



Distinguishing Providing Public Services from Receiving Government Funding as Factors in Nonprofit Advocacy

Itaru Yanagi¹ · Yohei Kobashi² · Robert J. Pekkanen³ · Yutaka Tsujinaka⁴

© International Society for Third-Sector Research 2020

Abstract This study innovates by introducing a conceptual distinction between the provision of public services and the receipt of government funding. The study also provides empirical analysis to show that public service provision, independent of government funding, is associated with greater nonprofit advocacy. There are implications for previous studies of nonprofit advocacy, our understanding of the mechanism of nonprofit advocacy, and the role that organizational mission may play in leading organizations to engage in advocacy. Previous studies exploring the effect of government funding on nonprofit advocacy have perceived the provision of public services as being identical to the receipt of government funding. In contrast, our

analysis distinguishes between providing public services and receiving government funding. Empirically, the study also uses survey questions differentiating the two in the JIGS international datasets to investigate the relationship. This study examines the effect of the provision of public services by nonprofit organizations on nonprofit advocacy in Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, and the USA. We conducted a logistic regression analysis using nonprofit advocacy as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed two key points. First, public service alone and distinct from government funding enhances nonprofit advocacy. Second, public service provision had positive effects on advocacy, not only in the USA but also in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines, which each feature a different institutional context. In conclusion, we suggest that organizational mission could be a more important driver of nonprofit advocacy than previous studies have found.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00206-9>) contains supplementary material, which is accessible to authorized users.

✉ Itaru Yanagi
i-yanagi@fc.ritsumei.ac.jp

Yohei Kobashi
kobashi@watashiha.co.jp

Robert J. Pekkanen
pekkanen@uw.edu

Yutaka Tsujinaka
ty807039@tsc.u-tokai.ac.jp

¹ College of Law, Ritsumeikan University, 56-1 Toji-in Kitamachi, Kita-ku, Kyoto 603-8577, Japan

² Watashiha Corporation, 3-7-21-504, Nishishinjuku, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-0023, Japan

³ Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington, Box 353650, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

⁴ School of Political Science and Economics, Tokai University, 4-1-1, Kitakaname, Hiratsuka-shi, Kanagawa 259-1292, Japan

Keywords Advocacy · Nonprofit organizations · Provision of public services · Government funding

Introduction

Nonprofit advocacy has been the subject of extensive study (Chaves et al. 2004; Bass et al. 2007; Schmid et al. 2008; Nicholson-Crotty 2009; Mosley 2010; 2011; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015; Arvidson et al. 2018a). One key question in such research has been the impact of government funding on nonprofit advocacy. The literature argues that compared to other nonprofits, nonprofit organizations receiving government funding are either more likely to engage in advocacy, in order to secure additional funding, or less likely to do so, to protect the funding they already possess (Chaves et al. 2004; Neumayr et al. 2015).

However, the literature to date has conflated the receipt of government funding and the provision of public services (Gazley and Brudney 2007; Smith 2008; Chin 2018); this article introduces a conceptual distinction between the receipt of government funding and the provision of public services. In this research endeavor, we correct a lacuna in the literature. This step also permits us to reconsider past studies that may have overestimated the effect of government funding on advocacy, due to its conflation with the provision of public services. The distinction is also important because the provision of public services could be tied to other factors, such as the organizational mission. This article provides an empirical analysis to demonstrate that providing public services alone influences nonprofit advocacy behavior, independent of the receipt of government funds.

This is a significant finding, as it offers important new insights into nonprofit advocacy. Nonprofit organizations have come to play a greater role in providing public services, and this development magnifies the significance of the finding (Dunleavy and Hood 1994; Furneaux and Ryan 2014). In addition, this finding may also call for a reinterpretation of much of the literature regarding the relationship between government funding and nonprofit advocacy, by allowing us to more precisely specify the causal mechanism at work. Thus, it is important to clarify how the provision of public services affects advocacy activities.

Through the advocacy work of nonprofit organizations, public policy reflects not only government actors but also a broader range of civil society experiences and perspectives (Reid 2006). In this study, advocacy is defined as “the attempt to influence public policy, either directly or indirectly” (Pekkanen and Smith 2014a: 3). Tactics by nonprofit organizations to engage in advocacy include insider strategies, such as lobbying the government, and outsider strategies, such as public demonstrations (Pekkanen and Smith 2014a). In this study, we focus on all actions that seek to influence the government, regardless of strategy. Advocacy also calls into question whose interests the nonprofit organizations represent. For example, nonprofit organizations may engage in lobbying to further the interests of their organizations or make policy recommendations on behalf of broader civil society interests. In this study, we consider all nonprofit advocacy, regardless of the motivation behind it.

Many studies have examined whether government funding affects advocacy positively or negatively (Chaves et al. 2004; Schmid et al. 2008; Nicholson-Crotty 2009; Mosley 2010, 2011; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015). These studies focused on the amount of government funding nonprofits received, as a possible influence on their advocacy activities. However, these studies

never considered the provision of public services as a possible independent influence on whether nonprofits engaged in advocacy work. In other words, these studies analyzed the effect of the provision of public services on nonprofit organizations’ advocacy activities by establishing the receipt of government funding as identical to the provision of public services (Fyall 2017).

In this study, the provision of public services is defined as the direct implementation of public services by nonprofit organizations. Various forms of the relationship between governments and nonprofit organizations exist, including contracting-out (Skelcher 2007). When the government contracts out to nonprofit organizations, nonprofit organizations often receive government funding. However, nonprofit organizations do not always receive government funding when they cooperate in the implementation of public services, nor do they always provide public services only according to the government’s direction. For example, providing food at a food bank is a public service, but this service could be implemented per the nonprofit’s own plan—that is, without government funding and not in response to a government contract or policy directive.

In other words, the provision of public services and the receipt of government funding are not the same (Yanagi and Kobashi 2017). As we will illustrate in this article, many nonprofit organizations provide public services but receive no government funding. By distinguishing the provision of public services and receipt of government funding, we can analyze the effect of public service provision alone. Theory grounds our current belief that when taken by itself and regardless of the presence of government funding, the provision of public services could influence the advocacy activity of nonprofit organizations. For example, nonprofit organizations engaged in public service may be more likely to have a mission that leads them to engage in advocacy. In other words, an organization’s identity or mission could drive advocacy. Further, it is also possible for nonprofit organizations providing public services to create networks with government actors that would make advocacy easier or more attractive. The former would imply that previous studies might have misidentified the motivation for advocacy through conflation to an extent, while the latter could indicate a different mechanism at work. We must investigate this matter further, as previous studies do not distinguish between the provision of public services and the receipt of government funding.

