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Abstract

Developing partnerships is a crucial strategy for Community based organizations (CBOs) to maximize service capacity, serve clients of diverse needs, and compete for funding, yet the evidence is scant. The study asks whether organizational networking is helpful to a CBOs’ service performance and whether the effect of networking varies by certain organizational features of a CBO. The research framework is built with the literature review of social capital theories with a focus of organizations, community practice models, and case studies on CBOs’ networking. Two forms of networking, within and beyond community, are hypothesized as associated with two traits of performance, effectiveness of carrying out the services and innovation regarding the long-term service development when organization factors including leadership, community capacity, and funding sources are controlled. Furthermore, the moderation effects of those organization factors are included and examined.

Using a secondary survey dataset of 640 community development associations in Taiwan, the results of the multiple regression analysis show that networking beyond community enhances a CBOs’ effectiveness as well as innovation. Networking within community is found negatively associated with the overall performance probably because of the potential tension between a CBO and political entities in the same neighborhood. In addition, the study finds the desirable effects of organization networking vary by the organization factors. Networking beyond community enhances effectiveness of a CBO; such effect is strengthened by leadership and weakened by community capacity. Within-community networking leads to effectiveness improvement only for CBOs having mixed funding sources. Practice suggestions are made according to the findings for CBOs and
potential funders of their partnership development in societies like Taiwan where CBOs’ networking is developing and mostly informal. Implications about applying a social capital perspective in community practice and none-European-American societies are discussed.
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Introduction

*Importance of Networking for Community Based Organizations*

Facing the withdrawing role of government in social welfare all over the world, community based organizations (CBOs) become increasingly important contributors to the care of local residents in need because of their understanding of community needs, flexibilities of integrating resources, and grassroots advocacy actions (O'Donnell, 1993; Powell & Clemens, 1998; Sommerfeld & Reisch, 2003; Abramovitz, 2005; Oakley, 2006; O'Toole, Dennis, Kilpatrick, & Farmer, 2010). Developing partnerships with other organizations is a crucial strategy for CBOs to expand their range of services and respond proactively to the competitive environment (Salamon, 1993; Veeder, 1999). It is particularly important for CBOs that are small and rely on volunteers to make external connections for access to information, diverse expertise, and resources (Mulroy & Shay, 1998; Byrne & Hansberry, 2007). Networking is also an essential strategy for CBOs to proactively respond to the complex nature of individual needs.

Many initiatives are meant to develop networks among CBOs in order to leverage resources and fulfill clients’ various and multiple needs that are beyond a single agency’s capacity. For example, the regional dementia care networks in Canada fill the service delivery gaps of the member agencies by building shared databases, contributing resources to joint projects, or collaboratively conducting research and service planning (Lemieux-Charles, Chambers, Cockerill, Jaglal, Brazil, Cohen, et al, 2005). Moreover, many sponsors of social services, public or private, have been encouraging or mandating inter-organizational approaches to address complex community needs such as the funding...
packages of youth education services (in Byrne & Hansberry, 2007) and child abuse prevention (in Mulroy & Shay, 1998) in the United States.

Networking of CBOs even has been adopted at the national policy level as a solution for social problems beyond single client population or service category. A recent example is the New Deal for Communities in England from 1998 to 2007. Organizational networking was the core strategy of the British Labour Government to alleviate social exclusion problems in 39 areas where problems of employment, education, housing, health and crime were serious (Lawless, 2004; Lawless, Foden, Wilson, & Beatty, 2010). The Government carefully organized local partnerships of governmental departments, companies, voluntary groups, and community organizations to make decisions of social service structure and delivery (Wright, Parry, Mathers, Jones, & Orford, 2006).

In addition, a movement promoting partnership of CBOs had emerged from the fields of social work and public health, drawing heavily on social capital theories (Hutchinson, Vidal, Putnam, Light, de Souza Briggs, Rohe, et al., 2004; McNeely, 1999). The concept of social capital in general refers to the social networks and norms that facilitate reciprocal interaction amongst people (Putnam, 2000). It is the construct conceptualizing the resourceful potentiality of personal and organizational networks which are important sources of community capacity to make community change (Chaskin, 2001; Chaskin, Goerge, Skyles, & Guiltinan, 2006). The belief is that civic engagement through voluntary associations would cultivate social networks and interpersonal trust, mobilize effective collective actions that bring out individual and social benefits, and eventually feed back into civic engagement motivation (Rohe, 2004). In other words, the theory assumes that networking among individuals and organizations
in a community builds social capital and social capital further advances development of the community.

*Community Based Organizations and Their Networking in Taiwan*

In Taiwan, voluntary groups of religion, leisure, public issues and charity started to pop up and gradually took the role of mediating individuals and the state when democracy was rapidly emerging in 1990s (Chang, 1997; Chen & Chian, 2005; Wong, 2003; Wu, 2004). CBOs have been partners with the government since the provision of social services started transferring from the central government to local governments and non-profit organizations in 1995 (Hwang, Hsiao, & Liu, 2009). Initiating partnerships among CBOs was extremely difficult in the early experimental stage because the CBOs lacked experience and capacity to work collaboratively and community leaders had competing interests and turf issues (Shih & Song, 1999; Hwang, 1999). These challenges are still common, but the CBOs in Taiwan widely recognize the importance of networking to sustain a variety of funding, expertise and volunteers (Hwang, Chuang, & Liu, 2011; Hwang & Liu, 2009; Lai, 2010; Wang, 2007). Unlike the advanced development in Canada, America, and England mentioned earlier, formal partnerships among CBOs in Taiwan are only seen in short-term events such as disaster relief (e.g. Wang, Chao, & Hsu, 2011), policy advocacy (e.g. Luo, 2001), and mandated protective services (e.g. for older adults in Liu, 2004). Also, there is no policy mandate or private funder systematically utilizing partnership development to improve CBOs’ service performance.

Noticeably, a large number of CBOs are named as the Community Development Association (CDA) in Taiwan. These CDAs share a common history in Taiwan’s
community development policy. Community development had been an approach of implementing social welfare policies since “community development committees” were financially and politically supported by the Taiwan government for construction, health education, child care, and many public affairs at the neighborhood level in 1965 (in Lai, 2010; Lin & Shen, 2008). In the 1990s, community based programs started booming in national policies for culture preservation, social services, public health, and adult education (Hwang, Liu, Chuang, & Lin, 2010; Hwang et al, 2011). At approximately the same time, related laws were amended for the government to properly monitor accountability of the groups carrying out these services and receiving public funding. The law, Regulations on the Work of Community Development, was announced in 1991 and amended in 1999. It officially defines a community as the geographical neighborhood for municipal administration and demands the township, city or district offices to support every community in developing its own CDA. The purpose is so that

the residents in a community, based on their common needs, own initiatives, and the virtue of mutual aid, match with the administrative support and technical guidance provided by the government to effectively utilize various resources to carry out integrated construction, so as to improve the life quality of the residents in the community (Article 2).

Afterwards, CDAs have been initiated from scratch or reorganized from existing groups with similar functions. They generally provide a variety of services to community residents such as traditional charity (e.g. disaster relief, home visit to the poor, and food pantry on holidays), leisure groups, and adult learning programs. For the overall organization performance, the central government hosts an evaluation program. The
participating CDAs receive assessment and suggestions from the experts. The grading rank of the evaluation is open to the public and offers a reference for potential funders of the CDAs.

The program of Community Primary Care Units is a typical example in social services demonstrating the relationships between the government and CBOs in Taiwan. In 2005, the national Six Stars Plan integrated government supports for CBOs’ six major functions, including social services, community watch, area business renovation, nature reservation, culture and education, and living environment improvement. Community Primary Care Units was the core program in social services. There were 1,598 units held by CBOs providing home visits or telephone checkups, group meals, and health activities for older adults in their neighborhoods in 2009. Most of these CBOs were CDAs (Ministry of Interior, 2010). The CBOs applied for funding with the local governments, passed the review, and received funding, annual evaluations, consultation, trainings, and regional supervision from the local governments. The government funds are generally performance based, require alternative funding source raised by the applicants, and come with accountability requirements. However, the CBOs don’t necessarily compete with other CBOs since at times a community does not have its own CDA, its own CDA is inactive, or other CBOs in/near the community are not interested in primary care or serving older adults. As to networking with other organizations, the CBOs involved in the Community Primary Care Units may or may not maintain relationships with other organizations besides the local government and the local government may or may not facilitate the collaboration across the CBOs. Some of the CBOs intensively absorb information (e.g. skills of grant writing and reimbursement) and resources (e.g. give-
away gifts and experts that can be invited as guest speakers in wellness activities) from local groups, while some maintain partnerships with national organizations or only the government funders (Chen, 2013).

**The Research Questions**

Despite this push to promote partnerships of CBOs all over the world, little evidence articulating the effects of organizational networking on organization performance has been presented. The systematic literature review of Jones, Crook, and Webb (2007) concluded there was a lack of rigorous empirical studies on best practices in collaborative relationships and few empirical studies specified theories supporting their methodology or research hypothesis. For example, the ideal cycle that community development builds social capital and social capital further advances community development does not always happen in practice (e.g. case studies of Bolda, Lowe, Maddox, & Patnaik, 2005; Marwell, 2004; Ohmer & Korr, 2006). Numerous barriers against the desired effect of organizational networking have been found in case studies such as a history of competition among CBOs, poor leadership, unstable membership, relying on government funding, and lacking incentive to cooperate due to rich resources (Griffin & Floyd, 2006; Lemieux-Charles et al., 2005; Nemon, 2007). These barriers and many other factors have not been integrated in social capital theories to reflect the challenges in community practice. Therefore, the dissertation aims to fill the existing gap in the research by specifying the relationship between organizational networking and service performance of CBOs.

To be noted, CBOs in this dissertation refer to the non-governmental, non-profit, and voluntary groups that are oriented to serve the needs of community residents. These
organizations are non-governmental but they may accept public funding to deliver government programs such as community care for the elderly. Being non-profits, CBOs are motivated to maximize their activities to reach their altruistic missions because the difference between cost and revenue cannot be distributed to any individuals (Galaskiewicz, Bielefeld, & Myron, 2006, pp. 339-342). Additionally, the CBOs of interest are voluntary groups that utilize volunteers in decision making boards and daily operational activities with or without paid workers. These CBOs provide a way for people to participate in local affairs and deepen civic engagement by improving participants’ self-efficacy, service effectiveness, and sense of the community (Ohmer, 2007).

The dissertation aims to answer two questions. (1) Does organizational networking benefit organization performance of a CBO? In specific, what kind of organizational networking leads to what aspect of performance improvement? (2) Knowing the desirable effects of organizational networking on organization performance does not always occur, what are the factors impeding or strengthening the desirable effects of organizational networking on organization performance? By integrating social capital theories on organizational network, social work models of organizational networking, and cases studies examining networking and performance of CBOs, I develop a research framework specifying the paths among organizational networking, service performance, and the related factors. A secondary dataset of CBOs in Taiwan collected by a cross-sectional survey is adopted and analyzed. The purpose is to provide evidence-based guidance for the best practice of CBOs’ networking and initiatives supporting CBOs’ partnership development.
The Theoretical Base

Organizational Networking and Its Benefits on Organization Performance

Definition of Organizational Networking

Organizational networking refers to the active collaborative relationships among organizations for the purpose of service improvement. Depending on the purpose, referral and information networks are usually intense and mixed with organizations across sectors and services, but planning and funding networks are likely to be sparse and loose (Banaszak-Holl, Allen, Mor, & Schott, 1998; Bolland and Wilson, 1994). The forms of organizational networking arrange themselves in a continuum from informal to formal such as communication, cooperation, coordination and collaboration. Communication often refers to autonomous information sharing or exchange; cooperation is informal reciprocal relationship without defined structure; coordination requires a modest degree of planning on common goals and actions; collaboration takes intensive efforts to build and maintain a shared purpose, membership, structure of roles and rules, and process of implementation, and resources (Claiborne & Lawson, 2005; Reilly, 2001). Other variations at the community level may be called service integration, liaison networks, partnership or wraparound services made by interagency agreements, one-stop-shop for client entry, co-location of several independent agencies, or integrated team (Morrison, 2004). Because CBOs’ relationships in Taiwan rarely stay at formal and systematic status, the dissertation uses the terms of organizational networking, networking, and partnership interchangeably. Also to be noted, CBOs that provide direct services are the focused actors of the dissertation, thus the inter-organizational mechanisms for social movements are not of interest.
Organization Performance and Its Relation to Organization Networking

Organization performance generally regards the degree an organization’s mission is carried out. Performance often refers to efficiency as productivity in relation to cost, outputs such as numbers of services provided, outcomes related to organizational goals, impact referring to influence to the society, service quality, customer satisfaction, sustainable development and so on (Poister, 2004). The exact scope of performance depends on values and concerns of evaluators which can be evaluation professionals, clients, staff, board members, funders, other interest related stakeholders or combinations of any these parties (Poister, 2004). In the dissertation, effectiveness and innovation are the core traits of organization performance that CBOs’ networking may improve. Effectiveness means the degree organization goals are realized. Innovation is the continuous and long-term development of an organization. Both traits were identified as outcomes of organizational networking in the three case studies of CBOs.

Mulroy and Shay (1998) studied a network of small CBOs in a project for reducing child abuse and neglect in low-income neighborhoods in northeast America. They observed 32 meetings and conducted 56 individual interviews in two and half years. The rewards of partnership exceeded the cost of solving conflicts and reaching consensus, from the CBOs’ perspective. They reported that the project goal of developing a child abuse prevention collaboration model was fulfilled and individual CBOs’ expectations of funding and service development were met. The most valuable reward they identified was professional development which enhanced a CBO’s performance. The involved staff members learned substantive knowledge about child abuse practices and
theories and the project leaders improved management skills and styles and unexpectedly prevented turnover of project staff.

Byrne & Hansberry (2007) identified several positive outcomes of a partnership among an extended learning agency, recreation CBOs and sites, and public schools for youth in Denver. The collaboration made possible the wide recruitment and high participation levels of youth. Recreation services and academic services were integrated into summer and afterschool programs and as a result augmented each other. In addition, the success improved effectiveness of every partner because the collaboration process demanded comprehensive planning, skills of confronting conflicts, and creatively using resources. Organizational management improvement and collaborative activities were identified as the strongest predictor to effectiveness in the study no matter the size of a CBO.

Lemieux-Charles et al. (2005) surveyed four dementia care networks which had formal membership of non-profits and were involved in providing services in Ontario, Canada. The members conducted frequent exchanges of administrative information, case coordination, case referral, and client information. The network which functioned well actually generated positive changes of organizational effectiveness in members. With respect to administration, the cost of referral and case management decreased dramatically because partners learned to trust each other, a common referral form was created, and a joint education and research committee was established. With respect to service delivery, the staff gained sufficient information about dementia care and the clients perceived better continuity of care.
Above studies indicate that effectiveness and innovation of a CBO can potentially benefit from organizational networking. In terms of effectiveness, alliance of CBOs offers access to information, funding, expertise, and other resources that are essential for reaching organizational goals. Moreover, network members gain the capacity to fulfill their present goals and may develop advanced goals. In terms of innovation, networking can help CBOs learn fund raising strategies, service design, and volunteer management from others. Staff’s personal and professional needs are fulfilled and leaders’ management skills are polished because the process requires challenging tasks of accountability, openness, planning, and creativity.

*Social Capital Theories*

The dissertation broadly defines social capital as the relationships and norms that facilitate reciprocal interaction. Referring to resources that can be derived from relations and valuable resources for collective benefits, social capital has become an umbrella concept covering studies that include trust, social support, social network, and civil society activities like voluntary organizations (Adler & Kwon, 2002). This section introduces the theory development, analysis level and unit, as well as forms of social capital, and then evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of applying social capital concepts to examine organizational networks.

*Social Capital Theories, Application, and Critiques*

One of the first scholars to introduce the concept of social capital was Pierre Bourdieu (1986), who wrote about power structure. He argued that one’s social status, such as a membership of a prestigious club, worked like an asset that could be exchanged with others and transformed to power in a society. Then, James S. Coleman (1988; 1990)
emphasized the relational perspective in social capital. In rational choice theory, individuals act for their own best interests disregarding others’ benefits. Social relations introduce norms and social structures into individuals’ rational choices because there is a cost of damaging a relationship such as losing access to information and resources. As a result of calculating costs and benefits, individuals need to constrain their own interest for others’ concerns or they can demand others to compromise. More recently, Robert Putnam (1995a; 1995b) and others consider social capital as a common good composed of trust, reciprocity and civic involvement which decreases the cost of information exchange and facilitates collective action. Putnam’s influential study (1993) of Italy claimed prevalent civic participation in voluntary associations (as a social capital indicator of a society) was the reason why northern Italy had better economic development and democratic politics than the southern part. The numerous benefits of social capital on the market and the state draw the attention of social science researchers and policy makers (McLean, Schultz, & Steger, 2002). Henceforth, the concept of social capital has been adopted in health care and social service studies. High rates of social capital have been found to be helpful for alleviating social problems such as homelessness (Rosenheck, Lam, Calloway, Johnsen, Goldman, Randolph, et al., 1998), mental and physical illness (Scheffler, Brown, & Rice, 2007; Scheffler & Brown, 2008; Scheffler, Brown, Syme, Kawachi, Tolstykh, & Iribarren, 2008), health care distribution disparity (Laporte, Nauenberg, & Shen, 2008), fragility of the elderly (Lemieux-Charles et al., 2005), and hunger (Martin, Rogers, Cook, & Joseph, 2004).

The concept of social capital catches wide attention in part for the term “capital” which indicates a social network can be converted from one purpose (e.g. friendship) to
another (e.g. information gathering) and transitioned from one actor to another thus worth investment. However, it can be misleading for practice or research to take social capital as private property like other forms of capital and ignore it as a kind of public good (Woolcock, 1998; Fine, 2003). Once social capital is built, it is non-excludable, meaning everyone can use it for his or her own benefit, and non-rivalrous, meaning use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. Without proper coordination of the potential users of social capital to require them to be contributors, the problem of free rider can happen and endanger the sustainability of social capital. For example, Miller (1997) and her team made an effort to create a collective community coalition to improve the quality of life in Boston neighborhoods. They found the term social capital was easily understood as a kind of commodity for people who were eager to build relationships or contribute to the general public. This confusion sometimes made social capital become the goal rather than means to reach certain outcomes of a community. Without a clear agreement on the purpose of networking, the contributors had divergent expectations on the social capital to be developed, which eventually harmed the nurturing process of community change. In coherence with rational choice theory, social capital is never a free lunch. The balance between costs and benefits is a constant concern for actors involved in a partnership.

The flipside of its wide applicability is the problem of neglecting contextual factors in the theorization of social capital. Putnam (2000) claims social capital tends to accumulate naturally because a rational person or society would not refuse the economic prosperity brought by cooperative actions in civic engagement. Methodologically, the causality between association life and economic development cannot be fully proved with
Putnam’s cross-sectional data (Fried, 2002). Moreover, the structural forces like economic equity and political institutions are not properly mentioned (Schultz, 2002; Fine, 2003). For example, poverty may inhibit people’s engagement in elections, direct participation in public affairs, and political communication (Alex-Assenson, 2002). Residents of an inner-city immigrant community who struggle for day-to-day survival actually avoid meeting people, resist having relationships that create obligations, and trust outside agencies like the police better than community organizations (Hutchinson, 2004). It is also questionable whether social capital theories based on Euro-American experiences where national states are stable are applicable in other societies like South Africa which is full of conflicts and inequality (LiPuma & Koelble, 2009), post-soviet Central Asian countries where general trust to the public and institutions is weak (Radnitz, Wheatley, & Zurcher, 2009), or Taiwan where associational life has not been an important source of generating social trust among individuals as in America (Marsh, 2003, 2005). It is necessary for the dissertation to be aware of the conditions in the macro environment for social capital to emerge, such as social equity, basic wellbeing of life, and a pro-democracy political regime.

