. She has made the transition to work in CSR in the private sector. However, her previous work in NSR and Public Relations was one of the main pieces of literature utilized in the literature review for this research. As such, her unique perspective from the origins of the study of NSR was incredibly valuable.

Interviewee Four. This woman is the Director of Corporate Social Responsibility (which they call GiveBack) for a well-known for-profit company. She was selected because, while she does not work for a nonprofit, NSR is in many ways a branch off of Corporate Social Responsibility. Her perspective offered an interesting “original” perspective from the for-profit world, thereby filling out more of the Corporate Social Responsibility structure and mindset.

Interviewee Five. This gentleman is a Development Director at an Environmental Nonprofit. He was considered an expert in this field for his work in sustainability. I also knew that the organization he works for focused on environmental sustainability, a topic of particular interest on a personal level. From his position, he had insights and suggestions about how organizations, nonprofit and otherwise, would be able to incorporate NSR, specifically thinking about environmental sustainability.

Interviewee Six. This interviewee is a Development Director in another environmental organization, with a Higher Education Institution. He was selected because of his position within an institution of higher learning, and for his work trying to push for environmental programs that are not necessarily a part of the University’s direct mission.

Interview Question Design. Because all of those interviewed came from such varied fields, the interview questions asked of each of them were slightly different. A full list of all of the questions asked, and who was asked which questions, is included in the appendix (Appendix Figure 1). These questions were chosen specifically to target each individual’s unique experience, as well as to gain their understanding of the subject. The interview questions were capped at six, however, the structure of the interviews was intentionally conversational. I wanted to design an interview in which respondents felt comfortable to share their thoughts, and to take questions in a variety of directions, depending on what they thought was important. Each of the interview respondents were told at the beginning of the interview to feel free to bring up other topics, introduce new ideas or questions, or even to ask their own questions. This led to many of the interviewees introducing new topic that were valuable in terms of the direction of

the research. All of the interviews were between twenty and thirty-five minutes long, and they were conducted over Zoom. This was useful not only as a way to record the interviews, but also as a measure to counteract geographic distance (some interview subjects live out of state, including New York and Washington). Additionally, the Zoom measures helped address the added pressure of social distancing as a result of the COVID-19.

The questions, while they targeted each individual's work and perspective, held some similarities. Like in the surveys, the hope was to focus on barriers, but I also wanted to know what the interviewees felt about the role of NSR in nonprofits. All interview respondents had been provided the following definition of NSR: "anything an organization does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis." The interview also had a brief opening script, including this definition, along with some examples based on the literature review. Interviewees were all sent the questions to examine at least two days prior to the interview, with the exception of one interviewee, whose only availability was on the same day as introduction. In her case, questions were sent an hour prior to the interview.

The rationale for selection of each of the questions were as follows:

What is your initial reaction to this idea of Nonprofit Social Responsibility? This question was designed in an attempt to gauge whether Nonprofit Social Responsibility was a topic that the interviewees were familiar with. I also wanted to determine the interviewees general attitude towards the idea, and whether it was positive or negative.

What does your organization do, that is unrelated to your mission, that falls into the category of Nonprofit Social Responsibility? Or, what additional programs would you like to see at your organization, unrelated to the mission. This question, targeting my first research question, was designed to determine what types of NSR programs already exist, by seeing which types of programs came up most often. This was also meant to measure what types of programs the interviewees were most interested in. Additionally, it was a backup means to measure the general positive or negative attitude interviewees had towards NSR.

What do you think some nonprofits struggle to get involved in Nonprofit Social Responsibility programs when they do not relate directly to their missions? This question was posed in the hopes of determining some of the most common, or indeed uncommon barriers that nonprofits run into when attempting to generate NSR programs, gathering information for my second research question. This question allowed me to gather a little more information about barriers that did not appear in the literature review, and to support those that did.

Are there any policies at your organization that regulate how and where the organization invests its money? This question was designed specifically to target Socially Responsible Investing. This is a topic that came up quite a bit in the literature review, and

left me with a lot of questions and interest. I also believe that there are a lot of different participants in organizations who either have never heard of Socially Responsible Investing, or who do not know whether their organizations have any policies in this realm, and I wanted to test that theory.

What do you think are some of the benefits to organizations taking on social responsibility programs? This question was chosen because I wanted to identify tangible reasons why nonprofits should want to participate in NSR. This was be valuable information to support my findings for my third research question, and when designing a model for the resolutions and recommendations of this research.

What better terms are out there to describe this idea of taking responsibility for all of your actions/expanding an organization's mission to include "social good"? It was clear from the literature review that the terminology for this field is varied and disparate. Few people can agree on what to call it. This question was posed in the hope that it would gather new ideas about a better way to describe the subject, that could lead to more cohesive research.

Can you think of anyone else I should speak with about this topic? This was my last question in all of the interviews. I used it as a jumping off point to gain connections with others who might have insights that would be valuable in this research, thereby participating in snowball sampling.

Each interview ended with a discussion of what else might have been left out of the discussions, and who else it would be prudent for me to speak with. All interview subjects were thanked via email for their contribution to the research, and told to reach out if they had any additional thoughts that they would like to share.

Coding Measures. Once all six interviews were conducted, they were each transcribed by hand into word documents. They were then coded for ideas relating to Nonprofit Social Responsibility. I used open thematic coding in order to analyze the transcripts. In this, through re-reading the transcripts and identifying themes, I was looking not for specific terms, but for bigger picture ideas. I wanted ultimately to see what themes came up multiple times within each of the interviews. After identifying these themes, they were then counted to measure the number of instances within each interview.

Survey Methodology

Along with conducting expert interviews, this research also examined quantitative responses to a survey (Appendix Figure 2), which was given out to nonprofit professionals (anyone working in a nonprofit). While thirty-three people opened the survey, only nineteen completed it, with the remainder being partially completed, and thus unusable.

Survey Questions and Design. The survey used in this research went through many iterations. The survey was limited to nine questions, to maximize the number of

people who completed it, under the assumption that any more than ten questions would deter completion. All questions were examined by several people to ensure clarity. This team included two professors, as well as a classmate, a family member, and a coworker. By using “editors” from so many backgrounds, the researcher felt comfortable that the questions did not rely on any pre-existing knowledge that would make completing it difficult. An additional concern was with potentially offending respondents. This survey asked a number of questions concerning what might be interpreted as a “failure” of nonprofits to take responsibility for their actions, or to pursue the most ethical course of action. By using all of these editors, I sought to ensure that none of the respondents felt offended by the research.

The survey opened with a definition of NSR. That definition was the same as the interview: “anything a nonprofit does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis.” The nine following questions consisted of three categorical questions, one open ended question, and five Likert scale questions. By using this configuration, the majority of the questions were built to gather the maximum amount of data about people's opinions and experience. The first two questions concerned nonprofit “attitudes” towards NSR. The next two questions focused on my first research question, identifying types of NSR programs. The next question targeted research question two, concerning barriers, while the following question sought to answer research question 3 about what resources could support these programs. The survey culminated in three demographic questions.

All categories represented in the survey were based on information from the literature review, and expanded only when I saw a glaring hole in the research. For example, when it came to the different types of NSR that nonprofits can participate in, the focus was broken down into six categories: Waste Management/Reduction, Responsible Sourcing, Diversity Equity and Inclusion, Responsible Partnerships, Socially Responsible Investing, and Environmental Sustainability. While these are the categories represented in the research, they may not be the only types of NSR currently or potentially in use. As such, an “other” category with a fill box was included in this question. A similar box was included in other questions that may have additional options, such as Question 5: “Please rate your level of agreement for each item as to whether it is a barrier to your nonprofit participating in Nonprofit Social Responsibility.”

The demographic questions included at the end of this survey were meant to gather information about the specific responders, to see how a person’s background, and their position in an agency, and the type of nonprofit, affects their perception of NSR.

The breakdown of question rationale is as follows:

Category 1: Scale Agreement questions to determine interest in NSR and existing structures. “Nonprofits are generally trying to do more social good than just

their mission.” With this Likert scale question, I wanted to hear what nonprofit employees felt about the distinction between what is in their mission, and what is outside it, in the hopes of hearing what they felt the nonprofit’s ultimate responsibility was.

