



**London South Bank
University**

*Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Theoretical insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England*

Appendices

for a thesis submitted to

London South Bank University

in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the award of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Charles Jardine

Student No. 2305338

May 2017

(circa 80,000 words excluding Appendices, References and Bibliography)

VOLUME 2

LIST OF APPENDICES (page numbers refer to the main thesis text, Volume 1)

Appendix 01 – Analysis of Constructs, Objectives & Propositions (2.3.2)	37
Appendix 02 – Main Objectives linked to Sample Literature (2.3.2)	37
Appendix 03 - Theory Links to the Questionnaire (2.3.2)	37
Appendix 04 – Theory-based Macro and Sub-Propositions (2.3.3)	38
Appendix 05 – Analysis of Sample Literature for Sub-Objectives (4.4)	67
Appendix 06 – Questionnaire (4.7)	88
Appendix 07 – Theory Based Thematic Methodological Linkages (4.7)	88
Appendix 08 – Sub-Sub Questions on Collaboration (memo only) (5.7.3)	133
Appendix 09 – Observation Guide (6.4.2)	159
Appendix 10 – Interviews linked to Questionnaire (6.4.2)	159
Appendix 11 – List of Respondents (6.4.2)	161
Appendix 12 – Case Study Protocol (6.4.2)	161
Appendix 13 – Observations and Secondary Data Checklists (6.4.4)	164
Appendix 14 – Interview Protocol (6.4.5)	165
Appendix 15 – Sample Invitations to Research Participation (6.4.7)	166
Appendix 16 – Participant Information and Consent (6.4.7)	167
Appendix 17 – Ethical Approval (6.4.7)	167
Appendix 18 – Methodological Aspects (6.5.1)	169
Appendix 19 - Analytical Framework (6.5.2)	171
Appendix 20 – Case-Specific Public and Internal Documents (7.2)	179
Appendix 21 – Questionnaire and Interview Framework (7.3)	182
Appendix 22 – Within-Case Data Analysis Overviews (7.3)	182
Appendix 23 – Case Study Reports – Questionnaire & Interview (7.3.17)	214
Appendix 24 – Cross-Case Questionnaire Data (7.4.1)	227
Appendix 25 – Cross-Case Synthesis (7.4.3)	255
Appendix 26 – Archbishop Welby’s Charge - February 2012 (8.3.2.2)	292
Appendix 27 – An evaluation of RBT and DCT for DRT theory building (8.3.4.1)	314
Appendix 28 – Theory Building from Management Orientations (8.3.4.1)	314
Appendix 29 – Theory Based Arguments for New Theory (8.4)	318
Appendix 30 – New Theory Building (8.4.2)	320
Appendix 31 - Dynamic Resource Theory (DRT) - Themes & Strands (8.4.2)	323
Appendix 32 – DRT Priorities for Strategic Development (8.4.2)	323

THEORETICALLY LINKED ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTS, OBJECTIVES AND PROPOSITIONS

THEORY	THEORY BASIS	THEORY OBJECTIVE O1	RESEARCH STRANDS	RESEARCH SUB-OBJECTIVES	RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS	METHOD OF ANALYSIS	CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCT A - PERFORMANCE												ADDITIONAL CLARIFYING REMARKS
							Business Serv Mgt. (CC1/a)			Governance Mgt. (CC1/b)				Resource Investment Mgt. (CC1/c)					
							RESEARCH QUESTIONS												
			BUSINESS SERVICES MGT.		Macro Proposition P1/a: That if a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm efficiency will be improved.	QUESTIONS:	PMES	ESYS	QUAL	IPOL	GPOL	RMGT	STKH	PIMS	PIMI	RDY1			
			Firm approaches to measurement and management of VRIO resources as a function of internal business services affect performance and SCA.	Sub-Objective 1.1: To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services.	Sub-Proposition 1.1 That if business services identify, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross Case Synthesis	performance & measurement	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		This proposition: Managing firm performance through appropriate measurement is central to optimising the value of core resources and achieving SCA.	
			GOVERNANCE MGT.		Macro Proposition P1/b: That if firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.														
			Firm strategy in support of mission through the governance process is a key determinant in its deployment of VRIO resources.	Sub-Objective 1.2: To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts	Sub-Proposition 1.2 That if mission-based strategy is linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross Case Synthesis	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	strategy for social impacts	✓	✓		This proposition: As donations and grants decline in favour of outcome and impact results-based contracts, mission-based strategy provides a governance-level framework for reviewing and increasing social outcomes and impacts	
			The importance of internal and external policy and process to the effective governance of unique firm resources to achieve SCA in external markets shaped by business and government policies.	Sub-Objective 1.3: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in relation to external policy and process.	Sub-Proposition 1.3 That if a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that takes due regard of key external policy and process, then the firm performs better than if it does not.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross Case Synthesis				policy and process	policy and process	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		This proposition: The firm's policy and process achieves strategic mission objectives and optimises its unique resource position by exploiting opportunities created by external government policy and process.	
			RESOURCE INVESTMENT MGT.		Macro Proposition P1/c: That if firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.														
			Firm and industry performance and attractiveness are heavily dependent on social, economic and environmental performance results to guide resource investment decisions.	Sub-Objective 1.4: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of firm and industry performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing.	Sub-Proposition 1.4 That if the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross Case Synthesis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	performance for investment	✓		This proposition: The external market shift towards results-based funding supports the growing trend among investors to demand competitive firm and industry performance results.	

THEORETICALLY LINKED ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTS, OBJECTIVES AND PROPOSITIONS

THEORY	THEORY BASIS	THEORY OBJECTIVE	RESEARCH STRANDS	RESEARCH SUB-OBJECTIVES	RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS	METHOD OF ANALYSIS	CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCT 8 - GROWTH												ADDITIONAL CLARIFYING REMARKS
							Collaboration Mgt. (CC2/a)				SE Mgt. (CC2/b)				Growth Mgt. (CC2/c)				
							RESEARCH QUESTIONS												
QUESTIONS:	STKH	XSCO	ISCO	PROA	RDYO	ENTR	INNV	RDVC	ED-M	SO/I	SCAL								
			COLLABORATION MGT.		Macro Proposition CC2/a: That if firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the strategic collaboration growth option is facilitated by SE models deploying relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities.														
			Relational capabilities for collaborative purposes involve the proactive dynamic management of interpersonal relationships through relationship-specific assets, effective governance, interfirm knowledge-sharing and complementary capabilities.	Sub-Objective 2.1: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of proactive relational capabilities in the strategic management of organisational collaboration.	Sub-Proposition 2.1 That if relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis	✓	✓	✓	relational capabilities	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	This proposition: Traditionally high levels of relational capability could be proactively and strategically managed to optimise the benefits of collaborative work, including sector scalability.	
			The capability to collaborate through alliances draws upon managerial dynamic capabilities which enable the combination, reconfiguration and protection of assets.	Sub-Objective 2.2: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in a firm's readiness to sense, seize and shape opportunities for collaborative alliances	Sub-Proposition 2.2 That if firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis	✓	✓	✓	✓	alliances			✓	✓	✓	✓	This proposition: Successful collaboration with a variety of other organisations through alliances yields greater return on investments in assets and capabilities, thereby financing growth and scalability.	
			SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP MGT.		Macro Proposition CC2/b That if firms adopt social entrepreneurship principles and practices in their deployment of strategic management dynamic capabilities, then they will innovate and change so as to succeed in complex unstable market conditions.														
			The capability of managers to practice social entrepreneurship which identifies suitable opportunities in markets, technologies and business models, and seizes and shapes them for SCA.	Sub-Objective 2.3: To identify, explain and evaluate management's social entrepreneurship capability for social enterprise approaches to sector scalability.	Sub-Proposition 2.3 That if charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets, then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis				✓	✓	social entrepreneurship	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This proposition: Entrepreneurship as 'the pursuit of opportunities beyond the resources controlled' (Harvard) offers a well-researched social entrepreneurship approach to firm effectiveness.	
			The social entrepreneurship capabilities to help a firm create, extend or modify its resource base so as to compete in an external environment which demands continual organisational change .	Sub-Objective 2.4: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of social enterprise dynamic capabilities in readiness for organisational change .	Sub-Proposition 2.4 That if charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths, then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis				✓	✓	✓	change	✓	✓	✓	✓	This proposition: Despite the obstacles to change posed by path dependencies and routine biases, continuous SE adaptiveness promotes firm success and subsector scalability.	
			GROWTH MGT.		Macro Proposition CC2/c: That if firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve mission-centric social outcomes and impacts, then they facilitate organisational growth and sector scalability.														
			The capabilities within an organisation to sense, seize and shape opportunities for optimising its social outcomes and impacts , so as to ensure the firm's survival and growth in changing markets.	Sub-Objective 2.5: To identify, explain and evaluate the contribution of dynamic capabilities to achieving social outcomes and impacts in terms of organisational growth.	Sub-Proposition 2.5 That if firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts , then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	This proposition: Optimising and reporting social outcomes and impacts is central to SE legitimacy, capitalisation and access for political influence, all of which stimulate growth.	
Organisations measure the performance of their dynamic capabilities through firm growth - which usually takes the form of expansion through new and/or existing products and markets, and/or joint working or merger with other firms.	Sub-Objective 2.6: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in the strategic management of firm growth as a measure of performance (and as a means to scalability).	Sub-Proposition 2.6 That if manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.	Pattern Matching, Explanation Building, Cross-Case Synthesis				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	growth	This proposition: Firm growth is the primary requirement of subsector scalability, itself a contribution to economically expendent Third Sector capacity-building.				

