



**Public Welfare
Foundation**



Coalition Conditions for Success

MAY 2025

Introduction

Nonprofits, funders, directly impacted communities, government agencies, and other partners often come together in coalition to address complex problems that benefit from diverse perspectives and coordinated action. Some coalitions achieve meaningful successes and impacts such as policy changes, changes in programs and institutions, and direct positive benefits for people. However, coalition building alone doesn't guarantee success. This prompted us to explore several key questions: What conditions are associated with coalition success? What matters for coalitions to be effective? How can coalitions be supported to achieve the impact they seek?

In continuing our work to support Public Welfare Foundation's exploration of criminal justice transformation advocacy coalitions, ORS Impact (ORS) has conducted two literature scans. The first identifies the factors that lead to successful coalition *formation*. This second literature scan provides more context and targeted information about the conditions that enable coalition success. Through this process, **we have identified 10 conditions that contribute to coalition success: shared vision and goals, coalition culture, resource availability, staff roles and leadership, governance structures, strategy and theory of change, diversity of membership, collaboration and partnership, community engagement, and power sharing.**

These 10 conditions that influence coalition formation can be grouped into three broader categories of understanding:

- I. Resources and structural factors:** shared vision and goals, strategy and theory of change, governance structures, and resource availability
- II. Presence of key actors:** staff roles and leadership, diversity of membership
- III. Approach to coalition activity:** coalition culture, collaboration and partnerships, community engagement, power sharing

This literature scan explores how, and in what contexts, these conditions enable advocacy coalition success.

Context on Coalition Types

Though this literature scan focuses on traditional advocacy coalitions, before exploring the conditions that make these coalitions effective, it is important to review the different forms that coalitions can take, as these differences influence how much each condition impacts a coalition's success.

Advocacy Coalitions

Advocacy coalitions are long-term alliances formed by actors and organizations that share core policy beliefs and work collectively to influence public policy. These coalitions consist of diverse stakeholders—including political parties, think tanks, interest groups, and grassroots organizations—that coordinate activities such as protests, lobbying, and public messaging (Weible & Ingold, 2018). Coalition members may hold primary decision-making roles (e.g., policy officials) or operate from the periphery, contributing knowledge and legitimacy (e.g., think tank researchers). Depending on the resources they have, advocacy coalitions seek to exert influence through direct policy change, agenda setting, and/or shaping public discourse (Weible et al., 2019). The Advocacy Coalition Framework—a conceptual framework created to better understand advocacy coalitions—sorts the coordination of political activities into two categories: among allies who share core policy beliefs and among rivals who share commitment to addressing a policy even though they might fundamentally think differently about the issue. Among rivals, coordination means aligning goals and striving for win-win solutions.

Coalitions of Convenience

Coalitions of convenience are short-lived, goal-oriented alliances that emerge in response to specific policy threats or opportunities. Unlike long-standing advocacy coalitions, these are typically pragmatic, issue-specific partnerships that disband after they achieve the immediate objective—such as halting a harmful policy. While often temporary and loosely organized at inception, coalitions of convenience may gain cohesion and evolve into more stable advocacy coalitions over time (Weible & Ingold, 2018). Because they are issue specific, members of these coalitions may not need to tightly align around shared beliefs. Coalitions of convenience may be most useful in contexts that require quick mobilization rather than long-term coordination.

Clever Coalitions

Clever coalitions are adaptive, temporary alliances that exhibit high levels of collective intelligence and flexibility (Mortensen, 2017). As described by Mortensen (2017), clever coalitions continuously integrate new data and insights to revise their approach, making them particularly effective in addressing complex, dynamic social issues. These coalitions prioritize broad participation and foster experimentation and innovation. Unlike more static models, clever coalitions are dynamic and flexible, and they are best suited for understanding social issues in evolving complex environments.

Conditions That Influence Coalition Success

ORS Observations

This literature scan illuminated various conditions that contributed to advocacy coalition success. We found that the conditions for coalition success were highly interrelated. This often made it difficult to separate out conditions as distinct categories, as much of their impact depended on other conditions. For instance, a coalition's culture highly depends on the coalition's leadership, governance structure, and staffing. As such, though this literature scan presents the content in three discrete categories, we often reference similar information across multiple categories. This highlights how certain conditions rely on other conditions, and often multiple variables enable coalition success. This interplay demonstrates the complexity of advocacy coalitions.