To be noted, the analytical units of social capital can be individual, organizational, or societal, as big as a nation or as small as a neighborhood. The dissertation is about CBOs’ networking, taking organizations as the unit of analysis. Theory development on the social networks of groups is less typical compared to networks of individuals (Marsden, 2000). Relatively few studies about organizational networking have been done due to the diversity of groups as well as data accessibility (Chan, Bazzoli, Shortell, & Hasnain-Wynia, 2000; Lemieux-Charles et al., 2005; Provan
& Sebastian, 1998). It is difficult to gain research approval from multiple organizations and it is complex to measure interactive activities involving many individuals among organizations. If these barriers are overcome, the research tends to be case studies of a small sample of specific groups with limited ability to generalize. The dissertation may contribute to the on-going theory development of organizational networking by specifying the paths from partnership to performance of CBOs.

**Dimensions and Types of Social Capital**

Social capital in organizations has relational, structural, and cognitive dimensions. (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Staber, 2006). The relational dimension of social capital refers to properties in a relationship such as trust, shared expectations, and obligations. Trust among members is necessary for cooperative initiatives to work (Coleman, 1988). One helps others because of a belief that others will do so in return when he/she has a need, thus a reciprocal cycle begins. Second, the structural dimension refers to the strength, diversity, or strategic position of actors in a social network. The relationships based on similarity tend to be intensive and reciprocal thus is called strong tie. Strong ties are known to bring in social-emotional supports and relational resources for individuals to move upward the social ladders by knowing people owning high social recognition (Lin, 2001). For organizations, strong ties are useful for transferring complex knowledge across organizations or organization subunits because it requires tremendous investment of time and effort to innovate or produce a product that is depend on a larger system (Hansen, 1999). Weak ties often exist in dissimilar actors for instrumental functions such as the search and spread of new information. Knowing diverse may speed up a project by facilitating the "looking for and identifying" of assorted information among organizations.
or organization subunits (Hansen, 1999). Additionally, actors loosely connected to non-redundant others have better negotiation power since they bridge information sources (Burt, 1997). Third, the cognitive dimension of social capital denotes the norms the actors follow to interpret information. An organization needs pre-existing related knowledge in order to assimilate any new information learned from others (in Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). For activities that involve multiple organizations, shared knowledge and common language for communication and cooperation demand infrastructure in financial and service systems (Claiborne & Lawson, 2005; Morrison, 2004).

Putnam (1995a, 2000) distinguished three types of social capital: bonding, bridging, and linking. The differentiation is helpful to understand what actors are linked for what purpose. Bonding social capital exists in relations based on homogeneity which brings similar actors together and has them acting collectively. It usually co-exists with strong ties such as kinship, ethnic groups, and groups of common interest and makes the relations more intensive (Lin, 2001). Bridging social capital refers to resourceful linkages among actors with heterogeneous qualities but of common interest, which is crucial for information and resources to spread and grow within and between groups (Putnam, 2000). The relation between networks or cliques also counts as bridging social capital to secure resources across dense clusters (Rusch, 2010). Linking social capital refers to the reciprocal relationship shared by entities of different status in power or wealth, a kind of bridging social capital in vertical ties across social class hierarchy. This kind of interaction would facilitate resource exchange and status mobilizing thus it plays an important role in poverty relief and economic development (Hutchinson et al. 2004).
Benefits and Risks of Social Capital

What type of social capital is most important? It depends on what outcome is desired. In brief, bonding social capital is more about the internal linkages that provide emotional support and enhance solidarity of a network; bridging and linking social capital are more about external relations that offer instrumental functions and shift a network from getting by to getting ahead (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Leonard & Onyx, 2003). In correspondence to the types and dimensions of social capital, there are three kinds of benefits. With respect to relation dimension, bonding social capital leads to solidarity benefits. Coleman (1988) and Putnam (1995a, 2000) claim network closure contributes positively to social capital formulation because actors know each other and reactions are predictable in a stable relation. By managing risk and facilitating sanction enforcement, bonding social capital unites network members, mobilizes collective actions, and enhances communication (Burt, 2000). With respect to structural dimension, bridging and linking social capital leads to the control benefits of having a brokerage position in a network. Having disconnected contacts increases the power of an actor in bargaining and sustains his or her autonomy because there is little risk of being abandoned or dominated by others. With respect to cognitive dimension, the information benefits are brought commonly by all types of social capital. The advantages refer to access, timing, and referral of resources. An actor having few redundant contacts, which Burt (2000) called having deep “structural holes”, owns access to a variety of information, saves time on gaining information, and gains power by forwarding information needed by other actors in the network. Trust and shared norms, the essential elements of social capital, also
mobilize information flow by enhancing people’s interpretation scheme to take in cooperative activities.

There are dark sides of social capital. Bonding social capital brings the members together, but a highly cohesive network can oversee the interests of members thus disregarding and even threatening new comers, other actors, and the general public. Strong solidarity also could constrain innovation because new ideas challenge existent norms, impede organizational development by resisting any changes, and even worsen social exclusion of a poor community or CBO by refusing outside resources (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Hutchinson et al. 2004; Hwang & Liu, 2009). Ideally, bridging and linking social capital would overcome the exclusiveness of bonding social capital by linking to actors of different attributes and resources. However, a network with significant inequalities and tensions would create problems like unequally sharing benefits and costs for participants thus endangering the partnership (Rusch, 2010). Linking with politicians and local leaders who have power over resource distribution can be harmful for community development since their supports to CBOs are in exchange for votes and their attention comes and goes with election seasons (Lai, 2010).

For the co-existing pros and cons, the right combination of bonding and bridging social capital is artful. Agnitsch, Flora, and Ryan (2006) found both bonding social capital and bridging social capital (including linking social capital in their operationalization) are necessary for community actions of individuals and groups. They conducted two mail surveys in 99 rural communities whose populations were between 500 and 10,000 in Iowa. The results showed communities of high bridging social capital (connecting to outside-community actors) and low bonding social capital (connecting to
in-community actors) had a similar level of active civic engagement as the communities of low bridging and high bonding social capital. They indicated one type of social capital can supplement the absence of the other in some conditions.

In terms of whom to connect with, Halseth and Ryser (2007) found partnership inside and outside community might have different function for CBOs. They interviewed key actors in 29 CBOs (called as voluntary organizations) in small towns with less than 10,000 people across Canada to explore the development and maintenance of organizational networks. It was found that local partnerships were perceived more important than the relationships with organizations outside community. Nonetheless, the CBOs discontinued many of the partnerships in community in a three year period while external partnerships with governments and non-service providers remained strong. The CBOs having networking beyond community were more likely to sustain government funding at the time the Canada government was restructured and downsized the social service budget. Although networking within community was regarded as the source of legitimacy for serving the community, network expansion, and expertise inquiry, the partners in distance turned out to be positively associated with access to the remained public funding.

**Applying a Social Capital Perspective to The Research Topic**

The above review of theories and empirical studies indicate that different types of social capital involved in organizational networking would facilitate or constrain certain benefits that improve organization performance of a CBO. I summarize the theoretical association paths between organizational networking and performance with a social capital perspective in Table 1. Bonding social capital and bridging social capital work
together to create norms and trust which are necessary for solidarity of a CBO to carry out its services. Bridging and linking social capital bring in external resources that are required by a CBO to provide effective services and initiate innovation to stay current. Additionally, both bridging and bonding social capital lead to information benefits. Information exchange such as referring cases or experts in a network would facilitate an organization’s effectiveness as well as innovation. For the fact that a CBO is limited by time and resources to maintain its partnerships, it would be good to give priority to the type of social capital that fulfills the benefit most in need or to avoid the risk that is most harmful.

Table 1

Benefits of Social Capital in Relation to Types and Dimensions of Social Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dimension (networking)</th>
<th>Relational (trust)</th>
<th>Cognitive (norm)</th>
<th>Organization performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging &amp; Linking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is a social capital perspective applicable to CBO’s networking in Taiwan? The earlier mentioned critiques of social capital theories suggest that it is necessary to examine whether the social, economic, and political environments of a society fit assumptions behind social capital. In general, Taiwan meets pre-conditions of social capital, regarding social equity, basic wellbeing of life, and a pro-democracy political regime. The income level of Taiwan is categorized as high by the World Bank in 2007.
The economy grew rapidly before the 1990s while income distribution improved or did not worsen primarily because of investment in education in addition to active government policies on land reform, public housing, and industrial development (International Monetary Fund, 2007). The long-time equitable economic growth fostered people’s belief of state intervention toward social welfare and environmental issues as well as general expectation of socio-economic equity (Wong, 2003). The democracy of Taiwan progressed considerably during the late 1980s and 90s for the frequent direct elections, tight competition of political parties, and progressive legislation of multiple social policies such as National Health Insurance (Wong, 2003). Furthermore, the role of CBOs in public affairs is rising and hopeful. Many civil society groups have been important actors in setting the political agenda, policy planning, and providing social services, although organizational participation has not been an important source of generating social trust as in America (Marsh, 2003, 2005). After years of participating in community development and community care for older adults, some CBOs have performed autonomously in service implementation and been actively working with professionals and governments to strengthen service sustainability and effectiveness (Chen & Chen, 2006). Certain service programs within a CBO have settled historical political conflicts among cliques within a community for the sake of common good of the community residents (Lai, 2010).

In fact, the concept of social capital has been adopted to explain organizational networking in a few studies of community partnerships in Taiwan. Wang (2007) examined two CDAs’ resource mobilization and integration with social capital theories by interviewing key actors involved. He found governments and local organizations such
as other nearby CDAs, temples, and universities were the main resources. He also discovered that leaders of the CDAs utilized their personal relationships as a base to expand the organizational network like rolling a snow ball. Partnerships of a CBO brought in external experts and sponsors thus greatly diminished the operation uncertainty in funding and service sustainability. Case studies of Hipwell (2009) and Tai (2007) were both about balance between nature conservation and economic development in indigenous communities. Despite the distinct characteristics of the communities studied, they found long-term conversations among the residents, CBOs, and municipal governments lead to thick social capital and strengthened capacities needed for sustainable community development. More recently, the research team of Hwang (Hwang & Liu, 2009; Hwang et al., 2011) regarded the concept of social capital as meaningful for Taiwan’s community development because both the policy and practice were in need of shifting from a top-down approach to bottom-up. Their nation-wide survey further proved social capital, trust and networking among community residents and organizations, was positively associated to general wellbeing of residents and community development outcomes (Hwang et al., 2010).

Overall, it appears plausible to use a social capital perspective to learn more about CBOs’ networking in Taiwan. The social economic and political conditions of Taiwan are not far from the European American society where social capital theories are rooted. Also, a number of researchers have affirmed the meaningfulness of studying Taiwan’s community issues with a social capital perspective. For the research questions, the types and dimensions of social capital can specify the paths from networking to organization performance; the concept of capital additionally indicates the value of networking for the
organizations involved and potentially the general public. However, factors affecting the formulation and benefits of networking, which is one of the research questions, are not clearly identified in social capital theories. In the following chapter, the dissertation will specify these factors by reviewing the relevant theoretical works in social work and empirical studies of CBOs’ partnerships.
Literature Review

Models of Organizational Networking

To identify factors that are influential to organizational networking, this section will review five related models in social work. The models integrate the stages, activities, factors, and qualities of inter-organization interaction that leads to better service. They fall in two theoretical approaches. One is about service collaboration among agencies and the other is community building. Broadly defined, both approaches are major foci of current community practice that seeks to bring change in organizations and communities by planning, organizing, and engaging in social action (Weil & Gamble, 2005). My purpose of reviewing these models is to identify influential factors affecting the success of organizational networking and to deepen potential findings’ insights for social work practice.

The Service Collaboration Approach

Both Collaborative Pathway of Reilly (2001) and the organization collaboration framework of Claiborne and Lawson (2005) were developed for guiding organization management and community practice in the context of social service privatization or contracting. They are process oriented models for formal partnerships involving a shared purpose for action, structure of roles, rules, and communication, as well as resources including funding, leadership, and consensus-based decision making (Reilly, 2001). Also, both are based on literature review and case studies.

Reilly (2001) generated a model of organizational collaboration, the Collaborative Pathway, by examining documents and conducting surveys and interviews of four successful cases and three failed ones. Recognizing the uncertainty and fragility of
partnerships, the model presents six steps and necessary conditions for involved organizations to realize their interdependence. (1) Identification path is the first step. Stakeholders consider joining the coordination based on their immediacy of need for resolution through working with other organizations. Stakeholder diversity and alternative resolutions are challenging for the emergence of a partnership. The window of opportunity opens when environmental circumstances such as political and economic forces support and historical patterns of cooperation exist. (2) At the stage of formulation, the five dimensions of collaboration including purpose, membership, structure, process and resources need to be settled by formal agreement of the stakeholders. (3) Factors found critical at the implementation stage are including all stakeholders affected by the issue, bringing in an outside and skilled facilitator, and potential loss of funding and political support. (4) The engagement stage is important because a collaboration process can be long so it is important to maintain partners’ moral altruism, enlightened self-interest, and balance of territories among participants. (5) The resolution stage comes when the targeted social problems are solved and the collaboration endeavor continues at one form or another. (6) The final stage of evolution may occur if increasing social capital shifts a partnership to broader concerns. Social capital is a by-product of working together successfully and repeatedly.

Claiborne and Lawson (2005; Lawson, 2004) developed a framework for planning and evaluating inter-professional, inter-disciplinary, and community collaborations by reviewing literature including the work of Reilly (2001). They defined collaboration as autonomous, interdependent stakeholders (with their respective competency domains) that organize and mobilize to pursue and obtain the results and
benefits comprising the common agenda they develop. The phases of organizational collaboration are a series of “c-words” with related tasks, including communication, connecting, cooperating, consulting, coordinating, co-locating, community-building, and contracting. These phases usually evolve in non-linear orders but eventually build toward an institutionalization of goals, process, and structure in the process. The outcomes of collaboration include innovation in processes and products and organization knowledge learning and creativity which are the two organization performance traits brought by social capital. In addition, this framework emphasizes the importance of turning conflict into consensus. A few factors are identified as useful moderators to soften controversy or mediators to facilitate the desirable effects of collaboration. They are intermediary people serving as brokers linking cultures and resources, intermediary organizations providing governance on the partnership, collaborative leadership that mediates turf issues and interest conflicts, norms of reciprocity and trust that minimize risk and maintain autonomy, and negotiations of stakeholders for agreement on rules and accountabilities.

The above two models are relevant to my first research question about the association between networking and performance of a CBO. Both models indicate organizational networking is beneficial for a CBO to carry out their missions efficiently and effectively. In addition, they identified several factors influential factors of organizational networking. Whereas, these models have yet to specify the paths regarding what kind of organizational networking leads to what aspect of service performance improvement. They are starting points of theory development of organization networking that requires more of an evidence base and stronger clarity for further generalization. The way of laying out steps and influential factors of building a partnership would be more
applicable for studies using longitudinal data or action research involving interventions than the dissertation. Another limitation for the dissertation to adopt the models is that they tend to focus on a formal kind of organizational networking that aims to coordinate service provision which rarely exists in the dissertation’s subject.

Community Building Approach

The concept of social capital serves as the hub linking several community practice streams which emphasize personal relationships, social networks, and interagency partnership as critical resources to reach physical development and community empowerment under the umbrella term of community building (Sites, Chaskin, & Parks, 2007). Community building refers to efforts and goals “of going beyond community-based service provision or production (e.g. of housing, commercial activities, jobs) to strengthen informal relationships and the organizational infrastructure of communities, and to build the capacity of communities to manage and foster community change” (Chaskin et al., 2006, p.389). In other words, the target of community building is community capacity which refer to “the interaction of human capital, organizational resources, and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the well-being of a given community” (Chaskin, 2001, p.295). There are seven essential characteristics of community building (McNeely, 1999): (1) achieving concrete outcomes and reinforcing social capital, (2) being community-driven with broad resident involvement, (3) comprehensive, strategic, and entrepreneurial, (4) asset-based, (5) tailored to neighborhood scale and conditions, (6) collaboratively linked to the broader society, and (7) consciously changing institutional barriers. Here I review three related theories, including the Asset-Based
Community Development model (ABCD Model) developed by Kretzmann and McKnight (1993, 1996), the community organizing framework of Gittell and Vidal (1998), and the relational framework of community capacity and capacity building of Chaskin (2001). All of the frameworks see organizational networking as one of the essential strategies to generate social capital for collective decision making and action.

The ABCD Model (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, 1996) is a well-known framework of community building. Traditionally, helping professions use a deficit/need driven perspective in community practice, i.e., focusing on problems, deficiencies, and weakness of individual residents. Contrarily, the core value of ABCD model is to cultivate the present strengths of a community. The philosophy is every individual has capacities, talents, and skills to contribute no matter of age, wealth, and health; associations have capacities to provide a network of care, respond to local problems fast, and individualize the support needed (McKnight, 1997). According to Greens & Haines (2008), a successful community development initiative should start with mapping local assets of a community and building relationships among these assets, which are two on-going initial tasks and they strengthen each other, so that a sense of hope and capability grows in the community. Then, the initiative has to mobilize the community’s assets for purposes that are agreeable and desirable for the community through conversations in public places, local mass media, and everyday conversation. A broadly representative group thus forms and convenes the community to develop a vision and a plan. Only if the decision making body is established to ensure that community development is driven by local residents can outside supports be utilized. The ABCD model emphasizes that a community building initiative must remain inner-focused and strength-based. It is very
cautious of dependence on external resources. External partners can be sources of knowledge, training, resources and experiences but they should not come with their own agenda other than supporting the community to take action from the inside out and bottom up.

Gittell and Vidal (1998) analyzed three sites of Local Initiatives Support Cooperation (LISC) which are one of the national community building organizations in the U. S. They recognized these sites utilized social capital as a development strategy. The studied initiatives were centered on real estate development at the neighborhood level and incorporated other community issues such as employment, poverty, and crime. The common purpose was activating residents to solve their own problems and eventually develop a sustainable community network. Social capital building is identified as the strategy because of the belief that strengthening the weak ties between and among community organizations, residents and community development support network (e.g. LISC and its partners) could bring new ideas, resources, and opportunities to these communities. Gittell and Vidal (1998) introduced the six steps of LISC work model but suggested that every instance of community building would have its own phases for specific goals and communities. Also, they developed a framework incorporating key elements for building social capital as 14 c-words at three levels - desirable outcome, intermediate outcome, and program implementation. Commitment, capacity, and control are the aspects of desirable outcome. The five Cs in program implementation are communication of all participants, consistency of vision, purpose and intervention, congruence between actions and objectives, counterbalancing resource in and outside the community, and context in local environment of a community. The six Cs in necessary
intermediate outcomes in the process are comprehension of participants, credibility of the program, staff, and sponsors, confidence of participants being contributive to their commitment, competence in technical, financial, and organization issues, comfort among participants based on shared positive experience, and critique from the participants.

