

ARTICLES

Submitted 07.03.2019. Approved 10.06.2020

Evaluated through a double-blind review process. Scientific Editor: Marcos Barros

Original version | DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020210606>

A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE VALUE CREATION BETWEEN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND BUSINESSES

Revisão sistemática da literatura sobre criação de valor colaborativo entre organizações sem fins lucrativos e empresariais

Una revisión sistemática de la literatura sobre la creación de valor colaborativo entre organizaciones sin fines de lucro y empresas

Cláudia Fabiana Gohr^a | claudiagohr@ct.ufpb.br | ORCID: 0000-0001-9774-7140

Felipe Alves de Oliveira Soares^a | faosoares@gmail.com | ORCID: 0000-0002-6968-6077

Lucas Carvalho de Oliveira^a | lucascarvalhodeoliveira@hotmail.com | ORCID: 0000-0003-1466-2518

Matheus Henrique da Silva Amorim^a | matheushenrique.ufpb@gmail.com | ORCID: 0000-0003-2144-7947

^aUniversidade Federal da Paraíba, Departamento de Engenharia de Produção, João Pessoa, PB, Brazil

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to propose an integrative framework that synthesizes the literature on collaborative value creation between nonprofit and business organizations. A systematic literature review was conducted of 41 papers. We analyzed the content of the papers quantitatively to present an overview. We also provided a qualitative analysis with the aim of identifying those attributes that influence collaborative value creation. The proposed integrative framework was based on the main findings, and the attributes and sub-attributes for value creation were presented. The framework extends the study on collaborative value creation, and provides the context (countries and businesses) and the main theories found in the literature. There is a lack of studies of emerging economies that adopt relevant theories (such as the relational view) and quantitative methods. Studies that address the environmental and economic impacts of partnerships and analyze the relationship between attributes and their influence on value creation are also scarce. Thus, a research agenda was proposed encompassing such aspects.

KEYWORDS | Collaboration, value creation, business, nonprofit organizations, systematic literature review.

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como objetivo propor um framework integrativo que sintetiza a literatura sobre criação de valor colaborativo entre organizações sem fins lucrativos e empresariais. Uma revisão sistemática da literatura foi conduzida, resultando em 41 artigos. Os artigos foram analisados quantitativamente para apresentar uma visão geral; e qualitativamente com o objetivo de identificar fatores que influenciam a criação de valor colaborativo. O framework proposto apresenta atributos e subatributos para criação de valor. O framework amplia o estudo sobre a temática, apresentando o contexto (países e empresas) e as principais teorias da literatura. Estudos em economias emergentes baseados em teorias relevantes e métodos quantitativos ainda são escassos. Também são poucos os estudos que abordam os impactos ambientais e econômicos das parcerias e que analisam a relação entre os atributos e sua influência na criação de valor. Assim, uma agenda de pesquisa abrangendo tais aspectos foi proposta.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE | Colaboração, criação de valor, organizações empresariais, organizações sem fins lucrativos, revisão sistemática da literatura.

RESUMEN

Este artículo propone un marco integrador que sintetice la literatura sobre la creación de valor colaborativo entre organizaciones sin fines de lucro y organizaciones empresariales. Se realizó una revisión sistemática de la literatura que resultó en 41 artículos. Aplicando análisis de contenido, analizamos los artículos cuantitativamente. También proporcionamos un análisis cualitativo para identificar los factores que influyen en la creación de valor. El marco tiene atributos y subatributos para la creación de valor, y amplía el estudio sobre el tema presentando el contexto y las principales teorías. Hay una falta de estudios en las economías emergentes que adopten teorías relevantes y métodos cuantitativos. También son escasos los estudios que abordan los impactos ambientales y económicos de las colaboraciones y analizan la relación entre los atributos y su influencia en la creación de valor. Así, se propuso una agenda de investigación que englobe estos aspectos.

PALABRAS CLAVE | Colaboración, creación de valor, negocios, organizaciones sin fines de lucro, revisión sistemática de la literatura.

INTRODUCTION

The growth of inter-organizational collaboration has led researchers to explore how different factors may contribute to the development of competitive (Arya & Lin, 2007) or collaborative advantages (Dyer & Singh, 1998). However, much of the research on inter-organizational collaboration has studied this phenomenon in the context of for-profit business (FPB) (Cao & Zhang, 2011; Lewis et al., 2010). Few papers have focused on collaboration involving nonprofit organizations (NPO) or other organizations (Arya & Lin, 2007).

Among the various types of collaboration involving NPOs, collaboration with for-profit business stands out (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Parker & Selsky, 2004). In the literature, this type of partnership is called a business-nonprofit (BNPP). A BNPP “is a discretionary agreement between an NPO and an FPB for addressing social or environmental issues to produce specific organizational benefits for both partners” (Al-Tabbaa, Leach, & March, 2014, p. 659).

The number of BNPPs has increased rapidly and they are considered by academics and practitioners to be an inescapable and powerful vehicle for implementing corporate social responsibility, undertaking social and economic missions, and developing social innovation practices (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012; Sanzo, Álvarez, Rey, & García, 2015a). Al-Tabbaa et al. (2014) also consider collaboration through BNPPs as a process of value creation that benefits society, business, and NPOs.

Thus, one of the most critical elements that affects the success of this partnership is the value that is created, which means mutual benefits (Schiller & Almog-Bar, 2013). Value creation refers to the benefits produced for both the FPBs and NPOs involved in the collaboration, as well as the communities affected by this relationship (Austin, 2000; Murphy et al., 2015).

Although cross-sector collaboration between business and NPOs is already well explored in the literature, we limit the scope of the paper to the value creation process in those partnerships, since it is still a recent phenomenon, and little explored in the literature. The few studies found have focused on a theoretical model for evaluating collaboration, such as the one proposed by Gajda (2004). Murphy et al. (2015) analyzed whether partners in a BNPP perceived the type and degree of benefits created by their cross-sector partnership. Moldovan, Greenley, and Lakatos (2016) explained how NPOs and various businesses can benefit each other through reputation, knowledge and useful resources. In particular, Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) presented an advanced study of value creation processes in BNPPs, and identified the benefits they generated.

