

Teaching Paper: Glossary of Collaborative Terms for NGO Alliances and Networks

Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia

NEYA Global | NEYA Global Publishing

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5669-1676>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-tp-04>

Abstract

This Teaching Paper presents a comprehensive glossary of terms that underpin the study and practice of NGO alliances and collaborative networks. Covering over thirty key concepts— from **accountability** and **advocacy networks** to **polycentric governance** and **transnational solidarity movements**—the glossary links theory with practice. Each term is defined with reference to authoritative scholarship (Olson, 1965; Ostrom, 1990; Suchman, 1995; Provan & Kenis, 2008) and paired with practical notes relevant to non-profit leaders and practitioners. The glossary provides conceptual clarity for researchers while equipping practitioners with a shared vocabulary for managing collaboration.

Keywords

NGO collaboration; alliances; networks; governance; legitimacy; social capital; advocacy; transnational movements

Executive Summary

Collaboration is central to NGO effectiveness but requires clear concepts to understand governance, risks, and opportunities. This glossary provides precise definitions of 30+ terms—including **brokerage**, **federations**, **power asymmetry**, **legitimacy**, **social network analysis**, and **mission drift**—each connected to practical applications. For academics, it consolidates key theoretical frameworks. For practitioners, it offers a usable reference for alliance-building, governance design, and risk assessment.

Purpose and Learning Objectives

By engaging with this Teaching Paper, readers will:

1. Learn the core terminology for analyzing NGO networks and alliances.
2. Understand how academic theories translate into practical challenges.
3. Apply key terms in diagnosing collaboration dynamics.
4. Strengthen conceptual foundations for both research and practice.

Background and Context

Scholarship on NGO collaboration spans organizational theory, political science, and sociology. Olson's (1965) logic of collective action highlighted coordination challenges. Ostrom (1990) advanced polycentric governance models for resource management. Suchman (1995) analyzed legitimacy as a social judgment critical for NGOs. Provan and Kenis (2008) defined governance forms such as NAOs.

These works, alongside insights from Bourdieu (1986), Putnam (1993), and Burt (2005), provide a conceptual map of how networks function. Yet, NGOs often lack accessible references to this vocabulary. This glossary bridges academic theory with applied NGO practice.

Practical Guide:

Accountability — Mechanisms ensuring NGOs and networks remain answerable to stakeholders, including donors, governments, and communities.

Practical note: Requires balancing donor reporting with community engagement.

Advocacy Networks — Transnational coalitions mobilizing around issues to influence policy and norms (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

Practical note: Effective in agenda-setting but face power imbalances.

Alliances — Agreements among NGOs or across sectors to achieve shared objectives collectively while retaining autonomy.

Practical note: Allow flexibility while pooling resources.

Brokerage — Connecting disconnected groups to enable resource and information flows (Burt, 2005).

Practical note: Brokers often gain influence but may distort representation.

Centralized Networks — Structures coordinated by a lead organization or secretariat for efficiency.

Practical note: Fast decision-making but vulnerable to domination.

Coalitions — Temporary, issue-specific collaborations, often for advocacy campaigns.

Practical note: Useful for urgent mobilization but not sustainable.

Collective Action — Joint efforts to achieve shared goals despite free-rider problems (Olson, 1965).

Practical note: NGOs must build incentives for participation.

Consensus Governance — Decision-making based on equal participation and agreement.

Practical note: Inclusive but often slow.

Cross-Sector Partnerships — Collaborations between NGOs, states, and businesses to combine resources.

Practical note: Offer scale but raise risks of co-optation.

Decentralized Networks — Distributed decision-making structures.

Practical note: Enhance resilience but require strong coordination tools.

Donor Capture — NGO agendas dominated by external funders.

Practical note: Undermines grassroots legitimacy.

Federations — Long-term institutionalized alliances under shared governance.

Practical note: Provide stability but risk bureaucracy.

Governance — Rules and mechanisms for coordination, accountability, and conflict resolution.

Practical note: Determines effectiveness and legitimacy.

Hybrid Alliances — Cross-sector, cross-issue, or cross-regional collaborations.

Practical note: Foster innovation but complicate management.

Institutional Isomorphism — NGOs adopt similar structures due to legitimacy pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Practical note: Enhances recognition but reduces diversity.

Legitimacy — Social perception that actions are appropriate (Suchman, 1995).

Practical note: Fragile and must be continually reinforced.

Mission Drift — Loss of purpose under donor or coalition pressure.