Chaskin (2001) developed a relational framework of community capacity and capacity building which was based on a literature review, interviews of 46 key informants involved in community building efforts, and the implementation of a study of a four-site comprehensive community initiative. This model identified human capital, organizational resources, social capital, and their interaction as assets of a community to solve collective problems and improve the wellbeing of a community. Interventions in community capacity can be combinations of three social agency levels - individuals, organizations, and networks. Four fundamental elements of community capacity are identified necessary for any agency to accomplish its goals of community building. They are sense of community, commitment, problem solving ability, and access to resources which Chaskin (2001, pp296-297) defined as-

Sense of community reflects a degree of connectedness among members and a recognition of mutuality of circumstance, including a threshold level of collectively held values, norms, and vision.

Level of commitment describes the responsibility that particular individuals, groups, or organizations take for what happens in the community. Level of commitment has two essential aspects: (1) the existence of community members who see themselves as stakeholders in the collective well-being of the
neighborhood and (2) the willingness of these members to participate actively in that role.

The ability to solve problems—that is, to translate commitment into action—is an important component of virtually all definitions of capacity relating to community. A community may identify and address problems or pursue collective goals through formal or informal means, spontaneously or through planned action.

The final characteristic of community capacity is access to resources—economic, human, physical, and political—within and beyond the neighborhood.

...Communities with abundant capacity have some ability to influence policies that directly affect them and to garner resources to support their development.

In the capacity building process, conditioning influences come from community safety, residential stability, density of acquaintance, structure of opportunity, patterns of migration, race and class dynamics, and distribution of poverty and resources. The desirable outcomes of a community building initiative include better services, influence on decision-making, and economic well-being of a community. Building inter-organizational relations was specifically discussed in the work of Chanskin, Browon, Venkatesh, and Vidal (2001). They stated three intervention strategies including creating broker organizations, ongoing mechanisms of inter-organizational connection, and specialized partnerships, which often coexisted in practice. Success of community capacity building in their study relied on over-time outweigh of benefits and cost, appropriate selection, and representative participation of stakeholders. Contextual influences came from community history, racial dynamics, and equal distribution of
political power among organizations involved. The indication for the dissertation is that organizational capacity is a critical factor for the occurrence of networking, with respect to resources, management, and abilities to recognize and engage in the strategic intervention. Also seen in the study is the potential rewards of collaboration including broadening access to resources, opportunities of learning, and power of affecting policy.

All three frameworks face challenges of applicability in other societies. ABCD model’s tools for mapping assets and lens of seeing the positives of a community surely make differences in community development (Morse, 2011). However, ABCD model is criticized as a “feel-good practice” lacking in impact upon the macro-level structures (e.g. the political, economics, and cultural systems) that in part cause the social problems which the communities’ development initiatives aim to solve (in Ennis & West, 2010). The frameworks of Gittell and Vidal (1998) and Chaskin (2001) address influences from the macro environment and the importance of concrete goals of community building such as housing, neighborhood economic development, or comprehensive service. However, the casual paths among influential factors, intervention, social capital, and desired outcomes remain loosely defined, which leads to difficulties of application. Kramer, Seedat, Lazarus, and Suffla (2011) critically reviewed instruments assessing community features (e.g. social capital and sense of community) for assets-based community development in South Africa where there are serious problems with unemployment, violence, and poverty. They concluded the concepts were ambiguously defined and the measures had many assumptions of community (e.g. small size and urban settings) which did not fit the context of South Africa. Also, Yeneabat and Butterfield (2012) cautioned that the hidden assumptions in community building frameworks were based on American
society. They reported a partnership using ABCD model in an urban area of Africa. They found the participating residents appreciated the strength-based approach which facilitated conversation and developed trust in the community. Although ABCD model promotes a diverse network of active leaders, it did not occur in this case despite the continuous efforts of involving residents of different strengths and backgrounds. Few core individuals worked intensively with the project coordinator in leadership and many other members contributed less time to certain tasks quietly and passively. Yeneabat and Butterfield (2012) regarded the participation pattern was fine because it reflected the general culture of the community as well as personal preferences of the participants. Contrary to the ABCD model’s cautiousness to external resources, they suggested a healthy balance between inside and outside resources. The stability of outside resources such as funding, access to facilities, and trainings were rather important for this partnership to proceed.

Comparison of The Intervention Models and Their Indications

A summary of the five intervention frameworks is in Table 2. All of the frameworks were developed to guide practice of organization management and community work related to organizational networking. They have the same concern that a partnership should have some degree of formalization in setting missions and goals, membership, decision making mechanisms, and accountability. A shared vision and action plan are the means to link stakeholders (individual and organizations) inside and outside a geographic community together because everyone’s interest is enlightened and reciprocity norms are strengthened through continuous communication. Another primary commonality is that social capital is identified as the intermediate outcome of
intervention/collaboration to reach the goals in most frameworks, except the one of Reilly (2001) in which social capital was seen as the final by-product to boost wider action. Concurring with social capital theories, the frameworks all believe networking of stakeholders generates benefits for solving concerning social problems. In terms of social capital theories, the organizations involved in partnership gain benefits of solidarity by bonding organizations of similar interest and different resources, information by bridging varieties of information access, and control by linking organizations of strategic position in the network.

Two major differences exist in the structure of networking processes and influential factors for the purposes of collaboration. First, each framework has a distinct set of intervention steps due to the desirable outcomes targeted. Service effectiveness and efficiency are primary concerns of the service collaboration approach so institutionalization of products, procedures and information systems stand as single steps for special attention, e.g. the implementation step in Reilly’s model (2001) and the coordination step and co-locating step in the one of Claiborne and Lawson (2005). On the contrary, representativeness and efficacy of the partnership is instead the intervention focus in community building efforts because wellbeing of the whole community is often the concern. For example, both the frameworks of Gittell and Vidal (1998) and Chaskin (2001) elaborate related process in multiple steps and ABCD model heavily addresses openness to public participation. Second, the frameworks have different focuses on influential factors while most of them emphasize factors in network level. For example, both frameworks of Reilly (2001) and Claiborne and Lawson (2005) addressed the positive role of outside facilitator or an intermediate governance organization in a
network, while the former recognized political and historic forces at initial and implementation stages and the latter paid little attention to the macro environment. Both Gittell and Vidal (1998) and Chaskin (2001) recognized members’ commitment for action and capacity as network factors, but the latter additionally identified many features of the geographical community (e.g. residential stability and racial composition) that are critical to form a representative agency in a community building initiative. The ABCD Model merely highlights the negative impact of reliance on external resources and does not specify other influential factors.

For the dissertation, these frameworks point out a number of factors affecting the success of a partnership in levels of network and organization, which can complement the weakness of contextual neglect in social capital theories. At the network level, a partnership is likely to happen where there is a need for sharing resources, lack of competition history, existence of a culture of reciprocity and trust, and occurrence of intermediary mechanisms. At the organizational level, collaborative leadership and independence from external resources are the two key factors leading to successful networking. Furthermore, the factor of competency identified in Gittell & Vidal (1998) and the factor of resource slightly mentioned in Reilly (2001) indicate that a CBO needs to have adequate organization capacity for networking to occur and serve its goals. The time, energy, and even financial investment for a partnership to sustain can be discouraging for CBOs that have no sufficient funding and workforce. In addition, community capacity addressed in Chaskin (2001) is essential for a CBO’s effectiveness and innovation. One of the strengths makes CBOs important in social services is that they utilize local resources to respond to local needs. Without community residents’ inputs
such as volunteering and decision making, a CBO would hardly sustain and even survive. The elements of community capacity, including sense of community, commitment, problem solving ability, and access to resources, are assets which a CBO needs to leverage for fulfilling its goals in both short and long term.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development phases</td>
<td>(in order)</td>
<td>(move back and forth)</td>
<td>(#1&amp;#2 ongoing, #4 prior to #5)</td>
<td>(not suggested for other communities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.Identification</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1.Mapping assets</td>
<td>1.Site selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.Formulation</td>
<td>Connecting</td>
<td>2.Building relationships</td>
<td>2.Staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.Engagement</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>4.Convenering the community to develop a vision and a plan</td>
<td>4.Organizing CDCs and developing indigenous leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.Resolution</td>
<td>Co-locating</td>
<td>5.Leveraging outside resources</td>
<td>5.Building relationships with the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighted factors</td>
<td>Uncertainty of collaboration, factors with respect to phases</td>
<td>Conflict and consensus</td>
<td>Internal focus vs. outside resources</td>
<td>Commitment, Capacity, Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome</td>
<td>Resolution of public problem, social capital as by-product</td>
<td>Improved service access, quality of service, efficiency, effectiveness</td>
<td>A self-sustainable community (economic wellbeing is often the base)</td>
<td>Community social and economic development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community capacity improvement, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continuing next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization type most concerned</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Human services agencies, community organizations</td>
<td>Social associations</td>
<td>CDCs, neighborhood organizations</td>
<td>CCIs, community building efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors at macro environment level</td>
<td>1. competition history*, economic &amp; political condition* 4. environmental factors</td>
<td>(Not specified)</td>
<td>(Not specified)</td>
<td>Implementation: Context*</td>
<td>Structure of opportunity*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors at network level</td>
<td>(with respect to phases) 1. stakeholder diversity*, alternative resolution*, immediacy of need for resolution* 2&amp;3. purpose, membership, structure, process, resources 4. inclusion of stakeholders, outside facilitator, losing outside support 5. moral altruism, enlightened self-interest, balance of terror</td>
<td>(to solve conflicts) Intermediary people*, Intermediary organizations*, Reciprocity and trust*, Negotiated institutional power (network structure)</td>
<td>(Not specified)</td>
<td>Implementation: Communication, Consistency, Congruence, Counterbalancing, Context Process: Confidence, Credibility, Comfort, Comprehension, Critiques, Competence</td>
<td>(Demographic features of a network) Community safety, Residential stability, Density of acquaintance, Structure of opportunity, Patterns of migration, Race and class dynamics, Distribution of poor and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors at organization level</td>
<td>(Not specified, maybe resources)</td>
<td>Collaborative leaderships*</td>
<td>Reliance on external resources*</td>
<td>Process: competence*</td>
<td>Community capacity*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Factors that are applicable to the informal organizational networking of CBOs in Taiwan.
Empirical Case Studies of CBOs’ Organizational Networking

Both critiques of social capital theories and the reviewed intervention frameworks of organizational networking indicate that the occurrence of partnerships depends on many conditions. That is, some CBOs are able to utilize networking as social capital to improve service performance and others are not. To develop a comprehensive research framework for the dissertation, this section specifies the factors that have been identified in empirical studies of organizational networking. The factors can be organized into two levels, network and organization. At the network level, partnerships are more likely to emerge when intermediate mechanisms among CBOs work, history of competition does not exist, and external resources are rich. At the organizational level, key factors influencing the pattern of a CBO’s networking at least include funding sources and leadership.

Factors at Network Level

Intermediary mechanisms such as a hub agency, a clique group, and professionals facilitate cooperation among organizations. Provan and Milward (1995) studied networks of mental health CBOs in four cities of similar population size in the United States. They identified the city with the best network effectiveness had a centralized integration network through a single agency providing statewide case management and serving as a hub linking many other agencies. Despite the poor funding in that city, the external control of governmental funding was clear and consistent thus the hub agency could focus on service collaboration. Provan later worked with Sebastian examining the service link overlap in those four cities and found the best client outcomes appeared in the city of a core clique where active reciprocated referral and case coordination happened across
and within the member organizations (Provan & Sebastian, 1998). In terms of social
capital, intensive and multiplex integration within a clique decreases transaction cost and
establish trustful working relationships and the overlaps among cliques would enhance
dissemination of new ideas from one clique to another. In Western Australia, Leonard &
Onyx (2003) found linkage across CBOs was helpful for access to information and
resources but many of the between-group links depend on existing between-individuals
ties like friendship and family or professionals who have long-time trustful relationships
with multiple CBOs.

History of competition hinders cooperation among organizations. Bolda et al.
(2005) analyzed a national initiative supporting partnerships of CBOs providing long-
term care for older adults in United States. They found some organizations were reluctant
to collaborate with one another because they competed for limited resources in the same
pool. Contrarily, organizations with a tradition of cooperation had a culture of
communicating with the community members and preferred alliance with other
organizations. Similarly, Griffin & Floyd (2006) found that competition history was the
primary barriers in the coalition of HIV/AIDS service planning in Atlanta region of
America. The confrontations between stakeholders who competed for resources were so
serious that they would not attend a meeting at the same time. It took five years for the
staff to ease turf issues among the thirty HIV/AIDS research, prevention, treatment, and
service organizations. Unless the involved organizations recognize their interdependency
and the common benefit of collaboration, it is unlikely that they would spend the time
and resource required for a partnership.
Richness of resources in a network can be an incentive for CBOs to network with one another. For instance, Bolland and Wilson (1994) found more coordination in the elderly service systems occurring in urban areas in the six Alabama cities studied. CBOs in rural areas performed lower level of collaboration due to general lack of resources and less specialization that demanded follow-up after referral. In addition, the design of service payment or support funding matters as seen in the study of Lemieux-Charles et al (2005). They studied four Canadian dementia care networks and specified several system factors related to external resources. One is the fee-for-service payment of the health insurance which discouraged family physicians to become involved because they would earn less for taking time to attend network meetings. Additionally, the network with more financial and human resources allocated for collaboration activities had better effectiveness of caring for individuals with complex needs. Without sufficient resources, serving the clients should and did take the priority over networking in the involved agencies.

Factors at Organization Level

Dependency on government funding may reduce CBOs’ capacity for networking. Nemon (2007) indicated the anti-poverty partnership of Community Action Agencies relied on federal funding to a degree that its service was limited by distinct regulations, expectations, and procedures demanded by the federal programs. As a result, little attention was paid to coordinating services within and among agencies to better meet clients’ needs. On the contrary, CBOs mainly supported by donations need to maintain ties to distinguished groups thus growing donors’ interest. As seen in the study of Galaskiewicz et al. (2006), CBOs which received a lot of personnel, clients, and facilities
or supplies from other agencies and gave away a lot of these resources were those which relied on donations from urban elites. The study collected panel data from 1980 to 1993 by interviewing 156 leaders of CBOs. Corresponding to the benefits of social capital, great centrality of a CBO, meaning linking to many other organizations in a network directly or through hub agencies, was found positively associated to faster organizational growth.

The importance of leadership for a CBO to engage in and maintain a partnership cannot be overstated. Cooperation across organizations is costly in terms of time and efforts required in the careful planning and intensive communication. Only if their leaders have strong commitment and competency of strategic thinking could the organizations keep engaged. Lin (1999) reported certain CBO leaders were one of the most challenging barriers to organizational cooperation in a community care program for older adults in Taiwan. Other barriers included members’ identity of the program, inner solidarity of a CBO, and support from significant individuals in the community. Those leaders were satisfied with existent self-interests and reluctant to participate in conversation across organizations, not to mention making any change on their own procedure. As a result, the community failed to sustain a broad networking that could benefit all involved CBOs and the older adults who needed the service. Another example is the study of Munn (2003) in rural South Australia, which also identified managers’ support the main facilitator of service coordination in addition to informal friendship between workers of different organizations. The practice wisdom generated from nine focus groups showed managers’ vision of empowering the community to work together
facilitated frontline workers’ confidence and resources applying organizational networking as an alternative way for serving the clients.

Last, organizational capacity matters. Networking requires CBOs’ leadership, management, and staff to recognize and handle the potential costs and benefits. From the community building perspective, a CBO needs to have sufficient time, flexible infrastructure, financial support, and technical abilities for communication across organizational boundary to happen (Chaskin et al., 2001, pp.143-146). Chaskin & Abunimah (1999) supported this argument by interviewing 52 experts and government officials about seven community building initiatives in the United States. From the perspective of the municipal governments, some initiative failed to have viable and solid impact on community issues due to their limitation of technical capacity. Those CBOs and the individuals involved were unable to adapt to the technology, financial system, or documentation required in conversations with the government. The study indicated a CBO had to partner with the organizations of adequate capacity in order to minimize the time and efforts of clarifying individual roles and shared terms.
Methodology

In the previous chapter, I reviewed social capital theories, intervention models of networking, and case studies of CBOs’ partnerships and related them to my research questions and Taiwan’s CBOs. In this chapter of methodology, I develop a preliminary conceptual framework of networking and performance of CBOs including the influential factors based on the literature review. It is a comprehensive framework that covers the possible dynamics among the research variables and the influential factors that have been found consistently significant in the literature. For the purpose of analysis, I modify the preliminary conceptual framework into the research framework with respect to the secondary data to be used. The later sections specify the research hypotheses, measures, and analysis strategy.

Research Framework

The Preliminary Conceptual Framework

The dissertation examines the relation between organizational networking (networking) and organization performance (performance) of a CBO with a social capital perspective. There is no single theoretical model that is completely applicable to my research subject and object. Therefore, I develop a preliminary conceptual framework (Figure 1) to explain why some CBOs gain positive outcomes from networking while some do not. The conceptual framework is a synthesis of existing literature on the association between networking and performance of a CBO. The goal is for the framework to be a comprehensive structure to examine what type of networking improves which trait of organization performance for cross-sectional research. When it
comes to the analysis, the research framework will be further narrowed down with regards to the secondary data and CBOs’ networking in Taiwan.

Figure 1

A Preliminary Conceptual Framework of CBOs’ Networking and Performance

Organizational networking and organization performance.

Networking of a CBO is categorized into two forms, within community and beyond community. Community in this dissertation refers to a living area where people share identity and resources. A community can be, but is not limited to, a geographical or administrative neighborhood. Social capital theories indicate networking with different organizations in or outside the community would lead to different benefits and risks for a CBO (earlier summarized in Table 1). Partnerships with organizations that locate in the
same community as a targeted CBO may primarily function as bonding social capital. These organizations are alike in that they generally share concerns of the community and they all care about the wellbeing of community residents. For example, local churches, temples, hospitals, clinics, pharmacies, and public health centers may work with a CBO in an older adult wellness programs because serving the community is their common mission. On the other hand, partnerships with organizations outside the community of a targeted CBO may primarily function as bridging social capital. These organizations are different in terms of their service users, but they may connect with one another because sharing the same interests in community organizing or other public affairs in a broad scope. For example, a CBO may maintain contact with other communities for the sake of learning service skills, exchanging funding information, sharing resources, or advocating policies on community development.

In brief, the positive effects of networking are three. Through these benefits, networking may improve a CBO’s performance in terms of effectiveness and innovation. Solidarity benefits connect a CBO with other organizations in the community to work together for residents’ wellbeing; this is the mechanism for networking within community to be helpful for effectiveness of a CBO. Information benefits in access, timing, and referral of resources are critical for a CBO to effectively carry out its services and innovatively develop the organization. Control benefits sustain a CBO’s autonomy in management while surviving in the competitive environment, which refers to the performance trait of innovation. Specifically, networking within community brings solidarity and information benefits; networking beyond community lead to information and control benefits. These paths are illustrated as solid arrows in Figure 1.
Benefits come with costs. The solidarity created by bonding with organizations in the same community to a degree could overlook new service trends or resources that are emerging in the wider scope, which in turn constrains innovation of a CBO. Bridging with different organizations inevitably causes conflict and tension among organizations that require excessive effort for the involved CBO to manage, which may wear away the already scarce resources for service. The administration cost of meeting regulations and requirements carried in grants can be enormous for a CBO to link resourceful agencies like governments. Overall, CBOs need to consider the most needed benefit or most harmful risk for them and then balance types of linkages in their networking management so that networking may lead to services improvements. The dashed arrows in Figure 1 represent risks or costs of networking.