Although the authors mention the relevance of value creation, there is still a gap as to what it consists of precisely, especially in the context of BNPPs (Lodsgård & Aagaard, 2017). Furthermore, none of the studies have sought to systematize the knowledge about this process by identifying those attributes that could influence the value creation process. In seeking to fill these gaps, therefore, this paper undertakes a systematic literature review (SLR) and provides: (i) an overview of the studies that addressed collaborative value creation between nonprofit and business organizations; (ii) the research gaps; and (iii) a research agenda. Based on the main findings, we propose an integrative framework that synthesizes the literature on collaborative value creation between nonprofit and business organizations, and present the attributes and sub-attributes required for value creation, as well as the theories, sustainable aspects, businesses and countries that are the focus of the studies.

Since the paper identifies attributes for value creation in BNPPs, nonprofit and business leaders can evaluate this process and identify what needs to be improved to develop collaborative value, or what needs to be kept in order to maintain the expected benefits. This paper also makes a substantial contribution by creating an integrated analysis of the literature concerning the phenomenon under investigation.


This paper is divided as follows. After this introduction (Section 1), we present the research design (Section 2). Section 3 presents the results. Section 4 presents a discussion that is followed by the integrative framework and the research agenda. The last section (Section 5) provides the main conclusions.

Methods

SLRs are characterized as adopting a replicable and cognitive process for assembling, critically appraising, and synthesizing related studies that address a specific issue about a particular phenomenon (Ishak & Osman, 2016).

In this paper, we apply the steps to SLRs that were suggested by Ensslin et al. (2017): preliminary investigation, and article selection and analysis (Figure 1). We started with the preliminary investigation for defining the initial search strings and verifying if the terms were adherent to the subject. The search strings were defined during the exploratory research.

Figure 1. SRL steps




Web of Science (WOS), Scopus, Science Direct, Emerald, and SciELO were the selected databases. The preliminary investigation started (first step) with an adherence test using some keywords (Exhibit 1) and making combinations between them. According to Maier et al. (2016), the term NPO has distinct nomenclatures, and exploratory research allowed us to identify a wide variety of terms related to it, which we adopted in the adherence

test. During the search, a brief review of the titles was undertaken. After the combinations had been exhausted, the term "third sector" was excluded since it did not appear in the publications. This can be explained by the fact that the term was gradually replaced by "nonprofit sector" (Salamon & Anheier, 1997). The most appropriate terms and combinations are shown in Figure 2. The Emerald, Direct Science, and SciELO databases were excluded because either the return of articles from them was low, there was no return at all, or the papers were the same as those from WOS.

Exhibit 1. Search strings in the adhesion test

Group 1	Research Subject	Group 2
<p>NPO; Nonprofit; NGO (non-governmental organizations); Nongovernmental; Not for profit; Civil Society; Voluntary; Foundation; Third sector</p>	<p>Business; Cross-Sector; Social Alliance</p>	<p>Collaboration; Partnership; Competitive advantage; collaborative advantage; Trust; Evaluation; Assessment</p>

Figure 2. Keywords and combinations



The search strings related to the search subject interacted with the keywords presented in Groups 1 and 2 (Exhibit 1), resulting in 482 articles excluding those resulting from conferences, patents, book chapters, etc., since they have no scientific relevance as measured by the impact factor. Table 1 shows the results found in each database. With the purpose of examining the maximum number of papers, we included papers from the exploratory research found in Mendeley software, in order to guarantee a broad analysis.

Table 1. Databases

Database	Number of articles
<i>Web of Science</i>	217
<i>Scopus</i>	230
<i>Mendeley</i>	35
Total	482

The selection process (second step) started with the elimination of duplicated articles (using EndNote software), as recommended by Ensslin et al. (2017). We deleted 353 papers, because we adopted different combinations of search strings (see Exhibit 1), thus increasing the chances of having many duplicated papers. A sequence of analyses was then performed (Ensslin et al., 2017): titles, scientific relevance (due to the low number of articles remaining at this stage, it was decided not to eliminate articles with low scientific recognition), abstracts, and the ready availability of full articles (only nine papers were excluded because it was impossible to download them without paying). We established inclusion and exclusion criteria at each step, and provided reasons for our exclusions (Exhibit 2 3). Finally, after reading all the papers, the final portfolio comprised 41 articles (Exhibit 3).

Exhibit 2. Inclusion and exclusion parameters

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Search Scope	WOS Exploratory research in Mendeley software	Emerald, Direct Science and SciELO
Publication Type	Scientific papers	Conferences, patents, books, etc.
Time Period	Until August 2018	-
Search Parameters	Keywords present in titles and abstracts	Keywords present in other parts of the article
Language	English	Other languages
Content Analysis	Papers that addressed value creation between NPOs and business	Papers that approach value creation only in the context of business or NPOs, or other kinds of arrangement

