

The Double-Edged Nature of Non-Profit Collaboration: Strategic Lessons and Future Research Directions

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-10>

Abstract

Collaboration has become indispensable to non-profit organizations navigating constrained resources, legitimacy challenges, and shifting political landscapes. Yet it remains a double-edged practice—strengthening NGOs through scale, solidarity, and legitimacy while simultaneously generating dependency, mission drift, and inequality. This article synthesizes key theoretical and empirical insights to illuminate both the strategic value and inherent ambivalence of NGO collaboration. It identifies the governance conditions under which alliances enhance effectiveness, the risks that undermine integrity, and the implications for practice and scholarship. Effective collaboration requires balancing inclusivity with efficiency, fostering trust alongside accountability, and linking grassroots actors with institutional arenas without erasing their agency. Conversely, when governance is weak or donor influence dominates, networks risk becoming instruments of control rather than empowerment. For practitioners, the strategic question is not whether to collaborate, but under what conditions collaboration sustains rather than compromises mission integrity. For scholars, the future research agenda must address digital vulnerabilities, ethical dilemmas, and contextual variations across political regimes and regional environments. Ultimately, collaboration represents both necessity and risk—an evolving practice that demands critical reflection, adaptive strategy, and ethical vigilance.

Keywords

non-profit collaboration; NGO networks; governance; donor dependency; legitimacy; solidarity; digital transformation

1. Introduction

In the twenty-first century, collaboration has become a structural condition for non-profit survival and impact. NGOs increasingly rely on alliances to mobilize resources, influence policy, and maintain legitimacy in complex governance systems. Yet, collaboration is not an unqualified good. It can empower or constrain, depending on how it is structured and

governed. The assumption that “working together” is inherently beneficial obscures the nuanced realities of power, dependency, and accountability that shape networked action. This article explores the dual nature of non-profit collaboration. It synthesizes theoretical and empirical perspectives to examine when and how networks enhance effectiveness, the ambivalences that accompany cooperative practice, and the strategic and research implications for the field. By treating collaboration as both an opportunity and a site of contestation, it advances a more critical and reflective understanding of the role of alliances in contemporary civil society.

2. Conditions for Effective Collaboration

The effectiveness of NGO collaboration depends on governance design rather than goodwill alone. Networks thrive when they balance inclusivity with efficiency, trust with accountability, and grassroots participation with strategic coordination. As Provan and Kenis (2008) note, governance structures—ranging from participant-led models to network administrative organizations—determine the capacity of alliances to manage complexity and sustain legitimacy.

Transparent decision-making, clear role delineation, and effective conflict resolution are prerequisites for equitable participation. Leadership must be distributed rather than monopolized, ensuring that local and marginalized actors retain voice and influence. Moreover, successful collaboration depends on institutionalized accountability mechanisms—financial audits, participatory evaluations, and rotating leadership—that reinforce trust and prevent dominance by a few well-resourced organizations.

In short, governance structures that combine procedural rigor with participatory inclusivity form the foundation of sustainable collaboration. Without them, alliances risk replicating the same inequalities they seek to challenge.

3. Ambivalences and Risks

Collaboration’s value lies precisely in its ambivalence. It enhances legitimacy, scale, and resilience but simultaneously exposes NGOs to risks of co-optation, dependency, and power distortion. Edwards and Hulme (1996) warned that partnerships may reinforce the very hierarchies they aim to dismantle, particularly when large international NGOs dominate smaller local actors. Similarly, Banks, Hulme, and Edwards (2015) highlight donor capture as a persistent threat: when funding drives agendas, collaboration becomes instrumental rather than transformative.

These dynamics produce what can be termed “asymmetric cooperation”—alliances in which smaller NGOs gain access to resources and visibility but lose strategic autonomy. Mission drift often follows, as grassroots priorities are reframed to align with donor or governmental expectations. Such ambivalence underscores the need for reflexivity: recognizing that alliances are political spaces where representation, legitimacy, and agency must be continually negotiated.

4. Strategic Implications for Practitioners

For practitioners, the question is not whether collaboration is inherently desirable but whether it serves the mission within a given context. Strategic discernment is essential. NGOs should engage in alliances when partnerships advance advocacy objectives, build capacity, or enhance resilience without eroding independence. Collaboration can amplify marginalized voices, foster collective learning, and improve access to policy arenas.

However, withdrawal or selective engagement may be the more ethical and strategic choice when donor-driven agendas dominate, when the distribution of power is inequitable, or when collaboration requires compromising core principles. Strategic reflection thus becomes a form of governance—a continual process of assessing trade-offs, negotiating boundaries, and recalibrating commitments. Ultimately, effective collaboration is not measured by participation alone but by alignment between collective goals and individual mission integrity.

5. Research Directions for Scholars

The scholarly study of NGO collaboration remains both vibrant and incomplete. Future research must address emerging challenges at the intersection of digitalization, ethics, and global governance.

First, **digital transformation** introduces new forms of risk and opportunity. Digital networks expand reach and coordination capacity but also expose NGOs to surveillance, data breaches, and algorithmic control (Morozov, 2011; Tufekci, 2017). How these dynamics reshape power relations and trust within transnational alliances remains underexplored.

Second, **comparative political analysis** is essential to understand how regime type shapes collaboration. In authoritarian or hybrid systems, alliances often serve defensive or protective functions, while in democratic contexts they function as vehicles for advocacy and policy engagement. Comparative studies can reveal how governance structures adapt to varying levels of political freedom and donor oversight.

Third, **ethical dilemmas**—balancing donor compliance with grassroots autonomy, or transparency with security—require interdisciplinary engagement across political science, sociology, and digital ethics. Future scholarship must move beyond instrumental analysis to address collaboration as a moral and epistemic practice, shaping not only outcomes but values and identities.

6. Conclusion

Collaboration is indispensable to the future of civil society yet inherently fraught. It expands influence and collective capacity while risking dependency, inequality, and mission distortion. For practitioners, effective collaboration requires strategic and ethical discernment—engaging when partnerships strengthen rather than compromise integrity. For scholars, deeper theoretical and empirical inquiry is needed to capture the complexity of networked governance in an era of digital transformation and geopolitical flux.

The double-edged nature of collaboration thus defines both its power and its peril. NGOs cannot thrive in isolation, yet they must guard against alliances that replicate the hierarchies they seek to overcome. The future of non-profit collaboration will depend on the capacity of organizations and scholars alike to cultivate critical reflection, adaptive governance, and ethical vigilance—ensuring that collective action remains a means of empowerment, not control.

References

- Banks, N., Hulme, D., & Edwards, M. (2015). NGOs, states, and donors revisited: Still too close for comfort? *World Development*, 66, 707–718.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.09.028>
- Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (1996). Too close for comfort? The impact of official aid on NGOs. *World Development*, 24(6), 961–973.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(96\)00019-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(96)00019-8)
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Networks & Alliances: Strategies for Social Impact*. NEYA Global Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/collaboration-2025>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Motivations for networking among non-profit organizations: Instrumental, normative, and defensive drivers. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-04>

- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Benefits and risks of NGO alliances: Balancing efficiency, legitimacy, and autonomy. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-06>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). The future of non-profit collaboration: Digital innovation, transnational solidarity, and hybrid alliances. *Neya Global Journal of Non-Profit Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-ntallstrscimp-09>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Participatory Development for Change*. NEYA Global Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/participatory-development-2025>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Climate Change and Development: Strategies for Adaptation*. NEYA Global Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.64357/climate-change-and-development-2025>
- Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: The dark side of internet freedom*. PublicAffairs.
- 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>
- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.