To be clear, networking with organizations with higher hierarchical status in the administration or resource chain is included in the form of networking beyond community. Although some social capital theories identify this as linking social capital and differentiate it from bridging social capital, both linking and bridging social capital lead to benefits of information and control. The government agencies or grant-offering foundations that provide resources to CBOs often have wider scope of missions or service populations, thus they are different from the targeted CBOs in nature. Table 3 lays out the social capital types behind the categorization of networking. For example, networking with a central government branch in charge of nationwide or county-wide older adult wellness program that happens to locate in the same geographical/administrative neighborhood as a CBO should be counted as the form of networking beyond neighborhood. Nonetheless, networking with the local public health
center in charge of a targeted CBO’s community wellness and other two communities’ is considered the form of networking within community in this dissertation.

Table 3
Comparison of Networking Forms and Social Capital Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking forms</th>
<th>Within community</th>
<th>Beyond community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Not higher</td>
<td>Bonding social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Linking social capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors influencing the networking effects.

The benefits of networking for a CBO depend on certain conditions at the levels of macro environment, network, and organization. Regarding macro environment, both critiques of social capital theories (Alex-Assenson, 2002; Fine, 2003; Fried, 2001; Hutchinson et al., 2004) and studies of non-American and non-European context (LiPuma & Koelble, 2009; Radnitz et al., 2009; Schultz, 2002) indicate social equity, basic wellbeing of life, and a pro-democracy regime of a society are necessary for social capital to emerge. Several influential factors at network and organization levels are pointed out by the intervention models and relevant case studies. At the network level, intermediate mechanisms such as a program or individuals are helpful for CBOs’ partnership development (Bolda et al, 2005; Claiborne & Lawson, 2005; Leonard & Onyx, 2003; Provan & Milward, 1995; Provan & Sebastian, 1998; Reilly, 2001), richness of resources encourages CBOs to reach out and benefit from the partnerships (Bolland &
Wilson, 1994; Lemieux-Charles et al, 2005), while history of competition does the opposite (Bolda et al, 2005; Griffin & Floyd, 2006).

Factors at the organization level include reliance on government funding (Galaskewicz et al., 2006; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993), collaborative and effective leadership (Claiborne & Lawson, 2005; Lin, 1999; Munn, 2003), and organizational capacity of handling the costs and changes caused by networking (Chaskin & Abunimah, 1999; Chaskin et al., 2001). Also related to the organization level, capacity of the community that a CBO work with/for is influential to the occurrence of partnership across organizations. Adopting the community building framework of Chaskin (2001), I specify four elements of community capacity—community residents’ sense of community, commitment, problem-solving ability, and access to resources. A CBO needs to draw upon or work on these elements of community capacity in order to generate the necessary supports for networking and performance improvement.

*The Research Framework for Analysis*

The preliminary conceptual framework (Figure 1) can be an ideal model for research examining the dynamics between networking and performance of CBOs with a comprehensive list of influential factors. For this dissertation, it has to be modified with regard to the targeted CBOs in Taiwan and the applied secondary data. First, the dissertation omits all the influential factors at macro environment and network level. I assume the previously described conditions about Taiwan’s society, CBOs’ networking, and the support mechanisms are generally true for the CBOs to be analyzed. That is, the CBOs operate within the social, political, and economical context of Taiwan where the preconditions for social capital to emerge exist, the CBOs’ networking tends to be
informal, and the support for partnership development is scant for CBOs. Second, fewer influential factors can be included due to measurement unavailability with the dataset (see Appendix B). Among influential factors at organization level, organizational capacity is left out because the relevant survey items may or may not link to networking and they are meaningfully close to the dependent variable of effectiveness. Last and structurally, the intermediate variables of networking benefits are also removed because the concept cannot be appropriately measured with the data. For example, I find only one item directly refers to information benefits, “the community has good information disseminating network such as trough Neighborhood Administrator or volunteers”, which is not necessarily related to networking. The changes do not affect the research questions of the dissertation but may have impact on the research findings that I will bring up in the discussion chapter. As a result of these analytical considerations, the research framework is simplified as Figure 2 which focuses on the dynamics among networking, performance, and the influential factors at organization level.
The research framework is to examine the relation between networking and performance of a CBO with a social capital perspective. Organizational networking regarding the active collaborative relationships among organizations is the independent variable. There are two forms of networking. The partnerships with other agencies in the same living neighborhood as a targeted CBO, such as local temples or churches, police office, and Neighborhood Administrator office, are called “networking within community”. The inner partnerships may benefit solidarity of being a community and information exchange, which works as bonding social capital that leads to improved performance of a CBO. On the other hand, networking beyond community is defined as
the partnerships with agencies outside of a targeted CBO’s living neighborhood. The agencies to connect with can be local and central governments, other CBOs, and private organizations that provide funding, learning opportunities, and other resources. These external relationships function as linking and bridging social capital that may enhance information exchange and control of autonomous development that are critical for a CBO’s sustainability in the competitive environment.

The dependent variables are effectiveness and innovation, the core traits of performance that networking can benefit. Effectiveness is the degree organization goals are realized. Innovation is the continuous and long-term development of an organization. Effectiveness and innovation are correlated because one can be means and aims of the other. Implementing organization goals in short term is the base for a CBO to work on organization development in the long term. The continuous preparation for organization development helps a CBO to carry out the present goals. The two dependent variables are correlated in practice.

The control variables are organization factors that are influential for networking to be present and/or beneficial for a CBO, including funding sources, leadership, and community capacity. Reliance on government funding impedes a CBO from networking with other organizations. Leadership that effectively responds to community needs and organization management issues are crucial for a CBO’s performance as well as partnership development. Community capacity in this dissertation is defined as the assets of a given community that can be leveraged by a CBO to improve its performance and in turn enhance the wellbeing of the community. Four elements of community capacity have been identified critical. Sense of community refers to the shared norms and values that
reflect connectedness of community residents. Commitment is community residents’ willingness and perception of being stakeholders of the community. Problem-solving ability regards the opportunities and actions of community resident to solve problems collectively. Access to resources is about obtaining and integrating resources within and beyond the community. These elements of community capacity are created and owned by residents of a community, which are conceptually close to social capital of a community that facilitate cooperative actions toward common good. Essentially, CBOs like CDAs in Taiwan need to draw upon (and work on) community capacity in order to carry out its short-term goals and long-term development. These organization factors should be taken into consideration when the association between networking and performance is claimed.

In order to produce useful indication for the practice and advance the theory development, the study selectively assumes that the organization factors are moderators modifying the relation of networking to performance. The interaction between networking and leadership, community capacity, or funding resources would strengthen or weaken the desirable performance outcomes. The literature suggests networking can be considered a possible cause of performance, but the third variables are treated as mediator, confounder, covariate, or moderator interchangeably or indifferently. Taking leadership for example, networking may enhance leadership and good leadership makes performance improvement, leadership can be a confounding variable causing both networking and performance or a covariate that is related both networking and performance, or leadership may modify the relation of networking to performance. Any of these relations appears possible because the theories are developing and the practice is complex. However, it is necessary for the present study to specify the roles of the
organization factors in the research framework so that the analysis could be made precisely. By including the moderation effects at some point of analysis, the study will be able to explain why networking improves performance of one CBO but not another. The funders and CBOs would be interested to know what kind of CBO in terms of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources is more likely to benefit from networking.

The Secondary Data

Introduction of The Dataset

This dissertation is a secondary data analysis. I obtained a survey dataset about the operational practice of Community Development Associations (CDAs) in Taiwan. As stated in earlier chapters, CDAs are a kind of CBOs that are non-governmental, non-profit, and voluntary groups oriented to serve the needs of community residents. The data were from a research project, titled “Growth or Development: A Study on Community Capacity and Community Life Quality” sponsored by the National Science Council of Taiwan (Hwang, 2011). The data were collected by face-to-face interview with a structured survey instrument during the years of 2009 to 2011. The survey questions were developed with inputs of a group of experts. Hwang (2011) first conducted a literature review and interviewed 20 experienced community leaders to develop the survey instrument. The draft survey was reviewed by five experts, and then all comments were integrated and provided for their second-round review. The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that the scope, content, and wording were meaningful to targeted CDAs and reflective to the community practice in Taiwan. In addition, a few questions that had low construct validity and reliability in a pilot test were removed from the survey instrument (see the survey instrument in Appendix A). Besides a few open-ended questions about
basic information of the organization and the community, most questions in the survey use a five-point Likert scale.

The dataset is a probability sample which was collected by stratified random sampling. The primary selection unit was town and the secondary level was CDA. The sampling frame included 6,443 CDAs officially registered with local governments in 2009. The research team of Hwang (2011) randomly selected 40 units, in which two towns of few CDAs were combined as the one unit, and then 15 CDAs in each chosen unit. A sample of 600 CDAs was generated for the pilot test in 2010 and 301 CDAs responded, a 50.2% response rate. Another 600 CDAs were selected in the same way from the remaining CDAs in the sample frame for the formal test in 2011, and 339 CDAs responded, a 56.5% response rate. The respondents who actually completed the survey were mostly Presidents (66.8%) and Executive Directors (21.5%) of the CDAs who were in charge of their organizations and knew their communities well. Due to the little difference on instruments and data collection time between pretest and official survey, I use both data to have the maximum sample size for future analysis; that is, a total of 640 CDAs.

Many of the survey items measuring community capacity are applicable to the dissertation for two reasons. First, the constructs of community capacity in the data were primarily based on the ABCD Model and community building framework of Chanskin (2001) which the dissertation also includes in developing the conceptual model. Second, networking with other communities and resources was recognized as a kind of “active capacity” in contrast to “static capacity” such as human capital, cultural assets and public constructions of a CDA. However, there are discrepancies between the survey constructs
and this dissertation because of our different units of analysis. Hwang (2011) took a community as the analysis unit and a CDA as a representative of a community. In the survey design, the construct of bonding social capital focused on cooperative relationships among community residents and linking social capital referred to a community(or the representing CDA)’s connection with other CDAs. Whereas, my focus is organizational networking, my unit of analysis is a CDA, and the connection among community residents is not my primary interest. These differences add complications for me to use this data set that have been mentioned in the section of research framework and will be discussed again in the section of measurement.

Overall, the dataset is valuable for the dissertation. It provides rich, though not perfect, information about the CDAs’ networking and performance. The survey instrument has good quality for its careful efforts fitting the content and wording with the present context in Taiwan. The sample size allows me to conduct multivariate statistical analysis for testing the research hypotheses. To my knowledge, it is the only existing data of probability sample of CBOs in Taiwan. The findings are likely to have adequate power of generalization for Taiwan and offer implications for other similar societies.

Overview of The Sample

For an overview of the sample, I hereby summarize the descriptive statistics of the CDAs’ basic characteristics in the dataset (see Table 4). The CDAs are located in rural area (48.8%), urban area (27.7%), and mixed area (23.4%). The communities the CDAs located can have as few as 30 households or as many as 11,000 households. The average size of these communities is 1,208 household (SD=1,264.5) or 3,833 individuals (SD=3,689.9). The proportions of major ethnic groups of community residents generally
reflect the population structure of Taiwan. Most CDAs identify their top one resident ethnicity is Min-Nan (82.2%) while other ethnic groups are well mixed in the community. Min-Nan is one ethnic group whose people are originally from a south eastern area of mainland China near Taiwan more than two generations ago. However, the structure of residents’ occupation is the opposite of Taiwan society, which indicates the CDAs from rural areas may be over represented in the sample.

Here are some organization characteristics about the CDAs. First is membership. Members of a CDA, individuals or group, by law have the obligation of paying membership fees, have votes in elections of president and board of directors, and rights of making major decisions of the association. Staff, volunteers, and community residents are not necessarily members unless they apply to be and fulfill the obligations. Sponsor members have equal rights and obligations with other kinds of members but have no vote in decision making. In the dataset, the average membership size is 133 persons (SD=128.1), and 47 CDAs have on average two group members (SD=19.8). How experienced are the CDAs and their main leaders? The CDAs have an average age of 12.5 years (SD=2.54) and median 14 years, with 7.1% CDAs newly initiated in the last 3 years. The leaders of CDAs also have a mixture of length of experience on the positions. The average tenure of current elected Presidents is 3.8 years (SD=2.79) and 3.9 years (SD=3.21) for Executive Director but some of them have been in their roles more than 20 years.

CDAs provide a variety of services and programs: 48.3% run elderly clubs offering learning and/or leisure activities for older adults, 49.4% host “mothers’ class” which is a learning and/or leisure group for female residents, 54.7% maintain community
watch programs, 60.3% provide Community Primary Care Units for older adults, and 3.5% have other programs of sports, leisure and education. As to the workforce of the CDAs, volunteers are important but the sizes of formally trained volunteer teams vary within a range from 0 to 300 people. Among the CDAs, 71.1% have formally trained volunteer teams with an average size of 29 volunteers (SD=32.6). It is not common for a CDA to hire staff. Only 25.4% (n=160) of the CDAs have part-time (mean=1, SD=2.0) or full-time workers (mean=3, SD=2.3). Even Executive Directors are mostly employed part-time (76.9%, n=465).

As to funding sources, 76.9% (n=489) of the CDAs applied for governmental sponsorship or private funders during the three years prior to the survey, from 2008 to 2010. Comparing frequency and funding scale, governments are more important partners for financial reasons than private sector agencies. On average, each CDA submitted about six applications to governments for awards, program assistance, and/or service contract and successfully received about five funds in the past three years. The total amount of public funding a CDA receives in three years has a median of NT$150,000 (about US$50,000) and average of NT$451,128 (about US$15,000). Only 11.7% of the CDAs had applied for funding from private organizations. They received on average NT$22,476 (about US$7,000) in the past three years, one twentieth of the public funding. These external funding can be contracts which comes with strict reimbursement obligations including but not limited to accounting procedures and executive reports with proofs of outputs and/or outcomes, for example, the Primary Care Units for older adults and most government administrated programs. Poor implementation of the sponsored program would lead to discontinuation or decreased fund in the following years. Nonetheless,
some funds are by nature awards that require application but the obligation of fulfilling
the program is loosely monitored, such as funding from private organizations and certain
public support for bottom-up activities of CDAs. Unfortunately, the dataset does not
include any information about other funding sources such as donation and fee for service.
Table 4

Characteristics of The Research Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households in community</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1264.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in community</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27800</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>3833</td>
<td>3689.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual members</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>128.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group members</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor members</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally trained volunteers</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time workers</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time workers</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the organization (year)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of current President (year)</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of current Executive Director (year)</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funding in the past three years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application submitted</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application received</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received amount (NT$)</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>980000</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>451128</td>
<td>983029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding in the past three years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application received</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received amount (NT$)</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3800000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22476</td>
<td>173837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area including mountain</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnics majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Nan</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China originated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal &amp; others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top one occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/ retired</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continuing next page)
### (Table 4 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services/programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior club</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ class</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community watch</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Primary Care Unit</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO government funding applied and received in three years</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO private funding applied and receive in three years</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Hypotheses**

The dissertation asks (1) whether organization networking improves a CBO’s organization performance and (2) what the factors impeding or strengthening the desirable effects of organizational networking on organization performance are.

Effectiveness and innovation are the primary traits of performance that networking would benefit. Networking is categorized into two forms, within community and beyond community. The influential factors identified in the literature reviewed and available with the secondary data are at organization level, including leadership, community capacity, and funding sources. These organization factors are considered as control variables as well as moderators for the effects of networking on performance. A series of research hypotheses are built with the conclusions of literature review to answer the research questions. To be rigid, the subjects in the research hypotheses are CDAs with respect to the research sample. The potentiality and limitation of generalizing the findings for other kinds of CBOs in Taiwan and other societies will be explicated in the discussion chapter. The direction of relations between networking and performance are not specified in the hypotheses because partnership development brings benefits and costs for a CBO. Here are the hypotheses to be tested:
1. Organizational networking is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the organization factors are controlled.

1a. Networking within community is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

1b. Networking beyond community is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

2. Organizational networking is associated with innovation of a CDA when the organization factors are controlled.

2a. Networking within community is associated with innovation of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

2b. Networking beyond community is associated with innovation of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

3. Organizational networking is associated with organization performance, including effectiveness and innovation, of a CDA when other forms of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

3a. Networking within community is associated with organization performance of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.
3b. Networking beyond community is associated with organization performance of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.

4. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance varies by leadership of a CDA when the other organization factors are considered.

5. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance for a CDA varies by community capacity when the other organization factors are considered.

6. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance varies by funding sources of a CDA when the other organization factors are considered.

The first three hypotheses answer my first research question, “Whether organization networking is beneficial to performance of a CBO?” The first and second hypotheses examine the effect of organizational networking on two traits of organization performance separately, and their sub-hypotheses specify the two forms of organizational networking. The third hypothesis considers the relation between the overall organization networking and the aggregated variable of organization performance in a general approach. The influential organization factors are included as control variables in these hypotheses since the existing literature has recognized they may facilitate or impede the occurrence or benefits of organizational networking.

The rest of the hypotheses answer the other research question, "What are the factors impeding or strengthening the desirable effects of organizational networking on organization performance?" As the conclusion of literature review, the positive impact of networking on performance does not always occur because factors at organization, network, and macro environment levels may work in between. The dissertation will
inspect interactions between networking and the three organization factors. These hypotheses include the moderating effects of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources on networking in addition to the main effects of these variables. The purpose is to explore some of the possible dynamics among the features of a CBO, its community, and partnership development so that the dissertation would provide realistic expectation of networking and precise suggestions about partnership management. In reality, a CBO can have different combination of networking activities, leadership quality, community capacity, and concerns of performance, all of which may interact with one another in practice. For the best practice, a CBO needs to know the priority of networking types (whom to connect with i.e. organization within or outside the community; government agencies, private organizations, or other CDAs) in consideration of their given organization qualities (i.e. leadership, funding source, and community capacity).

**Measures**

None of the established scales in the dataset can directly apply to the dissertation. I developed measures of the research variables by selecting all survey items that are meaningfully appropriate for a variable (see Appendix B) and then examine the correlation structure of the survey items with principal component analysis (PCA), using IBM SPSS Statistics19.0 for construct validity. The statistics generated in PCA, informed that the composing items selected for a variable (factor) are related to one another and summarize most of the information (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The base of extracting factor properties was set as covariance matrix rather than correlation due to the same scaling of all survey items adopted in the measures. The results of factor
analysis are summarized in Appendix C. I did not use the tool of rotation to achieve a simple factor pattern because the variables were either single-dimension (e.g. leadership) or of dimensions that were theoretically correlated (e.g. types of networking, traits of performance, and elements of community capacity); the oblique rotation suitable for the meaning-related factors like this study was tried but not adopted because the results involved too many cross-loading items. The measures of the research variables were developed as in Table 5. Mean scores of the composing items are calculated to present a CDA’s features on the variables quantitatively. Cronbach Alpha is generated for each measure to indicate internal reliability of the measuring items, and all are acceptable in a range from .603 to .901 (Hair et al., 1998).