Exhibit 3. Paper sample

n.	Author(s)	Journal
1	Austin (2000)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
2	Ashman (2001)	World Development
3	Wymer and Samu (2003)	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing
4	Martinez (2003)	Journal of Business Ethics
5	Parker and Selsky (2004)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
6	Gajda (2004)	American Journal of Evaluation
7	Paton (2006)	Progress in Industrial Ecology: an International Journal
8	Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006)	Public Administration Review
9	Eweje (2007)	Sustainable Development
10	Kolk, Tulder, and Kostwinder (2008)	European Management Journal
11	Seitanidi (2007)	Management Decision
12	Seitanidi and Crane (2009)	Journal of Business Ethics
13	Jamali and Keshishian (2009)	Journal of Business Ethics
14	Dahan, Doh, Oetzel, and Yaziji (2010)	Long Range Planning
15	Liu and Ko (2011)	Journal of Business Ethics
16	Seitanidi, Koufopoulos, and Palmer (2010)	Journal of Business Ethics
17	Austin and Seitanidi (2012a)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
18	Austin and Seitanidi (2012b)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
19	Sakarya, Bodur, Yildirim-Öktem, and Selekler-Göksen (2012)	Journal of Business Research
20	Burgos (2013)	Journal of Business Strategy
21	Erakovich and Anderson (2013)	International Journal of Public Sector Management
22	Schillerand Almog-Bar (2013)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
23	Burchell and Cook (2013)	Journal of Business Ethics
24	Suárez and Hwang (2013)	Voluntas
25	Sanzo, Alvarez, Rey, and Garcia (2015a)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
26	Al-Tabbaa, Leach, and March (2014)	Voluntas
27	Boenigk and Schuchardt (2015)	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
28	Sanzo, Álvarez, Rey, and García (2015b)	Service Business
29	Bitzer and Glasbergen (2015)	Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability
30	Harangozó and Zilahy (2015)	Journal of Cleaner Production
31	Skagerlind, Westman, and Berglund (2015)	Business and Society Review
32	Murphy, Arenas, and Batista (2015)	Journal of Business Ethics
33	Barroso-Méndez, Galera-Casquet, and Valero-Amaro (2015)	BRQ-Business Research Quarterly
34	Hond, Bakker, and Doh (2015)	Business & Society
35	Zatepilina-Monacell (2015)	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing
36	Moldovan, Greenley, and Lakatos (2016)	Review of Applied Socio- Economic Research
37	Liu, Ko, and Chapleo (2018)	Journal of Business Ethics
38	Álvarez-González, García-Rodríguez, Rey-García, and Sanzo-Perez (2017)	BRQ Business Research Quarterly
39	Lyakhov and Gliedt (2017)	Voluntas
40	Jones, Edwardsb, Bocarrob, Bundsb, and. Smith (2017)	European Sport Management Quarterly
41	Shumate, Sophia, and Cooper (2018)	Journal of Business Ethics

As suggested by Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003), to develop a data synthesis (third step), we considered the information that was required for designing the summary tables. These tables included details on the source of information and any other features relevant to the study. We created a spreadsheet in MS Excel, fed it with information such as title, authors, year, journal, the most cited references and authors, the main journals, the number of citations, the objectives, theories, countries, the business in which the research was developed, research

methods, gaps, research opportunities and, attributes, and the variables or characteristics used by the authors for addressing value creation. This spreadsheet was important for assisting with the analysis, as we adopted the content analysis methodology. This is a highly flexible research methodology that is widely used as a systematic and rigorous approach for analyzing the data obtained or generated during the study (White & Marsh, 2006). Content analysis may have either qualitative or quantitative applications, or both, as in the case of this paper.

Therefore, the results were structured in two parts. First, we conducted an overview when we analyzed articles quantitatively and descriptively, and also using BibExcel software. Second, by in-depth analyses of the attributes, variables or characteristics used by the sample's author(s), we defined codes (categories) by inductive content. To do so the researchers interpreted and decided which information should be grouped in the same category (called attributes and sub-attributes in this paper). Since we identified many attributes of value creation, the main objective was to reduce the number by grouping similar ones (as presented in Section 3.2). To include each sub-attribute into the attributes, the authors identified those that were interrelated.

Finally, by considering the quantitative and in-depth analyses, it was possible to provide an overview of the agenda of future opportunities and propose an integrative framework that represents a synthesis of collaborative value between NPOs and business. Both analyses are presented in Section 3.

It is worth noting the limitations of the research method that will influence the development of future studies. For example: (i) the “selecting papers” step is influenced by the personal perception of each researcher; and (ii) the study does not represent the whole population of papers that address value creation because exclusion criteria and specific search strings were used.

RESULTS

General overview of the value creation process in BNPPs: descriptive analyses

Figure 3 provides the total number of publications by year. Even though we did not determine a period for the SLR, the oldest paper was Austin (2000), showing that the subject is relatively new, although studies have increased in the last five years. The increase in the complex socio-economic problems faced by society, and the conclusion reached by organizations, that approaches restricted to only one sector are not sufficient for solving crises anymore, may have had an influence on the recent interest in the subject.

Figure 3. Publications by year




Exhibit 4 shows the main theories that were adopted. The most widely-used were the Stakeholder and Resource-based theories, followed by the Resource Dependence and Institutional theories. The stakeholder theory is an alternative theoretical bridge linking the resource dependence and institutional theories. The primary justification for using it is that both approaches offer possible strategic tools for explaining and managing the issues raised in the technical and institutional environment. Stakeholder theory also helps with recognition of how partners in a BNPP mobilize the interest of different stakeholders in social and environmental issues (Parker & Selsky, 2004). On the other hand, resource-based approaches help explain how partners exchange, improve or develop resources and capabilities. Therefore, both theories have been applied for explaining the phenomenon of BNPPs and for understanding the value creation process. Furthermore, even without a consensus about the most appropriate theory, all these approaches seem to be essential for understanding cross-sector collaboration, especially the process of value creation. Hond, Bakker, and Doh (2015) also suggest that different theoretical lenses could recognize which dependencies exist, taking into account the environmental contingencies, or understand the complexity of the relationships between NPOs and FPBs.