I. Resourcing and Structural Factors

Shared Vision and Goals

A coalition's effectiveness depends significantly on clear vision, shared principles, and strategic communication of its purpose and value.

Across the literature, several common themes emerge regarding the vision necessary to ensure coalitions are unified, credible, and sustainable. One foundational element is establishing core principles that guide coalition activities and decision making. Reflecting on how the Global Health Technologies Coalition developed and changed over time, participants found that as the coalition grew, diverging member priorities began to hinder progress. To prevent this, they emphasized reaching an early consensus on foundational principles and developing a membership application process that aligned new members with these values. This approach helped avoid stagnation around disagreements and supported collective momentum (Chmiola, 2016).

Closely linked to core principles is articulating a clear and shared vision. Both Ellis and Lenczner (2000) and the Altarum Institute (2016) highlighted the importance of a mission statement in clarifying goals for members, external stakeholders, and funders. A strong mission statement provides internal cohesion and external clarity on the coalition's work. The Altarum Institute noted that the mission statement should reflect the coalition's values and be developed collaboratively to foster ownership and buy-in (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001; Wynn et al., 2006; Knitzer & Adely, 2001). Revisiting this shared vision over time maintains focus and relevance (Wolff, 2001; Cramer et al., 2003).

Raynor (2011) introduced the concepts of “goal destination” and “value proposition” as critical components of a coalition’s shared vision. “Goal destination” refers to the coalition’s clearly defined long-term outcomes (e.g., ending homelessness), which serve as a north star for members and stakeholders. Coalitions should also connect their goal to the existing work of participating organizations. “Value proposition” addresses why the coalition is the optimal vehicle to achieve those outcomes. In a crowded advocacy landscape, articulating the value proposition helps coalitions stand out and attract committed partners who may otherwise join another coalition or none at all (Raynor, 2011).

Strategy and Theory of Change

A strong strategy and well-defined theory of change are critical foundations for effective advocacy coalitions.

Across the literature, several strategic elements emerged as important for successful coalitions: aligning action with long-term goals, continuous strategic planning and evaluation, and commitment to data-informed decision making. A theory of change clarifies the logical sequence of actions that leads to desired outcomes and explains why a collaborative coalition is necessary (Mortensen, 2017). Mortensen emphasized that coalitions should exist to achieve a specific impact—not merely to sustain themselves. This outcome-focused orientation ensures that strategic decisions remain purposeful and aligned with a larger vision.

Strategic planning translates this theory into actionable steps. Nardi and Porter (2017) described strategic planning as a process through which coalitions align their agenda, goals, and activities to produce community impact. They advocated for regular (at least annual) reassessment of vision, mission, and goals based on collected data, ensuring responsiveness to changing community conditions. This process often involves SWOT analyses, which gather internal and external data to assess strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats—guiding the setting of new strategic goals. The importance of comprehensive and data-informed strategy development is echoed in Nagorcka-Smith et al. (2022), who found that strategic plans were positively associated with a range of coalition outcomes, including the number of implemented strategies, health-promoting environments, and community empowerment. Their review highlighted that coalitions that use multiple data sources, have comprehensive strategies, and implement plans with fidelity are more likely to achieve meaningful impact. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (n.d.) underscored the importance of the sustainability of a coalition’s strategy. They suggested that for coalitions to maintain impact over time, they must integrate their goals and strategies into member organizations’ missions.

Another widely recognized core element of effective coalition strategy is evaluation. Raynor (2011) argued that coalitions must go beyond binary policy outcomes and instead evaluate incremental progress and increased advocacy capacity. Downey et al. (2008) similarly stressed that coalitions should integrate evaluation into the strategic plan from the outset (during the coalition’s formation stage) and make evaluation iterative, allowing them to adapt

based on findings. This culture of reflection and adaptation was also emphasized by the Local Government Association (2023), which highlighted the importance of building in regular review mechanisms to assess what's working and what needs adjustment. These reviews can be formal or informal, depending on context and capacity, and can help assess barriers and strategies for overcoming them.

Governance Structures

Effective governance structures, including participatory decision making, central coordination, and clear structures and meeting cadence, contribute to coalition success and sustainability.