To ensure a sounder empirical and theoretical footing, we must also consider this matter from a comparative perspective. Most previous studies target nonprofit organizations in developed countries, such as Europe and the USA (Neumayr et al. 2015). Previous studies have pointed to both structural and normative institutional contexts and

to culture as factors in advocacy activities (Arvidson et al. 2018a). This context differs from one country to another. To ensure reliable generalization, we must examine the relationship between nonprofit organizations and government in various countries.

This study examines two issues that have not been addressed in the literature using data from the Japan Interest Group Study (JIGS). The first issue regards whether public services affect advocacy activities. The second examines whether these effects on advocacy can be seen in Asian countries, such as Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea, as well as in the USA. JIGS is an empirical, comparative study of civil society that collects survey data. JIGS conducted a survey that distinguishes between public services and government funding in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA. This study explains the effect of public services provision on nonprofit advocacy in these four countries.

Previous Studies on Factors that Influence Advocacy

Several studies have identified the factors that enhance or suppress nonprofit advocacy activities. In these studies, the factors of focus are government funding, organizational characteristics, such as organizational resources or capacity, and the institutional context (both structural and normative), and culture (Arvidson et al. 2018a). The factor that draws the most attention is government funding.

In studies showing that government funding suppresses nonprofit advocacy, two reasons are given. First, the independence of nonprofit organizations is relinquished in their contract with the government (Knutsen 2017). For example, nonprofit organizations receiving government funding are afraid of losing government funding. For this reason, they might not advocate in ways that conflict with government policies (Chaves et al. 2004; Reid, 2006; Bass et al. 2007; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b). Second, perceptions of legal rules might suppress nonprofit advocacy (Berry and Arons 2003; Chaves et al. 2004; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b). Nonprofit organizations are unsure whether their organizations are allowed to engage in advocacy if they receive government funding (Berry and Arons 2003).

Conversely, many studies clearly highlighted that government funding enhances nonprofit advocacy (Chaves et al. 2004; Bass et al. 2007; Mosley 2010, 2011; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b). Reviews and meta-analyses conducted by previous studies reveal that a greater number of studies found that government funding promotes advocacy rather than discouraging it (Neumayr et al. 2015; Lu 2018).

Two arguments explain why government funding enhances nonprofit advocacy. First, nonprofit organizations receiving government funding tend to engage in advocacy with the aim of protecting their own resources or acquiring further resources (Chaves et al. 2004; Neumayr et al. 2015). Second, nonprofit organizations that receive government funding have a network with public organizations. Nonprofit organizations increase the opportunities for advocacy activities through these networks (Bass et al. 2007; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015). These studies regard the receipt of government funding as synonymous to the provision of public services (Fyall 2017).

However, when the government and nonprofit organizations co-deliver public services, nonprofit organizations do not always receive government funding. Nabatchi and Sancino (2017) reviewed previous studies on coproduction and divided it into four phases: co-commissioning, co-design, co-delivery, and co-assessment. Co-delivery refers to the activities used to provide or improve the provision of concurrent public services (Nabatchi and Sancino 2017: 773). The presence or absence of government funding is not mentioned in this definition. In many of the examples, actors working with the government have not received government funding (Nabatchi and Sancino 2017).

Therefore, by analyzing the provision of public services and government funding simultaneously as independent variables, it is possible to truly understand the reasons the provision of public services and government funding influence advocacy. The nonprofit organizations that do not receive government funding yet provide public services build a network with the government, but have not received any resources from it. This study proposes that nonprofit advocacy is enhanced by building a network with the government through the provision of public services. A previous study demonstrating that government funding enhances nonprofit advocacy had proposed hypotheses pertaining to resources and an organization's network. By setting the provision of public services as an independent variable alongside government funding, we can explain how a network premised on the provision of public services affects advocacy. The networks built through the provision of public services promote advocacy.

Then, why do nonprofit organizations that provide public services engage in advocacy in the first place? In other words, even if networks built through the provision of public services are advantageous for advocacy, why would nonprofit organizations providing public services engage in advocacy at all? Organizational identity is key to understanding advocacy engagement by nonprofit organizations that provide public services—the two activities, i.e., providing the public services and the advocacy that comes along with it, are undertaken because of their mission/

identity. The influence of organizational identity over engagement in advocacy activities has been examined in previous studies (Schmit et al. 2008; Garrow and Hasenfeld 2014; Arvidson et al. 2018a).

Methods and Data

Analytical Approach

In this study, we use logistic regression analysis to understand the impact of the provision of public services on nonprofit advocacy. As Arvidson et al. (2018a) point out, government funding, organizational characteristics, and institutional context have been regarded as advocacy factors in previous studies. Therefore, in this analysis, the provision of public services is the independent variable and government funding and organizational characteristics are the control variables. The dependent variable is a dummy variable that reports whether nonprofit organizations engage in advocacy activities. This analysis verifies whether the provision of public services has an impact on advocacy when control variables are inserted. Meanwhile, previous studies in which public services were not inserted as variables may not have been able to properly verify the impact of government funding. We examine whether Model 1, which includes public services based on the hypothesis of this study, or Model 2, which does not include public services based on previous studies, is better fitted. In the analysis of this study, we search for the best combination by including high Akaike information criterion (AIC) in each model to ensure the best fit for each model. Therefore, the control variables of both models are not aligned. We will also analyze countries other than the USA that have been the central focus of analysis in previous studies. This analysis can confirm whether the provision of public services has a positive impact on advocacy activities despite the institutional context that differs from one country to another.

A country-wise comparison would enable an understanding of the factors at play in each country. The vocabulary used in the research tool, i.e., the survey questionnaire, varied slightly from one country to the other, and cultural variations were apparent in those countries. For this reason, this study only compared the factors that affect each country based on the analysis of that country. In other words, this study did not compare the odds ratio of a factor by country to assess the magnitude of the effect.