Exhibit 4. Theories

Theories									
Author (s)	Transaction costs	Resource dependence	Social network	Institutional theory	Stakeholder theory	Resource-based view - RBV	Relationship marketing	Commitment-consistency	Collaboration theory
(Al-Tabbaa et al. 2014)	•			•	•				
(James E. Austin, 2000)		•							
(Barroso-Méndez et al., 2015)							•		
(Boenigk Silke & Viktoria, 2015)								•	
(Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006)				•					
(Burchell & Cook, 2013)					•				
(den Hond et al., 2015)		•	•			•			
(Gajda, 2004)									•
(Harangozó & Zilahy, 2015)					•				
(Liu & Ko, 2011)						•			
(Sakarya et al., 2012)				•					
(Sanzo, Álvarez, Rey, & García, 2015b)						•			
(Suárez & Hwang, 2013)		•			•				
(Liu, Wai, & Chris, 2018) (Jones et al., 2017)			•			•			
Total	1	3	2	3	4	4	1	1	1

Figure 4 shows the main research methods adopted. After years of predominantly using case studies, researchers have also recently been using literature reviews and surveys. Case studies were applied predominantly to explain the phenomena since there was no preliminary research, but as the subject evolved, other methods were used. Recently, case studies are being applied in the context of developing countries, since research on the

subject is still contemporaneous in this context. With regard to theoretical studies, most of them developed a framework (Exhibit 5). Three of them analyzed the literature in a non-structured way, and the other three papers designed propositions or hypotheses by way of the framework they proposed.

Figure 4. Research methods




Exhibit 5. Theoretical papers

Authors (year)	Theoretical papers					
	SLR	Meta-analytical	Non-structured literature review	Content analysis	Framework proposition	Theoretical proposition or hypotheses
Moldovan, et al. (2016)				•		
Barroso-Mendez et al. (2015)	•	•			•	
Bitzer and Glasbergen (2015)			•			
Al-Tabbaa et al. (2014)					•	•
Erakovich and Anderson (2013)			•			
(Burgos, 2013)			•			
Austin and Seitanidi (2012ab)					•	•
Dahan et al. (2010)					•	
Bryson et al. (2006)					•	•
Paton (2006)					•	
Wymer and Samu (2003)					•	

Exhibit 3 also presents the journals that publish on the theme. The most cited were the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* and the *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly (NVSQ)*. They have an evident prominence in the academic sphere, with the Journal Citation Report (JCR2017) of 3796 and 1932, respectively.

Collaborative value creation attributes in BNPPs

Understanding how a BNPP can create value is critical to its training and implementation initiatives, as well as providing its partners with a ‘safe bet’, that it is worth investing time and effort in partnering with it in order to achieve the expected benefits. However, according to Austin and Seitanidi (2012a), although there has been significant progress in the subject, there is no common language with regard to the definition and the dynamics of how different processes of collaboration can contribute to value creation. Furthermore, in a collaboration between an NPO and business, value may be created by the independent actions of one of the partners, which is called ‘unique creation,’ or by the joint actions of the partners, which is called ‘co-creation’ (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a).

After an in-depth reading of all the articles, it was possible to identify the factors or variables (called factors in this paper) related to the value creation process in BNPPs (Exhibit 6). In examining Exhibit 6, we observed that there are similarities between the concepts behind the different terminologies. The authors usually associate these factors with success or the value creation process in a BNPP. We also noticed that most of the factors are related to the sources of the collaborative value creation process mentioned by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a): resource complementarity, resource nature, resource directionality, use, and linked interests.

Exhibit 6. Factors related to collaborative value creation in a BNPP from the SLR

Author (s)	Factors
Shumate et al. (2018)	Cross-sector network portfolio / Adaptive and operational capacity / Average duration of partnerships
Jones et al. (2017)	Structural Characteristics (Integration Mechanisms, formalization, size, external control, Inner stability) / Contextual Characteristics (System stability, resource munificence, community cohesion) / Function characteristics (Buffering/Nurturing, steering processes, managerial work, generic networking)
Lyakhov and Gliedt (2017)	Political opportunity structure / political ideology / environmental philosophy
Álvarez-González et al. (2017)	Trust / affective commitment / internal marketing approach / volume of funding / scale of operations / mission accomplishment
Liu et al. (2018)	Social Alliance / Relationship-Building Motive / Social Alliance Benefits-Exploiting Motive / Mutual trust / Relational embeddedness / Relational commitment
Moldovan et al. (2016)	Collaboration of reputation / knowledge / effective resources
Barroso-Mendez et al. (2015)	Shared values / opportunistic behavior / trust / commitment / relationship learning / cooperation / functional conflict
Bitzer and Glasbergen (2015)	The ability for participation and inclusive arrangements / the contribution of market-based approaches to the problems targeted / impact of partnerships

Continue

Exhibit 6. Factors related to collaborative value creation in a BNNP from the SLR

Author (s)	Factors
Hond et al. (2015)	The level of commitment of the firm to CSR / the strategic fit between the firm's and the NGO's resources / the level of trust the firm has in NGOs / the frequency of contact with NGOs / prior level and perception of experience with NGOs / the level of pressure exerted by NGOs
Harangozó and Zilahy (2015)	The size of organizations / motivation / NGOs can most effectively influence the business sector
Skagerlind et al. (2015)	Partner relations, roles, and responsibilities / trust and motivation / agenda setting, autonomy, ownership, and participation / cost x benefit allocation / complementary core competencies and critical cooperation
Murphy et al. (2015)	Prior experience / alignment of partners
Sanzo et al. (2015a)	Trust / affective commitment / innovation development / information and communication technology competence / internal marketing / visibility / scale of operations / funding / mission accomplishment
Sanzo et al. (2015b)	Perceived value / communication / mission and strategy alignment (lower conflict and lower reputation damage risk) / trust / commitment
Zatepilina-Monacell (2015)	Types and motives for community involvement / expectations of community involvement and of NPO partners / the desired type of relationship with community-based NPOs
Al-Tabbaa et al. (2014)	Context (Nonprofit Business Collaboration - NBC - purpose, stakeholder expectation, nonprofit competition and cultural barrier) / content (collaboration level and strategic position) / process (power imbalance, communication channels and transaction costs)
Boenigk Silke and Viktoria (2015)	Cause related Marketing (CRM) donations / NPO attitudes / donor acquisition / attitudes toward partnership / fit of CRM partners / organizational identification
Burchell and Cook (2013)	Transformations in the drivers for engagement / transformations in the processes of engagement / transformations in the terms of engagement
Burgos (2013)	NPO trustful image / technology and the power shift to NGOs / the corporate response to NGO pressure
Erakovich and Anderson (2013)	Structural issues / core values / communicate with stakeholders / special interest / political officials / economic advisors / leaders of bureaucracy / values discovered / values aligned
Schiller and Almog-Bar (2013)	Mission-related collaborations / marketing collaborations / learning collaborations / infrastructure collaborations / political collaborations and marginal collaborations
Suárez and Hwang (2013)	Marketization and managerialism (rationalization, leader management degree and earned income) / resources and constraints (funding diversity, deficits and downturn)
Austin and Seitanidi (2012a, 2012b)	Organizational fit / mobilize distinctive competencies / integrate their resources conjointly / perceive self-interests linked and fairness in the sharing of value
Sakarya et al. (2012)	Inputs provided by the partners / outcomes / social transformation impact
Liu and Ko (2011)	Alliance formation / resource position / management approaches
Dahan et al. (2010)	Resources and skills / organizational fit, cultural compatibility and trust / understanding the unique conditions of developing countries / supporting local business environments