A consistent theme across the literature is the importance of inclusive and participatory decision making. High-functioning coalitions tend to engage members in leadership processes, which enhances both model fidelity and overall coalition performance (Jenkins et al., 2022). This participatory approach ensures diverse voices are heard and increases member investment in coalition goals.

Having a coordinating body is another important governance feature. The “opt-in” coalition model allows a central coordinating entity to drive strategy and maintain cohesion without requiring full consensus for every decision. This structure helps coalitions flexibly expand or contract around specific objectives while maintaining clarity of purpose (Mortensen, 2017). Steering committees often serve this function by bringing together leaders from different segments of the coalition to guide strategy, make informed decisions, and act efficiently without needing unanimous member agreement (Chmiola, 2016; Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002). The establishment of a representative convening organization or secretariat is also critical. This entity should be well-resourced, aligned with the coalition's mission, and positioned to prevent internal conflict (Chmiola, 2016). Assigning a lead agency to handle administrative responsibilities can reduce burdens on coalition members and improve functionality (Ellis & Lenczner, 2000).

Effective coalitions also benefit from clear processes and defined structures. Without clear decision-making processes, even a well-structured coalition may struggle to make progress. Adopting agreed-upon rules for making decisions enhances efficiency and prevents gridlock (Nardi & Porter, 2017). Elements such as bylaws, committees, workgroups, and defined conflict resolution protocols help manage tasks and reduce ambiguity (Altarum Institute, 2016). Committees are most effective when they have engaged leadership; hold productive, regular meetings; and maintain accountability through consistent reporting to the full coalition (Nardi & Porter, 2017). Well-organized agendas ensure members are prepared, roles are clear, and time is used productively—contributing to a culture of accountability and continuous progress (Nardi & Porter, 2017).

Ultimately, the literature emphasized that coalitions must balance structure with flexibility. Overly rigid governance can hinder innovation and responsiveness, while a lack of structure can lead to confusion and inefficiency. Striking this balance by tailoring governance models to coalition size, goals, and context helps support collaboration, manage conflict, and achieve impact (Altarum Institute, 2016; Foster-Fishman et al., 2001).

Resources

Effective advocacy coalitions require a range of resources—human, financial, and strategic—to achieve and sustain their goals.

The literature consistently emphasized the importance of resource mobilization as foundational to coalition success. For resources to be effective, coalitions must use them strategically. Research emphasized the importance of timing over method: coalitions were more successful when they aligned their most abundant resources with their current stage in the policy process (Wiley et al., 2021). However, the assets—people power, political resources, information—needed at each phase of the policy process are not universal and instead depend on the coalition and its context.

Human resources are among the most critical assets for advocacy coalitions. Wiley et al. (2021) highlighted that formal coalitions relied heavily on members—their “mobilizable troops”—to act as secondary policy actors that advance policy changes (Wiley et al., 2021; Jenkins-Smith et al., 2018; Edwards & McCarthy, 2004). In analyzing the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, research found that individual members and their affiliated organizations were the coalition’s primary resource and were activated throughout all stages of the policy process, from agenda setting to evaluation (Wiley et al., 2021). As the coalition progressed over time, members became more professionalized and adept at translating information into policy (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004; Arnold, 2011; Wiley et al., 2021).

Importantly, financial resources are also a key input to coalition success. Crowder et al. (2022) stressed the importance of innovative funding sources—whether self-generated, government-supported, or foundation-based—to ensure long-term sustainability. However, as Ellis and Lenczner (2000) cautioned, coalitions must align funding sources with their core missions to avoid mission drift or internal competition between coalition members. Funding should be a tool to advance goals, not dictate them.

The broader category of strategic resources—encompassing staffing, training, technical assistance, and resource management—also plays a significant role in coalition effectiveness. Nagorcka-Smith et al. (2022) found that coalitions with stronger resourcing achieved greater community participation, social capital, and knowledge gains. Specifically, adequate staffing was linked to improved member satisfaction and capacity-building, while community control over resources enhanced partnership synergy and outcomes. Opportunities for training and technical assistance were positively associated with improved short- and medium-term coalition outcomes.

Potential Considerations and Takeaways:

- » To what degree do coalitions maintain their goals, guiding visions, and principles over the coalition's lifespan? How might these evolve over time, and how do resulting changes affect coalition cohesion and membership?
- » How might coalition members struggle with “goal destination” given the range of ideologies about criminal justice work (from incremental reforms to abolition)?