THEORY	MAIN OBJ.	AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	PUBLICATION	AUTHOR'S PURPOSE	AUTHOR'S FINDINGS	RELEVANCE TO THIS RESEARCH
		Wernerfelt, B	1984	<i>A resource-based view of the firm.</i>	Strategic Management Journal, 5, 171-180	To explore the usefulness of analysing from the resources (not products) perspective. In analogy to entry barriers and growth-share matrices, the concepts of resource position barrier and resource-product matrices are suggested. These tools are then used to highlight the new strategic options which naturally emerge from the resource perspective.' (p 171).	The author develops a resource-product model, which links resources to profitability (competitive rents) through a) first mover advantages to create resource position barriers, b) identifying attractive resources (including technology) to build resource barriers, and c) mergers and acquisitions as vehicles to optimise the resource pool. The emergent resource-growth matrix offers a stepping stone approach to strategic resource use for SCA.	Insights from this paper which strengthen this thesis include: 1) linking resources to rents (viable social returns in this thesis), 2) linking resources (produced jointly with products) to markets, 3) a means of identifying core resources through performance measurement, 4) a means for incrementally optimising the resource pool, 5) linking core resources to growth (e.g. through mergers). Potential weaknesses include its dependence on 1) pure for-profit modeling, 2) open market pricing, and 3) joint resource-product production
		Barney, J	1991	<i>Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage.</i>	Journal of Management, 17, 99-120	To improve strategic management understanding of sources of SCA in heterogeneous firms that operate in stable markets. Four empirical indicators of the potential of firm resources to generate SCA are examined: Value, Rareness, Inimitability, and Non-substitutability (VRIN). (p99)	Barney draws on Porter's 'five forces' and SWOT models to derive a resource based model and environmental models of competitive advantage. He maps the logic from resource heterogeneity and immobility, through Value, Rareness, Inimitability (as varied by: history/path dependence, causal ambiguity and social complexity) and Non-substitutability, to SCA (p112).	Relevant strengths derived from this seminal paper include: 1) revealing the effects of heterogeneity and resource mobility, 2) discussing the variables which affect VRIN resources, 3) explaining the effects of historic/path dependency, causal ambiguity and social ambiguity in the context of Inimitability 4) linking SCA to PIMM and social welfare. Potential weaknesses include: 1) strategic management demands on CSACs, 2) decision-making freedom assumptions, 3) cultural resistance
		Barney, J and Clark, D	2007	<i>Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage.</i>	Oxford University Press, New York, USA	The authors reviewed RBT development. The strategic management of VRIN resources to achieve SCA views resources as bundles of tangible and intangible assets, importantly including a firm's management skills, processes, and the information and knowledge it controls. This paper summarises and synthesises current contributions, and proposes an ongoing research agenda.	Their findings included: strategic HR could only be inferentially linked to SCA; that economic performance is implicitly linked to path dependency and tentatively to diversification and innovation in changing markets; entrepreneurs discern resource value and apply knowledge to achieve SCA; market-oriented insights enhance network effects, customer value, and inimitable cross-selling and bundling; resource use to overcome 'foreignness' liability and inform process and implementation priorities.	Key strengths noted for this thesis include: 1) HR incentives are required to promote capabilities; 2) firm performance is linked to path dependency and innovation in changing markets, 3) entrepreneurial discernment and exploitation of resource value is socially complex, 4) market orientation promotes innovation, and 5) resources are clearly linked to governance, financing and dynamic capabilities. Weaknesses include: 1) lack of explanation concerning causal ambiguity in entrepreneurship, and 2) for-profit assumptions regarding the freedom to invest in potentially risky development.

THEORETICALLY LINKED ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE LITERATURE RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 1

APPENDIX 2b

THEORY	MAIN OBJ.	AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	PUBLICATION	AUTHOR'S PURPOSE	AUTHOR'S FINDINGS	RELEVANCE TO THIS RESEARCH
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)		Eisenhardt, K., and Martin, J	2000	<i>Dynamic capabilities: What are they?</i>	Strategic Management Journal, 21, 1105-1121	To explore the relationship between RBT and DCT and in particular to consider the added value for firm SCA that DCT affords. Building on previous research, their paper examines dynamic capabilities in terms of: Common key features and idiosyncratic details, identifiable and specific processes, and the effects of medium and high-velocity markets on dynamism.	The authors argue that dynamic capabilities are idiosyncratic in their details, path dependent and share significant 'best practice' commonalities. They are detailed, analytic, stable processes with predictable outcomes. They also found that traditional RBT misidentifies the locus of long-term competitive advantage in dynamic markets, overemphasises the strategic logic of leverage, and reaches a boundary condition in high velocity markets where long-term SCA lies in resource reconfiguration rather than dynamic capabilities.	Identified strategic dynamic capabilities which constitute strengths applicable to this thesis include: 1) change 2) decision-making, 3) collaboration and alliances, 4) product development, and 5) learning. DCT is present in management in stable markets where it is routinised, but responds increasingly to market volatility with simple, experiential processes that rely on new knowledge and adaptability. Weaknesses in the DCT position for this this research include: 1) long-term SCA based on resource reconfigurations were not addressed in detail, 2) criteria to assess levels of market volatility were too broad for accurate application.
		Helfat, C., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D., and Winter, S (Eds.)	2007	<i>Dynamic capabilities: understanding strategic change in organizations</i>	Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK	To address firm strategic changes that require dynamic management capabilities, and to describe what these capabilities can be developed and deployed to improve performance and achieve mission-centric SCA.	The authors found that in thin markets characterised by change, resources could no longer be merely allocated, but must be reconfigured through a process of building, aligning and adapting and co-specialising assets. Beyond technical fitness, firm processes become resources (VRIO). Knowledge and learning are prioritised to support collaboration and growth.	For this research, this comprehensive research offers strengths including: 1) guidance on asset configuration as markets gain velocity, 2) linking strategic process and content, 3) leadership of change from technical to evolutionary fitness, 4) relational and alliance-based knowledge requirements, 5) growth imperatives. Weaknesses include: 1) a consideration of optimal non-growth for SCA, and 2) entrepreneurial factors for SCA.
		Teece, D	2009	<i>Dynamic capabilities and strategic management: organizing for innovation and growth</i>	Oxford University Press, New York, USA	To explain the skills, processes, routines, firm structures and disciplines which enable firms to build, employ and orchestrate inimitable intangible assets valued by customers. This enables firms to compete, to earn above-normal returns and to sustain superior performance.	The author discovers the microfoundations of enterprise performance. Entrepreneurial management is enabled by market-oriented strategic capabilities and linked to public policy and bargaining theory. Further, he links technology, know-how, knowledge and competencies to achieve SCA during periods of rapid technological change.	Relevant strengths for this thesis include: 1) clear linkages between stages of DCT development, 2) guidance on entrepreneurial management in developed economies, 3) growth as an outcome of optimal resource-capability deployment, 4) technology as a source of SCA, and 5) dynamic competition deploying competitor analysis. Weaknesses include: 1) lack of advice on competitor-collaborator dynamics 2) limited advice on innovation.