“All organizations, including nonprofits, bear responsibility to be global citizens.” This question came about as a result of a theme from the literature review, that businesses are global actors, and that the public is holding companies more and more accountable for the consequences of their actions, both positive and negative. I wanted to determine if staff within nonprofits see the actions of their organization as having broader, far reaching effects that are not related to their mission.

“My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be mostly aligned with the mission.” With this question, I sought to verify the responses from question one, this time about the specific nonprofit the respondent works in, instead of nonprofits in general. I wanted to know if staff felt that anything beyond their nonprofit’s mission was superfluous, or if it felt baked into their “social good” work.

“My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be chosen based on what is most beneficial to the larger community.” This question is the inverse of the previous one, and was added to provide an alternative perspective, in a way fact checking the answers to the previous question.

“The leadership in my nonprofit is more concerned with doing good, than the mission.” With this question I wanted to see if nonprofit staff felt that NSR was a priority in their organizations, or if it was even on their radar. I wanted to know if nonprofits were talking at all about NSR in a strategic way.

Category 2: Existing NSR Programs. “In which of the following areas does your nonprofit currently have active social responsibility programs that are unrelated to your mission? Select all that apply.” I wanted to know what the most common forms of NSR currently are, and which of these tend to be overlooked, or viewed as too complicated to pursue. The categories selected were based on the literature review, and to a lesser degree on interviews. They were grouped into the six most common categories that appeared, with a seventh option of “other” in which respondents could include any other programs that we had not included in our categories.

“How interested would you be in seeing the following types of programs in your nonprofit?” This Likert scale question used the same six categories as the previous question, but this time I was interested in seeing not existing programs, but which programs respondents most wanted to see implemented. I wanted to see which of these programs would have the greatest support from the staff perspective, and which were seen as unnecessary.

Category 3: Barriers. “Please rate your level of agreement for each item as to whether it is a barrier to your nonprofit participating in Nonprofit Social Responsibility.” Based again on information from the literature review, seven barriers to participation in

NSR were selected, being cost, staff time, staff capacity (unlike staff time, staff capacity was meant to target staff abilities, if they had time), leadership buy-in, awareness of the issues, education, and mission drift. The eighth option, other, included a text box to share anything I missed. With this question, I hoped to learn what the biggest challenges were that prevent different types of nonprofits from adding new NSR programs.

“Please rate how much the following would help your nonprofit add new Nonprofit Social Responsibility Programs.” As a backup to the previous question, this question looked at the issue of barriers from a different perspective. In this question, I looked at what resources would help an organization to implement new NSR programs. It was my hope that the resulting data would lead to answers to support my third research question, about supporting the incorporation of these programs.

Category 4: Demographic. “Please select which category best describes your nonprofit.” Jumping off from the nonprofit categories from Give USA 2019 Report, the respondents were asked to mark the type of nonprofit they worked for in this categorical question. This later allowed me to cross reference which barriers and ideologies are most prevalent in which types of organizations.

“What is your job title?” This was an open-ended question in which respondents typed in their answers. These were later grouped, allowing me to examine some of the dissemination of information within organizations, as well as interest at various levels.

“Please select your level of education.” I used the generally accepted categories of Some High School, High School Degree or Equivalent, Some College, Associate Degree, Undergraduate Degree, Graduate Degree, and Other or Not Listed for this categorical question. Doing so allowed for further cross referencing to see if people with different educational experiences saw the issue of NSR differently.

Survey Distribution. This survey was distributed remotely. The majority of responses came from the University of San Francisco MNA group on LinkedIn, and from my own personal Facebook page, although a few responses came from contacts who reached out to me individually after hearing that I was working on this project. The survey was also shared, both on LinkedIn and Facebook, by my friends and contacts. All who responded were self-responders, who saw or heard about the survey and chose to participate. It was my decision to use this type of convenience sampling, due to the certainty that respondents would work in nonprofits, and allowed me to gain a wide variety of positions and types of nonprofit, as well as of course for the availability of contacts. It took roughly two weeks for all of the survey’s to be collected. As was the case of the interviews, I did not feel comfortable chasing down additional responders at this time.

Limitations in The Interviews and Survey

It is important to note that only three of the interviews had been completed before the survey was sent out to respondents. As such, the survey was based on thoughts and ideas that were developed before the interviews began, and early on in the process. This was later seen as unfortunate, as discussions during the fourth, fifth, and sixth interviews brought up additional questions and avenues of research that I would have liked to pursue. Having already sent out the survey, I was limited to what information that initial survey could provide, and was unable to pursue additional research based on information from the final three interviews.

Section 4. Data Analysis

With only six interviews and nineteen survey responses, this research is not statistically significant. It does however provide several interesting implications and avenues for future research.

Interview Data Analysis

The open thematic coding scheme used on the interviews introduced a number of novel ideas. Focusing first on barriers, the most frequent barriers that came up were funding (18 instances), staff and leadership buy in (8 instances), mission drift (10 instances), time available/required (8 instances), education (6 instances), overworked staff (4 instances), agency policies (5 instances), size of the organization (3 instances), immediate return (3 instances), taboo topics (2 instances), and practicality/ability (2 instances). These measurements are of instances, but across the interviews, the number of people who discussed each topic were funding (all six interviews), staff and leadership buy in (five interviews), mission drift (five interviews), time (four interviews), education (four interviews), overworked staff (all six interviews), agency policies (two interviews), overworked staff (three interviews), immediate return (one interview), taboo topics (one interview), and practicality/ability (one interview). Barriers with only one instance were not included on this list. Represented in the following chart, there is a clear distribution, suggesting that multiple factors are at play.

Table 1
Instances of Barriers Broken Out Through Interview

Interviewees	Barriers							
	Funding	Staff/ Leadership buy in	Mission Drift	Time	Education	Overworked Staff	Size	Agency Policies
Interview 1	4	2	1	2	1	1	-	4
Interview 2	3	-	2	2	2	-	-	-
Interview 3	4	1	2	1	-	-	3	-
Interview 4	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-
Interview 5	3	2	2	2	1	2	-	1
Interview 6	3	2	1	1	2	1	-	-
Totals:	18	8	10	8	6	4	3	5

Several other important factors came up over the course of the interviews. These could not be classified as barriers to implementing NSR programs, but were nonetheless significant. The most common were the idea that social responsibility is a natural extension for nonprofits (9 instances), the disagreement/lack of understanding of the NSR terminology (4 instances), nonprofit's lack of communication about NSR (6 instances), partnerships (11 instances), organizational branding (3 instances), and the lack of a certification for NSR (4 instances). The consistency of these topics being mentioned suggests that they are key factors in NSR, even if they do not relate directly to barriers.

While the following themes appeared infrequently (once or twice) throughout the interview process, they were notable enough that I felt they merited inclusion as single data points, all on their own. They were as follows:

- Fiscally Sponsored Projects are in a unique position, as they are dependent on the rules of the agency that they are dependent upon, and can sometimes receive push back from those organizations.
- When nonprofits attempt to implement NSR programs, but they are unsuccessful, it is incredibly discouraging, to the point where they do not seek out similar opportunities in the future.
- NSR in nonprofits is a form of intersectionality.
- Most nonprofits are participating in some form of NSR, but they are not properly communicating about it to their communities.
- Some nonprofits feel that it is uncomfortable, even embarrassing to talk about their impact, especially when it is not directly related to mission.
- NSR can be an important factor in organizational branding and visibility. It can also get them into more rooms where they would not otherwise be included.
- The type of organization, i.e. the organization's mission, can dramatically affect their ability to participate in different forms of NSR.
- One interviewee discussed the term "social impact" as opposed to "social responsibility."
- NSR can make an organization more nimble.
- Young people generally seem to want companies they support to be aligned with their values. It can act to galvanize populations.
- Competition can be a barrier for nonprofits.
- Nonprofits are already under an intense amount of scrutiny. They do not require more oversight.
- The role of the Board of Directors in NSR, specifically how it can conflict with the opinions of staff within an agency. This is unfortunate as staff often feel that they are unable to disagree with the Board.