Practical note: Common in long-term collaborations.

Multi-Level Governance — Overlapping decision-making at local, regional, and global levels (Ostrom, 1990).

Practical note: Increases adaptability but is complex.

Networks — Inter-organizational ties enabling flows of resources, information, and legitimacy.

Practical note: Foundation of collaborative systems.

Network Administrative Organization (NAO) — Independent entity coordinating a network (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

Practical note: Professionalizes management but risks bureaucracy.

Normative Motivations — Value-driven reasons for collaboration, such as solidarity.

Practical note: Strengthen cohesion but not always sustainable.

Polycentric Governance — Multiple overlapping centers of authority (Ostrom, 1990).

Practical note: Provides resilience but raises coordination costs.

Power Asymmetry — Unequal influence among NGOs within alliances.

Practical note: Marginalizes smaller members unless mitigated.

Process Measures — Evaluation criteria emphasizing inclusivity and participation.

Practical note: Balance outcome metrics with learning.

Resource Dependence — Reliance on external actors (Pfeffer & Salancik).

Practical note: Drives collaboration but limits autonomy.

Risk of Co-optation — NGOs losing independence by aligning too closely with donors or states.

Practical note: A persistent danger in partnerships.

Social Capital — Relational resources such as trust and reciprocity (Putnam, 1993; Bourdieu, 1986).

Practical note: Enables cooperation but is easily eroded.

Social Network Analysis (SNA) — Method for mapping ties, centrality, and brokerage.

Practical note: Helps NGOs visualize collaboration structures.

Solidarity — Normative commitment to shared identity and empowerment.

Practical note: Builds legitimacy but must be supported by practice.

Structural Holes — Gaps brokers exploit to connect groups (Burt, 2005).

Practical note: Can create influence but also inequality.

Surveillance Risk — Threat of monitoring, hacking, or misuse of digital data.

Practical note: Demands digital security and resilience.

Temporary Collaborations — Short-term alliances for specific campaigns.

Practical note: Flexible but rarely durable.

Transaction Costs — Hidden costs of collaboration, such as negotiation time.

Practical note: Must be budgeted realistically.

Transnational Solidarity Movements — Global campaigns linking grassroots and international actors.

Practical note: Enhance visibility but require equitable governance.

Case Study

A global gender justice coalition mapped its network using **social network analysis**. Findings showed **power asymmetry**—large international NGOs dominated communication channels. Smaller grassroots actors highlighted risks of **donor capture** and **mission drift**. By adopting a **polycentric governance** model and enhancing **solidarity** commitments, the coalition redistributed leadership roles, improved inclusivity, and reduced transaction costs.

Common Challenges and Tips

- **Challenge:** Risk of jargon alienating practitioners.
 - *Tip:* Integrate glossary terms into training and planning workshops.
- **Challenge:** Collaboration risks like surveillance and co-optation overlooked.
 - *Tip:* Make them explicit in partnership agreements.
- **Challenge:** Transaction costs underestimated.
 - *Tip:* Plan for hidden costs in governance design.

Reflection Questions

1. Which glossary terms describe challenges in your current alliances?
2. How does your organization mitigate risks like mission drift or donor capture?
3. Could social network analysis improve your alliance strategies?
4. What role do legitimacy and solidarity play in sustaining collaboration?

Limitations and Considerations

While comprehensive, the glossary cannot capture all contextual variations. Terms may hold different meanings across cultures and disciplines. Adaptation to local practice is essential.

Academic Value

For scholars, this glossary consolidates key literature on NGO alliances. For practitioners, it provides a shared vocabulary for diagnosing collaboration. It strengthens the bridge between academic theory and applied NGO governance.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Effective collaboration depends on shared language. This glossary equips NGOs and researchers with conceptual tools to design, evaluate, and sustain alliances. Next steps include applying these terms in organizational training, adapting them to context, and embedding them in monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

Suggested Citation

Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Teaching Paper: Glossary of Collaborative Terms for NGO Alliances and Networks*. NEYA Global Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-tp-04>

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199249145.001.0001>
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Theoretical foundations of collaboration in the non-profit sector. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-02>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Forms of non-profit collaboration: Typologies, structures, and strategic trade-offs. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-03>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Structures and governance of non-profit networks. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-05>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Benefits and risks of NGO alliances. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-06>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Networks & Alliances: Strategies for Social Impact*. NEYA Global Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/collaboration-2025>

- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674041660>
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807763>
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015>
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7s8r7>
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/258788>