Data

We analyzed survey data for Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA. Japan, South Korea, and the

Philippines have rarely been analyzed in previous studies. Japan is an important country. It is the third largest economy in the world and one of the ten most populous countries. South Korea is a newly industrialized country that has been a member of the OECD since 1996. The Philippines is a developing nation with a population of over 100 million people. The socioeconomic situations in these three countries vary widely. For comparative purposes, we also analyzed the USA, which has been the focus of previous studies.

Table 1 outlines the survey in each country. The survey spot, year, data source used in the extraction of the target, size of the target, survey method, sample size, number of valid responses, and response rate are summarized. For the survey of the USA, as different question items were employed in Washington, D. C. and Washington State, the data have been presented in two separate columns. All surveys were conducted as part of the JIGS project led by Yutaka Tsujinaka. In all countries except Japan, local researchers were in charge of the surveys.

The subject of the Japanese survey was “specified nonprofit corporation” in Japan. The “specified nonprofit corporation” is a nonprofit organization that is recognized as a juridical person via a certification from the government. There are several legal categories of nonprofit organizations in Japan, but this one is particularly appropriate for our study because it is a broad category, is most commonly associated with the idea of a “nonprofit organization,” and is most easily comparable to well-known groups, such as the 501(c)3 in the USA. As of December 2006, there were 23,403 specified nonprofit corporations in Japan. The survey was conducted from December 2006 to March 2007 via the postal service. All 23,403 specified nonprofit corporations formed the sample, and responses were received from 5127 specified nonprofit corporations. The survey response rate was 21.9%.

The South Korean survey was conducted by a team led by Jaeho Yeom of Korea University. The South Korean survey focused on specified nonprofit organizations registered in the central government, the provinces, and cities as of December 2007. The sample size was 7030. The survey was conducted from March 2008 to March 2009 through the postal service, fax, e-mail, and interviews. A total of 7030 specified nonprofit organizations comprised the sample, and responses were received from 425 organizations. The survey response rate was 6.0%.

The Philippines survey was conducted by a team led by Ma. Rosario Piquero-Balleascas of the University of the Philippines Visayas, Cebu College. The subject of the Philippines survey was civil society organizations in Manila and Cebu. Data from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Philippine Foundation Center (PFC), an umbrella NGO organization, were used as the

Table 1 Overview of the Survey

Country	Japan	South Korea	Philippines	USA	
City	Nationwide	Nationwide	Manila, Cebu	King County State of Washington	Metropolitan area Washington, DC
Year	2006–2007	2007–2008	2004–2005	2009	2010
Data Source	Registered organizations	Organizations directory (Nonprofits Organizations)	Organization databases made by research institutes (Securities and Exchange Commission and Philippine Foundation Center)	Washington secretary of state's list of registered nonprofit organizations in the state	Nonprofit organization database made by research institute (National Center for Charitable Statistics)
Size	23,403	7030	44,051	8000	10,581
Survey method	Postal service	Postal service, fax, e-mail, and interview	Interview	Postal service and telephone	
Sampling size	23,403	7030	5172	3983	3300
Valid response	5127	425	1014	1501	571
Response rate (%)	21.9	6.0	19.6	37.7	17.3

sampling frame for the survey. Foundations, trade unions, and religious, political, business, professional, and membership organizations were extracted, as these were civil society organizations. Also, only organizations with telephone numbers were extracted. The sample size was 5172. This survey was conducted from October 2004 to July 2005, and data were collected through interviews. Responses were received from 1014 organizations. The survey response rate was 19.6%.

The study in the USA was conducted by a team led by Robert Pekkanen and Steven Rathgeb Smith. The subject of the survey was nonprofit organizations in King County in Washington State and the metropolitan area of Washington, DC. The surveys in the two areas were conducted separately. Data from the Washington Secretary of State's list of registered nonprofit organizations in the state were used as the sampling frame for the King County survey. We extracted the names of those organizations whose contact information was available. The sample size was 3983. This survey was conducted from February to May 2009 via the postal service and telephone. Responses were received from 1501 organizations. The survey response rate was 37.7%. Data from the National Center for Charitable Statistics were used as the sampling frame for the DC Metropolitan area survey. Here, a total of 3300 organizations were randomly selected. The survey was conducted from January to July 2010 via the postal service and telephone. Responses were received from 571 organizations. The survey response rate was 17.3%.

Variables

Advocacy The dependent variable used in the analysis of this study is the presence or absence of nonprofit advocacy. Advocacy involves various activities (Reid 2006). Previous studies have analyzed one variable as advocacy (Child and Grønbjerg 2007; Mosley 2011; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013). Meanwhile, some studies have analyzed multiple advocacy activities as dependent variables (Chaves et al. 2004; Bass et al. 2007). This study analyzes the factors affecting advocacy itself, without regard for the type of advocacy. We integrated several advocacy activities into one variable for our analysis. In Japanese and South Korean data, we judge that nonprofit organizations engaged in advocacy when they offered policy motions, sent members to commissions, monitored policies, or made claims on the government. In the data from the Philippines, we judged that the organizations engaged in advocacy when they offered policy motions, sent members to commissions, participated in formulating plans, or lodged appeals in the budgetary process of the government. From the data derived from the USA, we judged that they engaged in advocacy when they appealed to the government, monitored policy, or attempted to influence policy.

Public Service The independent variables were the presence or absence of public services provided by nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit organizations enhance advocacy to the government through the network they build (Bass et al. 2007; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015). In the data regarding Japan and South

Korea, we judged that nonprofit organizations provide public services when they cooperate with the central government or local governments in the implementation of public policy. From the Philippines data, we judged that the nonprofit organizations provided public services when they forged a partnership with the central government or local governments around project implementation. From the data of the USA, we judged that the nonprofit organizations provided public services when they provide public services desired by the central government or local governments. We coded 1 if the organization was found to be providing public services and 0 if not.