These additional ideas, while not statistically significant, are nonetheless important to note in my opinion. They display themes and ideas that may be more

relevant to the topic than implied by the data, as they were not specifically targeted. They may also present barriers or solutions unique to the interviewees experience. With so few interviews, it is unclear if they might come up more often in a larger sample size.

Survey Data Analysis

Of the 34 people who began the survey, only 19 completed it fully, supplying me with a 55% completion rate of the survey. Of the participants in the survey, 8 were from educational nonprofits, 6 were from human services nonprofits, 1 was from an international affairs nonprofit, 3 were from Arts & Culture nonprofits, and 1 was from an Environment & Animals based nonprofit. The participants ranged dramatically in position from Executive Director to Womanhood Counselor. Generally, the positions were grouped into Board: 1, Management: 7, Admin and Finance: 5, Program Delivery: 5, and Retired: 1. In terms of education level, 1 participant had a High School Degree or Equivalent, 6 had Undergraduate Degrees, and 12 had Graduate Degrees, skewing my sample heavily.

The first category of questions in the survey were designed to gauge interest in NSR from current nonprofit staff, and they resulted in the following responses:

When asked whether they agree that “Nonprofits are generally trying to do more social good than just their mission, 6 individuals strongly agreed, 12 individuals agreed, and 1 individual neither agree nor disagree. The mean score was 1.74 (1 being strongly agree, 5 being strongly disagree), with a standard deviation of .56. No participants disagreed.

When asked whether they agree that “All organizations, including nonprofits, bear responsibility to be global citizens.”, 13 individuals strongly agreed, 4 individuals agreed, and 2 individuals neither agree nor disagree. The mean score was 1.42 (1 being strongly agree, 5 being strongly disagree), with a standard deviation of .69. No participants disagreed.

When asked whether they agree that “My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be mostly aligned with the mission.”, 8 individuals strongly agreed, 7 individuals agreed, 1 individual disagreed, and 3 individuals neither agreed, nor disagreed. The mean score was 1.84 (1 being strongly agree, 5 being strongly disagree), with a standard deviation .90.

When asked whether they agree with the statement “My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be chosen based on what is most beneficial to the larger community.”, 6 individuals strongly agreed, 12 individuals agreed, and 1 individual disagreed. The mean score was 1.79 (1 being Strongly Agree, 5 being Strongly Disagree), and the standard deviation was .71.

When asked whether they agree with the statement “The leadership in my nonprofit is more concerned with doing good than the mission.”, 2 people strongly

agreed, 5 individuals agreed, 5 individuals disagreed, and 7 individuals neither agreed nor disagreed. The mean score was 2.79 *1 being Strongly Agree, 5 being Strongly Disagree), and the standard deviation was .98.

An abbreviated version of the information presented in the previous few paragraphs is examined in Table 2

Table 2
Support for Nonprofit Social Responsibility

Nonprofit Social Responsibility Statements	Measure of Agreement		
	Agree or Strongly Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree
“Nonprofits are generally trying to do more social good than just their mission”	18	1	-
“All organizations, including nonprofits, bear responsibility to be global citizens”	17	2	-
“My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be mostly aligned with the mission”	15	3	1
“My nonprofit’s social responsibility should be chosen based on what is most beneficial to the larger community”	18	-	1
“The leadership in my nonprofit is more concerned with doing good than the mission”	7	5	7

Based on these responses, it is clear that that the majority of participants agreed that nonprofits hold some sort of responsibility to participate in NSR or NSR style activities. However, most participants also agreed that the majority of actions taken on by their nonprofit ought to be focused on the mission areas.

Once interest had been determined, I turned my attention to existing NSR type programs. Table A below demonstrates the mean score based on the categorical Yes (1) or No (2) answers. As is clear on the chart below, the most organizations (16) had DEI programs, while the least (4) had other programs not listed. Responsible Sourcing and Socially Responsible Investing were the two listed program areas least likely to be checked.

Table 3
Existing Nonprofit Social Responsibility Program Areas

Program Areas	Number of organizations with these programs
Waste Management	13
Responsible Sourcing	5
DEI	16
Responsible Partnerships	8
Socially Responsible Investing	5
Environmental Sustainability	11
Other	4

When inquiring about interest in the different forms of NSR programs, we can see below on Table 4 that there was a good deal of interest. This question, which measured Strongly Interested as 5 and Not At All Interested as 1 had consistently high mean scores. Waste Management had the lowest score of listed program areas with a mean of 3.89, and the highest standard deviation of the bunch. Clearly there were a lot of discrepancies within those programs. There was very little interest in Other Programs, with only one participant listing any amount of interest.

Table 4
Interest in Type of NSR Program

Types of Programs	Measure of Interest (1 being Not Interested, 5 being Very Interested)		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of organizations either A Little Interested or Very Interested
Waste Management	3.89	1.52	14
Responsible Purchasing	4.42	1.02	16
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	4.63	.96	18
Responsible Partnerships	4.53	.90	16
Socially Responsible Investing	4.53	.77	16
Environmental Sustainability	4.37	1.01	17
Other	1.21	.92	1

Having gauged interest, I then moved on to look at barriers to nonprofits participating in NSR. In order to do this, below on Table 5 is listed all of the mean scores for the identified barriers to NSR. These scores are based on the numerical scale of 1 Strongly Agree, and 5 being Strongly Disagree, based on the question “Please rate your level of agreement for each item as to whether it is a barrier to your nonprofit participating in NSR”. Interestingly, Staff Time and Staff Capacity were the most likely to be cited as barriers, with mean scores of 2.05. Staff capacity had a slightly lower standard deviation at 1.08. These two were followed not surprisingly by cost (mean of 2.58), then leadership buy in (mean of 2.89). Following these were mission drift (mean of 3.00), Awareness of the issues (mean of 3.11) and Education (3.16).

Table 5
Measurement of Barriers Represented in Surveys

Barrier	Measurement of Barriers (1 being Strongly Agree, 5 being Strongly Disagree)		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number either Agree or Strongly Agree
Cost	2.58	1.26	13
Staff Time	2.05	1.18	15
Staff Capacity	2.05	1.08	15
Leadership	2.89	1.37	8
Awareness	3.11	1.45	7
Education	3.16	1.38	7
Mission Drift	3.00	1.15	8
Other	3.00	2.00	1

Table 6 demonstrates the results from the next question, which was meant to look at barriers from a different perspective. This question asked whether the addition of the following resources would be helpful in implementing new NSR programs. On a scale of 1 being Not At All Helpful, to 5 being Very Helpful, the scores on Table D demonstrate a trend that an influx in all of these resources would be helpful on some level. The most helpful of the listed resources is Staff Time with a mean score of 4.26. Following this was Leadership Buy-In with a mean score of 4.21, Education/Training with a mean score of 3.95, and lastly Additional Funding with a mean score of 3.89. The

highest score was technically Other, with a mean of 5.00, but that is due to the fact that there was only one respondent to that category.

Table 6
Mean Score of The Value of Resources

Helpful Resources	Measurement of Value (1 being Not at all Helpful, 5 being Very Helpful)		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number either Agree or Strongly Agree
Additional Funding	3.89	.99	11
Staff Time	4.26	.87	16
Leadership Buy In	4.21	.92	15
Education/Training	3.95	.91	13
Other	5.00	n/a	1

The following Table 7 demonstrates how respondents felt about the different barriers suggested, based on the type of organization they work in. As a reminder, there were 8 respondents from Education based nonprofits, 6 from Human Services nonprofits, 1 from an International Affairs nonprofit, 3 from Arts & Culture nonprofits, and 1 from an Environmental & Animals nonprofit. With these small numbers, there is not much information to be pulled from this data, but it was performed to see if any surprises jumped out.

