INTERNATIONAL ENTRY MODE CHOICES OF NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS: A PROPOSITION DEVELOPMENT STUDY

Sirisena A.B.

Department of Marketing Management, Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka

amila@badm.ruh.ac.lk

ABSTRACT

Despite the significance of non-profit organizations (NPOs) as global actors in recent decades, research on the internationalization of NPOs has been largely absent from the management literature. The unique characteristics of NPOs, coupled with the relative shortage of studies, have created a considerable research gap when it comes to understanding the internationalization of NPOs. In order to bridge the gap, as the first step the study assess the validity of for-profit internationalization theories in non-profit contexts and suggest6 new propositions regarding the international entry mode selection of non-profit organizations. The study argue that that since control is less relevant in non-profit contexts, non-profit organizations tend to prefer shared ventures as long as they can find the right partners. The study thus provides a basis for future empirical research to bridge the knowledge gap in an area by extending and enriching the existing literature by integrating multiple theories on internationalization.

Keywords: *Entry Modes, For-Profits, Internationalization, Non-Profits*

1 INTRODUCTION

"A striking upsurge is underway around the globe in the creation of private, nonprofit or non-governmental organizations [...]. Indeed, we are in the midst of a global 'associational revolution' that may prove to be as significant to the latter twentieth century as the rise of the nation-state was to the latter nineteenth" (Salamon, 1994, p. 109).

The nonprofit sector, which is neither a state nor a market, has seen unprecedented growth during the past few decades (Besley & Ghatak, 2017; Islam, 2016). For example, "China has experienced an explosion of the NGO sector, where nearly within three decades, the number of officially registered NGOs has grown to 440,000—alongside many more unregistered ones" (Kaloudis, 2017, p. 90). A significant fraction of these nonprofit organizations have an international presence (Mayer, 2017; Oelberger, Fechter, & McWha-Hermann, 2017). In fact, some scholars (e.g., Martell, 2017) put NGOs on par with multinational corporations when discussing globalization, thus treating them as important actors in internationalization.

Yet, despite the fact that nonprofit organizations (NPOs) contribute significantly to internationalization and internationalization is one of the most researched areas in the field of management (Canabal & White, 2008; Werner, 2002), “the internationalization of the nonprofit sector has been relatively absent from the mainstream management literature and remains a significantly less understood sector” (Lambell, Ramia, Nyland, & Michelotti, 2008, p. 83). “Even the theorists of globalization have seldom taken the concept of the internationalization of NPOs into account” (Siméant, 2005, p. 851). Part of the reason that nonprofit firms are less understood is that they are distinct from state and for-profit firms not only in terms of legal status but also in terms of mission, products, and services offered, and funding mechanisms (Crittenden & Crittenden, 1997; Hull & Lio, 2006; Nutt & Backoff, 1992).

Therefore, as an starting the objective of the study is to look at the international entry mode decisions by nonprofit firms and thereby formulate key propositions to explain those decisions so that future studies can empirically test them.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Non-Profit Organization (NPO)

Hansmann (1980, p. 838) defines an NPO as “an organization which is barred from distributing its net earnings, if any, to individuals who exercise control over it, such as members, officers, directors, or trustees.” Many famous NPOs owe their origin to providing help to people during or after the outbreak of major wars. For example, Save the Children was founded in 1920 as a result of the displacement of populations caused by the First World War (Save the Children, 2017), while CARE was established during the latter part of the Second World War (CARE, 2017).NPOs also provide humanitarian and disaster relief in the form of food, clothing, shelter, and healthcare to victims of disasters, both man-made and natural. For example, many NPOs were established in Asia in the wake of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and Haiti after the 2010 earthquake. Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders) had their first mission in the Nicaraguan capital of Managua in 1972 immediately after a devastating earthquake (Médecins Sans Frontières, 2018). In addition to these important objectives, NPOs also engage in advocacy and lobbying. These activities can be categorized under three main political headings: symbolic politics: raising public awareness about specific issues;