Government Funding (Dummy) and Government Funding (Proportion) *Government Funding* was inserted as a control variable. The more government funding the nonprofit organizations receive, the better their advocacy to protect the resource or acquire more (Chaves et al. 2004; Child and Grønbjerg 2007; Almog-Bar and Schmid 2013; Neumayr et al. 2015). In previous studies, two types of government funding were introduced as independent variables. The first was the presence or absence of government funding, and this variable was added as a dummy variable (Chaves et al. 2004; Neumayr et al. 2015). The second was the proportion of government funding to the income of the organization (Chaves et al. 2004; Child and Grønbjerg 2007; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015). We used both types of variables to more optimally control the effect of government funding. This government funding comprised grants and contracts. Many previous studies examining the impact of government funding on advocacy have manipulated it without separating the two (Chaves et al. 2004; Child and Grønbjerg 2007; Schmid et al. 2008; Mosley 2010; 2011; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; Neumayr et al. 2015). One study, in which grants and contracts were broken down, revealed that grants and contracts have similar effects (Nicholson-Crotty 2009). The current study does not separate grants and contracts. In the surveys conducted in Japan, South Korea, and the USA, we asked respondents to reveal the percentage of government funding that was included in the organization's income. *Government Funding (Dummy)* was coded 0 if the proportion of government funding was 0 and 1 if not. *Government Funding (Proportion)* is a continuous variable, indicating the proportion of government funding to the income. In the Philippines survey, since only the presence or absence of government funding was known, *Government Funding (Dummy)* was used.

Staff, Budget, Year, Field, and Geographical Range In this analysis, the organizational characteristics that were used as control variables in previous studies were taken as control variables. In previous studies, staff and budget were used as indicators to measure the resources of the organizations (Chaves et al. 2004; Mosley 2011; Pekkanen and

Smith 2014b; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Neumayr et al. 2015). The organizations with resources used them to activate advocacy activities. A lack of resources operates as a constraining factor for advocacy (Bass et al. 2007; Almog-Bar and Schmid 2013). We used the budget amount of the organization and the number of full-time staff as control variables. In a previous study, it was pointed out that the oldest organizations were recognized by the government as legitimate, and they engaged in active advocacy (Almog-Bar and Schmid 2013). However, since questions on the establishment year were not included in the survey conducted in the metropolitan area in Washington DC, we did not use this variable in the analysis of this area. Furthermore, in previous studies, the field of activity and geographical range of organizations were used as control variables (Chaves et al. 2004; Child and Grønbjerg 2007; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Neumayr et al. 2015). The field and geographical range of the organization in which the organization engages are also control variables. Our survey included questions on the categories to which the organization belonged by providing field and geographical range. The types of fields surveyed vary slightly from one country to another. In Japan and South Korea, the survey asked about the activities of organizations that are stipulated in the laws of each country. In the Philippines, a question on group classification was included. In the USA, organizations were asked about their main policy areas of interest. A list of variables used in the *Field* and *Geographical Range* is provided in supplementary material. The first item in the table of supplementary material is defined as a reference category for both *Field* and *Geographical Range*. The number of organizational fields we present varies from one country to the next, but the maximum is 30 categories. A maximum of seven geographical ranges is provided. In this analysis, rather than adding all organizational characteristics mentioned earlier as variables, we chose them based on stepwise AIC (Yamashita et al. 2007). In the stepwise AIC method, the initial value of the step AIC function of R was used. Therefore, some variables do not appear in the table in which results are presented.

In this study, VIF was tested for the autocorrelation of variables used in the analysis. We output VIF for all models; the largest of which is 2.54 for *Government Funding (Proportion)* in Washington State. No variable had a VIF greater than 10.

Assumptions of the Analysis

Before conducting the logistic regression analysis, we reviewed the data and tested two assumptions of the analysis. This study identified *Public Service* and *Government Funding* as distinct variables and verified that

these variables affected advocacy activities differently. The first assumption was whether organizations exist whose *Public Service* and *Government Funding* do not match. We verified the extent to which the data from Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA showed disparities between *Public Service* and *Government Funding*. The second assumption pertained to the validity of our hypothesis. We assumed that the positive effect of *Public Service* on *Advocacy* was due to the network provided by *Public Service* and the positive effect of *Government Funding* on *Advocacy* was due to the resources obtained through *Government Funding*. We evaluated whether this assumption was validated by the data. We had to consider the issue with internal validity in this verification. In our hypothesis, nonprofit organizations that provide public services enhance advocacy activities by building a network with the government. However, it is possible that nonprofit organizations have already established a network with the government such that they provide public services and engage in advocacy activities. Therefore, the problem of internal validity was addressed by analyzing only those nonprofit organizations that had not contacted the government for 10 years leading up to the survey period. In the Japanese survey, respondents were asked to rate their frequency of contact with government officials over the last 10 years using a 5-point scale. We concluded that there had been no contact when the answer was Never or Seldom. We examined the validity of the second assumption based on the data from Japan by asking about the frequency of contact over the 10 years leading up to the survey.

First, we pointed out that there are organizations that provide public services even though they do not receive government funding. This was illustrated using data from Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA. In this section, we present the percentage of organizations in which the two variables do not match. We evaluated the number of organizations in which government funding and the provision of public services did not match. Table 2 is a crosstabulation of *Government Funding* and *Public Service*. In the survey, details pertaining to the income of the organization were requested. We determined an answer of “No” for *Government Funding* when the proportion of government funding to the organization’s income was 0%. Otherwise, it was “Yes.” The survey also included questions on whether the organization had provided public services. We determined an answer of “No” for *Public Service* when the organization did not provide public services. Organizations can be categorized into four types under *Government Funding* and *Public Service*. We named the group that received *Government Funding* and provided *Public Service* as the “funded-public service” type. The number of this type was low in the Philippines (4.2%) but was 17.8% in Japan, 34.7% in South Korea, 36.3% in

Washington State, and 38.0% in Washington DC. The groups that did not receive *Government Funding* and did not provide *Public Service* were classified as the “unfunded-no public service” type. This type occupied 73.6% of the cases in the Philippines, 42.5% in Japan, 28.2% in South Korea, 36.6% in Washington State, and 37.2% in Washington DC. The groups that did not receive *Government Funding* and provided *Public Service* were classified as the “unfunded-public service” type. The groups that received *Government Funding* but did not provide *Public Service* were named the “funded-no public service” type. The organizations classified into the “unfunded-public service” and “funded-no public service” types were found to be inconsistent with *Government Funding* and *Public Services*. These organizations accounted for 39.6% in Japan, 37.1% in South Korea, 22.2% in the Philippines, 27.1% in the State of Washington, and 24.6% in Washington DC. The data revealed that *Public Service* and *Government Funding* did not match for some organizations.