Table 7
Barriers Depending on Type of Nonprofit

Type of Nonprofit	Cost as a Barrier				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	0	5 (63%)	0	1 (13%)	2 (25%)
Human Services	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	0	1 (17%)
International Affairs	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Arts & Culture	0	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0	0
Environment & Animals	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0

Staff Time as a Barrier					
Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	0	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)
Human Services	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7%)	0
International Affairs	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Arts & Culture	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0	0	0
Environment & Animals	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Staff Capacity as a Barrier					
Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	0	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)
Human Services	0	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0	0
International Affairs	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Arts & Culture	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0	0	0
Environment & Animals	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Leadership Buy-In as a Barrier					
Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)
Human Services	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0
International Affairs	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0

Arts & Culture	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	0	0	1 (33.3%)
Environment & Animals	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0

Awareness as a Barrier

Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	1 (12.5%)	2 (25%)	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)
Human Services	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
International Affairs	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0
Arts & Culture	1 (33.3%)	0	0	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)
Environment & Animals	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0

Education on the Issues as a Barrier

Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	1 (12.5%)	2 (25%)	0	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)
Human Services	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
International Affairs	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0
Arts & Culture	1 (33.3%)	0	0	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)
Environment & Animals	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0

Mission Drift as a Barrier

Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	0	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	0

Human Services	0	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
International Affairs	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
Arts & Culture	0	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	0	1 (33.3%)
Environment & Animals	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
"Other" as a Barrier					
Type of Nonprofit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)
Human Services	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
International Affairs	0	0	0	0	0
Arts & Culture		0	1 (100%)	0	0
Environment & Animals	0	0	0	0	0

As you can see, cost appears to be a slightly greater barrier in human services nonprofits than in education-based nonprofits. That being said, all of the types of nonprofit represented had at least one participant who rated cost as being a barrier, making it undeniably valid. In terms of staff time, again all of the types of nonprofit felt that it was a barrier. This barrier was rated even higher for education nonprofits than cost (75% vs. 63%). It was also interestingly rated as a higher-level barrier for Environmental & Animal nonprofits, though admittedly there was only one participant in this category. Staff capacity had nearly the same responses as staff time, with one small exception being that no human services staff disagreed that staff capacity was a barrier, while one human services staff did disagree with the idea that staff time was a barrier. Leadership buy-in appeared not to be a major barrier in education-based nonprofits, with 5 of 8 participants disagreeing, and one being neutral. Similar trends were seen in the other types of nonprofits, with leadership buy in being rated less highly as a barrier than other suggested barriers. Awareness of the issues was also rated very low in terms of its position as a barrier to NSR, with all of the types of nonprofit having respondents represented who did not feel it was a barrier at all.

Below on Table 8 is a breakdown of how position within an organization affected interest in the identified types of NSR programs. For the purposes of this chart, (I) marks the number of respondents who were either A Little Interested or Very Interested, (N)

marks the number of respondents who were either Not Very Interested or Not Interested, and (-) marks the number of respondents who were Neither Interested nor Uninterested.

Table 8
Measure of Interest Depending on Staff Position

Position Type	Type of Nonprofit Social Responsibility Program						
	Waste Management	Responsible Purchasing	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Responsible Partnerships	Socially Responsible Investing	Environmental Sustainability	Other
Board of Directors	1 (N)	1 (I)	1 (N)	1 (I)	1 (I)	1 (N)	1 (N)
Management	7 (I)	1 (-) 6 (I)	7 (I)	1 (-) 6 (I)	1 (-) 6 (I)	7 (I)	6 (N) 1 (I)
Admin and Finance	2 (N) 2 (I)	1 (N) 3 (I)	4 (I)	1 (N) 3 (I)	1 (-) 3 (I)	4 (I)	4 (N)
Program Delivery	5 (I)	5 (I)	5 (I)	5 (I)	5 (I)	5 (I)	5 (N)
Retired	1 (N)	1 (I)	1 (I)	1 (I)	1 (I)	1 (I)	1 (N)
Unknown	1 (-)	1 (N)	1 (I)	1 (-)	1 (-)	1 (-)	1 (N)

As is clear by this table, staff within organizations tend to be consistently interested in these types of NSR programs. I wish that I had been able to look a little bit more at the Board of Directors. Without more responses, there is very little that can be taken from the table above. I did find it interesting that program delivery staff seemed interested in all of the different types of Nonprofit Social Responsibility, far more than any of the other staff types.

Section 5: Discussion and Recommendations

The key takeaways from this research were utilized for two purposes. First, to achieve the purpose of this research, to identify barriers and possible solutions. Second, I sought to identify areas that were key for future study of the field. These takeaways are discussed in detail here, organized based on my research questions. The answers were followed up by the creation of a model, to support nonprofits who are interested in implementing Nonprofit Social Responsibility style programs.

Research Question One: Types of Nonprofit Social Responsibility

It was important to start this research off by determining whether NSR is already happening, and if so, in what form. Half of my interviews referenced, sometimes with specific examples, how nonprofits are currently participating in NSR programs, and all but one made a point of referencing how natural an extension it is. This is reiterated by data in the surveys, implying that NSR is a natural extension of what nonprofits are already doing, baked in to the idea of having a social good mission. From this, it became clear that while the field of NSR is just beginning to gain traction, there is demonstrated interest in its growth from nonprofit professionals. After determining this, the survey data help flush out what types of programs, under the umbrella of NSR, are most common.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is the answer, according to the survey results. This was supported in the interview data, in which one of the interviewees felt that DEI, more so than most other forms of NSR, is baked into nonprofits and the way they function. "I feel like that is something, it's funny, I don't think of that as even part of Nonprofit Social Responsibility, I just think of it as so baked into what we do." - Interviewee One. Programs concerning Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are something that many nonprofits feel connected to on a very basic level. Having so many survey respondents identify DEI as an existing program avenue tells me that this is already happening. This is unsurprising, as nonprofits tend to have high numbers of minority staff, female staff, staff with disabilities, and other populations who are often the driving force behind the implementation of DEI programs in for profit companies (Arno, 2018). Waste Management was the second most common type of existing NSR program represented in the surveys. This too is unsurprising, given recycling and composting programs long history, and the fact that they are some of the simplest to implement (Grabianawski). They require only adding a few new bins to the office break room at base, as opposed to Responsible Sourcing programs for example which require hours of research, maintenance, and oversight. As we have already discussed, time is a massive barrier for nonprofits, so it stands to reason that Waste Management was the second most reported type of the NSR program.

Sadly, the least common types of NSR were Socially Responsible Investing and Responsible Sourcing, two programs that have the potential to really maximize a

nonprofit's impact. With only 5 organizations who had either of these programs, it is clear that while impactful, neither of these types of NSR have been widely adopted. Fortunately, these two both ranked high in terms of interest from respondents, with Responsible Sourcing scoring a mean of 4.42, and Socially Responsible Investing scoring a mean of 4.53 (5 being the highest possible score). This implies that staff are interested in seeing their organization's align more fully with their values. It is possible that the majority of staff, especially those not in leadership positions, either don't know what their organizations are doing (as implied in one of my interviews), or they do not feel empowered to share their desire to see such programs, likely in the belief that they would not be implemented.

All of this having been said, and even knowing, as demonstrated by the interviews and surveys, that some nonprofits are in fact already engaging in NSR, it is very clear that they are not communicating about it, internally or externally. It quickly became clear, through answers to the survey questions, as well as personal communications with survey respondents and even several interviewees, that many people were not sure what programs their organizations had in place. This placed some doubt on the results of my survey, but also introduced an element for future study. One avenue that might make the communication of NSR programs easier for nonprofits (remember, easier and simpler is better for NSR), would be the creation of a nonprofit specific certification to highlight NSR. For-profit companies often rely on measurement standards for their CSR, measurement standards like ISO 26000, or the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). Nonprofits can, if they are large enough, apply themselves to these standards, but they are designed to measure for profit companies, and were not built for the unique model of nonprofits. Therefore, all of the good work that nonprofits may be doing in the field of NSR can only ever be viewed as a nice addition to their standard work, but cannot realistically be either verified, or quantified. There are no certifications nonprofits can receive, no lists they can join of Socially Responsible nonprofits, no tangible way to measure their success and impact in NSR. While it is certainly years away, perhaps this burgeoning field of study concerning Nonprofit Social Responsibility will ultimately lead to a certification that could support nonprofits in their pursuit of NSR.