The independent variables are about organization networking. *Networking within community* is measured with three items (Alpha=.603) referring to the relationships with local organizations, Neighborhood Administrator, and local government branches (item B10, B11 and B12, respectively). *Networking beyond community* is measured with five items about cooperative relationships with other communities, government departments, and private organizations (Alpha=.829; also see Table 5 for details). The items include networking with other communities are in general (B9) and for learning (C10 and C11), collaboration with governments (C12), and collaboration with private organizations (C13). The aggregated variable of these two networking forms is called *organizational networking* (8 items, Alpha=.807). The face meaning of survey questions C12 and C13 does not specify location of the agencies to partner with, while they have similar factor loading patterns that are similar to item C10 and C11 and are distinctive from the items about networking within community. It appears that the respondents might related these
two questions to networking beyond community since they were asked along with other questions about external resource (e.g. C10 and C11; C18 about recruiting experts outside community).

The dependent variables are about organization performance. The four items measuring *effectiveness* (Alpha=.793) refer to implementation team (C33), goal setting annually (C36), willingness to carry out the annual goals (C37), and the coherence between organization activities and its goals (C38). The other items measuring *innovation* (Alpha=.814) include improving community strength (C15), developing various resources (C17), recruiting workforce from outside (C18), preparation for leadership continuation (C31), and improving organization capacity (C34). The aggregation of effectiveness and innovation is called *organization performance* (9 items, Alpha=.875).

The influential organization factors as control variables and moderators in the research framework are measured as below. *Leadership* is measured with eight items extracted from the leadership section of the survey data (Alpha=.935). Respondents were asked to evaluate the level of the CDA leader’s capacity to manage the organization (C19), solve community problems (C20), respond to needs and changes of community (C23), gather internal and external resources (C24), understand the pressing community problems (C25), understand the norms and values of the community (C26), communicate with the community (C27), and initiate community residents (C28).

The measure of *community capacity* is composed of 18 items in four elements (Alpha=.901). Sense of community includes the five items (Alpha=.825) regarding community residents’ trust toward each other (B1), respect to community norms (B5), compliance with community agreements (B6), residents' interaction with each other (B8),
and tolerance of different opinions (B17). Commitment has three measuring items (Alpha=.769) covering community residents’ willingness to help people in need (B18), responsiveness to public affairs (B21), and concern of collective interest (B22) in the community. Problem-solving ability has seven items (Alpha=.824), among which four are about community residents’ opportunity to participate in community affairs (B15, B24, and B25) and three are about their willingness to actually take action (B7, B8, and B9). Access to resources is measured with three items (Alpha=.610) referring to obtaining workforce (B28) and funding (B31) and integrating various resources (C16) for community development which is the general goal the CDAs. The average score of the totally 18 items is used as the aggregated value of community capacity for the following analysis.

**Funding sources** is the only categorical variable used in the analysis of this study. The level of reliance on government funding is concerning for networking and its benefits. There are 74.0% CDAs in the data that applied for and received funding from government in the past three years, while only 10.4% CDAs had funding from private organizations. In addition, the dataset does not provide information about other funding resources. Thus, I identify three groups of funding sources: no government funding (26.0%), only government funding (64.5%), and mixed funding (9.6%). Two dummy variables are created with CDAs receiving only government funding as the reference group for the following analysis. One is *no government funding*, in which CDAs scored one are those did not have any government funds in the three years surveyed. Most of them did not reported any external funding and six reported receiving some small-amout private grants. The other is *mixed funding sources*, in which the CDAs scored one are
those received both grants from governments and private funders during that period. If a case has both dummy variables scored zero, it is a CDA received only government funding.
### Table 5

The Measures of Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research variables</th>
<th>Measuring items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational networking (Alpha=.807)</td>
<td>B10. The community has good relationships with local organizations such as temple, churches, and community associations.&lt;br&gt;B11. The community has good relationships with the Neighborhood Administrator.&lt;br&gt;B12. The community has good relationships with local government branches such as police offices and public health centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within community (Alpha=.603)</td>
<td>B9. The community has good networking with other communities.&lt;br&gt;C10. The community often observes other communities for learning.&lt;br&gt;C11. The community proactively learns from other communities.&lt;br&gt;C12. The community would collaborate with governments to carry out programs/services.&lt;br&gt;C13. The community would collaborate with groups or agencies in private sector to carry out programs/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond neighborhood (Alpha=.829)</td>
<td>C14. The community would collaborate with other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization performance (Alpha=.793)</td>
<td>Effectiveness (Alpha=.793)&lt;br&gt;C33. The community has good implementation team/organization.&lt;br&gt;C36. This community organization makes annual goals.&lt;br&gt;C38. Most members respond to organization goals when carrying out the activities/services.&lt;br&gt;C39. The community had successes of community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation (Alpha=.814)</td>
<td>C15. The community utilizes its specialties to improve strengths of the community.&lt;br&gt;C17. The community has sufficient ability to develop/innovate various resources.&lt;br&gt;C18. The community has good ability to recruit workforce outside of community.&lt;br&gt;C31. The community has preparation for leadership (dis)continuation in the future.&lt;br&gt;C34. The community is able to improve organization development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (Alpha=.935)</td>
<td>C19. The community leader has the capacity to manage the community organization.&lt;br&gt;C20. The leader has capacity to solve community problems.&lt;br&gt;C23. The leader responds to the needs and changes of the community with flexibility.&lt;br&gt;C24. The leader knows how to gather internal and external resources.&lt;br&gt;C25. The leader understands the problems the community is facing.&lt;br&gt;C26. The leader understands the norms and values of the community.&lt;br&gt;C27. The leader has good communication mechanisms with community residents.&lt;br&gt;C28. The leader is able to initiate community residents to participate in community fairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research variables</td>
<td>Measuring items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity</td>
<td>Sense of community (Alpha=.901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alpha=.901)</td>
<td>B1. The community residents trust each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5. The community residents follow the general rituals and norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6. The residents accept community agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B8. The community residents interact with each other intensively or closely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B17. The community residents accepts/tolerant different opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Alpha=.769)</td>
<td>B18. The community residents give a hand to anyone in trouble in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B21. The community residents have good commitment to community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B22. The community residents concern the collective interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving ability</td>
<td>(Alpha=.824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B15. The community residents have equal opportunity to participate in public affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B16. The community residents have equal access to all services and welfare benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B24. The community residents have opportunities to express their thoughts on community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B25. The community residents have opportunities to participate in decision making of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7. The community residents would like to postpone their own work for public affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8. The community residents would like to contribute space, money, or labor for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9. The community mobilized residents in reaction to urgent needs rapidly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>(alpha=.610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B28. The community has workforce for community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B31. The community has enough funding for community development, including facilities and social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C16. The community has capacity to integrate various resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources</td>
<td>(A categorical variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The categorical variable is generated with answers of the three questions: A14.1 Have you applied to any grants/funds from the government during 1998-2000? A14.2 Government funding: How many programs/grants did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding? A14.3 Funding from private sector: How many programs did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Except items used for constructing the variable of funding sources, all measuring items adopted are in five-point Likert scale in the survey.*
**Data Analysis Strategy**

The analysis involves four steps which are conducted with the software packages of SPSS 19.0. The first step is descriptive statistics. The values of most variables are measured with the mean scores of their composing survey items in five-point Likert scale. The dispersion of the variables and their composing items/sub-scales show the general situations the CDAs have. The valid sample size for each variable reveals the quality of the data. With regard to the multivariable analysis methods adopted, too many missing values or a distribution against normality will bias the analysis. The basic characteristics of the CDAs such as size, services, and workforce have been summarized in the previous section introducing the secondary data thus will not be repeated.

The second step is bivariate analysis. I look at zero order correlation between pairs of the continuous research variables and one-way ANOVA (analysis of variance among groups) for the categorical variable of funding sources. The purpose is to preclude first examination of relations between independent variables and dependent variables without including the control variables and second examination of the co-linearity among variables that would bias the estimates in the following analysis.

The third step is to examine the research hypotheses by conducting multiple regression analysis. Two groups of modeling will be developed. One group is for examining the first three hypothesis and their sub-hypotheses about the associations between networking and performance by controlling the organization factors. The other group of modeling is for examining the other half hypotheses about the moderating effects of the organization factors. Interaction terms, products of one of the organization factors and one of the networking forms, will be computed and added in the regression
models. By testing the coefficient of an interaction term, I can say whether the effect of networking on performance is greater or weaker for a CDA whose certain organization property is higher or lower. A profile of the sample's networking and performance will be presented to integrate the main and moderating effects of the organization factors.
Findings

This chapter explicates the results of data analysis. First, descriptive characteristics of the research variables will be summarized for an overview of the organizational networking and organization performance of the CDAs studied. The organizational features of the CDAs and demographics of their community have been introduced in the methodology chapter thus are not repeated here. Afterwards, the results of bivariate analysis will be reported for a general understanding of the relation between the research variables. These two sections also prelude the concerns of missing values and co-linearity in the following multivariate analyses. Then, the major findings, the results of multiple regression analysis, will be presented. The research hypotheses about the effect of organization networking on organization performance for a CDA will be examined with consideration of the organization factors as control variables and moderators. Last, a profile of CDAs' networking is developed with the results of moderation models, specifying the degree of benefits a certain form of networking would bring to certain performance trait for the CDAs having certain combination of leadership level, community capacity level, and funding sources type.

Descriptive Characteristics

The descriptive statistics of the research variables and their composing items or subscales are listed in Table 6, including minimum value (min), maximum value (max), mean, stander deviation (SD), skewness, kurtosis, and valid sample size (n). Except the dummy variables of funding sources, “no government funding” and “mixed funding sources”, others are treated as continuous variables. Values of the continuous variables are mean scores of the composing survey items which are in five-point Likert scale, from
1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree and with 3=neutral. The higher value of a variable indicates the better its condition is. These continuous variables have means between 3.18 (access to resources, an element of community capacity) and 3.98 (relationships with local private organizations, an item of networking within community). That is, the respondents on average have neutral to positive evaluation on the research variables. For example, the variable of networking within community has a mean of 3.95 (SD=.546), meaning the CDAs tend to agree that they have good relationships with local government branches, local private organizations, and offices of Neighborhood Administrator; networking beyond community has a mean of 3.71 (SD=.606), showing the CDAs tend to agree that they maintain networking with other communities, external government departments, and private organizations.

The values of standard deviation show that moderate differences exist among the studied CDAs. The variables of relationships with Neighborhood Administrator (mean=3.92, SD=.843) and with external private organizations (mean=3.69, SD=.839) are especially of bigger standard deviation compared with other types of networking within or beyond community. It appears the studied CDAs vary at relatively greater levels of networking with these two potential partners, which decreases the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of the measure of networking within community. In addition, the standard deviation of the aggregated variable of organization performance is also high but not for its composing traits of effectiveness and innovation, which indicates the CDAs may be good at effectiveness but poor at innovation or vice versa. It is necessary to examine effectiveness and innovation separately.
Overall, the sample is good for the following analysis. The negative values of skewness suggest the variables have slightly left skewed distribution, with few respondents strongly disagreeing with the positive description of the adopted survey items. High Kurtosis indicates a sharp peak and long tail of distribution, a characteristic against normality. The values of Kurtosis are generally low for the research variables, indicating that the small range of values (from one to five) in the data does not bring distributions of the variables away from normality. The variable of relationships with local private organizations is the one of largest Kurtosis, meaning it has more respondent gave answers around the means and more on the negative side (longer tail, left skewed in this case) than other variables. In addition, the numbers of valid cases of the variables are in a range from 605 to 638 with 640 as the sample size. The missing cases are mostly small, less than 5% of the sample. The variable with the smallest valid sample size is funding sources which is categorical (missing n=35, 5.4% sample size). The valid sample size for listwise analysis, meaning the sample without any missing values on any of the research variables, is 577. No systematic difference is found between the missing cases and others (results of independent sample t-test in Table7). There appears to be no appreciable bias in the study sample due to missing data.
### Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of The Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational networking (aggregated)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within community</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government branches</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local private organizations</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>-.650</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Administrator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>-.820</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond community</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>-.412</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other communities/CDAs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External government departments</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>-.781</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External private organizations</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.889</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization performance (aggregated)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity (aggregated)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving ability</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No government funding (=1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed funding sources(=1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>2.752</td>
<td>5.593</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Comparison of Missing and Valid Cases in The Variable of Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Listwise valid cases</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational networking (aggregated)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within community</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government branches</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local private organizations</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Administrator</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond community</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other communities/CDAs</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External government departments</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External private organizations</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization performance (aggregated)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity (aggregated)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving ability</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Independent sample t-test, 2-tailed
**Bivariate Analysis**

I conducted bivariate analyses for a preliminary examination of relations between the research variables, including correlation analysis for continuous variables and ANOVA for the categorical variable. Table 8 lists the zero order correlations (Pearson’s $R^2$) among the research variables in which the categorical variable of funding sources is included as dummy variables. The correlation between each paired variable describes how much one variable is associated with the other. All continuous research variables are significantly associated in a positive direction ($p<.01$). The composing items of networking types and separate elements of community capacity are omitted here because only their aggregated values will be included in the following analysis due to the concern of partiailling fallacy (Gorden, 1968) in multiple regression (see Appendix D). In brief, the data show that some of the sub-variables are not substantially distinct, e.g. sense of community and resident commitment, thus the inclusion of these highly associated variables can bias the estimation of their effects (regression coefficients) on the dependent variable.

In general, the associations between independent and dependent variables are strong and require further examination. The correlation between overall networking and overall performance is significantly positive ($R^2=.664$). The more actively a CDA networks with other organizations, the better it performs in goal implementation and long term development generally. To be specific, networking within community is significantly associated with effectiveness ($R^2=.347$) and innovation ($R^2=.375$); networking beyond community and both traits of performance at a higher level ($R^2=.636$ for effectiveness, $R^2=.694$ for innovation). Preliminarily, networking with organizations
outside community has a stronger positive association with performance than networking with other organizations in the same community. Among variables of organization factors, leadership appears to be the most influential organization factor that has to be taken into consideration. Leadership has high correlation with overall organizational networking, networking beyond community, effectiveness, innovation, and overall performance ($R^2 > .6$). When the leaders of a CDA well respond to community needs and organization management issues, the given CDA performs fine and actively connects with other organizations and the community capacity of its community is good. The aggregated variable of community capacity is positively associated with all the other variables. Transforming the variable of funding sources as two dummy variables, the CDAs without government funding are significantly less active in networking and weaker in performance than those receiving only government funding.

Because the variable of funding sources is categorical in nature, its relation with other variables is also examined with One-way ANOVA (analysis of variance among groups). For all the variables except networking within community, the F statistics show there are significant differences among the three groups of funding sources regarding most research variables (Table 9). The CDAs without government funds have significantly lower scores on all variables than the other two groups. Regarding the independent and dependent variables, those without government funds are less active in networking beyond community (Figure 3) and less effective and less innovative (Figure 4) than the other CDAs. Two impressions are observed. First, compared with the CDAs receiving only government funding, those without any government funding are less proficient in organization operation and their communities are also less capable in
community development. Second, CDAs receiving mixed funding which are less reliant on government do not perform better or network more intensively than the CDAs with only government funding. It is conflicting to the literature about organizational networking that reliance on government funding may not discourage the CDAs in Taiwan from networking or diminish the benefits of networking.

It appears that the variable of funding sources may be a proxy of organization capacity in this study. As described in the section of research background, the government of Taiwan has been setting agenda of community development, initiating or supporting CDAs’ development, and sponsoring a variety of services CDAs and other kinds of CBOs provide in neighborhoods. Public funds for CDAs which can be contract or subsidy based generally comes with accountability requirements. The CDAs applying and receiving funds from government usually own adequate organization capacity to plan, carry out, and report their services. These ability and skills required by governmental money are also applicable to performance improvement of a CDA, which explains why government funding is positively associated with performance of a CDA. In addition, the CDAs might directly benefit from the governmental financial support that makes certain services possible. Indirectly, some CDAs might learn from the training opportunities and social network platforms embedded in the governmental grants, and these resources are helpful to the CDAs' performance in both short and long term. The consequent question would be-"If receiving external funding reflects organization capacity of a CDA, why does not it make performance even better by receiving private funds in addition to public funds?" A possible explanation could be that applying for private funds, on top of work demanded by the public funds, may constrain CDAs’
already limited capacity and impact their long-term development. The potential role of funding sources will be further examined in the following multivariate analysis by taking the effects of the other organization factors into consideration.
Table 8

Correlation Coefficients between Research Variables (Pearson’s R^2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Networking within community</td>
<td>.823**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Networking beyond community</td>
<td>.859**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization performance</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Innovation</td>
<td>.592**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.636**</td>
<td>.912**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Leadership</td>
<td>.643**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.942**</td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community capacity</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>.616**</td>
<td>.666**</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 No Government funding</td>
<td>-.168**</td>
<td>-.082**</td>
<td>-.188**</td>
<td>-.197**</td>
<td>-.199**</td>
<td>-.168**</td>
<td>-.155**</td>
<td>-.142**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Mixed funding sources</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.193**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< 0.05. **P< 0.01.

Table 9

Group Comparison by Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No Government Funding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within community</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond community</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>10.922</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>12.405</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>9.513</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>7.397</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>6.351</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ANOVA test, two-tailed*
Figure 3

Means Plot of Networking Forms by Funding Sources
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Figure 4

Means plot of performance traits by funding sources
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Multiple Regression

A series of multiple regression analysis is conducted to test the research hypotheses about the theoretical effects of networking on performance of a CDA by controlling the identified organization factors. There were two stages of modeling involved. I started with three groups of regression models using effectiveness, innovation, and organization performance (the aggregated variable of effectiveness and innovation) as dependent variables. The independent variables in each group of regression models were overall networking, networking within community, and networking beyond community. The purposes were to identify whether networking leads to performance improvement and specifically which type of organizational networking leads which trait of performance improvement. The second step was to examine the hypothesized interaction between the organization factors and networking. I examined whether organization factors moderated the effects of networking on either effectiveness or innovation. I included the interaction terms of both networking forms with leadership, community capacity, and the two dummy variables funding sources in separate regression models. The purpose was to observe whether the networking effects of interest vary by any of these organization factors. With the findings, a profile of CDA’s organization performance with regard to networking was made.

Main Effects of Networking

I summarize the results of multiple regression analysis in Table 10. Standardized regression coefficients (beta) are reported for comparing the relative importance of the variables in the same models. Effectiveness is the dependent variable in Model 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. It is measured with items about implementation team, setting and fulfilling
annual goals, and having community development success in the study. Hypothesis 1 about the association between overall networking and effectiveness is supported in Model 1.1. The overall networking variable (beta=.159, p<.001) has a positive effect on effectiveness when the organization factors are controlled. Model 1.2 includes the two forms of networking separately. The results show the hypothesis 1a is not supported. Networking within community explains little of the variance of effectiveness and in a surprisingly negative direction (beta=-.056, p<.1). Whereas, the hypothesis 1b is supported. Networking beyond community is positively associated with effectiveness (beta=.266, p<.001) when the other form of networking and the key organization factors are considered. For a CDA that needs to improve its effectiveness, the findings suggest organizations outside of the neighborhood, in relative to organizations in the neighborhood, may be among the higher priority to connect with although networking in general is helpful.