Next, we tested the validity of the hypothesis. Table 3 presents the average value of the organization’s resources, the percentage of organizations with networks, and the percentage of organizations engaging in advocacy for each of the four types in Japan. In a previous study, it was pointed out that resources, such as the number of staff and the organization’s budget, influence advocacy (Chaves et al. 2004; Mosley 2011; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Neumayr et al. 2015). This survey requested the number of full-time staff and the organization’s budget. In the survey, respondents were asked to rate the frequency of contact with government officials at the time of the survey on a 5-point scale. The choices were “never,” “seldom,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “very often.” We judged that there had been contact when the answer was “sometimes,” “often,” or “very often.” Table 3 suggests that only those organizations that had not contacted the government for 10 years leading up to the time of the survey were analyzed to address the problem of internal validity.

According to the data presented in Table 3, there are differences in the number of resources and the ratio of building a network depending on the organization type. The organizations classified as “funded-public service” and “funded-no public service” types and *Government Funding* have more full-time staff and a larger budget. Since organizations that receive *Government Funding* have more resources, it is expected that advocacy will be enhanced to obtain even more resources. The organizations that provide public services are in contact with the government frequently and tend to build a network with it. These organizations are expected to utilize the network to

Table 2 Percentage of group type

		Public service	
		Yes	No
Japan N = 1412			
Government funding	Yes	Funded-public service type 17.8%	Funded-no public service type 32.4%
	No	Unfunded-public service type 7.2%	Unfunded-no public service type 42.5%
South Korea N = 401			
		Public Service	
		Yes	No
Government funding	Yes	Funded-public service type 34.7%	Funded-no public service type 29.4%
	No	Unfunded-public service type 7.7%	Unfunded-no public service type 28.2%
Philippines N = 890			
		Public Service	
		Yes	No
Government funding	Yes	Funded-public service type 4.2%	Funded-no public service type 5.7%
	No	Unfunded-public service type 16.5%	Unfunded-no public service type 73.6%
USA (State of Washington) N = 369			
		Public service	
		Yes	No
Government funding	Yes	Funded-public service type 36.3%	Funded-no public service type 9.5%
	No	Unfunded-public service type 17.6%	Unfunded-no public service type 36.6%
USA (Washington, DC) N = 387			
		Public service	
		Yes	No
Government funding	Yes	Funded-public service type 38.0%	Funded-no public service type 14.2%
	No	Unfunded-public service type 10.6%	Unfunded-no public service type 37.2%

Table 3 Organization's resources, networks, and advocacy by group type

Organization type	Full-time staff	Budget (ten thousand Yen)	Contact (%)	Advocacy (%)
Funded-public service type	3.57	2653	95	95
Unfunded-public service type	0.25	234	75	88
Funded-no public service type	3.37	2913	55	63
Unfunded-no public service type	2.15	1253	23	34
Total	2.74	2086	49	57
N	148	153	150	155

engage in advocacy activities. The validity of our hypothesis is revealed by the data.

Public Service has a positive impact on advocacy activities and controls for the influence of *Government*

Funding. A comparison of the organizations classified as “funded-public service” and “funded-no public service” types did not reveal any major differences in resources, but a difference was found in terms of the organization’s network with the government; further, it was revealed that the “funded-public service” type of organization is more active in advocacy activities. When comparing the “unfunded-public service” and “unfunded-no public service” types, the organizations classified as “unfunded-no public service” were found to have more resources than “unfunded-public service” organizations. However, the “unfunded-public service” organizations have more networks than “unfunded-no public service” organizations, and the rate of advocacy activities is also high. The next section presents the results and confirms whether *Public Service* has a positive impact on *Advocacy* even after introducing control variables.

Results

Public Service has a positive effect on advocacy in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA. Table 4 presents the results of the logistic regression analysis for advocacy in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines. Table 5 presents the results of the logistic regression analysis for advocacy in the USA. Model 1 uses all variables, including *Public Service*. Model 2 does not include *Public Service*, as in previous studies. We interpreted the results of Model 1. *Public Service* has statistically significant results in all countries. The odds ratio is 5.173 in Japan, 8.590 in South Korea 3.483 in the Philippines, 3.150 in Washington State, and 2.067 in Washington DC. This means that, for example, in nonprofit organizations that provide public services in Japan, the ratio of advocacy activities is 5.173 times that of nonprofit organizations that do not provide public services.

The effectiveness of *Government Funding* as a control variable varies by country and region. In Japan and the Philippines, *Government Funding* has a positive effect on advocacy. In Japan and the Philippines, *Government Funding (Dummy)* has statistically significant results. The odds ratio is 1.981 in Japan and 2.904 in the Philippines. Both ratios are lower than the odds ratio of public services, but these have a positive effect. In South Korea, *Government Funding* was not found to be statistically significant. *Government Funding* has neither a positive nor a negative effect on advocacy in South Korea. *Government Funding* has a negative effect in Washington State. In Washington State, *Government Funding (Proportion)* has a statistically significant result, and the odds ratio is 0.163. Conversely, in Washington DC, *Government Funding (Dummy)* has a positive effect and the odds ratio is 2.333. The effect of

Government Funding in Washington State is different than that found in previous studies. Previous studies analyzing advocacy in the USA suggested that government funding had a positive effect on advocacy (Chaves et al. 2004; Bass et al. 2007; MacIndoe and Whalen 2013; Pekkanen and Smith 2014b).

To compare the findings of this study with that of a previous study that did not use *Public Service* as a variable, an analysis excluding *Public Service* was carried out using Model 2. We interpreted the results of Model 2 as follows. *Government Funding (Dummy)* was found to have a positive effect, not only in Washington DC but also in Washington State. Furthermore, in Japan, the Philippines, and Washington DC, *Government Funding (Dummy)* had a positive effect but the odds ratio declined in Model 2 when compared to Model 1. The odds ratio for *Government Funding (Dummy)* declined from 2.349 to 1.981 in Japan, from 3.390 to 2.904 in the Philippines, and from 2.975 to 2.333 in Washington DC. In other words, it is possible that the previous study that examined the effectiveness of *Government Funding* without using *Public Service* may have overestimated the positive effect of *Government Funding*. In comparing the goodness of fit for Models 1 and 2, AIC is found to be lower in Model 1 than in Model 2 in all countries. The results suggest that Model 1, which uses *Public Service* as a variable, explains the factors for nonprofit advocacy more effectively.