II. Presence of Key Actors

Staff Roles and Leadership

Effective advocacy coalitions depend heavily on strategic staffing and strong leadership. Coalitions thrive when roles such as policy entrepreneurs and inclusive leadership structures are well defined and aligned with coalition goals.

For example, policy entrepreneurs, as defined by Mintrom and Norman (2009), are critical actors who demonstrate social acuity, define problems, build teams, and lead by example. They initiate and sustain coalition activities, including setting agendas, organizing opportunities to share beliefs and learnings, and coordinating collective action (Cruz Rodrigues et al., 2020). These individuals not only help secure the issue on the policy agenda but also contribute to the coalition's recognition and stability over time. Conversely, policy brokers, who are typically tasked with managing conflict in a policy subsystem and negotiating solutions, were not positively correlated with building advocacy coalitions (Cruz Rodrigues et al., 2020).

Leadership consistently emerges as a pivotal factor across coalition stages. In reviewing how 43 coalitions developed across stages, Jenkins et al. (2022) found that coalition team leadership—marked by political acumen, community respect, and vision—was the only condition sufficient for achieving high model fidelity during the coalition formation phase. Leadership, particularly coordinator leadership, remained essential in the maintenance phase. Other studies reinforced that leadership characteristics such as inclusivity, vision alignment, collaboration, and supportiveness contributed significantly to coalition functioning and outcomes (Woulfe et al., 2010; Stokols et al., 2008; Zakocs & Guckenburg, 2007). Similarly, in a study on the efficacy of health equity coalitions, research found that high-quality coalition leadership was linked with improved community outcomes, including greater community capacity, social capital, and changes to health equity (Nagorcka-Smith et al., 2022).

Leadership from members with lived experience builds collective power within coalitions, as described by the Innovation Network (2024) in a collective power framework. Coalitions directed by lived experience must provide ongoing leadership development and support, remove any barriers to engagement, and build trust and safety.

Leadership in coalitions often resides not in a single individual but within steering committees comprised of leaders from various workgroups. This distributed model ensures that essential skills and competencies are collectively present (DiClemente et al., 2002). This leadership core is also essential for setting direction, managing conflict, and maintaining accountability (Raynor, 2011). The lead agency provides operational support while not assuming control over the coalition (Cohen et al., 2002).

Planning for leadership succession sustains coalition. Existing leaders must be succeeded by individuals identified through deliberate efforts to engage new voices, promote diversity, and offer leadership training and support (Nardi & Porter, 2017). Sustained success requires ongoing leadership development, including intentionally identifying and nurturing emerging leaders from within the coalition (Foster-Fishman et al., 2001; Roussos & Fawcett, 2000).

Diversity of Membership

A diverse coalition membership is a key condition for effective advocacy coalitions.

The literature underscored that diversity enhances strategic capacity, broadens perspectives, and enables tailored approaches to complex issues.

Diverse coalitions bring a wide range of expertise, perspectives, and experiences that can enrich strategy and advocacy efforts. For example, the Global Health Technologies Coalition uses its diverse membership—including actors across the global health research and development spectrum—to strengthen policy advocacy and effectively represent the broader field (Chmiola, 2016). Mortensen (2017) argued that effective coalitions strategically play to members' strengths, deploying individuals based on their distinct capabilities in areas such as research, communications, or design.

Empirical research shows how membership diversity improves coalition outcomes. Sectoral heterogeneity has been linked to increased implementation of systems-focused strategies and enhanced social capital (Nagorcka-Smith et al., 2022). While homogenous coalitions may experience more participation and easier coordination (Nagorcka-Smith et al., 2022), heterogeneous groups are more likely to deliver broader impacts by employing a wider array of strategies and perspectives. This suggests that although diversity may introduce challenges in coordination, it contributes to coalition resilience and the potential for transformative change.

Coalition membership composition should align with the coalition's goals, ensuring that members bring relevant skills or experiences to the table. As Raynor (2011) notes, while broad-based coalitions have the greatest potential to marshal diverse resources and achieve widespread impact, a narrower membership may be appropriate depending on the coalition's mission. In either case, effective coalitions must approach member recruitment intentionally.