THEORETICALLY LINKED ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE LITERATURE RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 2

APPENDIX 2c

THEORY	MAIN OBJECTIVE	AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	PUBLISHER	AUTHOR'S PURPOSE	AUTHOR'S FINDINGS	RELEVANCE TO THIS RESEARCH	
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	OBJECTIVE 2: To describe and empirically reveal insights from case-study evidence into the functional and operational nature of CSACs in terms of SE in the light of RBT and DCT	Young, D	2012 (9th Ed.)	Management Control in Nonprofit Organisations	The Crimson Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA	To provide up to date practical guidance on management control theory as it applies to nonprofit organisations, including state agencies.	The author's findings are premised on efficiency and economy through performance. First he describes the management control function as it is practiced in nonprofits. He then outlines key management control principles described finance based case-studies. Finally he explicates management control systems.	Young offers useful insights applicable to CSACs, including: 1) explaining the value of management in governance terms, 2) developing key controls (e.g. pricing decisions) to improve firm performance, 3) aligning resource investment programming with strategy, 4) measuring outputs and reporting performance, 5) evaluating programmes and management controls.	
		Hudson, M	2009	(3rd Ed) Managing Without Profit: Leadership, management and governance of third sector organisations	Directory of Social Change, London, UK	To give busy managers easily accessible advice that can be learned in a short space of time.	Writing to meet needs arising as a result of increasingly mixed state supply and market economics, the author addresses new expectations facing the third sector. Partnerships are proliferating, accountability is more demanding (e.g. Charities SORP 2015), competition is fiercer, SE is growing, and the third sector is expanding.	Hudson approaches functions and operations along an implicit RBT-DCT continuum, based on the imperative to improve performance. Relevance is notable here via: 1) multifaceted governance advice, 2) linking governance and management through strategy and performance, 3) impact and service performance for SCA, 4)partnerships and change 5) people, teams and learning.	
		Rusaw, R and Swanson, S	2004	The Externally Focused Church	Group.com, USA	To help the Church and Christians partner with those outside their church; to find the balance between service and worship, and to shift to an outward-facing focus.	The authors have experientially found that the externally focused Church can improve social justice in society. This is achieved through serving social needs and helping people grow through relationships. Enduring spiritual-social impacts are vital to deliver help and develop hope.	Rusaw and Swanson address relevant factors affecting CSACs, including: 1) mercy and justice based vision linked to strategy via mission, 2) understanding service and relationality to develop personal growth, 3) linking good news and good works, 4) assessing communal needs, 5) organising for useful impacts and growth.	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)		Harvard Business Essentials	2005	Entrepreneurs Toolkit: Tools and Techniques to launch and Grow Your New Business	Harvard Business School, Boston, USA	To be a mentor and guide to doing business effectively for entrepreneurs. The means to achieve this lie in providing practical tools and techniques.	This 'how-to' manual was compiled from findings across a wide range of essential aspects of entrepreneurship. To achieve performance and growth they combine research on: opportunities, organising, business model ling, business planning, financing, launching, and growing.	Entrepreneurialism is relevant to SE effects on CSAC functions and operations, for example: 1) sensing and seizing opportunities, 2) structuration including partnerships, 3) business models for income generation, 4) business planning for performance, 5) financing for growth in competitive markets.	
		Crutchfield, L and McLeod Grant, H	2008	Forces for Good – the six practices of high-impact nonprofits	John Wiley & Sons Inc, San Francisco, USA	To share distilled lessons from highly successful nonprofits in order to improve social impacts across the sector.	The authors' extensive research revealed 6 high-impact practices: advocate and serve, make markets work, inspire evangelists, nurture nonprofit networks, master adaptation, and share leadership.	Here relevance for CSACs includes: 1) strategic benefits via advocacy for policy change, 2) risk-aware performance improvement via business partnering, 3) managed change and growth via resource-sharing networks, 4) balanced and focused adaptation, 5) strategically shared and balanced teamwork.	
	Mawson, A	2008	The Social Entrepreneur: Making Communities Work	Atlantic Books, London, UK	To share lessons 'learned by doing' multifaceted entrepreneurial change to solve persistent community problems from the bottom up.	Mawson's polemic challenges approaches and attitudes prevailing within the social service industry, from government to practitioners. He found that spiritually-motivated individual relationships, despite minimal resources empowered people transform their community.	As a URC minister, Mawson combines worship with works through SE, with relevance for CSACs including: 1) scoping, building relationships, and investing in dreams despite the experts, 2) taking risks, creating change and avoiding bureaucracy, 3) people, structures, environments, and attitudes, 4) building a business and partnering with business, 5) sustainability and accountability.		

THEORETICALLY LINKED ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE LITERATURE RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 3

APPENDIX 2d

MAIN OBJECTIVE	AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	PUBLISHER	AUTHOR'S PURPOSE	AUTHOR'S FINDINGS	RELEVANCE TO THIS RESEARCH
OBJECTIVE 3: To construct from appropriate empirical case-study evidence a prescriptive hybrid theory of social entrepreneurship to help achieve mission effectiveness in CSACs	Nicholls, A (ed) et al	2006	<i>Social Entrepreneurship – New Models of Sustainable Social Change</i>	Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK	To identify and examine emerging agendas for developing new, sustainable models of social sector excellence and systematic impact. The authors explicate SE using frameworks to build bottom up collective action.	22 authors find nothing less than an unprecedented opportunity for global economic and social transformation, based on SE. Accordingly, the research models inter-related factors ranging from macro-economics, through national public policy and education, to examples of successful SE. A range of perspectives, theories, models and directions offer valuable guidance.	CSAC sustainability is predicated on meeting social needs effectively, in alignment with charitable mission. Nicholls et al supports this research by illuminating: 1) contextual factors including key players and funding, 2) organisational and behavioural drivers for social impacts, 3) known models and environmental conditionality, 4) growth and performance in SEs, and 5) research and risk modeling for collaborative progress as a force for good.
	Ridley-Duff, R and Bull, M	2011	<i>Understanding Social Enterprise: Theory & Practice</i>	Sage, London, UK	To explore issues of understanding the context and process of SE. This is achieved by developing a critical understanding of SE through an exploration of the relationship between theory and practice.	The authors approach theory from historical perspectives, the public, private and third sectors, SE definitions, social and ethical capital, and global and international views. In practice they find a complex field characterised by rapid quasi-market conditions for social service providers. Disciplines covered include governance, management, HRM, leadership, income and performance.	In this thesis, theory building demands a theory-praxis approach, so Ridley-Duff and Bull's textbook is relevant, particularly for: 1) a wide theoretical discussion, 2) a synthesis of management debates and issues of identity and legality, 3) empirically grounded strategic management and planning guidance, 4) income generation, social investment and measuring social outcomes and impacts, and 5) leadership, governance, HRM and stakeholders.
	Scheitle, C	2010	<i>Beyond the Congregation: The World of Christian Nonprofits</i>	Oxford University Press, New York, USA	To provide an overview of Christian nonprofits in the USA derived from government records. These organisations are neither churches nor denominations, but are dubbed 'para-churches'.	The author found that para-churches are transforming American Christianity. This growing sector is prospering on account of attention to market dynamics, donation and service, financial expertise, accountable leadership, and lobbying, legal probity and government funding.	Schietle's findings are relevant to CSACs as 'marketisation' increases in England, for example: 1) proportionality of CSAC services, 2) competition and collaboration in social service markets, 3) para-church profiles, 4) leadership and financial factors, and 5) relations with the state through policy, regulation and fundability.
	Hudson J, and Lowe S	2009 (2nd Ed.)	<i>Understanding the Policy Process: Analysing welfare policy and practice</i>	The Policy Press, Bristol, UK	To introduce students to an understanding of the policy processes which inform welfare policy and process in the UK.	The authors analyse the policy process across 3 levels: macro, meso and micro. First, they discuss political power, recognising the prevalence of neo-pluralist and elite pluralist approaches. Second, issues relating to changing governance, policy networks and institutions. Third, micro-level decision-making and implementation.	Welfare policy and the public policy environment impinge heavily on the third sector, and hence provide useful insights including: 1) types of policy networks and their impacts on policy, 2) prevailing institutional 'stickiness' and 'rules of the game', 3) personality and messy policy decision-making, 4) models of social programme implementation, and 5) evaluating evidence-based policy.
	Husted, B and Bruce-Allen, D	2011	<i>Corporate Social Strategy: Stakeholder Engagement and Competitive Advantage</i>	Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK	To explain how and when firms can develop successful corporate social strategies that establish strong commitments to shareholders, employees and other stakeholders.	Husted and Bruce-Allen find profit potential where corporations to do good alongside the significant risks of not doing so. Their evidence supports a 6 step social strategy building model of business development.	CSACs have the potential to both compete and collaborate with businesses, and this source aids understanding, e.g.: 1) generic competitive social strategies - differentiation, cost leadership and strategic interaction, 2) social and economic value creation through products and services, 3) 4) cross-sector alliances and stakeholder integration, 4) identifying and mobilising resources and capabilities, 5) firm identity and social strategy.
	Webster, A	2014	<i>Submission to the Commission on Religion and Belief in Public Life</i>	Church of England Board of Mission, Diocese of Oxford, UK	To report to a government commission, focusing on understanding a wide range of faith-based social action - in order to increase religious literacy amongst policy makers, politicians and media commentators.	Using a phenomenological approach, Webster finds that faith-based organisations are involved in social (and political) action in a complex range of ways. These are revealed in a matrix showing: the player categories, (e.g. personal/individual, congregational/collective and organisational) juxtaposed with activity dimensions (practical, pastoral, prophetic, political and partnership).	Churches and charities are increasingly united in mission, suggesting scope for improved performance and greater scale. This paper affords relevant insights into: 1) Christian ecumenical and interfaith engagement with public life, 2) the key players and their areas of social interest and activity focus, 3) a wide range of faith-based initiatives serving identified social needs, 4) an Anglican perspective reflecting its constitutional position, 5) ongoing social commitment.