Table 10

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis (Beta)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Effectiveness (a)</th>
<th>Innovation(b)</th>
<th>Performance (a+b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.159***</td>
<td>.243***</td>
<td>.218***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-.056+</td>
<td>-.055+</td>
<td>-.064*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.266***</td>
<td>.375***</td>
<td>.353***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-.055+</td>
<td>.325***</td>
<td>.446***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.490***</td>
<td>.381***</td>
<td>.446***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.179***</td>
<td>.325***</td>
<td>.220***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational networking (aggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.490***</td>
<td>.381***</td>
<td>.446***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity (aggregated)</td>
<td>.179***</td>
<td>.230***</td>
<td>.220***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No government funding</td>
<td>-.080**</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.070**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed funding sources</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.046+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+P<.1. *P<.05. **P<.01. *** P< .001.
The dependent variable in Model 2.1 and 2.2 is innovation, the continuous and long-term organization development which is measured with items referring to improving community strengths, developing various resources, recruiting external workforce, preparing for leadership continuation, and improving organization development. Hypothesis 2 about the association between networking and innovation is supported in Model 2.1. The variable of organization networking has a positive effect on innovation (beta=.243, p<.001) when the organization factors are controlled. Hypothesis 2a is not supported in Model 2.2 with the weak and negative effect of networking within community (beta=-.055, p<.1). Hypothesis 2b is supported in Model 2.2. Controlling the other form of networking and the organization factors, networking beyond community is found to be a strong predictor of innovation (beta=.375, p<.001). The finding indicates that a CDA may want to focus on building relationships with organizations outside of the community so that external resources could be introduced and used for improving the long-term organization development.

The dependent variables in Model 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 are organization performance, the aggregate variable of effectiveness and innovation. Hypothesis 3 is supported in Model 3.1. Controlling the organization factors, organization networking is generally beneficial for organization performance of a CDA (beta=.218, p<.001). The data support Hypothesis 3a which is concerned with the effect of networking within the community on organization performance while in a surprisingly negative direction (beta=-.064, p<.05). The cost of networking with organizations in the same neighborhood may exceed the benefit, or the dynamics among the potential partners and the included organization factors may go beyond the research framework. Hypothesis 3b is supported in Model 3.2.
Networking beyond community is found leading to positive organization performance when the other networking form and the organization factors are considered (beta=.353, p<.001). For a CDA that is not sure about which trait of performance they need to work on, developing cooperative ties with other communities, private agencies, and/or government departments outside the community seems less risky, regardless of its leadership, community capacity, and funding sources.

The above findings show that organizational networking is positively associated with performance of a CDA in terms of effectiveness and/or innovation regardless the leadership quality and funding sources of a CDA and the capacity of the community where the CDA locates. Networking beyond community is especially rewarding. The distant ties are critical for a CDA to carry out present goals as well as sustain in the changing environment. The social network outside the neighborhood of a given CDA is where the vital information, funding, and other resources are exchanged. Basically, the findings about the effects of networking beyond community on performance are coherent to social capital theories. Partnerships that bridge CDAs in different communities and links organizations of greater resources are both beneficial for performance of a CDA. However, the direction of which within-community networking affects performance is against the expectation. This might be a result of the low measurement reliability brought by using the secondary data or a reflection of a unique phenomenon of Taiwan's community practice.

**Main Effects of The Organization Factors**

Although the study focuses on the moderating effects of the organization factors, I briefly describe their main effects on performance variables for a complete understanding
of the variables' roles in the research framework before going into the analysis involving interaction effects. Two of three organization factors are consistently significant to performance variables across the models in Table 10. They are leadership and community capacity. Leadership is found influential to the aggregated variable of performance as well as the individual traits. A CDA performs well when its leader is capable in organization management and responsive to community needs. Community capacity is defined as the assets of a given community that can be leveraged by a CBO to improve its performance and in turn enhance the wellbeing of the community; and it is measured by the total scores of its four elements including sense of community, resident commitment, problem-solving ability, and access to resources. The above analysis results support the theoretical assumption that the better community capacity a CDA owns, the more innovative and/or effective the CDA can be.

In contrast to the robust impact of leadership and community capacity, the variable of funding sources is found only significant to effectiveness and the aggregated variable of performance. Building on the ANOVA analysis results reported earlier, the results of multiple regression precisely point out the difference between the three groups primarily comes from whether a CDA receiving government funds or not. The CDAs having no government funding, compared with the CDAs receiving only government funding, have significantly lower scores on effectiveness (beta=-.080, p<.01 in Model 1.1; beta=-.066, p<.05 in Model 1.2) and the aggregated organization performance (beta=-.070, p<.01 in Model 3.1; beta=-.052, p<.05 in Model 3.2). It could be that receiving governmental funds is a proxy of organization capacity that leads to positive performance, or the financial supports from governments and the related resources are
helpful for a CDA’s goal setting and fulfillment. However, the difference of innovation between the three groups becomes insignificant when networking variable(s) and the other organization factors are controlled. It seems the benefits of long-term organization development brought by external funding can also be accomplished by leadership, community capacity, or organization networking. From the perspective of managing a CDA, these resources can be assets that can be exchanged or transferred from one to another and in turn enhance long-term organization development. Also noticed in the findings, receiving funds from both public and private sectors is not always good for innovation of a CDA. Compared with the group receiving only government funding, the group of mixed funding sources is less innovative (beta=-.046, p<.1) and the difference is close to statistical significance level. The private funds may add too much extra work or focuses for the CDAs to sustain over time.

*Moderation of The Organization Factors*

The above multiple regression analysis treated the organization factors as control variables, and the results confirmed many positive impacts of networking on performance of a CBO regardless of its organization features. Given that not every CBO is able to benefit from networking, the study hypothesizes that the organization factors could be moderators strengthening or weakening the networking effects. The dependent variables used here are effectiveness and innovation, the individual traits of organization performance, because the previous analyses have found they are affected by networking differently. The significance and direction of the interaction terms will be examined to see if networking works differently by certain organization factors. Then, a profile of
CDAs will be presented to show how differently the networking effects vary at levels of the identified moderators.

Table 11 summarizes the results of models including moderation of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources. Based on the multiple regression models examined earlier (Model 1.2 on effectiveness and Model 2.2 on innovation), Model 1.3 on effectiveness and Model 2.3 on innovation are established by including the interaction terms hypothesized. With respect to effectiveness (Model 1.3), leadership strengthens the positive effect of networking beyond community (beta=.898, p<.05), community capacity weakens the positive effect of networking beyond community (beta=-1.069, p<.05), and networking within community is more helpful for CDAs receiving private and public funds (beta=.470, p<.05) than those receiving only government funding. With respect to innovation, none of the research variables’ effects reaches statistical significance level (Model 2.3). The data show that these organization factors, at least in the aggregated forms, do not moderate the impact of networking on innovation. If the measurement could be improved, further inquiry may examine the moderating effects of the composing constructs of community capacity toward networking and maybe separate the types of potential networking partners.
Table 11

Results of multiple regression analysis including moderation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effectiveness (Model 1.3)</th>
<th>Innovation (Model 2.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Networking within community (Within)</td>
<td>-.454</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Networking beyond community (Beyond)</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 No government funding (NoGov)</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Mixed funding sources (Mixed)</td>
<td>-.591</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2×1.1 Leadership × Within</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2×1.2 Leadership × Beyond</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3×1.1 Capacity × Within</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3×1.2 Capacity × Beyond</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1×1.1 NoGov × Within</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1×1.2 NoGov × Beyond</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2×1.1 Mixed × Within</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2×1.2 Mixed × Beyond</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+P < .1  *P < .05  **P < .01  ***P < .001.

In relation to the research hypotheses, the findings suggest moderation of the organization factors is limited to the performance trait of effectiveness. Hypothesis 4 is partially supported. The effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness varies by leadership. The better the leadership, the more beneficial the distant partnerships can be for a CDA. That is, the same amount of increase in networking beyond community would lead to greater level of long-term development improvement if the leaders are competent engaging community residents and managing the community organization. Hypothesis 5 is also partially supported. The effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness varies by community capacity. A CDA is more likely to advance its
effectiveness through beyond-community networking when its community owns a stronger combination of the assets including sense of community, commitment of residents, ability to solve problems, and access to resources. The data partially support the hypothesis 6 in that the CDAs having mixed funding sources gain more benefits of networking within community on effectiveness when compared with those receiving only government funds. This is the first and only time the variable of networking within community showing its significant influence on performance in the series of analyses. The variable of funding sources may mean more than a proxy of organization capacity. Receiving funding across public and private sectors seems to enable the benefits of partnerships in the same community.

In essence, results of the moderation models indicate that the networking effects on effectiveness differ by the levels of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources. In order to illustrate how much difference the moderators would make, a profile of the CDAs’ effectiveness is made by contrasting leadership at high and low levels, community capacity at high and low levels, and three groups of funding sources, i.e. twelve types of CDAs. High level is set as the mean value plus one standard deviation; low level is set as the mean value minus one standard deviation. I make charts visualizing the relation between networking forms (X axis) and effectiveness (Y axis). The value of effectiveness is predicted by assigning the values to the research variables into Model 1.2 (unstandardized coefficients reported in Table 11) for the twelve types of CDAs. In order to simplify the visualization the effect of a single networking form, the other networking form is set as zero when the values of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources are applied to the calculation. Figure 5 shows the total moderated effects of
networking within community on effectiveness; Figure 6 is for networking beyond community. The profile of networking’s effects on innovation is not presented because none of the hypothesized moderating effects of leadership, aggregated community capacity, and funding sources is supported by the data. Although the values have no absolute meanings, the direction and discrepancy of networking effects among CDAs of different features provide abundant indications to the practice.

With regard to networking within community (Figure 5), two similar trends exist among the CDAs without government funding, having mixed funding sources, and receiving only government funding. Community capacity is the determinant predictor of effectiveness when a CDA only networks within community. In relative to the CDAs of low level of community capacity, those of high community capacity have better effectiveness at the same level of networking within community. At the same level of community capacity, the moderation of leadership enhances the effect of networking within community on effectiveness. Distinctly, the slopes of the predicted effectiveness lines are positive in CDAs having mixed funding sources regardless of leadership level and community capacity level. These CDAs may share some properties, such as organization capacity of service planning and provision, which allows within-community networking to be manageable and beneficial. Organizational relationships in neighborhood can be complex especially in Taiwan where community partnerships are mostly informal and the CDAs sometimes compete for resources with other organizations (e.g. Neighborhood Administrator offices) in the same neighborhoods.

The slopes of lines regarding effectiveness and networking beyond community are all positive (Figure 6). Networking beyond community leads to effectiveness of a
CDA when effects of the organization factors are controlled and no networking within community occurs. At lower level of networking beyond community, the CDAs having high community capacity have better effectiveness for the strong main effect of leadership. As the level of networking beyond community increases, the moderator effect of community capacity reduces the positive impacts of leadership and such networking. The deepest slope appears in the types of high leadership and low community capacity across all three funding sources. That is, these types of CDAs obtain the best return rate of investment in networking beyond community. In addition, the chart shows networking beyond community can be a supplemental asset for a CDA to be effective in performance. Controlling leadership and networking within community, the CDAs having the low level of community capacity can eventually reach effectiveness at a level similar with those having high level community capacity by making the maximum level of beyond-community networking (=5).
Figure 5
Moderated Effects of Networking Within Community on Effectiveness
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Figure 6
Moderated Effects of Networking Beyond Community on Effectiveness
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Discussion

This chapter starts with a brief summary of the findings with regard to the supported and unsupported hypotheses. Followed is the section of discussion about the explanations and reflections of the findings with respect to the two research questions. One question is about the association between organizational networking and organization performance; the other is about the moderation effects of the influential organization factors. Implications of the important findings are developed for community organizations, policy makers and potential funders, and the relevant theory development and application. Before conclusion, limitations of generalizing the findings to community based organizations (CBOs) other than the studied community development organizations (CDAs) and societies other than Taiwan are raised and call for future research.

Summary of Findings

The descriptive characteristics of the sample show that the dataset has few missing data and little abnormal distribution of the research variables, thus it is a good fit for the designed multivariate regression analysis. The correlation analysis suggests high associations existing among the research variables, which is worth further examination. Based on the results of ANOVA, CDAs having only government funding, no government funding, and mixed funding sources are significantly different on all research variables except networking within community. Results of multiple regression analysis for testing the research hypotheses are summarized in Table 12. Organization networking in general leads to effectiveness, innovation, and the aggregated performance of both regardless of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources of a CDA. Networking beyond
community is found to be the form of networking bringing the benefits. When the moderator roles of leadership, community capacity, and funding sources are considered, the study finds that the theoretically beneficial impacts of networking can vary, in degree as well as direction, from one CDA to another because of these organization properties.

In brief, this study has six important findings. The first three are related to my first research question regarding the relation between networking and performance. (1) With regard to effectiveness, the hypothesized effects of networking beyond community and overall networking are supported when the key organization factors are controlled. (2) With regard to innovation, networking beyond community and overall networking are found to be positively associated when the key organization factors are controlled. (3) With regard to the aggregated variable of organization performance, networking beyond community is found to positively associated while networking within community is found to be negatively associated when the key organization factors are controlled.

The other half of the findings to be highlighted are regarding the moderating roles of the organization factors. While the moderation on innovation is not supported, the effect of organization networking on effectiveness can be strengthened by leadership, weakened by community capacity, and vary by funding sources. (4) Leadership enhances the effectiveness improvement brought by networking beyond community. If leaders of a CDA are competent in community engagement and organization management, the same amount of increase in external partnerships can lead to more positive change of effectiveness. (5) Community capacity reduces the return rate of networking by networking beyond community. The effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness may supplement the lack of community capacity. (6) The CDAs having
mixed funding sources receive greater benefits from networking within community than those having only government funding. Overall, reliance on government funding do not make networking less rewarding probably because the variable of funding sources reflects organization capacity of a CDA in Taiwan and the resources made possible by the external funds.

Table 12

Results of Testing the Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational networking is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 1.1) Organizational networking has a positive effect on effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Networking within community is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Not supported (Model 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Networking beyond community is associated with effectiveness of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 1.2) Networking beyond community has a positive effect on effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational networking is associated with innovation of a CDA when the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 2.1) Organizational networking has a positive effect on innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Networking within community is associated with innovation of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Not Supported (Model 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Networking beyond community is associated with innovation of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 2.2) Networking beyond community has a positive effect on innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continuing next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational networking is associated with organization performance, including effectiveness and innovation, of a CDA when other forms of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 3.1) Organizational networking has a positive effect on organization performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Networking within community is associated with organization performance of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 3.2) Networking within community has a negative effect on organization performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Networking beyond community is associated with organization performance of a CDA when the other form of organizational networking and the organization factors are controlled.</td>
<td>Supported (Model 3.2) Networking beyond community has a positive effect on organization performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance varies by leadership of a CDA when the other organization factors are considered.</td>
<td>Partially supported (Model 1.3) Leadership strengthens the effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance for a CDA varies by community capacity when the other organization factors are considered.</td>
<td>Partially supported (Model 1.3) Community capacity strengthens the effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The effect of organizational networking on organization performance varies by funding sources of a CDA when the other organization factors are considered.</td>
<td>Partially supported (Model 1.3) The CDAs having mixed funding sources receive greater benefit of effectiveness from within community networking than those receiving only government funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of the Findings

Organizational Networking and Organization Performance

This dissertation asks whether organizational networking (networking) leads to organization performance (performance) improvement for a CBO with a perspective of social capital. Overall, the study affirms that networking offers instrumental functions for a CBO’s effectiveness, innovation, and the aggregated performance of both, regardless of its leadership, community capacity, and funding sources. The explicit connection between the findings and social capital theories is visualized in Figure 7. The upper half is about the research variables of this study, two networking forms (within community and beyond community) and performance traits (effectiveness and innovation). The lower half of Figure 7 shows the relevant social capital concepts including benefits (solidarity, information, and control), types (bonding, and bridging & linking), and dimensions (structural, relational, and cognitive). The vertical position of each variable/concept is matched with theoretical meaning of the other relevant variables and concepts. For example, the dissertation hypothesized that networking beyond community would lead to positive outcome of effectiveness and innovation because theoretically such partnerships may work as bridging and linking social capital that generates benefits of information exchange and control over organization autonomy. The dashed areas are limitations of this study that will be explicated shortly.
The analysis results of this study identifies that networking beyond community is the form of partnership that leads to positive performance (effectiveness, innovation, and the aggregation of both). It appears that networking beyond community does work as bridging and/or linking social capital that brought in information benefits and control benefits. Information benefits refer to the broad access, short time, and wide referral of resources that are made possible by networking and shared norms in a social network (Burt, 2000). As the case study of Mulroy and Shay (1998) stated, partnerships across
neighborhoods enhanced the capacity of the involved leaders and members because the CBOs learned from each other and sharpened the skills demanded in the communication and collaboration across organization boundaries. This study too finds the relationships with other communities are positively related to performance of a CBO. With regard to control benefits of social capital referring to the strategic position that allows an actor to remain autonomy and maximize its own interests, Burt (2001) stated the ideal social network for an actor is to have deep structure holes around the adjacent contacts, meaning the actor connects with otherwise disconnected others. Such position in a social network ensures autonomy of an actor because it is relied on as the brokerage channel of external information and resources thus the partners are unlikely to dominate any negotiation in between. The study hypothesized such autonomy was a key for innovation of a CBO. This study confirmed the positive association between networking beyond community and innovation when the key organization factors were considered.

Drawing upon social capital theories and the relevant empirical studies, other communities may be important information sources for a CBO to know about common missions (e.g. community building in the study) or client population (e.g. older adults in Community Primary Care Unit Program and Senior Clubs in the study). On the other hand, governments and private agencies outside the community scope are the primary providers of formal learning opportunities for CBOs in Taiwan. The government in particular plays a key role as funder, planner, and organizer of workforce development in community development; some large private associations are contracted by the government to design and deliver education programs for staff, volunteers, and leaders of CBOs. Overall, networking beyond community in the dissertation seems representing the
platforms and mechanisms of capacity building for the studied CDAs. Taking the Primary Care Unit Program which 60% of the studied CDAs provided for example, local governments are in charge of assisting the involved CBOs by trainings, group meetings, and individual consultation regarding the service provision and other accountability requirements. Some local governments also request evaluation data from the older adults served and external experts so that precise advice would be provided to the CBOs.

In contrast, the study finds the effects of networking within community on performance are relatively complex. The data only support the hypothesized association between within-community networking and the aggregated variable of performance of a CBO. When the relevant traits of performance are specified as the dependent variables, the contribution of networking within community becomes insignificant and even negative. There are two levels of explanations. First is the limitation of measurement. Analytically with the data, the dissertation was not able to specify the effects of networking with different potential partners; nor is to include the relational dimension of social capital (e.g. trust in the networking and toward the potential partners) or the cognitive dimension of social capital (e.g. shared expectation or language in a partnership). The variable of networking within community was computed as summation of relationships with local government branches, local private organizations, and Neighborhood Administrators. It could be that the tension with one kind of relationship is disturbing to a degree that the total cost exceeds the benefits from relationships with the others. However, it is not appropriate for the analysis to include the three kinds of potential partners in neighborhood separately due to the low correlation of the kind of Neighborhood Administrators (see Appendix D about partialling fallacy). In addition, the
actual association between networking within community and the performance traits can be decreased by excluding the norms related to social capital in the measures of networking. Quite a large proportion of the social networking among organizations within a community can be identified as bonding social capital because it is based on being alike in goals or serving the same people. Social capital theories suggest that such relationships heavily involve the norm dimension of social capital which may bring in benefits of solidarity and information. Unfortunately, the data have no survey item referring to trust, sense of belonging, or any normal features of the organizational relationships.