Very briefly, I do want to mention that there was one other form of NSR that was suggested in the "other" category of the survey, which had not been explored in my literature review: support for affordable education. This is a fascinating addition that I did not consider, but certainly deserves attention in future research.

Research Question Two: Barriers to Nonprofit Social Responsibility

The barriers reflected in the survey were based on the literature review. The resulting data provided some very interesting results. Not surprisingly, funding was one of the major factors preventing nonprofits from pursuing NSR. This was especially well

represented in the interviews, seeing as it came up in all six of them, multiple times, with 18 instances. Equally, it was highly represented in the surveys. Based on the data collected, however, I determined that the funding barrier is not so much about the need for more funding to implement new programs. Instead, it demands that nonprofits have enough stable funding, which is unrestricted, that they feel that they can grow and be flexible. This has always been a difficult proposition for nonprofits, for whom funding is a constant source of uncertainty.

Another interesting factor when it comes to the cost of NSR is that it appeared to have slightly less weight in educational nonprofits, than in other types of nonprofits, specifically human services. This may be because educational nonprofits often, although not always, have a greater capacity for earned income, especially in the case of Institutions of Higher Education, and similar organizations. Additionally, many human services nonprofits serve historically under resourced communities, and we know from existing research that nonprofits who serve lower income communities are often similarly under resourced (Greco, 2020). This may explain why cost of NSR is a significantly heavier barrier in less affluent nonprofits, such as human services nonprofits.

That being said, funding was not the highest noted barrier in the surveys. That position was reserved for staff time and capacity. This suggests that while money is absolutely a factor in nonprofits choosing to pursue NSR, it is only a piece of the puzzle. It is just as important for staff within an organization to have the ability to be flexible, and to have the freedom to develop new interests, brainstorm and implement solutions, and learn new systems. In order to do this, it of course demands that NSR programs must be simple, and easy to implement. It is incredibly common for staff in nonprofits to over work themselves (Arno, 2018). Therefore, in order to make NSR part of an agency, and to encourage the larger global community of nonprofits to adopt it, it seems like one of the most important things to do is ensure it does not detract from already overworked staff time.

Leadership buy-in was one of the topics that I personally was most interested in studying with this research. What I learned from the surveys is that less than half of respondents felt that leadership buy in was a major barrier to the implementation of new NSR programs, even if the vast majority felt that leadership buy-in would be a helpful addition in developing NSR programs. This presented an interesting discrepancy, so I also looked at the interview data, to see what that added to the story. In the interviews, I saw instances in five of six interviews to both staff and leadership buy in. It is possible, based on this new information, that far from being a leadership down movement, buy in and motivation for NSR programs can also be a ground up system. Having someone in a nonprofit who cares about the issue could appear to come not necessarily from leadership, but a demonstrated desire from lower level staff up as well. It seems to be able to come from both directions, as long as someone within the

organization is interested enough to make it a priority. Having champions in “lower level” staff positions may be key in making NSR programs happen.

With the majority of my survey responses coming from educational and human services nonprofits, these were again the groups that had the most data to analyze. Leadership did not appear to be a concern in either type, but especially for educational nonprofits, in which 75% of respondents did not feel leadership buy in would help with implementing NSR. I was left wondering if this is because so many education nonprofits already list broad social good in their mission, so many of these programs are already baked into leadership advocacy. This is merely a possibility, with no data to back it up, but it is something I would be interested to see further study in.

Indeed, the importance of internal motivation to pursue NSR is supported by several of the interviews performed. All of the interviewees spoke about some combination of leadership and staff buy-in, time and capacity of staff, and education about how to implement NSR. This reads as a clear indication that staff need to be the driving force behind these programs. Nonprofits are already under the yolk of so many external policies and expectations. It is encouraging to see the implication that NSR might be something that can be purely motivated internally, that they can work their way into naturally, in a way that actually fits with their program structures.

I do want to point out that sometimes internal structures can also prevent NSR. In some cases even a nonprofit’s Board of Directors can have an oppressive influence on these types of programs. Interviewee One added an interesting point about the importance of power within organizations, and how that may manifest in who is pushing for NSR programs. In reference to adding NSR programs, he said “I think there might be some board members for example who might say ‘how is that central to what [the organization] does’, and I see it as very central, and as a staff we see it as central given the times that we live in, and imperatives in this country.” This quote highlights that while staff may be highly motivated about something, the Board of Directors, and other external pressures, may not necessarily share that focus, thereby creating conflict within the organization. This is especially true when it comes to programs whose impact cannot be immediately or directly tied to the organization’s mission, like most NSR programs.

Another barrier that, while it was not tested for in the surveys, came up during the interviews, is that some nonprofits may be uncomfortable with communicating their participation in NSR. This appears to be related primarily to mission drift. There is some discomfort among nonprofits, it appears, that would make them feel as though by directing attention towards anything other than their mission, they are “betraying” that mission. I would like to note that, as nonprofits should be in control of their own narrative, almost anything can, and should be connected back to their own full mission. Another factor that may contribute to the embarrassment nonprofits feel about communicating is a general attitude that nonprofits often have about not wanting to

“brag”. Many nonprofits focus much of their communication around specific stories about their clients. They thereby shift focus away from the organization itself, and onto the individual. However, there is an important difference between “bragging that your nonprofit is so great” and “accurately reporting your impact” (Shattuck, 2019). Through this lens, communicating something that the organization is doing, something that has a positive impact on the community, even if it does not relate directly to the mission, still may have a positive impact on an agency’s perception and brand. Hopefully, future research will examine this idea further.

Research Question Three: Resources and Recommendations

With barriers as diverse as funding, agency size, staff capacity, and education/training, it is clear that every organization will need to do an internal audit to gauge what barriers they most need to address in order to successfully generate NSR programs. The suggestions offered here are based on a combination of interviews, and surveys, as well as a few additions from the literature review, and are painted in broad strokes intentionally, to include suggestions that will be helpful to as many organizations as possible.

Based on the data collected, the first resource that would help bolster a burgeoning NSR program would be a discerning look at an agency’s financial position. NSR programs can only be properly pursued when the organizations feel comfortable and confident in the stability and flexibility of their funding, as is clear from the 18 instances of Funding concerns that came up in the interviews. That means that nonprofits cannot be struggling to pay rent or payroll, or to pay back debts, and their money cannot be tied to specific requirements by the funder. Their funding should be consistent, to the point where staff and management are not stressed about making ends meet, or reporting specific outcomes to the funder. According to Interviewee Three:

“I think that, you know, sometimes one of the barriers, just from having been on the corporate side is ... when you are the one controlling the money you have more say than the ones that are not, and so making sure that the actual mission and goals of the nonprofit partner are actually relayed.”

This quote clearly examines the concern nonprofit partners have with their funding organizations, whereby their own priorities, and the way they wish to use their funding, can be superseded by their powerful funders. Additionally, fears about risk and return that came up consistently in the literature review, also appeared several times in the interviews. According to Interviewee One, “[the] dilemma that nonprofits face, which is that they want to do good, and because their budgets are always so shoe string, they are always trying to do things in the cheapest way possible, and the cheapest way

possible isn't always the most socially responsible way possible." So, not only must nonprofits have stable funding before embarking on these programs, but they need to feel that doing so will not be a risk to that stable funding.

Once this first step has been completed, the next key factor is to find a champion within the organization who has a passion for the project. While the data collected did display some discrepancy about the importance of buy in and motivation, there was enough positive support by survey respondents and interviewees suggesting that the addition of more motivation from staff would be valuable, to imply that this element cannot be overlooked. Whether that project is Sustainable Sourcing or DEI Trainings, a project like this cannot start in a vacuum; it needs someone actively pushing for implementation. In order to do this, nonprofits should consistently be seeking to identify individuals within their organizations who are interested in projects that do not directly relate to the organization's mission, and support them in developing those interests.