THEORETICAL LINKS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix 3/a

THEORY	RBT Theme	RBT Strand	Question No.	Theoretical Impetus to Question	Text of Research Question
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	1.1 Resource Performance Measurement & Management	1.1.1	Performance measures underpin the potential quality of business services, inasmuch as they enable the strategic allocation of resources to be predicated on measurable results highlighted by key performance indicators (RBT).	Performance measures (PMs) - which description suits you best? PMs are set by the umbrella/strategic body and funders PMs are set at our level based on our beneficiaries' needs Unsure, but recognised national measures could be useful
			1.1.2	Systems are a primary resource for implementing and managing strategic objectives. Performance can depend heavily on efficient systems, and provides a means of informing strategic planning and resource allocation (RBT).	Efficient systems - which description suits you best? Minimum affordable systems to facilitate essential operations Multi-disciplinary integrated systems to facilitate growth Unsure, but adequate basic systems to cope with rapid growth
			1.1.3	High quality business services are key to performance. The efficient use of resources, and their deployment for optimum effect are operationalised through business support services. Visionary, adaptive use of ICT resources can be critical (RBT).	Quality service delivery - which description suits you best? Quality is mainly a function of external accreditation (e.g. IIP) Quality is mainly a function of internal perception/satisfaction Unsure, but our mission-driven impact is most important
	GOVERNANCE	1.2 Social Outcomes & Impacts Strategy	1.2.1	Performance Improvement Management (PIM) provides a framework for optimising the most valued outcomes from SE activity, mainly social impacts. It provides efficient means of Building scalable VRIN resources e.g. skills, knowledge (RBT)	PIM for social outcomes/impacts - which description suits you best? PIM is retrospective - an intuitive and informal process PIM is central to resource allocation for effective social impact Unsure, but may not adopt it if it is not required by statute
		1.3 Policies & Processes	1.3.1	Internal policy input, when it draws on the best resources, is a key asset in the building sustainable value creating strategy. In combination with decision-making information it enables development of complex learned dynamic capabilities (DCT).	Internal policy input - which description suits you best? Internal policy is handed down from the strategic level Internal policy is developed at all levels for final approval Unsure, but ensuring full policy implementation is critical
			1.3.2	Government policy input is possible for all CSAGs at various levels appropriate to their mission-based interests. For large national bodies possessing the resource capacity to engage directly with government, it can facilitate growth (DCT)	Government policy input - which description suits you best? We complete mandatory government returns and surveys We proactively engage with the government policy process Unsure, but more engagement would require clear justification
	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	1.4 Industry & Firm Performance for Investment	1.4.1	Risk management is particularly important for enterprises in the social arena where costs may be high and returns slow. It is an essential tool for good governance in the turbulent new social markets where dynamic capabilities excel (DCT)	Risk management - which description suits you best? Risk is essentially dangerous, and so we seek to avoid it Risk is inevitable, so we systematically assess it and manage it Unsure, but in any case it should be systematically assessed
			1.4.2	PIM for attracting essential capital and revenue resources has become a popular tool in a competitive funding environment. The capability of traditional charities to develop into SEs and grow depends on demonstrating performance (RBT).	PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - which suits? PIM results are/would be used for internal improvements PIM results should be used for investment and fundraising Unsure, but would be interested if PIM results could raise cash
			1.4.3	Investment readiness depends on a number of resource and dynamic capabilities, notably past results and viable strategic planning. It is particularly important in the development of technical capability, market development and growth (DCT).	Investment readiness - which description suits you best? Internal investment is primary, and based on past results External investment is primary, and current results matter Unsure, but could develop attractive investment evidence

THEORETICAL LINKS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix 3/b

THEORY	DCT Theme	DCT Strand	Question	Theoretical Impetus to Question	Text of Research Question
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	2.1 Relational Capabilities	2.1.1	Proactive engagement with social ills and key stakeholders is at the heart of social enterprise management. The primary stakeholder is the service users and CSAGs. Proactivity can shape resource deployment for better performance (RBT).	Proactive engagement - which description suits you best? Stakeholder engagement is conducted on a 'needs' basis Stakeholder engagement is planned and strategically managed Unsure, but any change would have to be cost-effective
			2.1.2	Stakeholders provide the means through which charities are able to operate in a highly relational manner, which enables their effectiveness and economy. Skills, care, knowledge, contacts, availability and goodwill are key resources (RBT).	Stakeholders - which description suits you best? Key stakeholders are trustees, management, and some staff Key stakeholders include our beneficiaries, critics and others Unsure, but stakeholder consultation is mainly for research
		2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities	2.2.1	Intra-sector collaboration locates CSAGs within the Christian subsector of the Third Sector, and relies on the management of internal, subsector, and Third Sector relationships in the common interest and optimal use of relational resources (RBT).	Intra-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? We are quite self-sufficient, so don't seek much collaboration Intra-sector collaboration is essential for survival and growth Unsure, but a clear strategy could be useful if it wasn't costly
			2.2.2	Cross-sector collaboration involves proactive engagement for mutual benefit, aligned with the parties' strategic missions. Social entrepreneurship needs business methods, skills, and andcomplementary resources e.g. CSR-based funding (RBT).	Cross-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? Little or no collaboration, unless for low-risk financial gain Despite mutual misunderstanding, we would like to explore Unsure, but above all we need to protect against mission drift
	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	2.3 Social Entrepreneurship	2.3.1	Entrepreneurialism for value creation involves identifying and exploiting opportunities, speculative investment and risk taking. It is alien to the culture of some nonprofits, but the key dynamic capabilities can be found among their staff (DCT)	Entrepreneurialism - which description suits you best? Entrepreneurialism is unnecessary in charities Entrepreneurialism is useful as ethical, creative opportunism Unsure, but to consider it seriously would be a major change
			2.3.2	Innovation to introduce new methods, services and products is a vital ingredient of social entrepreneurship. The capability of individuals and teams, often involving key stakeholders, to read environments and 'think outside the box' is vital (DCT).	Innovation - which description suits you best? Innovation is gradual and is the responsibility of top executives Innovation demands change, and all staff are responsible Unsure, but innovation is safest when copying proven models
		2.4 Change Readiness	2.4.1	Change readiness is widely viewed as important in turbulent environments where social needs are rising as funding falls. Social entrepreneurship drives income generation, often in collaboration. Change requires dynamic capability (DCT).	Change readiness - which description suits you best? Change should be incremental, and planned in advance Change management requires reactive and proactive skills Unsure, but for it to be useful it needs to be widely understood
	GROWTH	2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts	2.5.1	Effective decision-making is essential in the formulation and execution of value creating strategies. The CSAGs' position and dynamic capability resources directly affect its ability to develop governance to drive scalable impacts (DCT).	Effective decision-making - which description suits you best? Speed is paramount so only low staff input is needed The objectivity and inclusivity of the process is paramount Unsure, but protect our culture while improving effectiveness
			2.5.2	Social impacts derive from the social action activities of the participant charities. These impacts can be measured to help improve performance, which itself is closely related to the use of available resources and indirectly to growth (RBT).	Social outcomes or impacts - which description suits you best? Beneficial results from the organisation which can be proved Beneficial results which the recipient is known to value Unsure, but some public good aligned with our social mission
		2.6 Growth	2.6.1	Scalable social impacts from CSAGs and other social action entities are essential if the effects of cuts in government funding are not to be devastating for service users. CSAG capability is vital for sustainable growth (DCT).	Manageable scaling up - which description suits you best? Moderate, incremental increases in work volumes Flexibility to cope with large stepped increases in volumes Unsure, but sufficient capability to cope without overload