leverage politics: gaining leverage over powerful actors; and accountability politics: trying to hold states accountable (Kaloudis, 2017, p. 94). Amnesty International, one of the famous advocacy NPOs, was started in 1961 as a global movement to fight for human rights (Amnesty International, 2018). Greenpeace, another famous NPO, has worked to create an environmentally sustainable future for all through lobbying and awareness-building since 1971 (Greenpeace, 2017). While the three objectives discussed above deal with relatively temporary phenomena, NPOs also have longer-term objectives, one of them being social and economic development. NPOs have the ability to reach as well as operate at grassroots levels and contribute efficiently and effectively compared with alternative forms of governance (Edwards & Hulme, 1996). For example, Acumen Fund was created in 2001 to help alleviate poverty (Acumen Fund, 2017), and CERES was founded in 1989 to build a sustainable global economy (CERES, 2017). I focus on these social and economic development NPOs in my theory-testing phase.

2.2 What Differentiates Non-Profits from For-profits?

An organization's objectives and hence its strategies are directly influenced by its mission. Stone (1996, p. 32) defines an organization's mission statement as the "starting point for an organization's entire planning process" that creates "a sense of direction, focus, and unity." Therefore, differences in missions between for-profit and nonprofit firms will be one critical difference my research will focus on. Broadly speaking, the mission of for-profit firms is to achieve profits (Stone, 1996), whereas the mission of non-profit firms is to help people to thrive. It has been argued that mission influences nonprofit organizations more than it does their for-profit counterparts (Kirk & Beth Nolan, 2010). Accordingly, I assert that internationalization strategies, which are the focus of this study, are directly influenced by a nonprofit organization's mission.

Another important difference between these two types of organizations is ownership structure. For-profit organizations are owned by shareholders and funds for operations are provided through equity and debt, thus providing a clear chain of command and ownership (Hull & Lio, 2006). NPOs, on the other hand, present a more complicated picture in which funds may be provided by multiple parties, including foundations and public and private donors (Hull & Lio, 2006; Kirk & Nolan, 2010). Moreover, for- profit organizations are responsible for their shareholders and are evaluated through measures of profitability. Nonprofit organizations, on the other hand, are responsible to multiple prominent stakeholders with differing expectations; hence their performance expectations and evaluations are very complex (Kirk & Beth Nolan, 2010).

I argue that these differences lead these two types of organizations to select different internationalization strategies in general and entry modes in particular. As a result, I argue that traditional for-profit theories cannot be used to explain the internationalization of NPOs in general and entry modes in particular, and that there is a need to generate more research on the nonprofit sector.

2.3 Theories of For-Profits and Theories of Non-Profits

Makadok (2011) identifies four main theories of profit: the theory of competitive advantage, the theory of rivalry restraint, the theory of information asymmetry, and the theory of commitment timing. The theory of competitive advantage highlights the importance for the firm to create value for the customers beyond that of its competitors and argues that as long as a firm can deliver superior value to customers, the firm will be able to operate in any environment irrespective of how tough the competition is (Powell, 2001). By contrast, the theory of rivalry restraint predicts that “ceteris paribus, an industry’s profits will increase when its firms engage in less price competition with each other, or compete less directly with each other” (Makadok, 2010, p. 356). Thus, we are presented with two competing theories here: the former acknowledges and encourages competition whereas the latter highlights the importance of cooperation.

The theory of information asymmetry highlights the importance of equal access to information for all the parties involved in a transaction. “Some market participants may have better information than others about the value-in-use of the goods, services, or resources that they trade with each other and this information asymmetry may create hazards for the transaction since the better informed party may exploit its informational advantage at the expense of less informed parties” (Makadok, 2011, p. 1319). This situation gives rise to an imbalance between the two parties, and the party that has more information will have the upper hand in the transaction. Finally, the theory of commitment timing suggests that the timing of strategic commitments also plays a critical role in determining profit. The investment/commitment has an early bird advantage along with the extra risk that comes with initial-entry uncertainty (Isobe, Makino, & Montgomery, 2000). Thus, commitment timing is a critical decision that a firm needs to take after a careful evaluation of market factors and the resource availabilities of the firm (Makadok, 2011).