Third, nonprofits need to set aside time, away from all of the daily demands of being a nonprofit professional, to talk about NSR with their full staff. This would require an influx of time for staff to devote purely to these types of projects. Some recommendations to do this could be as simple as including a few moments at staff meetings, or even a full staff retreat once a year, to talk to staff about what NSR projects matter to them, and to brainstorm solutions. As stated by Interviewee One:

"Where do you find the time for the kinds of questions you're raising? And so it seems like [nonprofits] are the kind that need to be purposeful, and they need to be about taking a time out from business as usual, so um maybe a recommendation is that it's the kind of question that nonprofit organizations should be thinking about as a retreat, or a time when you kind of step outside of day to day and think about like what's our purpose and what's our processes."

As is abundantly obvious for most who have worked in nonprofits, nonprofit staff have a tendency to overwork themselves, by pouring themselves into the mission and program delivery. As such, in order to develop these types of programs, nonprofit staff need to be given time when they can turn away from the demands of their everyday tasks, and really focus on NSR.

Another key element, and the fourth step in this process follows through these same logic lines. With nonprofit staff being frequently overworked, whatever new programs, solutions, or systems the organization implements must be a natural, and easy integration into the existing nonprofit's system. As was just mentioned, nonprofit staff do not have an abundance of time that can be devoted to work that is not their everyday service delivery. Anything added to their plate must be quick and easy, so as not to disrupt services. This could be something as simple as asking the board to move

the agency's investment portfolio to a more socially responsible firm, or setting up a list of approved ethical vendors. Even something as simple as putting up waste management signs (i.e. how to re-use, recycle, compost, etc.) are a step in the right direction, and could potentially act to galvanize nonprofit staff to develop further interest in these programs.

All of the above steps discuss how nonprofits can best set up NSR programs internally, while this fifth step concerns how organizations market their own impact externally. Based on information from the literature review, and several interviews, it is clear that nonprofits need to reform the way they think and talk about their success and impact. Marketing tends to not be a top priority for nonprofits, who are focused instead on services delivery. When it does come to sharing their story, nonprofits are often so focused on telling the story of the client, that they do not explain their own work well. Even those nonprofits who are already participating in NSR, often are not reporting it. In the words of Interviewee Two: "They don't get paid for that, it's not in their deliverables... but they do it, and they don't even report it." Even when it is already happening, if it isn't part of their structured communication, most nonprofits aren't talking about NSR. One of the most important things that could potentially help nonprofits grow in their brand is learning how to communicate about themselves. NSR is just a small piece of this, but it is nonetheless an important one. We know that enhancing an organization's brand awareness by building out consistent communication has positive effects for nonprofits, and communicating about impact (even impact that does not relate to the mission) is a strong way to create that cohesion (Waters, 2019). In many ways, this is the most complicated step, because it demands that an organization be willing to take a hard look at how the organization as a whole, and how they communicate about their impact, with the intention of removing the stigma surrounding talking about themselves.

The five paragraphs above outline five key steps that, according to this research, are the building blocks of creating an NSR program. These steps are displayed in a model titled "Setting Up Success for Full Mission Style Programs" (Appendix Figure 3). This model is meant as a blueprint for interested nonprofits to measure themselves against. It should be noted, the model is by no means a one size fits all. It is designed to be broad, so as to be applied to many different types and sizes of nonprofit. It is structured as a wave, to mimic the potential amplification of impact that can be achieved through following through with NSR programs. All of the steps above are represented, in limited detail, and in the order that I believe is the most stable. Further research is needed to really examine whether this model is an effective guide, but it includes what my data suggests is a good starting point.

The Field of Nonprofit Social Responsibility

One of the most important things that came up in this research was the determination that the field as it exists right now is too scattered, too broad, and too unclear for thorough study. More work must be done to develop the building blocks of the Nonprofit Social Responsibility field. Hopefully, this will ultimately result in a greater cohesion of understanding, which will help not only with expanding research, but also with encouraging nonprofits to take these ideas into account.

That being said, though I started this research using the term “Nonprofit Social Responsibility,” I have since determined that this is not the best term for this subject. To begin with, the term it is derived from, Corporate Social Responsibility, is an inherently flawed term. One interviewee who works in CSR explained to me, on a previous occasion, why the company has recently changed the terminology that they use to refer to this idea. The term CSR implies that corporations have the ultimate say in how to responsibly support their communities, which removes agency from the communities themselves. Additionally, the term “responsibility” implies oversight. Already, too many nonprofits feel that they are under the thumb of various oversight agencies. Adding another layer to this already very delicate system would not be taken kindly from nonprofits, nor should it be. Therefore, the term Nonprofit Social Responsibility, while a good jumping off point, in many ways acts to undermine and add pressure to nonprofit who otherwise are only seeking to do as much good in the world as possible.

Several alternative names came out of my interviews. “Do Good Programs” and “Social Impact” programs are both titles currently in use at for-profit organizations, but neither really speaks to the heart of this issue for nonprofits, in my opinion. Instead, one of the interviewees I spoke with discussed the fact that, for most nonprofits, these “NSR” type programs are not unrelated to their missions. Instead, they are an extension of it, and a claiming of the “Full Mission” of the nonprofit. This is based in the idea that nonprofits have a larger mission than what is written on paper, and often things that are seemingly unrelated to their mission are in fact merely an extension of that mission beyond the obvious. According to Interviewee Two:

“So it’s not outside of your mission, it is inside your mission, it just isn’t inside your grant proposals as your mission or in your PR statement as your mission, so for example an African American organization is not just delivering so many units of service, they are delivering pipelines for leadership in the African American community, they’re a symbol of strength for people in the African American community even though they are not directly served by them, they act as a broker for African Americans with the city council, so they do all of those things, and instead of saying those things are outside their mission. I want to say that they are claiming everything that they do in their mission that their government contractors, their foundation grant says they do. But we have lost that ability to

talk about those kinds of things because we are so focused on writing the proposals and the reports, so we've forgotten that we even do the other stuff."

While none of the names listed here command the same immediate understanding that the "Social Responsibility" title does, they could become more common with further use. Of all the suggestions, it is my belief that the "Full Mission" title would ultimately be the easiest to adopt among nonprofits, as it is not asking them to work outside of their mission, but to expand it.

Section 6: Conclusions

Nonprofits are doing so much to help the world. They provide services and support that our communities rely on in order to be successful. Knowing that, we should be doing everything in our power to continue to support these incredible organizations. It is my belief that one of the best ways to do this is to support the development of programs that allow nonprofits to dig in to their “full mission” and keep them attentive to the full impact of their actions. This research was developed in the hope that by examining “Nonprofit Social Responsibility” through the lens of barriers, the resulting recommendations would put nonprofits in the best possible position to implement these new programs. While my data is limited, I still believe the results present a good jumping off point for nonprofits to begin building these programs. Additionally, this research has generated a number of new questions, which offer recommendations for future research.

There is no perfect cocktail to support nonprofits in pursuing these types of programs. Instead, it must inevitably be a trial by error situation. My research suggests that the major resources that seem to be vital to build these types of programs are listed in detail in the five steps recommended in the discussion session. In brief, they are:

1. Ensure that the organization has stable, flexible funding, allowing the organization some freedom to use the funding as they see fit, including in the creation of new programs.
2. Identify a champion for the cause within the organization, who can galvanize support for the new program. This should be someone who understands the situation, and is willing to help educate their coworkers about the problem, and lead the effort to identify solutions.
3. Identify time that can be set aside to discuss these programs with the full staff, not just the management team. This time should be kept completely separate from the daily demands of the organization.
4. Identify and implement solutions that are simple, so that they do not detract from the other important work that the organization is doing.
5. Keep communications in mind, and do not shy away from reporting the organizations full impact. Nonprofits must be empowered with the confidence to believe in their full mission, not just the obvious elements.

This series of steps is meant to provide a blueprint that nonprofits can, and should follow, or at least consider when they choose to initiate programming that extends their full mission. A full depiction of the model “Setting Up Success for Full Mission Style Programs” is available in the Appendix of this paper (Appendix Figure 3). Every nonprofit is different, and should treat this model as a general recommendation, not a targeted strategy. It should be weighed against each organization’s unique challenges, situation, resources, etc. This is the best way to develop an accurate program that will be able to

support the development of the agency's full mission, while not inhibiting their existing work and direct mission.