THEORY-BASED SUB-OBJECTIVES AND SUB-PROPOSITIONS

RBT-BASED ENQUIRY FRAMEWORK

RBT DIMENSION - PERFORMANCE		
THEME		BUSINESS SERVICES
MACRO PROP'N	P1/a	<i>That when a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm effectiveness will be improved.</i>
STRAND	1.1	Resource performance—measurement and management
SUB-OBJ	1.1	To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services
SUB-PROP'N	1.1	<i>That when business services identify, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.</i>
THEME		GOVERNANCE
MACRO PROP'N	P1/b	<i>That when firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.</i>
STRAND	1.2	Social outcome and impact strategies
SUB-OBJ	1.2	To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts.
SUB-PROP'N	1.2	<i>That when mission-based strategy is linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.</i>
STRAND	1.3	Policies and processes
SUB-OBJ	1.3	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in formulating internal policy and process in relation to external policy and process.
SUB-PROP'N	1.3	<i>That when a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that take due regard of key external policy and process, then the firm performs better than if it does not.</i>
THEME		RESOURCE INVESTMENT
MACRO PROP'N	P1/c	<i>That when firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.</i>
STRAND	1.4	Industry and firm performance for investment
SUB-OBJ	1.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of industry and firm performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing
SUB-PROP'N	1.4	<i>That when the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.</i>

DCT-BASED ENQUIRY FRAMEWORK

DCT DIMENSION - SCALABILITY		
THEME		COLLABORATION
MACRO PROP'N	P2/a	<i>That when firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the strategic collaboration growth option is facilitated by SE models deploying relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities.</i>
STRAND	2.1	Relational capabilities
SUB-OBJ	2.1	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of proactive relational capabilities in the strategic management of organisational collaboration.
SUB-PROP'N	2.1	<i>That when relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.</i>
STRAND	2.2	Alliance-based capabilities
SUB-OBJ	2.2	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in a firm's readiness to sense, seize and shape opportunities for collaborative alliances.
SUB-PROP'N	2.2	<i>That when firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.</i>
THEME		SOCIAL ENTERPRISE
MACRO PROP'N	P2/b	<i>That when firms adopt social entrepreneurship principles and practices in their deployment of strategic management dynamic capabilities, then they will innovate and change so as to succeed in complex unstable market conditions.</i>
STRAND	2.3	Social entrepreneurship
SUB-OBJ	2.3	To identify, explain and evaluate management's social entrepreneurship capability for social enterprise approaches to sector scalability.
SUB-PROP'N	2.3	<i>That when charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.</i>
STRAND	2.4	Change readiness
SUB-OBJ	2.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of social enterprise dynamic capabilities in readiness for organisational change.
SUB-PROP'N	2.4	<i>That when charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.</i>
THEME		GROWTH
MACRO PROP'N	P2/c	<i>That when firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve mission-centric social outcomes and impacts, then they facilitate organisational growth and sector scalability.</i>
STRAND	2.5	Social outcomes and impacts
SUB-OBJ	2.5	To identify, explain and evaluate the contribution of dynamic capabilities (inc decision-making and sensing, seizing and shaping) to achieving social outcomes and impacts in terms of organisational growth.
SUB-PROP'N	2.5	<i>That when firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts, then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.</i>
STRAND	2.6	Growth (of the organisation)
SUB-OBJ	2.6	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in the strategic management of firm growth as a measure of performance (and as a means to scalability).
SUB-PROP'N	2.6	<i>That when manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.</i>

ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE LITERATURE RELATING TO SUB-OBJECTIVES

APPENDIX 5

THEORY	RBT Theme	SUB-OBJECTIVES	AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	PUBLICATION	COUNTRY	No. & TYPE OF STUDIES	VARIABLES	AUTHOR'S PURPOSE	AUTHOR'S FINDINGS	RELEVANCE TO THIS RESEARCH
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	Sub-Objective 1.1: To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services.	Paton, R	2003	<i>Managing and Measuring Social Enterprises</i>	Sage Publications, London, UK	UK	30 cases	performance and measurement in SEs	To guide on how the performance agenda has impacted on management outside the private sector.	That performance measurement and management in nonprofits will continue to expand, while lacking a consistent set of recognised measures in the rapidly developing UK context.	The relevance of measurement in meeting the challenge of social performance is explained, including its relevance in the government policy context. Measurement methods are evaluated for their usefulness, cost and level of adoption from the practitioners viewpoint. Similarly 'best practice' benchmarking and 'itemark' accreditations are evaluated and the self-assessment approach is reviewed. Performance and its appropriate measurement are fundamental to the effectiveness of a scalable CSAG subsector to provide social services.
			Poister, T	2003	<i>Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organisations</i>	Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, USA	USA	65 cases	performance and measurement in nonprofits	To guide on designing and implementing effective performance measurement systems at agency level outside the private sector.	That performance measurement and management in nonprofits is under-developed and often non-strategic, thus forfeiting opportunities to coalesce and explain the relationships between complex activities - i.e. unrealised SCA	The centrality of outcomes to investment logic and organisational effectiveness is explained systematically with relevant, scalable examples. The cyclical performance measurement developmental process is integrated with aspects of strategy such as: planning, management, decision-making, budgeting, quality, productivity, customer service and competitiveness. Compelling justification for investment in measurement systems is provided, which links directly to my rationale for using RBT to explore potential performance gains in this research.
	GOVERNANCE	Sub-Objective 1.2: To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts	Magretta, M	2011	<i>Understanding Michael Porter: The Essential Guide to Competition and Strategy</i>	Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA, USA	Global	67 cases	governance and competitive strategy for firm performance	To guide managers and those who advise and work with them into a holistic and robust understanding of competition and strategy.	That firms should compete to be unique, and meet customers needs in a positive sum game, rather than compete to be the best in a zero sum game. The 5 Forces in context produce profits. While SCA is grounded in bespoke value chains. Strategy demands value creation, trade-offs, fit and continuity.	Where demand outstrips supply (as in the social services sector), competition between service providers for a wide range of funding streams is a positive sum game encouraging multiple winners. The point of competition is not to beat rivals but to earn profits or surpluses which can be reinvested. Industry structure determines profits by explaining industry prices and costs, and therefore the average to be beaten - in CSACs these prices and costs are relatively low, suggesting that performance and scale will improve profits when competing on the basis of a unique strategy embedded within a tailored and responsive value chain. Porter's competitive strategies provide adaptable frameworks suitable for CSACs
			SEKN - The Social Enterprise Knowledge Network	2006	<i>Effective Management of Social Enterprises: lessons from Business and Civil Society Organisations in Iberoamerica</i>	Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, USA	8 Latin American countries plus USA and Spain	11 business schools from 10 countries contributing 40 case studies	governance and SE strategy for social impact performance	To provide an integrated view of social and economic value creation for the social and private sectors.	That social entrepreneurship and competitiveness combined with business social interests creates social and economic value. (See Magretta 2013)	The study is comprehensive, including: SE, leadership, strategy, management, culture, structure, human resources, finance, governance, performance measurement and management, and capacity-building through integration. It therefore provides a broad context for integrative IT solutions which drive resource-based organisational efficiency, economy and effectiveness.
		Sub-Objective 1.3: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in formulating internal policy and process in relation to external policy and process .	New Economics Foundation	2009 & 2013	<i>Tools for You & Proving and Improving</i>	www.proveandiimprove.org	UK	108 cases	strategic policy-based tools to improve performance	To guide and support charities and SEs in the means to improve performance.	That numerous models exist and to explain how each one is suited for particular and differing organisational requirements.	The understanding of quality as a component of performance is fundamental to performance improvement management. The means to achieve appropriate quality can be confusing and costly, but when understood and applied judiciously yield improved performance.
			University College London	2010	<i>Joint Charity Commission/NCVO seminar exploring charities' role in public service delivery over the next 10 years - a note of the discussion</i>	www.ucl.ac.uk/.../Note_of_Charity_and_Public_Services_Seminar	UK	1 high level joint seminar and discussion between key players	national policy development for social services based on performance	To discuss the role of charities and other nonprofits in public service delivery within the public policy context	That the decisions facing charities, with regard to independence and integrity, organisational form and quality, localism and Charity Commission regulation are increasingly complex in a changing public-private-nonprofit market for services.	The consideration of quality as a factor in government contracting in a competitive market for funding is paramount. Providing services at appropriate quality levels (which can be demonstrated through achieving recognised standards) facilitates sustainability through repeat contracts, and in a localism context strengthens the firm's market position for maintaining its independence and integrity.
	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	Sub-Objective 1.4: To identify, explain and evaluate the role of firm and industry performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing.	Mattlof, R and Chaillou, J.	2013	<i>Nonprofit Investment and Development Solutions: A Guide to Thriving in Today's Economy.</i>	John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, USA	USA	24 cases and laws	nonprofit organisational resource investment for development based on performance	To provide a rigorous approach to nonprofit investment within governance policy and process for sustainability/SCA	That the nonprofit funding landscape has changed dramatically, to one in which investment decisions are based on measured returns managed by professionals to achieve mission and social impact.	The CSAC subsector in England is facing an increasingly demanding environments, both for funding and regulatory compliance. In order to scale up operations so as to secure larger, more profitable contracts charities are investing in improving and proving their social impact performance to investors and regulators. Where these mission-centric social impact results are externally verified and validated, they provide assurance to potential investors. This assurance is enhanced by professional investment management, either within or on behalf of the charity. Higher assurance leads encourages investment.
			Bugg-Levine, A and Emerson, J.	2011	<i>Impact Investing: Transforming How We Make Money While Making a Difference.</i>	John Wiley & Sons, San Francisco, USA	Global	over 100 cases cited	developments in the social impact investment market based on performance	To establish and increase collaboration between investors and social purpose firms on the basis of 'blended value' (social and financial) returns derived from social impact mission.	That numerous forms of social finance are available, but perceived risks in investees limit the amounts of money available to them despite the large sums waiting to invest. That a fully regulated market should be set up without delay.	The increasing societal awareness of sustainability imperatives that are negatively affected by social needs (and environmental degradation) has led to more money being available for investment in credible social impact initiatives. Credibility relates to external verification of measurable impacts in which investors can safely invest. CSACs typically enjoy high levels of trust, but low levels of performance related information. Performance data can attract investment for scaling operations.