Some of the main theories on the non-profit sector are contract failure theory, public goods theory, subsidy theory (Clarke & Estes, 1992), and supply-side theory (Valentinov, 2008). Contract failure theory maintains that the inability to meet the requirements needed to carry out a market transaction properly will result in market failure. These requirements include reasonable knowledge of the market by all parties, ability to reach explicit agreements with the intended parties, and ability to confirm the compliance of the parties with the agreement (Hansmann, 1987). Hence, failure to meet at least one of these criteria creates information asymmetry between the two parties, providing one party with the ability to manipulate the other party. Here it is generally agreed that in the absence of a clear ownership structure and the profit motive, non-profit organizations tend to be less opportunistic than their for-profit counterparts.

Public goods theory maintains that there are certain goods, where you cannot effectively exclude certain individuals from consuming them, at the same time their consumption does not limit the consumption of others. “Public goods are products or services such as national defense or clean air that, once produced, are enjoyed by everyone whether or not they have paid for them” (Salamon, 1987, p. 35). The market system will not provide these goods because nobody is willing to pay for them. This market failure creates a need for NPOs to step in and provide these essential goods.

Subsidy theory highlights the need for government to encourage NPOs to provide social benefits through grants and exemptions. NPOs depend on the subsidies provided to them by governments (Hasnain, 2014). However, there is also a criticism that these subsidies even enable inefficient NPOs to operate in the market (Kim & Kim, 2016).

Finally, supply-side theory highlights the relationship between altruism and entrepreneurship where entrepreneurs start new ventures in order to do ‘good’. Social entrepreneurship is a growing phenomenon where people use their skills and resources to do good things for society (Valentinov, 2008). These altruistic motives also help to maintain the NPO sector in the form of donations and voluntary work. A social venture, be it a classic NPO or a hybrid NPO with the mixed strategic position of both an NPO and FPO, implies re-investment of differing shares of profit in capacity development for delivery of a greater social benefit.

2.4 Internationalization: Entry Modes

An entry mode is an “institutional arrangement that an organization uses to market its product beyond its boundaries at least during the first five years” (Root, 1987, p. 5). The degree of control is the most common concern in categorizing entry modes. Full-control entry modes refer to sole ownership ventures while shared-control modes refer to collaborative modes of operations (Ekeledo & Sivakumar, 2004). The preferred degree of control is based on a number of factors, including cultural environment (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2001), political and legal situation (Brouthers, 2002), and market conditions (Shen & Puig, 2018). Full-control entry modes provide higher risks and potentially higher returns with full-resource commitments, while shared-control modes are more likely to provide moderate returns with moderate risks under moderate resource commitments (Anderson & Gatignon, 1986). Thus, selecting the right amount of control with the right amount of resource commitment is crucial for an organization to minimize risks and increase profits.

3 METHODOLOGY

The study which is conceptual in nature, aims to set the agenda for future empirical research to test entry mode choices of NPOs. Specifically, it describes the uniqueness of the nonprofit sector compared to the for-profit sector and formulates a set of propositions by revisiting for-profit internationalization theory in order to explain the entry mode choices of non-profit enterprises. Since the main purpose of the study is to present a new theory or extend the current theory, the literature recommends the formulation of propositions as a means of inducing the researcher to revise the current thinking as well as encourage subsequent research on the subject (Whetten, 1989). The limited availability of prior research on the subject, which makes proper operationalization of variables difficult (Cornelissen, 2017), is also a reason to formulate propositions instead of hypotheses. A proposition is defined as a statement in which “the author describes a possible association between certain constructs using ‘if, then’ clauses or general statements using a logical format” (Cornelissen, 2017, p. 3). “The primary difference between propositions and hypotheses is that propositions involve concepts, whereas hypotheses require measures” (Whetten, 1989, p. 491).

4 PROPOSED PROPOSITIONS

4.1 Resource Availability and Operational Efficiency

Establishing a fully owned subsidiary requires significant resource and capability commitment, compared to a joint venture-type entry mode. Therefore, the level of resources and capabilities a given company has at its disposal influences the type of entry mode it selects in entering a market (Dirk-Jan, 2001). This is supported by the for-profit literature, which documents a positive relationship between the size of the company and full control entry modes (Andersen, 1997; Dirk-Jan, 2001). For NPOs, however, lack of resources is a main concern, and a main motivation for coalitions and alliances (Ritchie, 1995). This is most relevant when the NPO is working with a local partner because lack of resources often results in cost sharing between the partners (AbouAssi et al., 2016). Furthermore, there are advantages for NPO to incrementally increase resource commitments in a given market (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977), especially since NPOs do not process large amounts of resources and deal mostly with markets with higher uncertainty, compared to their for-profit counterparts. Thus, I argue that the availability of resources is a concern of NPOs no less than of FPOs with respect to entry mode selection and, accordingly, I formulate the following proposition.