Second, the unexpected results about networking within community may reflect the unique history of community development in Taiwan. The CBOs including CDAs in Taiwan used to have a hard time cooperating with Neighborhood Administrators and other organizations in the same community because they lacked experience with collaboration and competed for political favor. The tension has reduced in the recent two decades of active community development movements and social service localization programs. As seen in the case study of Lai (2010), many CDA leaders have recognized that elected officials of local governments own the power of deciding the relevant resource allocation for the CDAs within their township but their supports to community development affairs easily change with election results. For the purpose of autonomy and sustainability, some CDAs keep clear division of functions from the government and limit the involvement of politicians in organization operation. Also, the survey of 780 CDAs made by Hwang et al. (2010) concluded that CDAs mostly maintained a certain degree of harmony and connection with organizations in or near their neighborhood; thus,
such social capital could be a hopeful means to improve the general community
development goals. However, this dissertation finds the CDAs' relationships with
Neighborhood Administrators vary in a greater degree than other potential partners in
neighborhoods, which says the issues of neighborhood politics are still present in some
communities. Or, the relationship improvement between a CDA and other organizations
in the same community might not be good enough or focused on a specific purpose for
the potential benefits of networking on performance to occur. Since this dissertation
merely focus on the structural dimension of social capital, that is, the networking
behaviors and relationships, more information about the contents and direction of the
exchange between a CBO and other local organizations is required to clarify the effects
of networking within community.

*Moderating Effects of The Organization Factors*

The other half of findings are about the organization features' interaction with
networking. Social capital does not occur naturally or equivalently to any CBOs. This
study finds leadership, community capacity, and funding sources may moderate certain
effects of networking on performance. Leadership has been identified to be critical for the
occurrence and sustaining of organizational networking in the case studies of
organization partnership and community development models. However, it is unclear
what role leadership plays. Is it a predictor having direct input, a moderator as booster of
the desirable effects, or a mediator that is affected by networking and then leading to
performance improvement? This study examined the first two potential roles and found
evidence for both. Strong leadership of a CBO is a significant predictor of networking's
positive effect on effectiveness and innovation. When specifying and including the
The study found leadership strengthens the effective improvement brought by beyond-community networking. In other words, a leader acknowledging the community and being capable of community organizing enhances the CBO's performance and, more important, he/she increases the benefits of partnership with organizations outside the neighborhood for goal setting and fulfillment. If the leadership is poor, a CBO could hardly handle the complicated communication of networking and transfer the external information or resources for their own good.

Community capacity matters for a CBO's effectiveness and for the desirable effects of networking. The study adopted four fundamental characteristics of community capacity, including sense of community, commitment, ability to solve problems, and access to resources, identified in the community building framework of Chaskin (2001). The aggregate variable of community capacity was found to be a predictor of effectiveness and, more important, a moderator buffering the effect of beyond-community networking on effectiveness. That is, a CBO in a community owning more inner assets to enhance community development and wellbeing of the residents benefits less from the partnerships outside the living neighborhood. The distant relationships appear to be an alternative resource for the studied CDAs. When a CDA is short of physical and mental support inside its community, it seeks help from other communities, non-local private organizations, government departments; and this strategy is working. Or, a CDA employs less community capacity in carrying out its goals if it has invested considerably in partnership development far from home. Theoretically, community capacity can be taken as social capital created and owned by residents in a community where a CBO locates, networking beyond community is measured as social capital.
between organizations outside community and a CBO, and both are assets for a CBO to improve its performance. The trade-off between the two kinds of social capital is curious and requires theoretical clarification. In the visualization of moderation effect of networking beyond community on effectiveness (Figure 6), it seems that the CDAs with low and high level of the community capacity could become equivalently effective if they maximize the partnerships. Nonetheless, the values of the variables computed from self-reported Likert scales have no absolute meaning and should not be over interpreted.

Last and no less important, networking affects effectiveness differently by funding sources of a CBO. In this study, the group of CDAs receiving funding from both governments and private organizations is the only one whose networking within community is positively associated with effectiveness when other variables are controlled. The study of Hwang et al. (2010) provides an explanation. It appears that these CDAs are the "super starts" that have accumulated successes of community development; the private funders, such as a real estate company chain and local manufacturers, are glad to share the credit of caring for local communities by providing financial support and maybe some volunteer work. Such “creaming effect” makes the capable CDAs even more resourceful at reaching their goals and less constrained by local potential tension. In contrast, the CDAs receiving only government funds would struggle with the balance between autonomy and local relationships; the CDAs having no external grants would lack an adequate level of organization capacity, a situation by choice or simply at an early stage of community development, for networking to be beneficial to effectiveness.
Implications

This section explicates the implications of the findings and develops suggestions for CBOs, policy makers and potential funders, and research applying social capital theories on community practice. With the large sample size and theory-informed framework, the study is able to provide evidences guiding the best practice of partnership development, which can be useful for CBOs like the studied CDAs and societies like Taiwan. Encouragingly, the study finds some forms of networking are specifically beneficial to certain performance traits regardless of organizational features. In addition, the study adds insight on the relevant community practice model by identifying the interaction effects of organization factors on networking. By answering why networking is beneficial for some CBOs but not others and critically examining the community development environment of Taiwan, the study also raises several issues of applying social capital theories in community practice and non-European-American societies.

For Community Based Organizations

The study finds organizational networking is positively associated with organization performance of a CBO in general. It is worth the investment for a CBO to build partnerships with other organizations. Moreover, the study identifies networking beyond community is the form bringing in significantly positive benefits on performance in a society like Taiwan. A CBO in need of effectiveness and/or innovation improvement may want to focus on connecting with organizations outside the community where the CBO locates because the benefits tend to be robust. Whereas, this study finds networking within community can lead to negative impact on performance when the dynamics inside its own neighborhood is difficult to manage. As pointed out in the studies of Halseth and
Ryser (2007) and Agnitsch et al. (2006), the importance of partnership inside and outside community depends on the context of networking. For Taiwan and the studied CDAs, it demands more careful thoughts to manage the relationships in neighborhood probably because the conflicts among local community leaders are still prevalent and local governments tend to be quite influential for funding and organization development of the CDAs.

In addition, a CBO needs to be aware of its organization conditions that are critical for networking to be beneficial to performance. As earlier demonstrated in Figure 5 and Figure 6, the direction and scale of the summation effects of the networking forms, organization factors, and their interaction terms can be complex. In order to make networking serve the purpose of performance improvement, a CBO may assess its leadership, community capacity, and mixture of funding sources before developing partnerships with other organizations. These aspects are directly associated with performance in terms of effectiveness and innovation and their interaction with networking may prevent the occurrence of positive effectiveness outcome of networking. Four preliminary principles regarding effectiveness emerge from the moderation model analysis. (1) The outcome of networking beyond community can be largely decided by leadership of the CBOs. (2) The outcome of networking within community can be largely decided by community capacity the CBOs have. (3) The CBOs receiving both private and public funds are likely to benefit from networking within community since they are less reliant on the geographically close organizations, but the rewards of networking beyond community can be reduced by the potential competition with other communities. (4) CBOs may want to consider that networking and community capacity are supplemental to
each other for the purpose of improving performance. In fact, networking is one of the strategies to improve CBO performance and it does not work for all CBOs.

*For Policy Makers and Potential Funders*

The findings imply the potential of utilizing organizational networking for performance improvement. Local and federal governments of Taiwan have been the major providers of funding, trainings, and evaluations. Taking the Community Primary Care Unit Program for example, local governments subsidize CBOs (including but not limited to CDAs) wellness services for older adults while having (or contracting out) social workers to train, coach, and evaluate the CBOs individually. In the systems supporting CBOs’ performance in the Program, a group approach is sometimes used in the trainings, but a network approach is rarely adopted and never consistently built.

Findings of this study show that networking beyond community is worth the investment. Organizational networking could be an alternative way for governments and private funders to support service performance of a CBO.

Four suggestions are provided to an initiative of facilitating CBOs' partnership development. First, it may want to target on effectiveness because there is no simple answer to the profile of CBOs receiving benefits from networking to innovation. Second, if efficiency of the investment is concerned, a initiative supporting CBO's networking may prioritize the CBOs to be selected according to their organization conditions. With the same increased level of networking, the CBOs that have strong leadership and low community capacity may reach the most progress of effectiveness (the line of deepest slope in Figure 5). Third, if needs of supports for partnership development is the priority, the funders should target at the CBOs facing challenges of leadership and community
capacity. The dissertation found that the CBOs having issues of leadership may need extra assistance for networking to improve performance. Additionally, the CBOs owning poor community capacity may rely on networking to obtain the resources that are necessary for a community building initiative to work since they hardly obtain supports from the community residents. Last, the strategy of networking within community should be cautiously applied. Organizations in the same community tend to be involved in complex competition for resources, historical turf issues, and divergence and emergence of missions. The study finds the cost of networking within community can exceed the benefits when other factors are controlled. It is especially true for the CBOs depending on government funding or receiving no external grants in Taiwan. These CBOs are sensitive to the local politics among private organizations, government branches, and offices of Neighborhood Administrators. In order to maintain autonomy that is the control benefits of social capital and leads to good performance, sometimes it is wise to keep a sparse social network with neighbors.

For the Theory Development and Application

The dissertation employs social capital theories in four ways-informing the importance of partnership for CBOs, developing the research framework, building the hypotheses, and explaining the analysis results. Social capital has become an umbrella concept referring to cooperative relationships and norms that produces collective benefits for actors involved. The typical analysis unit of social capital studies is individual and analysis level is often macro. For example, the pioneer study of Robert Putnam (1993) identified the positive association between citizens' participation in voluntary groups and economic development in northern Italy. In contrast, this study has CBOs as the analysis
units and the analysis level is entirely meso about relationships among organizations, which falls in the tradition of social network analysis lead by scholars such as Ronal Burt (1995). The theoretical base of the research framework primarily draws upon the structural dimension of social capital which is the relationship and exchange behaviors of networking. The other dimensions of social capital such as trust are not included in the dissertation because of measurement issues. There is no available information about trust between a CBO and partners beyond community in the dataset. The trust among organizations is tricky to measure and relatively subjective when the survey was filled by single person representing a CBO.

The findings contribute to the on-going theory development of social capital on the organizational social network by identifying some of the paths among organizational networking, organization performance, and the influential organization factors. The association between pairs of the three aspects has been indicated in intervention models of organizational networking, e.g., Claiborne & Lawson (2005), Gittell & Vidal (1997), and Chaskin (2001), but had not been empirically examined together. As one of the few quantitative studies of community organizations, the dissertation adopted a large sample that allows simultaneous examination of the associations among the three aspects. The findings suggest the social capital idea of leveraging partnerships to performance improvement of a CBO is generally true and realistic if a CBO owns adequate leadership and is not satisfied with the existing community capacity brought by active resident participation in the community activities. In other words, the findings indicate that both networking and community capacity are assets for a CBO to reach the service goals, and the benefits created by social network among organizations somewhat can be made by
the social network between the CBO and the community residents. The dynamics between units and levels of social capital coexisting in community calls for a new page of theory development.

Furthermore, the dissertation encounters a few challenges when applying a social capital perspective and integrating the intervention models of organizational networking to examine the networking of CDAs in Taiwan. The theoretical benefits brought by networking within community was weak in relation to networking beyond community in this study, which does not make sense to the "inside-out" vision of community building emphasized by Kretzmann and McKnight (1993, 1996). The ABCD Model (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, 1996) is very cautious to external resources that is potentially conflicting and distracting the inner focuses of a community initiative. In contrast, the outside-in approach of networking or the distant partnerships seems superior for the studied CDAs because of the tightly-bound relationships between the Taiwan government and CBOs, CDAs in particular. Governments in Taiwan, at national, municipal, or neighborhood levels, tend to be heavily involved in community practice. The roles of a local government for a CDA can be initiator, trainer, funder, and/or negotiators with other organizations in the community, depending on the municipal leadership, local politics, and available resources. Although the autonomy of CDAs grew considerably in recent years (e.g. case studies of Chen & Chen, 2006; Lai, 2010) and conflicts between the CDA and Neighborhood Administrator office in the same community was not as prevalent or serious (e.g. the nation-wide survey of Hwang et al., 2010), this study does see two facts against the optimistic reports. There is a wide range of relationships with the local government branches and Neighborhood Administrator offices, and the social network
with organizations within community appear insignificant to performance of a CDA. The local politics can be troubling to manage or unstable to a degree that disturbing and even counteracting to service performance of the studied CDAs.

To be noted, the typical way of applying social capital theories at the community level with a mixed analysis units of individuals and organizations can be confusing to the dissertation. For example, the study argues networking with other organizations in the same community works for a CDA bonding social capital because the relationships are based on alike goals of serving the same residents. Whereas, the study of Hwang et al (2010) names such relationships as "short-distance linking social capital" because they see churches or temples, police offices, and Neighborhood Administrators are different from the CDAs in terms of many organization features. In other words, the distinction of being alike (thus bonding), dislike (thus bridging) or hierarchy (thus linking) among the actors in a social network can vary by the focuses and purposes of research. Therefore, the dissertation categorizes the organizational networking forms based on the boundary of a living community instead of social capital types. The conceptualization offers intuitive meaning for CBOs about what organization to connect. Also, it makes sense for the increasingly blended role division in the social network a CBO involves. Taking the relationship between CBOs and the governments for example, many CBOs in Taiwan are transitioning from resource recipients to true partners and monitors of the government so the resource flow and power status between the two parties are not necessarily in a single direction. The distinction of linking social capital from other types of social capital is increasingly vague while the CBOs are growing affluent and autonomous.
Overall, there are pros and cons of using a social capital perspective. For the dissertation, it is good that the term of capital clearly indicates the potential rewards of networking that are attractive for CBOs and potential funders. The benefits and costs of networking that social capital theories explicate are useful for interpretation of the analysis results. The reviewed intervention models of organizational networking, using the term social capital or not, all treat the partnership development as an asset of community development. By integrating the models, the study precisely includes a list of key organization factors as a result that the analysis models reach high explanatory power (over 60% of the variance, which is rare in social science). Nevertheless, the costs of networking can be easily overlooked under the appealing concept of social capital. This study regards these negative effects as possibly compromising some of the expected effects of networking but has no available data for the measurement. Further research is needed on how networking distracts goal setting and fulfillment of a CBO and exceeds the potential benefits of solidarity of a community, information exchange, and control over organization autonomy.

For Community Practice in Social Work

Some of the dissertation findings present important implications for community practice in social work. The first dimension of community practice concerns the variable of funding source of a CBO. This study finds the CDAs having no government funding tend to perform poorly in Taiwan; additionally, having only government funding does not weaken the positive effects of networking on the performance variables. These findings add to the critiques of applying the ABCD Model, which emphasizes independence from government as the core of inner-focused and inside-out community building initiatives, in
non-European-American communities. The study of Yenebat and Butterfield (2011) pointed out funding and other resources sponsored by the government might be necessary for the urban African community they engaged and studied because of resource unavailability, personal preference of the individuals involved, and residents' low capacity of participation. Neither is relying on government funding necessarily a bad thing for the CDAs in Taiwan, at least regarding the dependent variable of performance. Government funding to CDAs and other social associations starts with an application procedure and comes with accountability requirements, regardless if the grant is subsidy or contract based. A common policy focus of the recent community development programs is to train the CDAs' program thinking from goal setting to implementation as well as sustainability building from leadership to service development. Furthermore, some macro conditions of Taiwan such as social equity and a pro-democracy political regime may be similar to the American society where the ABCD model is rooted, yet community residents’ participation in public affairs is still developing and alternative funding such as fee-for-service and individual donations remains underdeveloped. Government funding becomes the basic and stable, if not necessary, financial source for many CDAs. In other words, the positive association between receiving government funding and performance can reflect the purposeful outcome of government-led community development or simply the reality that the studied CDAs lack other funding sources.

Similarly, findings of the dissertation also challenges the argument that "close ties are strong ties" in social capital theories. For individuals, relationships based on being alike tend to be intensive and involve reciprocal obligations, thus called strong ties. In
addition to social-emotional supports, strong ties are beneficial for individuals to obtain resourceful social status such as finding jobs by knowing some influential people (Lin, 2001). For organizations, Hansen (1999) studied innovation projects among technology companies and claimed the strong ties based on similarity would be necessary for highly complex knowledge to be fully transferred across organization subunits or organizations. Contrarily, the dissertation found the networking beyond community was significantly associated with effectiveness and innovation while networking within community in which partners were alike in terms of serving the same community was either insignificant or negatively associated with the performance variables. This situation of favoring distant partners over neighbor organizations is not unique in Taiwan. Halseth and Ryser (2007) studied partnerships in rural and small towns in Canada and found the sampled CBOs regarded local partners as more important than non-local partners. The local partnerships were commonly used for expertise purposes e.g. obtaining advise, sharing information, and brainstorming, in addition to the purpose of expanding networks and resources. However, it was found that the CBOs' connection with local service providers, local voluntary groups, and local businesses declined from year 2003 to 2005. Halseth and Ryser (2007) explained that the CBOs might decrease networking activities with any groups at the time when the Canadian government was restructuring social service systems and downsizing the budget. In the CBOs' experiences, partnership development had been a way to retain access to public funds. Local partnerships demonstrated support and legitimacy of the community, non-local partnerships showed the wide appeal of the services provided, and both were helpful for a CBO to meet the qualification of governmental grants. When the service fees became the major revenue
source, many CBOs had to drop partnerships that did not bring in substantial resources and most of the relationships put aside were in the community. Such strategic thinking of the Canadian CBOs can be even more evident for the CDAs in Taiwan since the government funding is still the major revenue source. The CDAs are pulled toward networking with organizations far from home because the external social network would earn a reputation that is helpful to retain the assistances from governments, while the potential tensions with local organizations push the CDAs from networking within community.

In summary of the discussion about roles of government funding and the distant partnerships, the priority of inside-out over outside-in resources that is widely assumed in community practice frameworks may be seen through a different lens in a society like Taiwan. For a society where civil society is developing (e.g. this study of Taiwan and the reviewed studies of South Africa) or/and the government takes the lead in community practice (e.g. this study of Taiwan and the reviewed studies of Canada), it is not absolutely a bad thing for CBOs to receiving government funding. For CBOs facing a lack of community capacity in terms of residents' sense of community, commitment, problem-solving ability, and access to resources, appropriate supports from external organizations can help with the start-up stage. In addition to financial support, these outsiders can be sources of learning, information, experts, workforce, and collaborative projects that are positive for a CBO to specify and fulfill its service goals. Once the initial success is reached, a CBO may be able to build on that and obtain more support from organizations serving the same community or the community residents. Or, governments and private funders may keep cautious about leading the supported CBOs off the needs of
their own communities and may consider withdrawing their support when the supported CBOs gain sufficient capacity to operate independently and. To be clear, this is not to conclude that the distant partners are superior to the neighbors in the community building; nor is to say a CBO should place external expectations prior to internal needs. The dissertation is not able to claim that it would be harmful for a CBO to depend on a sole funding source, the governments, or outside organizations due to the cross-sectional design.