Other control variables also revealed different effects on advocacy activities in different countries. *Year* influenced both Japan and Washington State, as older organizations are revealed as more vocal advocates. *Staff* has an impact in South Korea, in which it was revealed that the lower the number of full-time staff, the greater the advocacy. *Field* affects Japan, the Philippines, Washington State, and Washington DC. The extent to which the policy field affects advocacy activities varies from one country to another. *Geographical Range* affected Japan, Washington State, and Washington DC, and the extent to which advocacy activities are affected varies by country. However, nonprofit organizations that are internationally active in these countries tend not to advocate with their governments.

Conclusion

In this study, we investigated the impact of public service and government funding on nonprofit advocacy. We introduced a conceptual distinction between nonprofit organizations that engage in public service and those that receive government funding: all nonprofit organizations that receive government funding are engaged in some public service activity by definition, but not all groups that

Table 4 Logistic regression for nonprofit advocacy in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines

	Japan					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Public service	1.643	0.192	5.173***			
Government Funding (Dummy)	0.684	0.189	1.981***	0.854	0.183	2.349***
Government Funding (Proportion)	0.559	0.304	1.748	0.666	0.293	1.946*
Budget	1.9E-05	2.19E-05	1.0000E+00	2.431E-05	2.343E-05	1.0000E+00
Year	- 0.020	0.007	0.980**	- 0.017	0.007	0.983*
Field						
Community planning	0.685	0.232	1.984**	0.806	0.223	2.240***
Culture/sport	- 0.528	0.231	0.590*	- 0.423	0.218	0.655
Environment	0.644	0.246	1.905**	0.723	0.240	2.060**
Disaster relief	1.640	1.094	5.156	1.998	1.106	7.373
Human rights/peace				0.869	0.573	2.384
Gender equality	13.070	332.200	4.7667E+05	14.030	339.000	1.2345E+06
Economic activity	- 1.004	0.684	0.367			
Organization building				0.860	0.597	2.362
Geographical range						
Prefectures	0.267	0.167	1.306	0.367	0.160	1.443*
International	- 0.599	0.283	0.550*	- 0.613	0.276	0.542*
Constant	38.790	13.800	7.0104E+16**	32.770	13.240	1.7062E+14*
Nagelkerke R square		0.276			0.190	
AIC		1286.7			1372.2	
Observations		1107			1107	

	South Korea					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Public service	2.151	0.404	8.590***			
Government Funding (Dummy)	0.239	0.386	1.270	0.504	0.368	1.655
Government Funding (Proportion)	- 0.335	0.719	0.716	0.284	0.691	1.328
Full-time staff	- 0.016	0.007	0.984*	- 0.014	0.006	0.986*
Budget				2.056E-10	1.635E-10	1.000
Year	0.011	0.007	1.011	0.010	0.009	1.010
Field						
Disaster relief	- 1.746	0.971	0.175	- 1.860	0.895	0.156*
Human rights/peace	1.005	0.583	2.733	1.097	0.585	2.994
Gender equality	1.424	1.084	4.152	1.425	1.054	4.157
Information-oriented society	15.260	1106.000	4.2351E+06			
Child care				- 0.990	0.635	3.7152E-01
Economic activity	15.300	842.300	4.4271E+06	15.320	901.300	4.4848E+06
Constant		14.100	2.9985E-10	- 19.730	16.980	2.7030E-09
Nagelkerke R square		0.267			0.127	
AIC		332.37			369.89	
Observations		355			355	

Table 4 continued

	Philippines					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Public service	1.248	0.258	3.483***			
Government Funding (Dummy)	1.066	0.355	2.904**	1.221	0.341	3.390***
Field						
Economic activity	0.657	0.439	1.930			
Trade	-16.030	-1160.071	1.0917E-07	-16.364	1142.439	7.8241E-08
Education	-0.847	0.457	0.429	-0.761	0.428	0.467
Political	16.584	964.192	1.5928E+07	16.786	1030.798	1.9505E+07
Foreign	17.424	2399.545	3.6904E+07	17.139	2399.545	2.7763E+07
Religion	-1.141	0.330	0.320***	-1.345	0.324	0.261***
Art/scholarship/sports	-1.100	0.670	0.333	-0.946	0.630	0.388
Geographical range						
Provincial				0.684	0.419	1.981
National	0.545	0.323	1.725	0.883	0.306	2.42E+00**
Constant	-0.858	0.158	0.424***	-0.573	0.139	0.564***
Nagelkerke R square		0.251			0.193	
AIC		493.96			521.04	
Observations		424			430	

*** 0.001; **0.01; *0.05

provide public services receive government funding. In addition, this study sheds new light on the importance of organizational identity by correcting the erroneous conflation of public services provision and the receipt of government funding. In Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, and the USA, nonprofit organizations that are service providers are more likely to be engaged in advocacy, even controlling for government funding. This is an important finding because it suggests the importance of the role played by a service provider's mission/identity in determining whether an organization engages in advocacy. It also provides the grounds for investigating the importance of organizational identity or mission (as service providers) in other areas that have been obscured by the conflation of public service provision and the receipt of government funding.

We examined the effect of nonprofit organizations' public service provision on nonprofit advocacy in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and the USA through empirical analysis. It should be noted that the operationalization of public service provision varies slightly from one country to another, but in all cases it covers the actual provision of public services by nonprofit organizations. The logistic regression analysis using JIGS data revealed that providing public services had a positive effect on advocacy in all four countries. Nonprofit organizations build connections or networks with the government

through the provision of public services (Fyall 2016). In fact, when verifying the data in Japan, nonprofit organizations providing public services were found to have more contact with the government than nonprofit organizations that did not provide public services. Nonprofit organizations can utilize this network to promote advocacy and influence public policy. Chin (2018) points out that the quality of advocacy by nonprofit organizations improves through daily interactions with clients and the service bureaucracy when these organizations provide public services. However, our study did not analyze in detail the mechanism regarding how the provision of public services leads to nonprofit advocacy. The relationship between public service provision and advocacy activities requires further study and could prove to be an interesting topic for the future research.