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX 6/a

Further to our discussion of the questionnaire, please note the following:
 There are 2 sections, each containing 9 or 10 questions.
 Please complete the questions which have been allocated to you.
 If you have time, and would like to answer all the questions, please do.
 Please return them to the researcher, Charles Jardine by 25th March
 at: crjardine@btinternet.com Many thanks for your help!

Name of Respondent:
 Job Title:
 Organisation:
 Date submitted:

Circle ONE preferred option and ONE rating in each question e.g.: a1.

organisation = department/charity/business

EXAMPLE:	Social Enterprise (SE) - which description suits you best?	Social enterprise - rate your organisation (1=low)					
	Not-for-Profit that must earn money to fulfil their mission	a	1	2	3	4	5
	Social purpose organisation reinvesting profits for public good	b	1	2	3	4	5
	Unsure, but any organisation seeking the public good	c	1	2	3	4	5

RESOURCE-BASED THEORY - PERFORMANCE

Business Services

1.1 Resource Performance Measurement & Management

1.1.1 Performance measures (PMs) - which description suits you best?

- PMs are set by the umbrella/strategic body and funders
 PMs are set at our level based on our beneficiaries' needs
 Unsure, but recognised national measures could be useful

Performance measurement - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.1.2 Efficient systems - which description suits you best?

- Minimum affordable systems to facilitate essential operations
 Multi-disciplinary integrated systems to facilitate growth
 Unsure, but adequate basic systems to cope with rapid growth

Efficient systems - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.1.3 Quality service delivery - which description suits you best?

- Quality is mainly a function of external accreditation (e.g. IIP)
 Quality is mainly a function of internal perception/satisfaction
 Unsure, but our mission-driven impact is most important

Quality service delivery - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

Governance

1.2 Social Outcomes & Impacts Strategy

1.2.1 PIM for social outcomes/impacts - which description suits you best?

- PIM is retrospective - an intuitive and informal process
 PIM is central to resource allocation for effective social impact
 Unsure, but may not adopt it if it is not required by statute

PIM for social outcomes/impacts - rate your organisation

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.3 Policies & Processes

1.3.1 Internal policy input - which description suits you best?

- Internal policy is handed down from the strategic level
 Internal policy is developed at all levels for final approval
 Unsure, but ensuring full policy implementation is critical

Internal policy input - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.3.2 Government policy input - which description suits you best?

- We complete mandatory government returns and surveys
 We proactively engage with the government policy process
 Unsure, but more engagement would require clear justification

Government policy input - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

Resource Investment

1.4 Industry & Firm Performance for Investment

1.4.1 Risk management - which description suits you best?

- Risk is essentially dangerous, and so we seek to avoid it
 Risk is inevitable, so we systematically assess it and manage it
 Unsure, but in any case it should be systematically assessed

Risk management - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.4.2 PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - which suits?

- PIM results are/would be used for internal improvements
 PIM results should be used for investment and fundraising
 Unsure, but would be interested if PIM results could raise cash

PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - rate your organisation

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

1.4.3 Investment readiness - which description suits you best?

- Internal investment is primary, and based on past results
 External investment is primary, and current results matter
 Unsure, but could develop attractive investment evidence

Investment readiness - rate your organisation (1=low)

- a 1 2 3 4 5
 b 1 2 3 4 5
 c 1 2 3 4 5

DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES - SCALABILITY

Collaboration

2.1 Relational Capabilities

2.1.1 **Proactive engagement** - which description suits you best?

- Stakeholder engagement is conducted on a 'needs' basis
 Stakeholder engagement is planned and strategically managed
 Unsure, but any change would have to be cost-effective

Proactive engagement - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.1.2 **Stakeholders** - which description suits you best?

- Key stakeholders are trustees, management, and some staff
 Key stakeholders include our beneficiaries, critics and others
 Unsure, but stakeholder consultation is mainly for research

Stakeholders - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities

2.2.1 **Intra-sector collaboration** - which description suits you best?

- We are quite self-sufficient, so don't seek much collaboration
 Intra-sector collaboration is essential for survival and growth
 Unsure, but a clear strategy could be useful if it wasn't costly

Intra-sector collaboration - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.2.2 **Cross-sector collaboration** - which description suits you best?

- Little or no collaboration, unless for low-risk financial gain
 Despite mutual misunderstanding, we would like to explore
 Unsure, but above all we need to protect against mission drift

Cross-sector collaboration - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

Social Enterprise

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 **Entrepreneurialism** - which description suits you best?

- Entrepreneurialism is unnecessary in charities
 Entrepreneurialism is useful as ethical, creative opportunism
 Unsure, but to consider it seriously would be a major change

Entrepreneurialism - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.3.2 **Innovation** - which description suits you best?

- Innovation is gradual and is the responsibility of top executives
 Innovation demands change, and all staff are responsible
 Unsure, but innovation is safest when copying proven models

Innovation - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.4 Change Readiness

2.4.1 **Change readiness** - which description suits you best?

- Change should be incremental, and planned in advance
 Change management requires reactive and proactive skills
 Unsure, but for it to be useful it needs to be widely understood

Change readiness - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

Growth

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 **Effective decision-making** - which description suits you best?

- Speed is paramount so only low staff input is needed
 The objectivity and inclusivity of the process is paramount
 Unsure, but protect our culture while improving effectiveness

Effective decision-making - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.5.2 **Social outcomes and impacts** - which description suits you best?

- Beneficial results from the organisation which can be proved
 Beneficial results which the recipient is known to value
 Unsure, but some public good aligned with our social mission

Social outcomes - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 **Manageable scaling up** - which description suits you best?