Several studies emphasize the importance of intentional inclusion criteria during coalition formation to optimize member composition (Altarum Institute, 2016). These criteria might include factors such as age, ethnicity, race, and cultural background, particularly when the coalition's efforts are targeted toward specific populations. Inclusive membership practices

are not only instrumental in building legitimacy within relevant communities but also crucial for tailoring interventions that are culturally appropriate and impactful. When coalitions actively center lived experience, particularly those of marginalized groups and especially in decision making and leadership, they must intentionally invest in supports to decrease barriers to meaningful participation (Innovation Network, 2024).

Potential Considerations and Takeaways:

- » How does diversity in thought around criminal justice transformation affect coalitions' success? How might racial and cultural diversity affect success differently based on geography?
- » Are there opportunities to source leadership support and development in places where existing organizations or individuals may not currently have the capacity to lead a coalition?

III. Approach to Coalition Activities

Coalition Culture

A coalition's internal culture impacts its effectiveness, influencing not only operational success but also the ability to build trust, sustain engagement, and promote equity. The literature identified several interconnected cultural characteristics—such as commitment to community, trust, cohesion, communication, and inclusion—that collectively shape the internal environment of successful advocacy coalitions.

Committing to and centering community voices is foundational. Coalitions that prioritize and are deeply embedded in the communities they serve tend to employ more innovative and responsive strategies. Their success is often rooted in their consistent efforts to meet their communities' needs through relationship building and context-specific approaches (Crowder et al., 2022).

Team cohesion and strong interpersonal relationships often characterize the cultures of successful coalitions. Research found that cohesive teams with effective communication were more likely to achieve their goals (Jenkins et al., 2022; Kegler et al., 1998). Mortensen (2017) similarly stressed the need for strong, trust-based relationships that extend beyond individual tasks and endure through disagreements.

Trust and safety are critically important for authentic engagement and collective power building. Coalitions that cultivate openness and respect can facilitate meaningful dialogue and encourage full participation. This is especially important when working with marginalized communities, where distrust based on historical, and often current, exclusion may be prevalent (Innovation Network, 2024). Transparent structures and accountability mechanisms can help foster safety, reinforcing collaborative norms (Chmiola, 2016; Innovation Network, 2024).

Effective communication underpins a culture of inclusivity and alignment. Nardi and Porter (2017) outlined a model where coalitions inform, consult, and involve members at appropriate levels, promoting both trust and strategic cohesion. High-functioning coalitions also use communication protocols—such as structured agendas, timely updates, and accessible feedback channels—to reduce transaction costs and maintain engagement (Mortensen, 2017).

Transparency in decision making enhances legitimacy and buy-in, especially in diverse coalitions. The Global Health Technologies Coalition, for instance, encourages input from all members even when consensus is not possible, preserving member engagement and unity despite differing perspectives (Chmiola, 2016).

Lastly, focusing on conflict management is an essential cultural characteristic of an effective coalition. Coalitions that foster mutual support, dialogue, and psychological safety report better outcomes and are less prone to destructive conflict or member turnover (Nagorcka-Smith et al., 2022). These practices reinforce cohesion and contribute to a stable, high-functioning coalition culture.

Collaboration and Partnership

Advocacy coalitions thrive on a strong commitment to collaboration and partnerships, which serve as a critical input for collective success.

Despite variations in focus and strategy, effective coalitions believe in the transformative power of collaboration. Examples such as LATIN-19, the Black Community Advocacy Coalition, and the Camden Coalition all emphasized that lasting change is possible only through trusting, multisectoral partnerships that honor the voices of directly impacted communities (Crowder et al., 2022).

Collaborative partnerships support a coalition's success. Studies showed that an increase in the number and quality of partnerships was significantly associated with stronger community outcomes, such as increased readiness for change and policy engagement. Specifically, intersectoral relationships—especially when reciprocal—were correlated with greater community activity, higher levels of grant submissions, and overall perceived coalition success (Nagorcka-Smith et al., 2022).

Effective coalitions also engage in broad-based, inclusive partnerships that extend across sectors and community domains. This inclusivity ensures that diverse perspectives inform decision making and fosters community ownership of initiatives (Ellis & Lenczner, 2000). Successful coalitions often include representatives from schools, the faith community, health care providers, business sectors, and elected officials. Some even form nontraditional alliances—such as labor unions—to extend their reach and deepen their impact (Ellis & Lenczner, 2000). These relationships succeed when there is mutual recognition of goals, ensuring that all parties benefit from the partnership.