P_1: The greater the pressure an NPO is under to achieve operational efficiency (i.e., to maximize limited resources and time), the greater the likelihood the NPO will enter the market using shared control modes.

4.2 Requirement for Legitimacy

NPOs that come from outside the host country with an agenda for change via the implementation of social objectives in local contexts require cooperation with local actors in order to succeed (Salm, 1999b). NPOs depend on the legitimacy they enjoy in their host society and therefore must overcome local suspicions and build trust in order to operate effectively. The issue of legitimacy is a key concept in institutional theory, and it is particularly relevant when trying to influence existing institutions in new environments (Lister, 2003). An NPO becomes legitimate when it has "the right to be and do something in society and […] is lawful, proper, admissible and justified in doing what it does, and saying what it says, and […] continues to enjoy the support of an identifiable constituency" (Edwards, 1999, p. 258). Legitimacy covers multiple aspects of an NPO's operation, including "representation, transparency, accountability, and compliance with legal frameworks, effectiveness and authority in the eyes of various stakeholders" (Hudson, 2001, p. 332). Some of these aspects of legitimacy can be gained from partnering with a locally trusted or familiar partner. The role of a local partner as a legitimacy enhancer is even more critical for relatively small NPOs, which do not have the overseas reputation or resources of large transnational NPOs. If local partners are not available, then the NPO is left with no option but to face the constituency alone or to pool resources with other foreign NPOs. Accordingly, I formulate the following proposition.

P_2: The stronger the requirement for an NPO to achieve legitimacy locally, the greater the likelihood the NPO will enter the market using shared control modes.

4.3 International Experience

International experience has been identified as another positive influence on a for-profit organization's selection of high control entry modes (Dow & Larimo, 2009; Erramilli, 1991; Nakos & Brouthers, 2002). In fact, the experience is acknowledged as one of the most used predictors in explaining entry mode choice in for-profit literature (Zhao, Luo, & Suh, 2004). With increased international experience, firms can reduce uncertainty and thereby risk in operating in a foreign country due to their increased knowledge of the market

(Erramilli, 1991). However, an important observation here is that a significant number of studies have used, overall- international experience instead of market-/country-specific experience (Dow & Larimo, 2009) in predicting entry mode choices. Host-country experience or culture-specific experience is much narrower and more focused than overall international experience (Kim & Kim, 2016). With increased cross-border experience firms tend to consider and prefer full resource commitments so that they can take full advantage of the market, while firms with less experience prefer partial commitments (Oguji & Owusu, 2017), creating a U-shaped relation between resource commitment and international experience (Erramilli,1991).

Like FPOs, NPOs also learn from experience and are willing to scale up their operations with increased experience in a country (Edwards & Hulme, 2000). But at the same time increased experience improves NPOs' capabilities in dealing with partners. Therefore, it is intuitive to argue that with increased experience NPOs prefer shared control modes since shared control modes require fewer resources. Moreover, since NPOs are not there to earn profits, there is no reason for them to control the entire market as long as they can manage their partners to achieve the common objectives. Accordingly, I formulate the following proposition.

P_3: Lack of location-specific knowledge increases the need for NPOs to work with local partners rather than attempt market entry alone.

4.4 Network Relations

Inter-firm relationships and networks are additional factors that influence the entry mode choices of internationalizing organizations (Bell, 1995). International networks enable firms to use multiple entry modes more effectively than firms that are not part of a network (Coviello & Munro, 1997). Furthermore, networks reduce transaction costs for organizations by minimizing uncertainty about a given market (Blois, 1990). NPOs in most cases operate in comparatively difficult and hostile places relative to FPOs (Edwards & Hulme, 1996a); thus they naturally prefer coalitions and other support networks as a means of enhancing their survival and growth (Ritchie, 1995). The types of partnerships and relationships NPOs have on the ground influence their selection of market entry strategies. Accordingly, I formulate the following proposition.