- Moderate, incremental increases in work volumes
 Flexibility to cope with large stepped increases in volumes
 Unsure, but sufficient capability to cope without overload

Manageable scaling up - rate your organisation (1=low)

a	1	2	3	4	5
b	1	2	3	4	5
c	1	2	3	4	5

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	RBT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	MACRO-PROPOSITION <i>P1/a</i>	BUSINESS SERVICES <i>That when a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm effectiveness will be improved</i>
		STRAND 1.1	Resource performance–measurement and management Firm approaches to measurement and management of VRIO resources as a function of internal business services affect performance and SCA.
		LINK to Objective	<i>VRIO resources are usually administered by firm business services</i>
		SUB-OBJ 1.1	To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services
		SUB-PROP'N 1.1	That when business services <u>identify</u>, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.
		LINK to Method	Heterogeneous nonprofit firms are not obliged to systematically manage non-financial performance, so their business services will adopt different inductive approaches.
		LINK to Question 1.1.1	<i>Measuring the performance of VRIO resources is key to managing them</i> Performance measures (PMs) - which description suits you best? PMs are set by the umbrella/strategic body and funders PMs are set at our level based on our beneficiaries' needs Unsure, but recognised national measures could be useful
		LINK to Question 1.1.2	<i>Systems are required to manage firm resources and capabilities</i> Efficient systems - which description suits you best? Minimum affordable systems to facilitate essential operations Multi-disciplinary integrated systems to facilitate growth Unsure, but adequate basic systems to cope with rapid growth
		LINK to Question 1.1.3	<i>Quality management affects VRIO resource performance</i> Quality service delivery - which description suits you best? Quality is mainly a function of external accreditation (e.g. IIP) Quality is mainly a function of internal perception/satisfaction Unsure, but our mission-driven impact is most important

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	RBT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	GOVERNANCE	MACRO-PROPOSITION <i>P1/b</i>	GOVERNANCE <i>That when firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.</i>
		STRAND 1.2	Social outcome and impact strategies Firm <i>strategy</i> in support of mission through the governance process is a key determinant in its deployment of VRIO resources.
		<i>LINK to Objective</i>	<i>Nonprofit strategies govern VRIO resource use to achieve social mission</i>
		SUB-OBJ 1.2	To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts.
		SUB-PROP'N 1.2	<i>That when mission-based strategy is <u>linked</u> to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.</i>
		<i>LINK to Method</i>	Mission-based strategy is common across the third sector, where success in achieving social results varies and is partially reflected for realistic (albeit non-deductive) assessment using private and public information.
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 1.2.1	<i>PIM connects strategic objectives to operational social outcomes/impacts</i> <i>PIM for social outcomes/impacts</i> - which description suits you best? PIM is retrospective - an intuitive and informal process PIM is central to resource allocation for effective social impact Unsure, but may not adopt it if it is not required by statute
		STRAND 1.3	Policies and processes The importance of <i>internal and external policy and process</i> to the effective governance of unique firm resources to achieve SCA in external markets shaped by business and government policies.
		<i>LINK to Objective</i>	<i>Internal and external policies affect firm competitiveness in social markets</i>
		SUB-OBJ 1.3	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in formulating internal policy and process in relation to external policy and process.
		SUB-PROP'N 1.3	<i>That when a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that take due regard of key external policy and process, then the firm performs better than if it does not.</i>
		<i>LINK to Method</i>	Governance processes seek to interpret the firm's internal resource policy and external policy-driven market environments realistically, in order to compete sustainably, but their unique VRIO resources preclude fully replicable results.
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 1.3.1	<i>Internal policy formulation and development affect mission effectiveness</i> <i>Internal policy input</i> - which description suits you best? Internal policy is handed down from the strategic level Internal policy is developed at all levels for final approval Unsure, but ensuring full policy implementation is critical
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 1.3.2	<i>External policies are central in the highly regulated social services market</i> <i>Government policy input</i> - which description suits you best? We complete mandatory government returns and surveys We proactively engage with the government policy process Unsure, but more engagement would require clear justification

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	RBT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	MACRO-PROPOSITION <i>P1/c</i>	RESOURCE INVESTMENT <i>That when firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.</i>
		STRAND 1.4	Industry and firm performance for investment <i>Firm and industry performance</i> and attractiveness are heavily dependent on social, economic and environmental performance results to guide resource investment decisions.
		<i>LINK to Objective</i>	<i>Social investors of all types are attracted to social firms that perform well</i>
		SUB-OBJ 1.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of industry and firm performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing
		SUB-PROP'N 1.4	<i>That when the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.</i>
		<i>LINK to Method</i>	Social service industry attractiveness and long-term firm sustainability are subject to critical realist appraisal by potential investors, which compares performance between potential rivals for funding.
		<i>LINK to Question 1.4.1</i>	<i>Social purpose firms' investment policies assess risks and returns</i> Risk management - which description suits you best? Risk is essentially dangerous, and so we seek to avoid it Risk is inevitable, so we systematically assess it and manage it Unsure, but in any case it should be systematically assessed
		<i>LINK to Question 1.4.2</i>	<i>Social purpose firms prioritise investment based on past/potential returns</i> PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - which suits? PIM results are/would be used for internal improvements PIM results should be used for investment and fundraising Unsure, but would be interested if PIM results could raise cash
		<i>LINK to Question 1.4.3</i>	<i>Social investment are source when the firm is investment-ready</i> Investment readiness - which description suits you best? Internal investment is primary, and based on past results External investment is primary, and current results matter Unsure, but could develop attractive investment evidence

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	DCT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	MACRO-PROPOSITION P2/a	COLLABORATION <i>That when firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the strategic collaboration growth option is facilitated by SE models deploying relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities.</i>
		STRAND 2.1	Relational capabilities <i>Relational capabilities</i> for collaborative purposes involve the proactive dynamic management of interpersonal relationships through relationship-specific assets, effective governance, interfirm knowledge-sharing and complementary capabilities.
		<i>LINK to Objective</i>	<i>Relational capabilities ground effective interfirm relationships</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.1	<i>To identify, explain and evaluate the role of proactive relational capabilities in the strategic management of organisational collaboration.</i>
		SUB-PROP'N 2.1	<i>That when relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.</i>
		<i>LINK to Method</i>	Firms interpret their relational needs and capabilities according to perceived realities, possibly overlooking causality inferred from data analysis on account of their cultural norms and managerial constraints.
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 2.1.1	<i>Proactive stakeholder relationships yield perspectives and opportunities</i> Proactive engagement - which description suits you best? Stakeholder engagement is conducted on a 'needs' basis Stakeholder engagement is planned and strategically managed Unsure, but any change would have to be cost-effective
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 2.1.2	<i>Stakeholders are assets in alliances, when their skills are well managed</i> Stakeholders - which description suits you best? Key stakeholders are trustees, management, and some staff Key stakeholders include our beneficiaries, critics and others Unsure, but stakeholder consultation is mainly for research
		STRAND 2.2	Alliance-based capabilities The capability to collaborate through alliances draws upon managerial dynamic capabilities which enable the combination, reconfiguration and protection of assets.
		<i>LINK to Objective</i>	<i>Alliances can facilitate asset orchestration for market opportunities</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.2	<i>To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in a firm's readiness to sense, seize and shape opportunities for collaborative alliances.</i>
		SUB-PROP'N 2.2	<i>That when firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.</i>
		<i>LINK to Method</i>	Alliance-based capabilities are not necessarily developed in firms unless they have perceived their needs or opportunities, possibly resulting from critical realist appraisal arising within a consultancy or research project.
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 2.2.1	<i>Collaboration is a potential means to scale up, e.g. with like-minded firms</i> Intra-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? We are quite self-sufficient, so don't seek much collaboration Intra-sector collaboration is essential for survival and growth Unsure, but a clear strategy could be useful if it wasn't costly
		<i>LINK to Question</i> 2.2.2	<i>Cross-sector collaborative opportunities introduce complexity into scaling up</i> Cross-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? Little or no collaboration, unless for low-risk financial gain Despite mutual misunderstanding, we would like to explore Unsure, but above all we need to protect against mission drift