Continue

Exhibit 6. Factors related to collaborative value creation in a BNNP from the SLR

Concludes

Author (s)	Factors
Seitanidi et al. (2010)	Organizational characteristics (transformative capacity) / partnership motivation (transformative intention) / history of interactions (transformative experience)
Jamali and Keshishian (2009)	Resource dependency / commitment symmetry / common goal symmetry / intensive communication / alignment of cooperation working capability / converging working culture / individual excellence / importance / interdependence / investment / information / integration / institutionalization / integrity
Seitanidi and Crane (2009)	Partner selection (assessing the different option of NPO or business; informal risk assessment process) / partnership design (experimentation, adaptation, operationalization) / partnership institutionalization (relationship mastering, personal familiarization)
Kolk et al. (2008)	<i>Input</i> (goals, motives and resources of individual partners) / <i>throughput</i> (partnership characteristics, dynamism and design.) / <i>output</i> (partnership objectives, sustainability and deliverables.) / <i>outcome</i> (impact) / efficiency (costs-benefit) / effectiveness (added value)
Eweje (2007)	Inter-organizational relationships / coordination mechanisms (mutual influence and shared control)
Seitanidi (2007)	Trust / human resources / information / reputation
Bryson et al. (2006)	Initial conditions (general environment, sector failure and direct antecedents) / process dimensions (formal and informal: forging agreements, building leadership, building legitimacy, building trust and managing conflict planning) / structural and governance dimensions (formal and informal: membership, structural configuration and governance structure) / contingencies and constraints (type of collaboration, power imbalances and competing institutional logics) / outcomes (public value; first-, second-, and third-order effects; resilience and reassessment) / accountability issues (inputs, processes, and outputs; results management system; relationships with political and professional constituencies)
Paton (2006)	Structural foundation/ social foundation/ structural frontier/ strategic frontier
Gajda (2004)	Integration / purpose / strategies and tasks / leadership and decision-making/ interpersonal and communication
Parker and Selsky (2004)	Integration / reculturation / separation
Martínez (2003)	Power imbalance (abuse conditions and parasitic attitude) / lack of partner match (unethical behavior and inability to manage the project)
Wymer and Samu (2003)	Motivation / partner selection and fit (mission fit, management fit, workforce fit, target market fit, product/cause fit, cycle fit, and cultural fit.) / communication
Ashman (2001)	Impact/ value creation (mutual benefits) / incentives / intermediary actors / shared control
Austin (2000)	Alignment of strategy, mission, and / personal connection and relationships / value generation and shared vision / continual learning / focused attention / communication / organizational system / mutual expectations and accountability / Trust

Concludes

DISCUSSION: AN INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH AGENDA

The aim of this paper is to propose an integrative framework that synthesizes the literature on collaborative value creation between nonprofit and business organizations, and Section 3 allowed to develop some analyses. For example, most of the papers in the sample described variables that are in line with the sources of collaborative value creation proposed by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a). This information shows that the attributes proposed by these authors are still essential for creating value in these partnerships. Thus, in order to synthesize the information from the analyzed papers, we called the attributes presented in Exhibit 5 sub-attributes, and we show how these sub-attributes are in line with the terms adopted by the authors in the sample. All this information is presented in Exhibit 7.

Exhibit 7. Attributes and generic terms for the sub-attributes

Attributes	Term adopted in this paper (sub-attributes)	Terms adopted by the authors from SLR	*Authors from the paper sample																																					
			1	2	3	4	6	8	9	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	24	25	26	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	36	38									
Resource complementarity	Appropriate partner selection	Lack of partner match				•																																		
		Partner selection and fit			•																																			
		Partnership selection										•																												
	Organizational fit	Organizational fit			•								•				•	•																						
		Strategic fit between company and NPO resources																																	•					
	Communication	Communication	•		•		•																																	
		Communication channels																																						
		Communicate with stakeholders																																						
		Intensive communication												•																										
	Trust	Build trust																																						
		Trust	•										•				•																							
		Trust rating																																						
Mutual trust																																								


Continue

sharing and the complementarity of partner resources in an alliance also bring specific benefits (Hond et al., 2015). The relational view (RV) and the extended resource-based view (ERBV) also consider that accessing a partner's resources allows companies to create value and, consequently, to develop collaborative advantages (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Lavie 2006). Dahan et al. (2010), Jamali and Keshishian (2009) and Liu and Ko (2011) support the same idea, emphasizing the importance of dependency and resource sharing to the process of value creation in the partnership. Finally, to assess resource complementarity and its potential value creation, it is important to recognize whether the resources of each partner have the potential to contribute, including tangible (money, land, facilities, machinery, supplies, structures and natural resources) and intangible resources (knowledge, skills, and management practices) (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b).