P_4: The stronger an NPO's local network relations, the greater the NPO's tendency to select a shared control entry mode.

4.5 Market Size and Growth

As regards factors external to the organization, the potential size and growth rate of the market are considered to be the most important factors that influence an NPO's choice of entry mode (Agarwal & Ramaswami, 1992; Nakos & Brouthers, 2002). Transaction cost theory predicts that firms prefer high control modes in larger and growing markets, in order to get the benefits of economies of scales as well as to reap the benefits of a larger market (Agarwal & Ramaswami, 1992). However, "findings on impact of population size and density on NPO market selection decisions are ambiguous" (Raschky & Schwindt, 2012, p. 5). Thus, it would be interesting to explore the relationship between market size and entry mode in the NPO context. Larger markets create both opportunities and challenges for NPOs. For example, larger markets might require NPOs to commit a greater amount of resources in order to make a meaningful impact on its intended beneficiaries. With this in mind, I introduce the following proposition.

P_5: Market size does not influence NPO entry mode decisions.

4.6 Cultural Distance

Cultural distance is another very important external concern of internationalizing organizations (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2001). Culture is defined as the "collective programming of the mind, which distinguishes the members of one group of people from another" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 5). Greater cultural distance creates larger transaction costs for organizations, due to misunderstandings and misinterpretations, prompting for-profit organizations to deal cautiously with culturally distant markets (Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Martín Martín & Drogendijk, 2013). NPOs, on the other hand, mostly work in culturally distant and institutionally weak environments where needy beneficiaries reside (Hoffman et al., 2010). In fact, one can argue that NPOs are in the business of bringing down transaction costs by helping to strengthen the institutions in a given country (Postma, 1994).

Furthermore, it has been argued that governance between NPOs and their local partners is less dependent upon formal hierarchies and more dependent upon relationships and trust between the parties (Montgomery, 2012). NPOs thus prefer shared control entry modes as long as they can find a "natural local partner" with whom they share a set of common objectives. "If a local partner has similar interests, objectives and intended beneficiaries, then the local partner can be called a natural partner for the internationalizing NPO" (Fowler, 1991, p. 11). NPOs seek to do as much social good as possible, and they can do so more effectively and with greater legitimacy together with a natural partner (Lewis, 1998). However, one can assume that the greater the cultural distance, the more difficult it will be for NPOs to find natural partners, because there may be situations where local partners may be absent or whoever is available may not be qualified as a legitimate promoter of change in that environment. Building on this, I propose the following two propositions.

P6a: The greater the cultural distance, the greater the tendency of an NPO to enter the market with full control entry modes.

P6b: The higher tendency of an NPO to enter a culturally distant market with full control entry modes is negatively moderated by the requirements for local legitimacy.

5 DISCUSSION

For for-profit organizations, entry mode choice deals with a delicate balancing act between control, risk management, and resource commitment. Control is vital to a for-profit organization's ability to minimize risk and maximize returns (Blomstermo & Sallis, 2006). From a nonprofit organization's perspective, however, control is required only to ensure the implementation of social objectives. Therefore, we argued that as long as NPOs can find like-minded partners in the host country, they will have no objections to shared control entry modes. With this in mind, we proposed a number of propositions. They are as follows. First, NPOs prefer joint ventures when there are resource limitations and a lack of location-specific knowledge. Both of these factors leave NPOs with no choice but to collaborate with partners. Second, NPOs prefer joint ventures also when there are strong networks because they make it easy for NPOs to find the right partner for the job. Finally, unlike FPOs, NPOs do not allow market size to influence their entry mode decisions.

REFERENCES

AbouAssi, K., Makhlouf, N., & Whalen, P. (2016). NGOs' resource capacity antecedents for partnerships. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 26(4), 435–451.

Agarwal, S., & Ramaswami, S. N. (1992). Choice of foreign market entry mode: Impact of ownership, location and internalization factors. Journal of International Business Studies, 23(1), 1–27.

Amnesty International (2018). Who We Are. Retrieved from https://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/

Anderson, E., & Gatignon, H. (1986). Modes of foreign entry: A transaction cost analysis and propositions. International Business Studies, 11, 1–26.

Bell, J. (1995). The internationalization of small computer software firms: A further challenge to "stage" theories. European Journal of Marketing, 29(8), 60–75.