It is important to reiterate that, as stated in the discussion, it is abundantly clear that the terminology "Nonprofit Social Responsibility" is an inappropriate way to define this field. Being not generally known, it is open to a great deal of personal interpretation, even when a definition is provided. It was clear from the interviews and surveys alike that everyone has a different understanding of this field, and the position of nonprofits within it. Suggestions like "Social Impact Programs" and "Give Back Programs" can also seem unclear, and in some ways redundant. My recommendation is to examine further the idea of nonprofits "claiming their Full Mission." This allows nonprofit staff to connect even more actions to their mission, thus expanding their impact.

With such a new field as social responsibility in nonprofits, there are many directions that new research could take, that have not already been examined. One that is currently lacking, but could be very beneficial is the idea of how confidently communicating impact would help support nonprofits growth. This theory, based on limited research examined in the literature review implies that full mission style programs could be incredibly valuable to nonprofits to build out their brand and to bring supporters to their cause, by allowing multiple points of entry and interest.

Partnerships are another direction that future research would benefit from examining, although it was beyond my scope to do so within this research. With 11 instances in my interviews, from four of my interviewees, it seems obvious that there is something to be said for the value that partnerships can bring to these types of programs. It is unclear whether these partnerships would be most productive among nonprofits, with for-profit companies, or in some combination. All that is clear from the data collected in this study is that it is a topic deserving of further scrutiny.

Another key element for future research should center around the creation of a certification for nonprofits relating to their overall impact. For profit certifications like the ISO 26000 or the Global Reporting Initiative are prevalent, and generally well respected. However, as discussed earlier, nonprofits quite simply do not fit the same mold that for-profit companies do. They have different aims and challenges, and they are not structured in the same way. Therefore, applying nonprofits to for-profit certifications, while possible, is not a natural fit. Instead, I would love to see future research leading in the direction of a certification for responsible handling of both positive and negative impact, specifically for nonprofits.

There are any number of valid reasons why nonprofits rarely stretch beyond their mission. They fear the cost that doing so might take away from their mission, they lack the time, energy, and flexibility to devote attention to anything that is not directly in their line of sight. Quite often, nonprofits prioritize their own mission to the point of excluding everything else. At base, this decision is based in good intentions, and a deep-

set care for the clients that nonprofits serve. With a little bit of support, I believe that nonprofits could use more of their actions in an intentional way to target “social good.” Actions speak louder than words, so using a nonprofit’s funds to make responsible purchases and investments, staff time in a way that minimizes carbon footprint, or partnerships in a way that prioritizes ethical labor, are all actions that put a nonprofit’s devotion to social good in the forefront of their work. Over the course of this research, several important insights were collected, resulting not only in a general blueprint for nonprofits, but also with several suggestions for future research. This research as it currently exists cannot stand alone, but with further interest and study could work in the favor nonprofits everywhere who strive to do as much as they can with as little as possible.

List of References

- Alijani, Sharam; Karyotis, Catherine. (January 2019). Coping with impact investing antagonistic objectives: A multi-stakeholder approach. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 47, pg. 10-17.
- Arno, Julia, J.D.. (Fall, 2018). Nonprofit Management: People, Programs & Policies. Class Notes.
- Associated Press. (February 20, 2020). Students push universities to stop investing in fossil fuels. *New York Post*. Retrieved from: <https://nypost.com/2020/02/20/students-push-universities-to-stop-investing-in-fossil-fuels/>
- Bloomquist, Karin. (n/a). Nonprofit Social Responsibility. *Georgetown University Center for Social Impact Communication*. Retrieved from: <https://csic.georgetown.edu/magazine/nonprofit-social-responsibility/>
- Buccella, Domenico; Wojna, Michal. (November 12, 2019). “Green” Managerial Delegation and Environmental Corporate Social Responsibility in Different Market Structures. *Central European Management Journal*, 27(4), pg. 2-22.
- Butler, Tyler. (n/a). Tools to track your CSR program. 11Eleven Consulting. Retrieved from: <http://11elevenconsulting.com/tools-to-track-your-csr-program/>
- Chen, M.-L., & Lin, C.-P. (2014). Modelling perceived corporate citizenship and psychological contracts: A mediating mechanism of perceived job efficacy. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23, pg. 231–247. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1359432X.2012.734455>
- Church, Bryan K.; Jiang, Wei; Kuang, Xi (Jason); Vitalis, Adam. (September 2019). A Dollar for a Tree or a Tree for a Dollar? The Behavior Effects of Measurement Basis on Managers’ CSR Investment Decision. *The Accounting Review*, 94(5), pg. 117-137.
- Coffman, Suzanne. (October 13, 2015). The State of Public Trust in Charities. *The GuideStar Blog*. Retrieved from: <https://trust.guidestar.org/blog/2015/10/13/the-state-of-public-trust-in-charities/>
- Ethical Markets Media. (2005). Socially Responsible Investing: Ethical Markets 1. *Films on Demand*. New York, N.Y. Retrieved from: https://fod-infobase.com.eu1.proxy.openathens.net/p_ViewVideo.aspx?xtid=37195

- Edmondson, Brian. (October 7, 2019). What Is Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)? *The Balance*. Retrieved from: <https://www.thebalance.com/corporate-social-responsibility-csr-4772443>
- Fritz, T.M.; von Schnurbein, Georg. (December 1, 2019). Beyond socially responsible investing: Effects of mission-driven portfolio selection. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(23).
- Giving USA. (2019). Giving USA 2019: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2018.
- Grabianowski, Ed. (n/a). How Recycling Works. *How Stuff Works*. Retrieved from: <https://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/green-science/recycling1.htm>
- Greco, David. (Spring 2020). Nonprofit Finance and Accountability, Lecture Notes.
- Haber, Michael. (Spring 2019). The New Activist Non-Profits: Four Models Breaking from the Non-Profit Industrial Complex. *University of Miami Law Review*. 73(3), pg. 863-954.
- Haffar, M., & Searcy, C. (August, 2019). How organizational logics shape trade-off decision-making in sustainability. *Long Range Planning*, 52(6).
- Jain, Ankur. (January 2020). Organizational Values, HR Bundles, & Collaboration with Nonprofit Organizations: A Conceptual Framework. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 55(3), pg. 426-440.
- Jung, Yuha. (2015). Diversity Matters: Theoretical Understanding of and Suggestions for the Current Fundraising Practices of Nonprofit Art Museums. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 45(4), pg. 255-268.
- Lee, James. (Summer 2019). Social Enterprise Solutions for Social Innovation. Class Notes.
- Lee, Seung Pil; Babiak, Kathy. (October 2017). Measured Societal Value and Its Impact on Donations And Perceptions Of Corporate Social Responsibility: An Experimental Approach. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(5), pg. 1030-1051.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R.; Drumwright, Minette E.; Braig, Bridgette M. (October 1, 2004). The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4).