- Resource nature. According to RBV, partners can contribute to collaboration with generic resources, that is, those that any company or NPO has, in order to mobilize and take advantage of more valuable resources, such as knowledge, capabilities, infrastructure and relationships that are critical to the success of the organization (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Hond et al. (2015) agree and believe that organizations look for partners that can add economic and social value, either by recombining valuable resources to which the partners have access, or by the joint development of new valuable resources, thereby generating collaborative advantages.
- Resource directionality and use. This deals with the flow of resources that may be mostly unilateral and coming mainly from one partner, or a bilateral and reciprocal exchange (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). According to the authors, parallel (but separate) entries or transfers can create value, but the integration of complementary and distinctive resources (from a relational perspective) that produce new services or activities that no organization could have created alone or in parallel, creates new value.
- Linked interests. Cross-sector collaborations may have distinct objectives and no common currency for assessing value (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). According to the authors, however, it is essential to: (i) clearly understand how partners consider value; (ii) reconcile any divergent value creation frames; and (iii) see value exchange as being fair.

However, because the authors' sample cited some sub-attributes that have no adherence to the attributes proposed by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a), we called them "other attributes" (right side of Figure 5). The numbers on the right side of Figure 5 represent the authors' sample listed in Exhibit 3. These sub-attributes have either a direct or indirect impact on value creation. For instance, if one of the partners behaves opportunistically (increasing the transaction cost, for example), this attitude will have a negative influence on value creation, since it is considered a relational factor (Barroso-Mendez et al., 2015). Organization size may act as a "moderating attribute" in the cooperation between NPOs and FPBs (Harangozó & Zilahy, 2015). Some "other attributes" are called "external attributes" since they are related to the external environment of the partnership. For example, with regard to stakeholder expectations, when designing and implementing new initiatives to create value, the BNPP needs to carefully consider its heterogeneous stakeholder groups (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2014), as well as social impact, since it leads to transformations in cultural, political and economic spheres (Sakarya et al., 2012). Finally, the "internal variables and inputs" are those related to each partner. For example, FPBs may influence innovation development in NPOs, while the internal marketing of NPOs may also produce advantages for FPBs (Sanzo et al., 2015a).

Figure 5. Integrative framework



*The numbers in the Figure represent the sample's papers presented in Exhibit 4

Thus, the logic of the framework is underpinned by the idea that collaboration creates synergy, which produces results and creates value, as can be seen at the bottom of Figure 5. Therefore, recognizing the attributes of value creation and what each attribute consists of may improve the organizational sustainability of all the organizations involved in a BNPP, for example, as well as enhancing reputation and providing a more diversified revenue base.


The framework also presents information about research into the collaborative value creation process in BNPPs. For example, although most of the sample authors do not use a specific theory to study this process, some are adopting some theories jointly (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2014; Hond et al., 2015; Suárez & Hwang, 2013), predominantly those authors who adopt the stakeholder theory and RBV (see Exhibit 4).

Few papers have analyzed the impact of value creation on sustainable performance. Some of them considered the three aspects of sustainability (economic, social and environmental), such as Austin and Seitanidi (2012a). Others focused only on social aspects, such as Moldovan et al. (2016) and Paton (2006). Environmental (Harangozó & Zilahy, 2015) and economic aspects (Dahan et al., 2010) were analyzed in a minority of the studies. The literature

also indicates that some studies focus on specific national contexts since they investigated the value creation process between specific business sectors, such as pharmaceutical companies, those in health and education, and micro and small businesses.

By analyzing the integrative framework as well as the main gaps, we propose some directions for future research (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Future agenda



Theories

There is no consensus about which theory can best explain value creation in cross-sector collaboration. Further research, therefore, could combine theories that consider the partnership as an essential strategy for achieving collaborative advantage, such as RV and ERBV, since neither has been considered in this article's sample. The main theories have also tended to focus on explaining the motives for collaboration and on the ongoing dynamics, leaving aside how this collaboration can create value for the parties. As the collaboration between NPOs and business can be related to sustainable issues, the Natural Resource-Based View (NRBV) may be a useful theory for studying this subject.

Research methods and context

The majority of the studies are qualitative or conceptual. Conceptual studies do not investigate the literature systematically, revealing that more SLRs are needed. There is also an opportunity for mixed or quantitative methods, such as survey or mathematical modeling.

There is still a lack of studies in emerging economies and cross-sector collaborations involving government and civil societies. Thus, further research can study cross-sector collaboration in those economies in more depth, by comparing them with other studies in developed countries.

Attributes

Further research can also investigate the influence of the relationship between attributes and sub-attributes (Figure 5), for example, by applying mixed methods that use experts and multicriteria tools. Through the Delphi technique, experts could infer the influence exerted by the attributes and sub-attributes in order to reach a consensus. Multicriteria tools also make it possible to model the attributes to achieve an index of collaborative value creation by adopting a Graphic Theoretical Approach (GTA). The Analytic Network Process (ANP) also enables prioritization of those attributes that exert a significant influence on collaborative value creation. Another opportunity consists in investigating those attributes that exert most influence in the value creation process, by way of surveys or Delphi, for example.

Sustainable aspects

Future studies can focus not only on the social aspect, but also on economic and environmental issues. However, to do so companies will need to go beyond philanthropy, and seek new engagement strategies in the communities where they operate, thereby obtaining greater corporate relevance and having a more significant social, economic and environmental impact.

Conclusions, limitations and future studies

We developed an integrative framework that represents a synthesis of the research on the value creation process in a BNPP. Even using different terminologies, some of the authors' sample described sub-attributes that are in line with the attributes proposed by [Austin and Seitanidi \(2012a\)](#), an advanced study of VC processes between a business and an NPO. These attributes were operationalized in 11 sub-attributes. We also verified some sub-attributes with no adherence to those proposed by [Austin and Seitanidi \(2012a\)](#); we called them "other attributes". These sub-attributes were grouped into four attributes (which were operationalized in 13 sub-attributes). "Other sub-attributes" also has a direct or indirect impact on the value creation process in a BNPP. Therefore, these attributes represent those that may influence value creation in a BNPP, and when value is created, the partnership produces results (whether expected or not). These findings represent the first contribution of this paper.