Community Engagement

Community engagement is an important condition of effective advocacy coalitions, influencing both internal functioning and external impact. The literature emphasized that meaningful engagement with community members enhances coalition outcomes, supports equity, and improves alignment with community needs.

Several studies showed positive associations between community engagement and coalition success. Nagorcka-Smith et al. (2022) found that engagement with community members correlated with a range of desirable outcomes, including increased community empowerment, more effective coalition action, and healthier environments. Engagement with political actors and communities of practice was linked to support for equitable policy changes and other short-term outcomes.

It is also crucial for a coalition to understand the community it serves. Ellis and Lenczner (2000) pointed out that knowledge of a community's assets, challenges, and culture—gained through formal needs assessments and the insights of long-term residents—can guide more responsive and effective action. This sentiment is echoed in broader coalition-building frameworks that advocate for early and sustained assessment of community dynamics.

Strategic planning processes, particularly those grounded in data and community input, provide a structured means to align coalition work with real-world conditions. According to the Altarum Institute (2016), strategic planning should incorporate insights from environmental scans and community assessments to shape goals, prioritize issues based on potential impact and sustainability, and identify key community supports. A well-informed planning process not only strengthens the implementation of interventions but also builds local legitimacy and accountability.

Potential Considerations and Takeaways:

- » What opportunities might exist for network development across partners that could enhance possibilities for partnership and collaboration?
- » When thinking of opportunities for multisectoral partnerships, what other issue areas (outside of criminal justice transformation) might have organizations that could serve as useful collaborators, including unlikely allies?

Power Sharing

Power sharing is vital for advocacy coalition effectiveness, particularly when aiming for equitable and sustainable systems change. The literature emphasized that coalitions that intentionally distribute power, center community voices, and engage in authentic collaboration are more likely to produce transformative, justice-oriented outcomes.

Wolff et al. (2016) introduced the Collaborating for Equity and Justice principles to guide coalitions toward deeper systemic change by emphasizing social justice, local leadership,

and equitable decision making (Reid et al., 2019). These principles reject short-term, project-based improvements in favor of long-term transformation driven by those most affected by inequities. Reid et al. (2019) stressed that making equity explicit in coalition governance and decision-making processes is necessary to shift how systems operate and whom they serve. Similarly, failing to share power with directly impacted communities can reinforce structural inequities (Wolf et al., 2019).

Power-sharing also requires a deliberate, inclusive, and reflective approach to collaboration. Farhang and Morales (2022) identified several interconnected principles to operationalize equity in coalitions. These include “act with care,” which emphasizes trust-building and recognizing privilege; “inclusivity,” which affirms that impacted communities are best positioned to define problems and solutions; and “authentic community collaboration,” which ensures that community members co-design, co-implement, and co-evaluate interventions. This approach reduces the risk of repeating historical harms in which communities were acted upon rather than engaged as full partners.

Changing who participates in coalition decision-making is itself a strategy for systems transformation. Farhang and Gould (2022) argued that bringing those most affected by systemic injustice—such as BIPOC communities, formerly incarcerated individuals, or people experiencing homelessness—into leadership roles changes both the substance and outcomes of advocacy work. They highlighted community power-building organizations as key allies in this effort. These groups redistribute power by organizing marginalized communities to identify shared struggles, build collective capacity, and pursue structural change. In doing so, they offer deep contextual knowledge and grounded strategies for systems reform.

Conclusion

The literature highlights several interrelated conditions that contribute to advocacy coalition success. This scan identified 10 of these conditions, which can serve as a useful reference point for coalitions engaging in learning-oriented reflection around their current strengths, resources, and opportunities for growth. Coalition effectiveness and success depend not only on the presence of individual conditions—such as shared values, clear strategies, key actors, resources, and diverse membership—but also on how these conditions interact within a specific context. Ultimately, this literature scan emphasizes that coalition success is shaped by a complex web of interconnected conditions and contextual factors.