Limitations and Future Research Agenda

To be noted are several limitations the study faces. First is about using a secondary data set. The data do not provide information about competition history and other influential factors at the network level, and they may be critical for the potential effects of within-community networking on performance. Also, there are no census data of CDAs in Taiwan for the study to examine the sample representativeness in terms of organization size, services, workforce, etc. Because of the high response rate and good data quality made possible by face-to-face interviews, the findings provide valuable implications for CDAs in Taiwan. However, the ability to generalize the findings to all CDAs in Taiwan and other kinds of CBOs is limited. Among CBOs in Taiwan, CDAs tend to be less professionalized, rely on volunteer workforce, provide a variety of informal services, and serve single geographically defined community. These characteristics may make CDAs relatively vulnerable to the risks and costs of networking and sensitive to the impact of leadership and community capacity. Moreover, application of the findings to other societies, even culturally similar such as China and Hong Kong, should take caution to assess the political, economical, and social preconditions of social
capital since the dissertation did not include the macro environment factors in the analysis. As just mentioned in the implications for theories, institutional settings such as the relation between private and public section or the funding structure of social service systems are influential to organizational networking.

Regarding the research framework, several issues were not able to be examined in this study and call for future research. This study adopts a cross-section design so has limited power to claim the causality relation from networking to performance. Knowing from the unsupported hypotheses of networking within community, the study senses the dynamics among the potential partners of a CBO could be far more complex than the research framework is able to capture. The moderation model of innovation is not supported by the data either. It is possible that networking's effects vary by certain elements of community capacity and the aggregated variable was not able to detach the subtle variation. For example, sense of community and resident commitment could strengthen the positive impact of networking beyond community for the theoretical belief that a CBO performs better when it knows its community needs better and stays inner focused. Another possibility is the organization factors would have alternative roles between networking and performance. For example, the organization factors could be confounding factors affecting networking and performance, covariates-sharing a common factor with networking and performance, or mediators between networking and performance. An attempt in the early stage of the dissertation was to employ structural equation modeling to explore mediator roles of organization factors, but the theory did not provide clear clues on the relation among the research variables and the measurement appeared insufficient with the data. Future research is needed to rule out alternative roles
of the organization factors in relation to networking and performance. Also needed is investigation on the social capital benefits which are illustrated in the preliminary conceptual framework but omitted in the research framework due to data availability. The CBOs and funders may want to know whether networking actually brings in positive effects or it is just that certain costs counteract the benefits so that they can work on alleviating the barrier.

Conclusion

Community based organizations are rising stars of social service provision in the worldwide trend of the withdrawing welfare state because of their knowledge of local needs and flexibility in utilizing a variety of resources. In practice and in theory, organizational networking is one of the strategies for a CBO to maximize their services by learning, cooperating, and exchanging resources with others. I was a social worker involved in an initiative supporting CBOs' services in the program of Community Primary Care Units. When inviting the CBOs to engage or be involved in networking activities, I easily received the response with an old saying “(I have only this much grain and it is) not enough for a meal, do not tell me to dry some for later” or “(I’d better) take care of my own business before peeking into others’ backyard.” Behind the hesitation was the reality of being busy with daily tasks and handling massive amount of needs with limited volunteers. At the time I wish I had evidence to claim that social capital and self-support networks were not just an ideal. Recognizing that relevant research is scant and often lacking a theoretical base, the dissertation asked whether organizational networking was associated with performance and why organizational networking worked for some CBOs but not the others. Generally, the answers are encouraging for CBOs and funders.
that are interested in partnership development. It is hopeful that CBOs could sustain their
goal fulfillment and organization development by partnering with other organizations in
particular beyond the scope of living community. Specifically, such positive effects of
networking vary by certain organization factors that should be taken into consideration of
the best practice. Leadership would strengthen the desirable effects of networking beyond
community on effectiveness, community capacity appears to reduce the motivation or
return rate of networking with external organizations, and receiving funds from both
private and public sectors can buffer the complex dynamics between a CBO and other
organizations within a neighborhood.
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Appendix A Community Capacity Development Survey

(Translated in English)

Title of the research project:
*Growth or Development: A Study on Community Capacity and Community Life Quality*

A. Basic information of the community
   1. Name of the community organization
   2. Year of organization registration
   3. Population size of community:
      3.1 number of households
      3.2 number of residents
   4. Location of the organization 1) community center, 2) office of neighborhood Administrator, 3) home of neighborhood Administrator, 4) home of the organization President
   5. Membership size
      5.1 number of individual members
      5.2 number of group members
      5.3 number of sponsor members
   6. Affiliated services/units
      6.1 Senior Club
      6.2 Mother Classroom
      6.3 volunteer team: number of volunteers
      6.4 Safety improvement: number of volunteers in community watch team, number of security cameras
      6.5 others
   7. Do you provide services of Community Primary Care Unit?
   8. How many years have the current organization Director on his position? How about the executive director? Is he/she full-time hired or part-time?
   9. Do you hire any worker? No/Yes: # of full-time worker, # of part-time worker
10. The top three ethnics of the community residents: 1) Min-nan, 2) Originated from other China province, 3) Ha-ka, 4) aboriginal, 5) others
11. The top three religions of the community residents: 1) none, 2) Folk convention, 3) Buddhism, 4) Dao, 5) Christian, 6) Catholic, 7) others
12. The top three occupations of the community residents: 1) government employee including positions in military and education, 2) agriculture, 3) manufactory, 4) business, 5) services, 6) unemployed or retired, 7) others
13. Geographical location of the community: 1) rural, 2) mountain, 3) urban, 4) rural-urban mix, 5) others
14. Programs in period from 2008 to 2010
   14.1 Have you applied to any grants from the government during 1998-2000?
   14.2 Government funding: How many programs did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding?
   14.3 Funding from private sector: How many programs did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding?

15. Did you participate in any community evaluation in the past three years (year 2008-2010)?
   15.1 The evaluation of district/town government: If did, the best ranking won:
   15.2 The evaluation of county government: If did, the best ranking won:
   15.3 The evaluation of Interior Ministry (administration of central government): If did, the best ranking won:

16. Is there any other local organization in the community such as foundations and associations? How many? What are the names of these organizations?

B. Static capacities of community
Five-point Likert scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree
[Social capital: resources of relationships]
   1. The community residents trust each other.
   2. The community residents trust the Neighborhood Administrators
   3. The community residents trust local government units such as District Office, Health Center, and Police Office.
   4. The community residents trust local private organizations such as temples, churches, and community associations.
   5. The community residents follow the general rituals and norms.
   6. The residents accept community agreement.
   7. The community residents obey laws.
   8. The community residents interact with each other intensively or closely.
   9. The community has good networking with other communities.
  10. The community has good relationships with local organizations such as temple, churches, and community associations.
  11. The community has good relationships with the Neighborhood Administrator.
  12. The community has good relationships with local government units.
  13. People of different ethics live in the community in harmony.
  14. The residents participating in community activities have different background.
  15. The community residents have equal opportunity to participate in public affairs.
16. The community residents have equal access to all services and welfare benefits.
17. The community residents accepts/tolerant different opinions.
18. The community residents give a hand to anyone in trouble.
19. The community residents only care about their own interests. (negative description)
20. The community residents have identity to the community.
21. The community residents have good commitment to community affairs.
22. The community residents concern the collective interests.
23. The community residents have opportunities to participate in community activities.
24. The community residents have opportunities to express their thoughts on community affairs.
25. The community residents have opportunities to participate in decision making of the community.
26. The community residents are willing to participated in decision making (or voting) of community affairs.

[Human capital: resources of people]
27. The community residents have the knowledge and skills to implement community development.
28. The community has workforce for community development.
29. The community has potential workforce for community development.
30. The community has workforce for volunteer services.

[Financial capital: resources of materials]
31. The community has enough funding for community development, including facilities and social services.
32. The community has its own space for community activities.
33. The community has independent office space.
34. The community well utilizes neglected spaces or buildings.
35. The community has good basic construction such as roads and lights.
36. The community has good transportation.
37. The community has good access to living necessities such as stores and hospitals.
38. The community has good public facilities such as community center, park, and performance hall.
39. The community has enough parking space.

[Environment/Ecology capital: resources of environment]
40. The community has good environment qualities such as water, air, and soil.
41. The community has good ecological environment such as reservation of animals, plants, or swamp.
42. The community has good scenery.
43. The community residents have crowded living space. (negative description)
44. Buildings in the community are disorganized. (negative description)
45. We have good recycle system in the community.
46. The neighborhood is clean.
47. The public facilities in the community are clean.

[Culture capital: Resources of culture]
48. We have historical architectures in community.
49. We have places demonstrating or reserving historical items.
50. We have traditional culture such as drawing, crafting, and singing in the community.
51. Most of the community residents have the same religion.
52. The community has local festival such as religious worship and lunar New Year celebration.

C. The active capacity
Five-point Likert scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

[Community participation]
1. The residents know how to get information related to the community.
2. The residents are aware of activities going on in the community.
3. Organizations in the community proactively inform residents things related to the community.
4. The community residents attend community meetings or debriefings.
5. Only with rewards/prizes, the community residents would attend community activities. (negative description)
6. The community residents are willing to do volunteer works such as community watch.
7. The community residents would like to postpone their own work for public affairs.
8. The community residents would like to contribute space, money, or labor for the community.
9. The community mobilized residents in reaction to urgent needs rapidly.

[Networking]
10. The community often observes other communities for learning.
11. The community proactively learns from other communities.
12. The community would collaborate with governments to carry out programs/services.
13. The community would collaborate with groups or agencies in private sector to carry out programs/services.
14. The community has good information disseminating network such as through Neighborhood Administrator or volunteers.
15. The community utilizes its specialties to improve strengths of the community.
16. The community has capacity to integrate various resources.
17. The community has sufficient ability to develop various resources.
18. The community has good ability to recruit workforce outside of community.

[Leadership]
19. The community leader has the capacity to manage the community organization.
20. The leader has capacity to solve community problems.
21. The leader’s efficacy is recognized.
22. The leader has rich experience of leadership.
23. The leader responds to the needs and changes of the community with flexibility.
24. The leader knows how to gather internal and external resources.
25. The leader understands the problems the community is facing.
26. The leader understands the norms and values of the community.
27. The leader has good communication mechanisms with community residents.
28. The leader is able to initiate community residents to participate in community affairs.
29. The leader is willing to sacrifice for community development.
30. It is generally supported how the community leader is selected.
31. The community has preparation for leadership (dis)continuation in the future.
32. The (dis)continuation of leadership has been smooth.

[Organization development]
33. The community has good implementation team/organization.
34. The community is able to improve organization development.
35. The community organizations are functioning.
36. This community organization makes annual goals.
37. Members of the community organization are willing to implement annual goals.
38. Most members respond to organization goals when carrying out the activities/services.
39. The community had successes of community development.
40. The previous experiences of community development enhance the leader’s confidence in managing the community.

D. Community development (outcomes)
Five-point Likert scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

1. In general, the community residents have stable income.
2. In general, the community residents have sufficient employment opportunities.
3. Overall, we have wealth inequality in the community.
4. In general, the less-privileged people in the community receive adequate services.
5. In general, we have good relationships in neighborhood level.
6. Basically, the community residents care about each other.
7. In general, we have visually comfortable environment in community.
8. In general, we have a clean environment.
9. Overall, the living environment of the community is good.
10. In general, it is a safe community.
11. In general, the community has a sufficient system for disaster reaction.
12. Overall, it is safe to live in the community.
13. In general, the community residents are satisfied with the living environment.
14. In general, living quality of the community is getting better and better.
15. Overall, the community is a good place to live in.

E. Basic information of the respondent
   1. Gender: 1) male, 2) female
   2. Birth year:
   3. Ethics: 1) Min-Nan, 2) Originated from other China province, 3) Ha-Ka, 4) aboriginal, 5) others
   4. Education degree: 1) elementary school or less than, 2) junior high school, 3) senior high school, 4) college, 5) graduate school or above
   5. Occupation: 1) government employee including positions in military and education, 2) agriculture, 3) manufactory, 4) business, 5) services, 6) unemployed or retired, 7) others
   6. Your position in the community organization: the President, the Executive Director, others
   7. How long have you been lived in the community, in how many years or for generations?

The End
Thank you.
Appendix B Matching Research Variable with the Data

The summary of matching the available survey items with the variables in the preliminary conceptual framework is shown in Table B1. The data source, the study of Hwang (2011), took a community as the analysis unit and asked a lot of questions about residents' relationships and trust. Whereas, my focus is organizational networking, my unit of analysis is a CDA thus the connection among community residents is not my primary interest. I am aware of two issues about using this dataset to the dissertation. First, information needed in the preliminary conceptual framework is not fully covered, e.g. benefits of social capital. Due to the focus on communities rather than the organization bodies of CDAs, the survey did not ask much about organization capacity and the factors at network level that are influential to the dissertation topic. As a result, the research framework can only include part of the factors identified by relevant studies. This may or may not lead to limitation on the findings. Second, many subjects in the questions about leadership and effectiveness are the communities rather than the CDA. From the direct contact with the research team of the CDAs in the survey appear to regard their organizations fully representing or equivalent to the community body. For the law of Regulations on the Work of Community Development, almost every administrative neighborhood (the sampling unit) has a CDA and most ones have only one CDA. When replying to questions about organizational properties, the respondents were unlikely to think about other organizations in the community.
Table B1

Summary of matching research variables with the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research variables</th>
<th>Potential measurement items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bonding social capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B10. The community has good relationships with local organizations such as temple, churches, and community associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B11. The community has good relationships with the Neighborhood Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bridging social capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B8. The community has good networking with other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10. The community often observes other communities for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C11. The community proactively learns from other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linking social capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B9. The community has good relationships with local government units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12. The community would collaborate with governments to carry out programs/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C13. The community would collaborate with groups or agencies in private sector to carry out programs/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational performance</strong></td>
<td>C15. The community utilizes its specialties to improve strengths of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C38. Most members respond to organization goals when carrying out the activities/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C39. The community had successes of community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>C17. The community has sufficient ability to develop/innovate various resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C23. The leader responds to the needs and changes of the community with flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C31. The community has preparation for leadership (dis)continuation in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C34. The community is able to improve organization development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator: Benefits of</strong></td>
<td><strong>Solidarity benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>social capital</strong></td>
<td>B13. People of different ethics live in the community in harmony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B14. The residents participating in community activities have different background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4. The community residents attend community meetings or debriefings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5. Only with rewards/prizes, the community residents would attend community activities. (negative description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6. The community residents are willing to do volunteer works such as community watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7. The community residents would like to postpone their own work for public affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8. The community residents would like to contribute space, money, or labor for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9. The community mobilized residents in reaction to urgent needs rapidly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C14. The community has good information disseminating network such as through Neighborhood Administrator or volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Control benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A16. Is there any other local organization in the community such as foundations and associations? How many?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research variables</td>
<td>Potential measurement items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate mechanism</td>
<td>C30. It is generally supported how the community leader is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition history</td>
<td>C32. The (dis)continuation of leadership has been smooth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich external resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relying on government funding</td>
<td>A14.2. Government funding: How many programs did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A14.3. Funding from private sector: How many programs did you applied? How many programs were funded? Total funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C16. The community has capacity to integrate various resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative leadership</td>
<td>C19. The community leader has the capacity to manage the community organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C20. The leader has capacity to solve community problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C21. The leader’s efficacy is recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C22. The leader has rich experience of leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C24. The leader knows how to gather internal and external resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C25. The leader understands the problems the community is facing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C26. The leader understands the norms and values of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C27. The leader has good communication mechanisms with community residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C28. The leader is able to initiate community residents to participate in community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C29. The leader is willing to sacrifice for community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization capacity</td>
<td>C33. The community has good implementation team/organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C35. The community organizations are functioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C36. This community organization makes annual goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C37. Members of the community organization are willing to implement annual goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C Results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research variables factors (% variance accounted)</th>
<th>Measuring items$^{(1)}$</th>
<th>Factor loading$^{(2)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational networking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within community (44.9%)</td>
<td>B10. The community has good relationships with local organizations such as temple, churches, and community associations.</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B11. The community has good relationships with the Neighborhood Administrator.</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B12. The community has good relationships with local government branches such as police offices and public health centers.</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond neighborhood (17.8%)</td>
<td>B9. The community has good networking with other communities.</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10. The community often observes other communities for learning.</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C11. The community proactively learns from other communities.</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12. The community would collaborate with governments to carry out programs/services.</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C13. The community would collaborate with groups or agencies in private sector to carry out programs/services.</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (50.8%)</td>
<td>C33. The community has good implementation team/organization.</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C36. This community organization makes annual goals.</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C38. Most members respond to organization goals when carrying out the activities/services.</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C39. The community had successes of community development.</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation (11.6%)</td>
<td>C15. The community utilizes its specialties to improve strengths of the community.</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C17. The community has sufficient ability to develop/innovate various resources.</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C18. The community has good ability to recruit workforce outside of community.</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C31. The community has preparation for leadership (dis)continuation in the future.</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C34. The community is able to improve organization development.</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (68.9%)</td>
<td>C19. The community leader has the capacity to manage the community organization.</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C20. The leader has capacity to solve community problems.</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C23. The leader responds to the needs and changes of the community with flexibility.</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C24. The leader knows how to gather internal and external resources.</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C25. The leader understands the problems the community is facing.</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C26. The leader understands the norms and values of the community.</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C27. The leader has good communication mechanisms with community residents.</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C28. The leader is able to initiate community residents to participate in community fairs.</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity</td>
<td>Sense of community (39.7%)</td>
<td>B1. The community residents trust each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5. The community residents follow the general rituals and norms.</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6. The residents accept community agreement.</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B8. The community residents interact with each other intensively or closely.</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B17. The community residents accepts/tolerant different opinions</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (8.2%)</td>
<td>B18. The community residents give a hand to anyone in trouble in the community.</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21. The community residents have good commitment to community affairs.</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22. The community residents concern the collective interests.</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving ability (6.1%)</td>
<td>B15. The community residents have equal opportunity to participate in public affairs.</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16. The community residents have equal access to all services and welfare benefits.</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24. The community residents have opportunities to express their thoughts on community affairs.</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25. The community residents have opportunities to participate in decision making of the community.</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7. The community residents would like to postpone their own work for public affairs.</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. The community residents would like to contribute space, money, or labor for the community.</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. The community mobilized residents in reaction to urgent needs rapidly.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources (6.3%)</td>
<td>B28. The community has workforce for community development.</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31. The community has enough funding for community development, including facilities and social services.</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16. The community has capacity to integrate various resources.</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Principle component analysis, no rotation, covariance based, Eigen value=1, and listwise method of missing data were used. (1) For cross-loading items, theory is the superior principle to identify the factor belonged. (2) Rescaled communality is reported because covariance matrix is used.
## Appendix D Examination of Partialling Fallacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable &amp; Elements</th>
<th>Correlation with dependent variable$^{(1)}$</th>
<th>Correlation with other elements$^{(2)}$</th>
<th>$R^2$ of regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local government branches</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local private organizations</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Neighborhood Administrator</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other communities</td>
<td>.645**</td>
<td>.584**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government departments</td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>.565**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organizations</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.552**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving ability</td>
<td>.638**</td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>.646**</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>.668**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Pearson’s Correlation coefficient is reported. (2) Parcialling fallacy occurs in the shaded cells. An element’s partial correlation with other elements of the variables is stronger than with the dependent variables, thus it is inappropriate to include such element as an independent variable in the regression model. *p<.05. **p<.01.