Second, the proposed framework contributes to the advancement of knowledge since it extends the study of BNPP and its value creation, showing, for example, the context (countries and businesses) in which research into value creation has been applied. This result makes room for discussion, especially in emerging economies and in many sectors other than those identified in this paper.

Third, even without consensus regarding the most appropriate theory, we show that the value creation process in BNPPs is complex, and that it needs to be addressed using different theories and point of views. Fourth, even though the literature presents different attributes (and sub-attributes) for addressing value creation,

understanding how they contribute to it is not easy, which highlights the need to examine how these attributes might differ and under what circumstances. Finally, the fifth contribution is related to the research agenda.

This research also has its limitations. First, we considered specific databases and limited search strings, and this may have led to a loss of content. Thus, future research should use different databases and other search strings. Further research can discuss each attribute and its sub-attributes, or re-group them to obtain a deeper understanding of the effects on the attributes and value creation process in BNPPs. Finally, based on our results, and analyzing the paper's gaps questions arise: (i) Which theories, governance structures and attributes can best explain collaborative value creation in BNPPs? (ii) Considering a collaborative relationship, what are the implications for nonprofit executive directors or business CEOs of the value created? (iii) How can nonprofit organization and business leaders sustain collaboration? (iv) Which values do the attributes create and how can they be measured? (v) What are the impacts of the attributes on sustainable aspects (economic, social and environmental)? These critical questions are important for scholars and practitioners, especially given the pressure on nonprofit organizations to generate corporate revenue and the corresponding expectation for businesses to be socially responsible, especially by supporting and establishing partnerships with nonprofit entities.

REFERENCES

- Al-Tabbaa, O., Leach, D., & March, J. (2014). *Collaboration between nonprofit and business sectors: A framework to guide strategy development for nonprofit organizations*. *Voluntas*, 25(3), 657-678. doi: 10.1007/s11266-013-9357-6
- Álvarez-González, L. I., García-Rodríguez, N., Rey-García, M., & Sanzo-Perez, M. J. (2017). *Business-nonprofit partnerships as a driver of internal marketing in nonprofit organizations: Consequences for nonprofit performance and moderators*. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 20(2), 112-123. doi: 10.1016/j.brq.2017.01.001
- Arya, B., & Lin, Z. (2007). *Understanding collaboration outcomes from an extended resource-based view perspective: The roles of organizational characteristics, partner attributes, and network structures*. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 697-723. doi: 10.1177/0149206307305561
- Ashman, D. (2001). *Civil society collaboration with business: Bringing empowerment back in*. *World Development*, 29(7), 1097-1113. doi: 10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00027-4
- Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012a). *Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses – Part 1: Value creation spectrum and collaboration stages*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(5), 726-758. doi: 10.1177/0899764012450777
- Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012b). *Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses – Part 2: Partnership processes and outcomes*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 929-968.
- Austin, J. E. (2000). *Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and businesses*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 69-97. doi: 10.1177/089976400773746346
- Barroso-Méndez, M. J., Galera-Casquet, C., & Valero-Amaro, V. (2015). *Proposal of a social alliance success model from a relationship marketing perspective: A meta-analytical study of the theoretical foundations*. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 18(3), 188-203. doi: 10.1016/j.brq.2014.09.002
- Bitzer, V., & Glasbergen, P. (2015). *Business-NGO partnerships in global value chains: Part of the solution or part of the problem of sustainable change? Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 12, 35-40. doi: 10.1016/j.cosust.2014.08.012
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006, December). *The design and implementation of cross-sector collaboration: Propositions from the literature*. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 17-18. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x
- Burchell, J., & Cook, J. (2013). *Sleeping with the enemy? Strategic transformations in business-NGO relationships through stakeholder dialogue*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 505-518. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1319-1
- Burgos, S. (2013). *Corporations and social responsibility: NGOs in the ascendancy*. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 34(1), 21-29. doi: 10.1108/02756661311301756
- Cao, M., & Zhang, Q. (2011). *Supply chain collaboration: Impact on collaborative advantage and firm performance*. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29(3), 163-180. doi:10.1016/j.jom.2010.12.008

- Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660-679.
- Ensslin, L., Ensslin, S. R., Dutra, A., Nunes, N. A., & Reis, C. (2017). BPM governance: A literature analysis of performance evaluation. *Business Process Management Journal*, 23(1), 71-86. doi: 10.1108/BPMJ-11-2015-0159
- Erakovich, R., & Anderson, T. (2013). Cross-sector collaboration: Management decision and change model. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(2), 163-173. doi: 10.1108/09513551311318031
- Eweje, G. (2007). Strategic partnerships between MNEs and civil society: The post-WSSD perspectives. *Sustainable Development*, 15(1), 15-27. doi: 10.1002/sd.295
- Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(1), 65-77. doi: 10.1016/j.ameval.2003.11.002
- Harangozó, G., & Zilahy, G. (2015). Cooperation between business and non-governmental organizations to promote sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 89, 18-31. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.10.092
- Hond, F. den, Bakker, F. G. A. de, & Doh, J. P. (2015). What prompts companies to collaboration with NGOs? Recent evidence from the Netherlands. *Business & Society* (54), 187-228. doi: 10.1177/0007650312439549
- Ishak, A. H., & Osman, M. R. (2016). A systematic literature review on Islamic values applied in quality management context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138(1), 103-112. doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2619-z
- Jamali, D., & Keshishian, T. (2009). Uneasy alliances: Lessons learned from partnerships between businesses and ngos in the context of CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(2), 277-295.
- Jones, G. J., Edwards, M. B., Bocarro, J. N., Bunds, K. S., Smith, W., Jones, G. J., ... Kyle, S. (2017). A structural perspective of cross-sector partnerships involving youth sport nonprofit organizations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 18(2), 133-155. doi: 10.1080/16184742.2017.1322625
- Kolk, A., Tulder, R. van, & Kostwinder, E. (2008). Business and partnerships for development. *European Management Journal*, 26(4), 262-273.
- Lavie, D. (2006). The competitive advantage of interconnected firms: An extension of the resource-based view. *The University of Texas at Austin*, 31(3), 638-658.
- Lewis, M., Brandon-Jones, A., Slack, N., & Howard, M. (2010). Competing through operations and supply: The role of classic and extended resource-based advantage. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 30(10), 1032-1058. doi: 10.1108/01443571011082517
- Liu, G., & Ko, W. W. (2011). Social alliance and employee voluntary activities: A resource-based perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(2), 251-268. doi: 10.1007/s10551-011-0907-9
- Liu, G., Wai, W., & Chris, K. (2018). How and when socially entrepreneurial nonprofit organizations benefit from adopting social alliance management routines to manage social alliances? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(2), 497-516. doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3231-6
- Lodsgård, L., & Aagaard, A. (2017, July). Creating value through CSR across company functions and NGO collaborations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 33, 2015-2017. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2017.05.002
- Lyakhov, A., & Gliedt, T. (2017). Understanding collaborative value creation by environmental nonprofit and renewable energy business partnerships. *Voluntas*, 28(4), 1448-1472. doi: 10.1007/s11266-016-9691-6
- Maier, F., Meyer, M., & Steinbereithner, M. (2016). Nonprofit organizations becoming business-like: A systematic review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(1), 64-86. doi: 10.1177/0899764014561796
- Martínez, C. V. (2003). Social alliances for fundraising: How Spanish nonprofits are hedging the risks. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(3), 209-222. doi: 10.1023/A:1026212902564
- Moldovan, A. M., Greenley, M., & Lakatos, E. S. (2016). Corporate social responsibility, NGOs and business partnerships for social sustainability. *Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research*, 11(1), 51-56. Retrieved from <http://www.reaser.eu>
- Murphy, M., Arenas, D., & Batista, J. M. (2015). Value creation in cross-sector collaborations: The roles of experience and alignment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1), 145-162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2204-x>
- Parker, B., & Selsky, J. W. (2004). Interface dynamics in cause-based partnerships: An exploration of emergent culture. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(3), 458-488.
- Paton, B. (2006). Collaboration among industry, civil society, and government for sustainability: A framework for identifying opportunities. *Progress in Industrial Ecology – An International Journal*, 3(12), 148-162.
- Sakarya, S., Bodur, M., Yildirim-Oktem, O., & Selekler-Goksen, N. (2012). Social alliances: Business and social enterprise collaboration for social transformation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(12), 1710-1720. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.012

- Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1997). *Defining the nonprofit sector: A cross-national analysis*. New York, USA: Manchester University Press.
- Sanzo, M. J., Álvarez, L. I., Rey, M., & García, N. (2015a). Business–nonprofit partnerships: Do their effects extend beyond the charitable donor-recipient model? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(2), 379-400. doi: 10.1177/0899764013517770
- Sanzo, M. J., Álvarez, L. I., Rey, M., & García, N. (2015b). Business nonprofit partnerships: A new form of collaboration in a corporate responsibility and social innovation context. *Service Business*, 9(4), 611-636. doi: 10.1007/s11628-014-0242-1
- Schiller, R. S., & Almog-Bar, M. (2013). Revisiting collaborations between nonprofits and businesses: An NPO-Centric view and typology. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5), 942-962. doi:10.1177/0899764012471753
- Seitanidi, M. M. (2007). Intangible economy : How can investors deliver change in businesses? Lessons from nonprofit-business partnerships. *Management Decision*, 45(5), 853-865. doi: 10.1108/00251740710753675
- Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR through partnerships: Understanding the selection, design and institutionalisation of nonprofit-business partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(Suppl. 2), 413-429
- Seitanidi, M. M., Koufopoulos, D. N., & Palmer, P. (2010). Partnership formation for change: indicators for transformative potential in cross sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(Suppl. 1), 139-161
- Shumate, M., Fu, J. S., & Cooper, K. R. (2018). Does cross-sector collaboration lead to higher nonprofit capacity? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(2), 385-399. doi: 10.1007/s10551-018-3856-8
- Silke, B., & Viktoria, S. (2015). Nonprofit collaboration with luxury brands: Positive and negative effects for cause-related marketing. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(4), 708-733
- Skagerlind, H. H., Westman, M. O. A., & Berglund, H. (2015). Cross-sector partnerships: The state, and the corporate. *Business and Society Review*, 120(2), 245-275
- Suárez, D. F., & Hwang, H. (2013). Resource constraints or cultural conformity? Nonprofit relationships with businesses. *Voluntas*, 24(3), 581-605.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 207-222. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.00375
- White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 22-45. doi: 10.1353/lib.2006.0053
- Wymer, W. W., & Samu, J. S. (2003). Dimensions of business and nonprofit collaborative relationships. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 3-22
- Zatepilina-Monacell, O. (2015). Small business–nonprofit collaboration: Locally owned businesses want to take their relationships with community-based NPOs to the next level. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 27(2), 216-237. doi: 10.1080/10495142.2015.1011511

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Cláudia Fabiana Gohr and Felipe Alves de Oliveira Soares make substantial contributions to the conception and design of the research, analyses, interpretation of data, framework proposition, and writing of the manuscript. Cláudia Fabiana Gohr also read the final manuscript and developed the final corrections and revisions. Lucas Carvalho de Oliveira and Matheus Henrique da Silva Amorim make contributions regarding the search in databases, selecting papers, extracting data from papers sample and helping in the tables and figures conception.