This study did analyze government funding, which has been positioned as the main independent variable for nonprofit advocacy in previous studies, but treated it as a control variable. Government funding yielded a positive effect on advocacy in Japan, the Philippines, and Washington DC in the USA. Several previous studies equated the provision of public services with the receipt of government funding. In this study, we distinguished between public service and government funding and examined the effect of each factor on advocacy. Using data from Washington State in the USA, we found that government

Table 5 Logistic regression for nonprofit advocacy in the USA

	State of Washington					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Public service	1.147	0.370	3.150**			
Government Funding (Dummy)	0.726	0.510	2.068	0.986	0.487	2.681*
Government Funding (Proportion)	- 1.814	0.839	0.163*	- 1.261	0.787	0.283
Year	- 0.029	0.009	0.971***	- 0.025	0.008	0.975**
Field						
Trade	2.452	1.475	11.613	2.482	1.459	11.966
Foreign	- 4.778	1.659	0.008**	- 3.482	1.309	0.031**
Peace/security	1.888	1.180	6.609			
Justice/human rights	0.707	0.411	2.029			
Crime prevention				1.108	0.579	3.027
Education	- 0.720	0.335	0.487*	- 0.606	0.325	0.546
Agriculture/fishing	17.869	708.975	5.7579E+07	17.749	717.399	5.1076E+07
Consumer rights/advocacy	1.388	0.793	4.009	1.715	0.783	5.554*
Art/scholarship/sports	- 0.681	0.414	0.506	- 0.779	0.395	0.459*
Organization building	0.839	0.506	2.315	0.861	0.507	2.366
Religion	- 2.486	0.747	0.083***	- 2.102	0.692	0.122**
Geographical range						
Seattle	- 1.679	0.574	0.187**	- 1.022	0.536	0.360
King County				0.751	0.449	2.119
Pacific Northwest Region	- 0.827	0.458	0.437			
National	2.141	1.251	8.510	2.893	1.383	18.051*
International	- 1.402	0.586	0.246*	- 1.129	0.578	0.323
Constant	59.804	17.565	9.3868E+25***	51.538	16.521	2.4139E+22**
Nagelkerke R square		0.376			0.335	
AIC		297			304.89	
Observations		355			355	
	Washington, DC					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Public service	0.726	0.329	2.067*			
Government Funding (Dummy)	0.847	0.397	2.333*	1.090	0.381	2.975**
Government Funding (Proportion)	- 0.419	0.555	0.658	- 0.228	0.540	0.796
Full-time staff	0.005	0.004	1.006	0.006	0.004	1.006
Field						
Fiscal	1.735	0.539	5.669**	1.621	0.533	5.058**
Industry promotion	1.591	0.737	4.909*	1.336	0.754	3.803
Construction/public works	- 1.564	0.770	0.209*	- 1.467	0.784	0.231
Traffic/transportation	1.441	0.647	4.225*	1.281	0.651	3.602*
Foreign	1.471	0.661	4.355*	1.208	0.716	3.348
Justice/human rights	0.578	0.385	1.783			
Peace/security				1.090	0.714	2.976
Gender	1.410	0.630	4.095*	1.406	0.633	4.079*
Local politics	1.646	0.590	5.188**	1.694	0.578	5.440**
Labor				1.062	0.753	2.892

Table 5 continued

	Washington, DC					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios	<i>b</i>	SE	Odds ratios
Arts and culture	– 1.230	0.396	0.292**	– 1.322	0.401	0.267***
Sports and recreation	– 1.023	0.572	0.359	– 0.821	0.566	0.440
Other	– 0.577	0.330	0.562	– 0.554	0.329	0.575
Geographical range						
Metro area	– 1.215	0.383	0.297**	– 1.096	0.374	0.334**
Northern VA or Montgomery and PG counties	– 1.282	0.628	0.278*	– 1.096	0.622	0.334
Maryland or Virginia	– 1.734	0.781	0.177*	– 1.484	0.765	0.227
National	0.864	0.401	2.374*	0.810	0.392	2.248*
International	– 0.937	0.471	0.392*	– 1.064	0.462	0.345*
Constant	– 0.471	0.317	0.624	– 0.293	0.301	0.746
Nagelkerke R square		0.440			0.433	
AIC		392.08			394.59	
Observations		360			360	

***0.001; **0.01; *0.05

funding had a negative effect on advocacy. However, when we used government funding as an independent variable without using public services provision, we found that government funding had a positive effect on advocacy. Furthermore, in Japan, the Philippines, and Washington DC, the models using public services as a variable had lower odds ratios for government funding than those models that did not include public services. This study compared the models in four countries and revealed the possibility that previous studies using only government funding as an independent variable may have excessively estimated the effect of this variable. This is significant, as it would force us to reconsider the importance of organizational identity as service providers, while relatively discounting the centrality of government funding for advocacy.

This study revealed the relationship between nonprofit organizations and the governments in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines, as well as the USA, which has been the subject of many previous studies. It has been argued that the relationship between nonprofit organizations and the government in authoritarian countries, such as China and Russia, differs from that of democratic countries (Pickvance 1998; Han 2015). Moreover, even among democratic countries, the relationship between nonprofit organizations and the government varies from one country to another. Pekkanen (2006) pointed out that Japanese civil society comprises many small, local groups, and only a few large, professionally managed national-level organizations exist. As a result, relatively few organizations engage in advocacy activities in Japan. Thus, the institutional context

differs from one country to another and the character of the civil society also varies. This study illustrates that a service provider's organizational identity has a positive impact on advocacy activities in four countries: Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, and the USA. Because we expect the national setting to impact organizational identity, further comparative research is required to examine this relationship further.¹

As a possible next step, we consider that the elements of organizational identity might also be influenced by the era in which an organization was formed (Child and Grønberg 2007). An analysis of data from Japan and Washington State in the USA suggests that older organizations are more active in advocacy. In both Japan and the USA, the 1960s and early 1970s were highly conflictual times and the 1980s was a relatively less conflictual decade for civil society. The culture of the era in which the nonprofit organizations were founded may shape its organizational identity and could therefore influence nonprofit advocacy.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Jaeho Yeom, Director of the Korean Survey, Rosario Piquero-Ballescás, Director of the Philippines survey, and Steven Rathgeb Smith, Co-director of the United States survey. The authors also would like to thank Haruya Sakamoto and Tatsuaki Kobayashi for their feedback and insight.