Methods

To gather this information, we revisited an initial literature scan we had conducted and identified the conditions for coalition success the research mentioned. We then refined our list of conditions to ones referenced multiple times. This allowed us to go deeper and provide a more refined and tailored analysis of the frequently cited conditions that enable coalition success. We then explored the relevant literature from that scan and searched for additional resources that provided added context and detail about each of the conditions. We used Perplexity and ChatGPT, both AI-powered tools, to source articles that explored the question: “What are the factors that enable advocacy coalition success?” We uploaded the resulting articles and the relevant articles from the initial literature scan into Genei, an AI-powered literature review tool, to summarize each article, and we reviewed each article to verify Genei’s summaries. We then reviewed those summaries to see whether the content of each article contributed to our guiding research question. We incorporated 36 articles into this literature scan. Once we verified that an article was relevant to our search, we explored its literature base and key findings and organized that content into the categories named above. After organizing all the information from our base of articles, we synthesized the key takeaways in narrative form, as reflected in this report.

Recommended Citation

» Goff, C., Burnett, J., Borges Farfan, C., and Stachowiak, S. (2025). *Coalition Conditions for Success*. Public Welfare Foundation.

Works Cited

- » Altarum Institute. (2016). *Building effective smart beginnings coalitions: Building blocks and measurement tools for success*. Virginia Early Childhood Foundation. <https://thecne.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Building-Effective-Smart-Beginnings-Coalitions-Building-Blocks-and-Measurement-Tools-for-Success.pdf>
- » Arnold, G. (2011). The impact of social ties on coalition strength and effectiveness: The case of the battered women's movement in St Louis. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(02), 131-150.
- » Butterfoss, F. D., & Kegler, M. (2002). Toward a comprehensive understanding of community coalitions. In R. DiClemente, L. Crosby, & M.C. Kegler (Eds.), *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research*, 157–193.
- » Chmiola, M. (2016). *Eight keys to success in building an effective coalition*. Global Health Technologies Coalition. <https://www.ghcoalition.org/blog/eight-keys-to-success-in-building-an-effective-coalition>

- » Cohen, L., Baer, N., & Satterwhite, P. (2002). Developing effective coalitions: An eight step guide. In M. E. Wurzbach (Ed.), *Community health education & promotion: A guide to program design and evaluation* (2nd ed., pp. 144–161). Aspen Publishers Inc.
- » Cramer, M. E., Mueller, K., & Harrop, D. (2003). Comprehensive evaluation of a community coalition: A case study of environmental tobacco smoke reduction. *Public Health Nursing*, 20(6), 464–477.
- » Crowder, S. J., Tanner, A. L., Dawson, M. A., Felsman, I. C., Hassmiller, S. B., Miller, L. C., ... & Toney, D. A. (2022). Better together: Coalitions committed to advancing health equity. *Nursing Outlook*, 70(6), S48-S58.
- » Cruz Rodrigues, D., Vasconcellos, M., & Albuquerque Vasconcellos, A. M. (2020). Advocacy coalition formation and key actors within the policy. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 54(6), 1711–1728.
- » DiClemente, R. J., Crosby, R., & Kegler, M. (2002). *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research: Strategies for improving public health*. John Wiley & Sons.
- » Downey, L. M., Ireson, C., Slavova, S., & McKee, G. (2008). Defining elements of success: A critical pathway of coalition development. *Health Promotion Practice*, 9(2), 130–139.
- » Edwards, B., & McCarthy, J. D. (2004). Strategy matters: The contingent value of social capital in the survival of local social movement organizations. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 621–651.
- » Ellis, T. M., & Lenczner, S.J. (2000). *Lessons from the field: Community anti-drug coalitions as catalysts for change*. Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- » Farhang, L., & Gould, S. (2022). Racial justice and power-sharing: the heart of leading systems change. *Medium*. <https://humanimpact-hip.medium.com/racial-justice-and-power-sharing-the-heart-of-leading-systems-change-45e4b53b9909>
- » Farhang, L., & Morales, X. (2022, June 13). Building community power to achieve health and racial equity: Principles to guide transformative partnerships with local communities. *NAM Perspectives*. <https://doi.org/10.31478/202206d>
- » Foster-Fishman, P. G., Berkowitz, S., Lounsbury, D., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. A. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(2), 241–261.
- » Innovation Network. (2024). *Collective power: framework and indicators*. <https://innonet.org/news-insights/resources/collective-power-framework-and-indicators/>
- » Jenkins, G. J., Cooper, B. R., Funaiole, A., & Hill, L. G. (2022). Which aspects of coalition functioning are key at different stages of coalition development? A qualitative comparative analysis. *Implementation Research and Practice*, 3, 26334895221112694. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26334895221112694>