- Lim, R. E., Sung, Y. H., & Lee, W.-N. (July, 2018). Connecting with global consumers through corporate social responsibility initiatives: A cross-cultural investigation of congruence effects of attribution and communication styles. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, pg. 11–19.
- Murphy, Simon. (January 20, 2019). Revealed: Spice Girls T-shirts made in factory paying staff 35p an hour. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/20/spice-girls-comic-relief-tshirts-made-bangladesh-factory-paying-staff-35p-an-hour>
- Nurn, Chong Wei; Tan, Gilbert. (September 2010). Obtaining Intangible and Tangible Benefits From Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6(4), pg. 360-371.
- Pope, Shawn; Bromley, Patricia; Lim, Alwyn; Meyer, John W.. (2018). The Pyramid on Nonprofit Responsibility: The Institutionalizations of Organizational Responsibility Across Sectors. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations: Official journal of the International Society for Third-Sector Research*, 29(6), pg. 1300-1314.
- Roth Tran, Brigitte. (2019). Divest, Disregard, or Double Down? Philanthropic Endowment Investments in Objectionable Firms. *AER: Insights*, 1(2), pg. 241-256.
- Sachdev, Ameet. (September 19, 2014). Money and mission: When investments conflict with philanthropy. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from: <https://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-macarthur-foundation-investment-0922-biz--20140919-story.html#page=1>
- Schrotgens, Jutta; Boenigk, Silke. (June 8, 2017). Social Impact Investment Behavior in the Nonprofit Sector: First Insights from an Online Survey Experiment. *International Society for Third-Sector Research*, 28, pg. 2658-2682.
- Shattuck, Steven. (April 3, 2019). Outcomes and output: Nonprofit impact reporting in the 21st century. *Big Duck*. Retrieved from: <https://bigduck.com/insights/nonprofit-impact-reporting-for-donor-retention/>
- Signori, Silvana. (July 1, 2010). Non-profit Organizations and Socially Responsible Investments: The Case of Italian Foundations. *Economia Aziendale Online 2000 Web*, 3, pg. 293-302.
- Taylor, Dorceta E.; Paul, Sophia; McCoy, Ember. (October 3, 2019). Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and the Salience of Publicly Disclosing Demographic Data in American Environmental Nonprofits. *Sustainability*, 11(19). Pg. 1-38.

- Tekula, Rebecca. Andersen, Kirsten. (2019). The Role of Government, Nonprofit, and Private Facilitation of the Impact Investing Marketplace. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 42(1), pg. 142-161.
- Tang, Connie P.Y.; Oxley, Michael; Mekic, Daniel. (2017). Meeting commercial and social goals: Institutional investment in the housing association sector. *Housing Studies*, 32(4), pg. 411-427.
- Van der Heijden, Beatrice Isabella Johanna Maria. (May 23, 2006). Age differences in career activities among higher-level employees in the Netherlands: a comparison between profit sector and non-profit sector staff. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 10(2).
- Waters, Richard D. Ph.D. (Spring 2019). Fundraising Lecture Notes.
- Waters, Richard D., Ph.D.; Ott, Holly K., M.S. (2014). Corporate Social Responsibility and the Nonprofit Sector: Assessing the Thoughts and Practices Across Three Nonprofit Subsectors. *Public Relations Journal*, 8(3). Retrieved from: <https://bellisario.psu.edu/assets/uploads/2014WATERSOTT.pdf>
- Zarei, Hamid; Rasti-Barzoki, Morteza; Moon, Ilkyeong. (January 15, 2020). A mechanism design approach to a buyer's optimal auditing policy to induce responsible sourcing in a supply chain. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 254. Pg. 1-20.

Appendix

Figure 1: List of Interview questions with corresponding Interviewees

What do you think of this idea of Nonprofit Social Responsibility?	Interviewee One, Two, Three, Five, Six
What brought you to this idea of Nonprofit Social Responsibility?	Interviewee Three,
What other terminology would you use for this idea?	Interviewee Two, Four,
Do you think Nonprofits are interested in doing NSR Programs?	Interviewee One
What type of NSR Programs have you seen in organizations?	Interviewee One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six
What type of NSR Programs would you like to see in action?	Interviewee Six
Is this something you think nonprofits should be doing?	Interviewee Five,
Can nonprofits pursue this independently, or does it require partnerships?	Interviewee Three,
What barriers do you see in your nonprofit, or other nonprofits, to developing these types of programs?	Interviewee One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six
What benefits do you think there are to nonprofits extending their mission?	Interviewee One, Two, Four,
Does the organization you work for have any policies that regulate investments?	Interviewee One, Five, Six
Can you think of anything else that I have missed, or any other ideas you would like to discuss?	Interviewee One, Three, Four, Five, Six

Is there anyone else you think I should speak with about this subject?	Interviewee One, Five, Six
--	----------------------------

Figure 2: Nonprofit Social Responsibility Survey

Thank you for taking this survey on Nonprofit Social Responsibility. For the purposes of this survey, we are defining Nonprofit Social Responsibility as "anything a nonprofit does, beyond the scope of their direct mission, that integrates social and environmental concerns in their operation and in their interactions on a voluntary basis."



To what degree do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Nonprofits are generally trying to do more social good than just their mission.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All organizations, including nonprofits, bear responsibility to be global citizens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My nonprofit's social responsibility should be mostly aligned with the mission.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My nonprofit's social responsibility should be chosen based on what is most beneficial to the larger community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The leadership in my nonprofit is more concerned with doing good, than the mission.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In which of the following areas does your nonprofit currently have active social responsibility programs that are unrelated to your mission? Select all that apply.

- Waste Management/Reduction (example: recycling and composting)
- Responsible Sourcing (example: purchasing materials or merchandise from fair trade or local producers)
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (example: staff training on implicit bias)
- Responsible Partnerships (example: choosing not to partner with "unethical" businesses)
- Socially Responsible Investing (example: investment policies regulating "ethical" investments)
- Environmental Sustainability (example: reduced carbon footprint)
- Other (please specify)

How interested would you be in seeing the following types of programs in your nonprofit (1 being not interested, 5 being very interested)?

	1 (Not interested)	2	3	4	5 (Very interested)
Waste Management/Reduction	<input type="radio"/>				
Responsible Purchasing	<input type="radio"/>				
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	<input type="radio"/>				
Responsible Partnerships	<input type="radio"/>				
Socially Responsible Investing	<input type="radio"/>				
Environmental Sustainability	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>				
<input type="text"/>					

Please rate your level of agreement for each item as to whether it is a barrier to your nonprofit participating in Nonprofit Social Responsibility.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Cost	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff Time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff Capacity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leadership Buy-In	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Awareness of the Issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mission Drift	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="text"/>					

Please rate how much the following would help your nonprofit add new Nonprofit Social Responsibility programs.

	Not at all Helpful	Mostly Unhelpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Extremely Helpful
Additional Funding	<input type="radio"/>				
Additional Staff Time	<input type="radio"/>				
Increased Leadership Emphasis	<input type="radio"/>				
Increased Access to Education and Training	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>				
<input type="text"/>					

Please select which category best describes your nonprofit.

- Religious
- Education
- Human Services
- Foundation
- Health
- Public Society Benefit
- International Affairs
- Arts & Culture
- Environment & Animals
- Individuals
- Other

What is your job title?

Please select your level of education:

Some high school

High school degree or equivalent

Some college

Associate Degree

Undergraduate Degree

Graduate Degree

Other, or not listed

Figure 3: “Setting Up Success for Full Mission Style Programs” Model



Figure 4: Full Transcripts of Interviews - Coded

[Interview One Transcript](#)

[Interview Two Transcript](#)

[Interview Three Transcript](#)

[Interview Four Transcript](#)

[Interview Five Transcript](#)

[Interview Six Transcript](#)

Figure 5: Survey Data Breakdown

[Full Survey Data](#)

Author's Bio

Kelly Cousins developed a passion for social justice early, majoring in Peace Studies at Manhattan College. This led to her first entry into the nonprofit world. While still in college, her multiple internships helped her develop a variety of skills. As a Community Organizer at Tenants Together, she developed her skills building relationships and public speaking. She used her role to help develop and strengthen the voices of immigrant renters to improve their living conditions. She also developed creatively as a writer and editor of both grants and articles while working as a Development Intern at Hot Bread Kitchen.

Kelly's work as a teacher and administrator in China helped her to expand her cultural competency, and challenge her expectations. She prioritized creating an inclusive classroom and work environment, where students felt comfortable to make mistakes and grow. This is a theme that has followed her throughout her work life, in which relationship building and inclusivity are her top priorities.

Kelly's work following her return to nonprofits focused on education equity and youth development. She worked for the MoonCatcher project, helping them to become part of the digital world by developing their website, and launching their social media. Her decision to pursue a degree in Nonprofit Administration led to her relocation to Oakland, CA, where she joined Family Support Services to run their Development Department. In this role she was responsible for developing the agency's fundraising strategy, as well as all of their communications and marketing. Her proudest achievement is in her ability to create a culture of sharing among the various programs and departments of the agency, thus helping them to operate more effectively.