Besley, T., & Ghatak, M. (2017). Public-private partnerships for the provision of public goods: Theory and an Application to NGOs. Research in Economics, 71(2), 356–371.

Blois, K. J. (1990). Transaction costs and networks. Strategic Management Journal, 11(6), 493–496.

Blomstermo, A., & Sallis, J. (2006). Choice of foreign market entry mode in service firms. International Marketing Review, 23(2), 211–299.

Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (1997). World culture in the world polity: A century of international non-governmental organization. American Sociological Review, 62(2), 171–190.

Brouthers, K. D. (2002). Institutional, cultural and transaction cost influences on entry mode choice and performance. Journal of International Business Studies, 33(2), 203–221.

Brouthers, K. D., & Brouthers, L. E. (2001). Explaining the national cultural distance paradox. Journal of International Business Studies, 32(1), 177–189.

Canabal, A., & White, G. O. (2008). Entry mode research: Past and future. International Business Review, 17(3), 267–284.

CARE (2017). History. Retrieved from https://www.care-international.org/who-we-are/cares-history

Cornelissen, J. (2017). Editor's comments: Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? Addressing the challenges of writing theory without a boilerplate. Academy of Management Review, 42(1), 1–9.

Coviello, N. E., & Munro, H. (1997). Network relationships and the internationalisation process of small software firms. International Business Review, 6(4), 361–386.

Crittenden, W. F., & Crittenden, V. L. (1997). Strategic planning in third-sector organizations. Journal of Managerial Issues, 9(1), 86–103.

Dirk-Jan, K. (2001). Factors influencing market and entry mode selection: Developing the MEMS model. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 19(5), 351–361.

Dow, D., & Karunaratna, A. (2006). Developing a multidimensional instrument to measure psychic distance stimuli. Journal of International Business Studies, 37(5), 578–602.

Dow, D., & Larimo, J. (2009). Challenging the conceptualization and measurement of distance and international experience in entry mode choice research. Journal of International Marketing, 17(2), 74–98.

Edwards, M. (1999). Legitimacy and values in NGOs and voluntary organizations: Some sceptical thoughts. In Lewis, D. (ed.), International Perspectives on Voluntary Action. London: Earthscan.

Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (1996a). Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Ekeledo, I., & Sivakumar, K. (2004). International market entry mode strategies of manufacturing firms and service firms: A resource-based perspective. International Marketing Review, 21(1), 68–101.

Erramilli, M. K. (1991). The experience factor in foreign market entry behavior of service firms. Journal of International Business Studies, 22(3), 479–501.

Fowler, A. (1991). Building partnerships between northern and southern development NGOs: Issues for the 1990s. Development in Practice, 1(1), 5–18.

Greenpeace (2017). About Us. Retrieved from http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/about/

Hansmann, H. (1987). Economic theories of nonprofit organization. In W. W. Powell (ed.), The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook (Vol. 1, pp. 27–42). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hasnain, S. S. (2014). Location of facilities: Towards a new approach for NGOs. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development, 5(2), 154–160.

Hoffman, A. J., Badiane, K. K., & Haigh, N. (2010). Hybrid organizations as agents of positive social change: Bridging the for-profit & non-profit divide. In Golden-Biddle, K. & Dutton, J. E. (eds.), Using a Positive Lens to Explore Social Change and Organizations. London: Routledge.

Hofstede, G. H. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations. New York: Sage.

Hudson, A. (2001). NGOs' transnational advocacy networks: From "legitimacy" to "political responsibility." Global Networks, 1(4), 331–352.

Hull, C. E., & Lio, B. H. (2006). Innovation in non-profit and for-profit organizations: Visionary, strategic, and financial considerations. Journal of Change Management, 6(1), 53–65.

Islam, M. R. (2016). NGOs in the development discourse. In M. R. Islam (ed.), NGOs, Social Capital and Community Empowerment in Bangladesh (pp. 7–19). Berlin: Springer.

Isobe, T., Makino, S., & Montgomery, D. B. (2000). Resource commitment, entry timing, and market performance of foreign direct investments in emerging economies: The case of Japanese international joint ventures in China. Academy of Management Journal, 43(3), 468–484.

Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J. E. (1977). The internationalization process of the firm: A model of knowledge development and increasing foreign market commitments. Journal of International Business Studies, 8(1), 23–32.

Kaloudis, G. (2017). Non-governmental organizations: Mostly a force for good. International Journal on World Peace, 34(1), 81–112.

Kim, Y. H., & Kim, S. E. (2016). Testing an economic model of nonprofit growth: Analyzing the behaviors and decisions of nonprofit organizations, private donors, and governments. Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 27(6), 2937–2961.

Kirk, G., & Beth Nolan, S. (2010). Nonprofit mission statement focus and financial performance. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 20(4), 473–490.

Lambell, R., Ramia, G., Nyland, C., & , M. (2008). NGOs and international business research: Progress, prospects and problems. International Journal of Management Reviews, 10(1), 75–92.

Lister, S. (2003). NGO legitimacy: Technical issue or social construct? Critique of Anthropology, 23(2), 175–192.

Makadok, R. (2011). Invited Eeditorial: The four theories of profit and their joint effects. Journal of Management, 37(5), 1316–1334.

Martín Martín, O., & Drogendijk, R. (2013). Country distance (COD): Development and validation of a new objective measure. Journal of Small Business Management, 52(1), 102–125.

Mayer, L. H. (2017). Globalization without a safety net: The challenge of protecting cross-border funding of NGOs. Minnesota Law Review, 102(3), 1–42.

Médecins Sans Frontières (2018). MSF History. Retrieved from http://www.msf.org/en/msf-history

Montgomery, C. M. (2012). Protocols and participatory democracy in a "North–South"product development partnership. Sociology of Health & Illness, 34(7), 1053–1069.

Nakos, G., & Brouthers, K. D. (2002). Entry mode choice of SMEs in Central and Eastern Europe. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 27(1), 47–63.

Nutt, P. C., & Backoff, R. W. (1992). Strategic Management of Public and Third Sector Organizations: A Handbook for Leaders. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oelberger, C. R., Fechter, A.-M., & McWha-Hermann, I. (2017). Managing human resources in international NGOs. In J. Sowa and J. Word (eds.), The

Nonprofit Human Resource Management Handbook: From Theory to Practice. Abingdon, UK: Taylor and Francis.

Oguji, N., & Owusu, R. A. (2017). Acquisitions entry strategies in Africa: The role of institutions, target-specific experience, and host-country capabilities: The case acquisitions of Finnish multinationals in Africa. Thunderbird International Business Review, 59(2), 209–225.

Postma, W. (1994). NGO partnership and institutional development: Making it real, making it intentional. Canadian Journal of African Studies, 28(3), 447–471.

Powell, T. C. (2001). Competitive advantage: Logical and philosophical considerations. Strategic Management Journal, 22(9), 875–888.

Raschky, P. A., & Schwindt, M. (2012). On the channel and type of aid: The case of international disaster assistance. European Journal of Political Economy, 28(1), 119–131.

Ritchie, C. (1995). Coordinate? Cooperate? Harmonise? NGO policy and operational coalitions. Third World Quarterly, 16(3), 513–524.

Root, F. R. (1987). Entry Strategies for International Market. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Salamon, L. M. (1987). Of market failure, voluntary failure, and third-party government: Toward a theory of government-nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 16(1–2), 29–49.

Sale, J. E., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. Quality and Quantity, 36(1), 43–53.

Salm, J. (1999a). Coping with globalization: A profile of the northern NGO sector. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 28(1), 87–103.

Save the Children. (2017). Our Story. Retrieved from https://www.savethechildren.net/about-us/our-story.

Shen, Z., & Puig, F. (2018). Spatial dependence of the FDI entry mode decision: Empirical evidence from emerging market enterprises. Management International Review, 1–23.

Siméant, J. (2005). What is going global? The internationalization of French NGOs ”without borders.” Review of International Political Economy, 12(5), 851–883.

Stone, R. A. (1996). Mission statements revisited. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 61(1), 31–37.

Valentinov, V. (2008). The economics of nonprofit organization: In search of an integrative theory. Journal of Economic Issues (Association for Evolutionary Economics), 42(3), 745–761.

Whetten, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? The Academy of Management Review, 14(4), 490–495.