¹ Two studies conducted in Sweden have found that service providers are less likely to criticize the government (Arvidson et al. 2018a) and also that Swedish CSOs draw on various advocacy strategies, the selection of which influences criticism of the government (Arvidson et al. 2018b). This suggests that the national context is important in shaping the organizational identity. Further comparative analysis could contribute to augmenting our understanding of these issues.

Funding This work was supported by The University of the Ryukyus Foundation “Grant-in-Aid for International Joint Research” and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16H01996. The surveys were supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Nos. JP22223001, JP17002001.

References

- Almog-Bar, M., & Schmid, H. (2013). Advocacy activities of nonprofit human service organizations: A critical review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(1), 11–35.
- Arvidson, M., Johansson, H., & Scaramuzzino, R. (2018a). Advocacy compromised: How financial, organizational and institutional factors shape advocacy strategies of civil society organizations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29(4), 844–856.
- Arvidson, M., Scaramuzzino, R., Johansson, H., & Meeuwisse, A. (2018b). A Swedish culture of advocacy?: Civil society organisations’ strategies for political influence. *Sociologisk Forskning*, 55(2–3), 341–364.
- Bass, G. D., Arons, D. F., Guinane, K., Carter, M. F., & Rees, S. (2007). *Seen but not heard: Strengthening nonprofit advocacy*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Berry, J. M., & Arons, D. F. (2003). *A voice for nonprofits*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Chaves, M., Stephens, L., & Galaskiewicz, J. (2004). Does government funding suppress nonprofits’ political activity? *American Sociological Review*, 69(2), 292–316.
- Child, C. D., & Grønbjerg, K. A. (2007). Nonprofit advocacy organizations: Their characteristics and activities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 88(1), 259–281.
- Chin, J. J. (2018). Service-providing nonprofits working in coalition to advocate for policy change. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(1), 27–48.
- Dunleavy, P., & Hood, C. (1994). From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money & Management*, 14(3), 9–16.
- Furneau, C., & Ryan, N. (2014). Modelling NPO–government Relations: Australian case studies. *Public Management Review*, 16(8), 1113–1140.
- Fyall, R. (2016). The power of nonprofits: mechanisms for nonprofit policy influence. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 938–948.
- Fyall, R. (2017). Nonprofits as advocates and providers: A conceptual framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(1), 121–143.
- Garrow, E. E., & Hasenfeld, Y. (2014). Institutional logics, moral frames, and advocacy: Explaining the purpose of advocacy among nonprofit human-service organizations. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(1), 80–98.
- Gazley, B., & Brudney, L. J. (2007). The purpose (and perils) of government-nonprofit partnership. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(3), 389–415.
- Han, J. (2015). Government-NPO relations in service procurement: Quasi-corporatist and quasi-pluralist practices and challenges in China. *The China Nonprofit Review*, 7, 90–109.
- Knutsen, W. L. (2017). Retaining the benefits of government–nonprofit contracting relationship: Opposites attract or clash? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(4), 1373–1398.
- Lu, J. (2018). Fear the government? A meta-analysis of the impact of government funding on nonprofit advocacy engagement. *American Review of Public Administration*, 48(3), 203–218.
- MacIndoe, H., & Whalen, R. (2013). Specialists, generalists, and policy advocacy by charitable nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 40(2), 119–149.
- Mosley, J. E. (2010). Organizational resources and environmental incentives: Understanding the policy advocacy involvement of human service nonprofits. *Social Service Review*, 84(1), 57–76.
- Mosley, J. E. (2011). Institutionalization, privatization, and political opportunity: What tactical choices reveal about the policy advocacy of human service nonprofits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(3), 435–457.
- Nabatchi, T., & Sancino, A. (2017). Varieties of participation in public services: The who, when, and what of coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, 77(5), 766–776.
- Neumayr, M., Schneider, U., & Meyer, M. (2015). Public funding and its impact on nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(2), 297–318.
- Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2009). The stages and strategies of advocacy among nonprofit reproductive health providers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 1044–1053.
- Pekkanen, R. J. (2006). *Japan’s Dual Civil Society: Members Without Advocates*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pekkanen, R. J., & Smith, S. R. (2014a). Nonprofit advocacy: Definitions and concepts. In R. J. Pekkanen, S. R. Smith, & Y. Tsujinaka (Eds.), *Nonprofits & Advocacy: Engaging Community and Government in an Era of Retrenchment* (pp. 1–17). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pekkanen, R. J., & Smith, S. R. (2014b). Nonprofit advocacy in Seattle and Washington, DC. In R. J. Pekkanen, S. R. Smith, & Y. Tsujinaka (Eds.), *Nonprofits & Advocacy: Engaging Community and Government in an Era of Retrenchment* (pp. 47–65). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pickvance, K. (1998). Democracy and grassroots opposition in Eastern Europe: Hungary and Russia compared. *The Sociological Review*, 46(2), 187–207.
- Reid, E. J. (2006). Advocacy and the challenges it presents for nonprofits. In E. T. Boris & C. E. Steuerle (Eds.), *Nonprofits and Government: Collaboration and Conflict* (2nd ed., pp. 343–371). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Schmid, H., Bar, M., & Nirel, R. (2008). Advocacy activities in nonprofit human service organizations: Implications for policy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37(4), 581–602.
- Skelcher, C. (2007). Public–private partnerships and hybridity. In E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn Jr., & C. Pollitt (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Public Management* (pp. 347–370). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, S. R. (2008). The challenge of strengthening nonprofits and civil society. *Public Administration Review*, 68(s1), S132–S145.
- Yamashita, T., Yamashita, K., & Kamimura, R. (2007). A stepwise AIC method for variable selection in linear regression. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 36(13), 2395–2403.
- Yanagi, I., & Kobashi, Y. (2017). Gyōsei to Kyōdō suru Dantai ha Gyōsei wo Tōsei shinainoka (Does not a group participating in the policy implementation process participate in the policy making process?). *Leviathan*, 61, 137–156.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.