- » Jenkins-Smith, H. C., Nohrstedt, D., Weible, C. M., & Ingold, K. (2018). The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An overview of the research program. In C. M. Weible, & Paul A. Sabatier (Eds.), *Theories of the Policy Practice* (4th ed., pp. 135–171). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494284-5>
- » Kegler, M. C., Steckler, A., McLeroy, K., & Malek, S. H. (1998). Factors that contribute to effective community health promotion coalitions: A study of 10 Project ASSIST coalitions in North Carolina. *Health education & behavior*, 25(3), 338-353.
- » Knitzer, J., & Adely, F. J. (2001). *Learning from starting points: Findings from the Starting Points Assessment Project*. National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University.
- » Local Government Association. (2023). The 12 components of effective coalitions. <https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/12-components-effective-coalitions>
- » Mintrom, M., & Norman, P. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(4), 649–667.
- » Mortensen, G. (2017). 10 things you need to build clever coalitions. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/10_things_you_need_to_build_clever_coalitions
- » Nagorcka-Smith, P., Bolton, K. A., Dam, J., et al. (2022). The impact of coalition characteristics on outcomes in community-based initiatives targeting the social determinants of health: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), 1358.
- » Nardi, C., & Porter, M. (2017). *Action to impact: A coalition-building roadmap*. Center for Nonprofit Excellence. <https://thecne.org/cne-toolkits-2-coalition-design-take-action-blueprint/>
- » Raynor, J. (2011). *What makes an effective coalition? Evidence-based indicators of success*. California Endowment. <https://www.tccgrp.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/What-Makes-an-Effective-Coalition.pdf>
- » Reid, A., Abraczinskas, M., Scott, V., et al. (2019). Using collaborative coalition processes to advance community health, well-being, and equity: A multiple–case study analysis from a national community transformation initiative. *Health Education & Behavior*, 46(1), 100S–109S.
- » Roussos, S. T., & Fawcett, S. B. (2000). A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 21(1), 369–402.
- » Stokols, D., Misra, S., Moser, R. P., Hall, K. L., & Taylor, B. K. (2008). The ecology of team science: Understanding contextual influences on transdisciplinary collaboration. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(2), S96–S115.
- » Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies. (n.d.) *Components of an effective coalition*. <https://frcog.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/SAMHSA-on-coalitin-capacity-building.pdf>

- » Weible, C., & Ingold, K. (2018). Why advocacy coalitions matter and practical insights about them. *Policy & Politics*, 46(2), 325–343. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557318X15230061739399>
- » Weible, C., Ingold, K., Nohrstedt, D., Douglas, A., & Jenkins-Smith, H. (2019). Sharpening advocacy coalitions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 48(4), 1054–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12360>
- » Wiley, K., Searing, E., & Young, S. (2021). Utility of the advocacy coalition framework in a regional budget crisis. *Public Policy and Administration*, 36(3), 401–426.
- » Wolf, L., Vigna, A. J., Inzeo, P. T., Ceraso, M., & Wolff, T. (2019). From roots to results: A qualitative case study of the evolution of a public health leadership institute building capacity in collaborating for equity and justice. *Health Education & Behavior*, 46(1), 33S–43S.
- » Wolff, T. (2001). Community coalition building—contemporary practice and research: introduction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(2), 165–172.
- » Wolff, T., Minkler, M., Wolfe, S. M., et al. (2016, Winter). Collaborating for equity and justice: Moving beyond collective impact. *Nonprofit Quarterly*, 42–53.
- » Woulfe, J., Oliver, T. R., Siemering, K. Q., & Zahner, S. J. (2010). Multisector partnerships in population health improvement. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 7(6), A119.
- » Wynn, T. A., Johnson, R. E., Fouad, M., et al. (2006). Addressing disparities through coalition building: Alabama REACH 2010 lessons learned. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 17(2), 55–77.
- » Zakocs, R. C., & Guckenburg, S. (2007). What coalition factors foster community capacity? Lessons learned from the Fighting Back Initiative. *Health Education & Behavior*, 34(2), 354–375.