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	DCT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	MACRO-PROPOSITION P2/b	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE <i>That when firms adopt social entrepreneurship principles and practices in their deployment of strategic management dynamic capabilities, then they will innovate and change so as to succeed in complex unstable market conditions.</i>
		STRAND 2.3	Social entrepreneurship The capability of managers to practice <i>social entrepreneurship</i> , which identifies suitable opportunities in markets, technologies and business models, and seizes and shapes them for SCA.
		LINK to Objective	<i>SE promotes flexible new approaches to exploit market opportunities</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.3	To identify, explain and evaluate management's social entrepreneurship capability for social enterprise approaches to sector scalability.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.3	<i>That when charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.</i>
		LINK to Method	In considering alternative ways to generate income, charities are likely to take an inductive approach to assessing SE options, by considering propositions and rival views of potential paths from their current position to effectively achieve mission.
		LINK to Question 2.3.1	<i>Social entrepreneurship draws on effective commercial entrepreneurship</i> Entrepreneurialism - which description suits you best? Entrepreneurialism is unnecessary in charities Entrepreneurialism is useful as ethical, creative opportunism Unsure, but to consider it seriously would be a major change
		LINK to Question 2.3.2	<i>Entrepreneurialism involves proactivity, risk-taking and innovation</i> Innovation - which description suits you best? Innovation is gradual and is the responsibility of top executives Innovation demands change, and all staff are responsible Unsure, but innovation is safest when copying proven models
		STRAND 2.4	Change readiness The social entrepreneurship capabilities to help a firm create, extend or modify its resource base so as to compete in an external environment which demands continual organisational change .
		LINK to Objective	<i>SE typically operates in volatile developmental markets where change is the norm</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of social enterprise dynamic capabilities in readiness for organisational change.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.4	<i>That when charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.</i>
		LINK to Method	Entrepreneurial capabilities stimulate change on the basis of short-term realistic appraisals of market opportunities involving strategies to analyse relevant data
		LINK to Question 2.4.1	<i>Change readiness to adapt to volatile markets affects firm competitive advantage</i> Change readiness - which description suits you best? Change should be incremental, and planned in advance Change management requires reactive and proactive skills Unsure, but for it to be useful it needs to be widely understood

THEORY BASED THEMATIC METHODOLOGICAL LINKAGES

THEORY	DCT Theme	Thesis reference	Description
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	MACRO-PROPOSITION P2/c	GROWTH <i>That when firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve mission-centric social outcomes and impacts, then they facilitate organisational growth and sector scalability.</i>
		STRAND 2.5	Social outcomes and impacts The capabilities within an organisation to sense, seize and shape opportunities for optimising its social outcomes and impacts , so as to ensure the firm's survival and growth in changing markets.
		LINK to Objective	<i>Mission effectiveness largely depends on optimising soc. outcomes/impacts</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.5	To identify, explain and evaluate the contribution of dynamic capabilities (inc decision-making and sensing, seizing and shaping) to achieving social outcomes and impacts in terms of organisational growth.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.5	That when firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts, then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.
		LINK to Method	The dynamic capabilities which promote improved social results may not be developed in charities, where inductive enquiry may reveal attractive mission-congruent opportunities which can be risk-assessed for selection purposes.
		LINK to Question 2.5.1	<i>Effective decision-making facilitates dynamic SE strategy and implementation</i> Effective decision-making - which description suits you best? Speed is paramount so only low staff input is needed The objectivity and inclusivity of the process is paramount Unsure, but protect our culture while improving effectiveness
		LINK to Question 2.5.2	<i>Social outcomes/impacts may manifest dynamic capabilities often via growth</i> Social outcomes or impacts - which description suits you best? Beneficial results from the organisation which can be proved Beneficial results which the recipient is known to value Unsure, but some public good aligned with our social mission
		STRAND 2.6	Growth (of the organisation) Organisations measure the performance of their dynamic capabilities through firm growth - which usually takes the form of expansion through new and/or existing products and markets, and/or joint working or merger with other firms.
		LINK to Objective	<i>Firm growth can contribute to sector-wide social service operations scalability</i>
		SUB-OBJ 2.6	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in the strategic management of firm growth as a measure of performance (and as a means to scalability).
		SUB-PROP'N 2.6	That when manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.
		LINK to Method	Firm growth and operational scale opportunities require both inductive enquiry and critical realist appraisal which will involve short and long-term strategic data analysis, mainly of internal data given the lack of comparable external data.
		LINK to Question 2.6.1	<i>Dynamic capabilities can strategically and sustainably scale up firm operations</i> Manageable scaling up - which description suits you best? Moderate, incremental increases in work volumes Flexibility to cope with large stepped increases in volumes Unsure, but sufficient capability to cope without overload

APPENDIX 8

SUB-SUB QUESTIONS ON COLLABORATION (MEMO ONLY)

(These questions formed part of the original Questionnaires, but were later removed because they provide excessive detail for this thesis).

Circle ONE preferred option and ONE rating in each question e.g.: a1.

organisation = department/charity/business

EXAMPLE:						
Social Enterprise (SE) - which description suits you best?			Social enterprise - rate your organisation (1=low)			
Not-for-Profit that must earn money to fulfil their mission	a	1	2	3	4	5
Social purpose organisation reinvesting profits for public good	b	1	2	3	4	5
Unsure, but any organisation seeking the public good	c	1	2	3	4	5

Readiness to work with other churches

Readiness to work with **other churches** on social issues - which suits?

Readiness to work with other churches - rate your organisation (1=low)

Other churches do not feature prominently in our programme	a	1	2	3	4	5
Other churches are important partners in some activities	b	1	2	3	4	5
Unsure, but would consider strategic mission-based projects	c	1	2	3	4	5

Readiness to work with charities

Readiness to work with **charities** on social issues - which suits?

Readiness to work with other charities - rate your organisation (1=low)

Other charities are not vital to our work	a	1	2	3	4	5
Other charities are important partners, and we meet regularly	b	1	2	3	4	5
Unsure, but new links may be worth exploring or developing	c	1	2	3	4	5

Readiness to work with business

Readiness to work with **business** on social issues - which suits?

Readiness to work with businesses - rate your organisation (1=low)

Business and the profit-motive is largely alien to our thinking	a	1	2	3	4	5
Business is an existing or planned area for beneficial alliances	b	1	2	3	4	5
Unsure, but would consider it if ethical benefits are available	c	1	2	3	4	5

Readiness to work with government bodies

Readiness to work with **government bodies** on social issues - which suits?

Readiness to work with government bodies - rate your organisation (1=low)

We cooperate with local authorities and statutory bodies	a	1	2	3	4	5
We collaborate with local authorities and statutory bodies	b	1	2	3	4	5
Unsure of the potential value of non-mandatory engagement	c	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 9

Observation Guide

Observation Guide

The author's observation techniques were initially informal, based on participation, experience of the subsector and anecdotal evidence to inform his views. Following the pilot research a more structured approach was taken with the selected cases. Generic guidelines published by Prentice Hall were consulted and the guidance below provided a checklist for observation. Its main benefit was to supplement the guidance provided by the Case Study Protocol in terms of organising essential activities.

http://www.pearsoned.ca/school/sightlines/gr_9/common/gam_ont/gam34.pdf

Generic Assessment Master #34

Conducting Research: Observation Checklist

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Observer: _____ **Project:** _____

Before conducting research Check if observed

- identifies, narrows, and establishes topic for research
- lists prior knowledge and formulates questions about the topic
- sorts ideas, information, and questions into subtopics
- makes a plan for gathering required information based on purpose and audience for research project

Conducting research

- uses a variety of strategies to search for information
- locates and collects information from a variety of sources (for example, Internet, CD-ROM, and print sources)
- uses a systematic method of documenting sources
- effectively summarizes information gathered (for example, by using graphic organizers, point-form notes, index cards)
- assesses the information for relevance, accuracy, bias, and completeness
- organizes ideas and information by subtopic
- analyses and synthesizes ideas and information by making inferences, generalizations and by drawing conclusions

After conducting research

- communicates ideas and information through research product (for example, written or oral report or multimedia presentation)
- prepares a complete and correct reference list or bibliography
- produces an orderly, coherent, and clear research product

Comments:

The right to reproduce this page is restricted to the purchasing school. SightLines 9 ^ 1999 Prentice Hall Canada

<http://www.fhi.org/nr/rdonlyres/ed2ruznpftevg34lxuftzjiiho65asz7betpqigbbbyorggs6tetjic367v44baysyomnbdjkdtbsium/participantobservation1.pdf>

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Questions
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	STRAND	
		1.1	Resource Performance Measurement & Management
		Questionnaire	
		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs) - which description suits you best? PMs are set by the umbrella/strategic body and funders PMs are set at our level based on our beneficiaries' needs Unsure, but recognised national measures could be useful <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: current measures, performance measurement for strategy and beneficiary engagement</i>
		LINK Interview	
		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs) In your roles, what would be useful to measure, if anything (e.g. time at meetings, decisions implemented, etc)? If you were to use performance measures, what value could they add to the way you work and your results? If you used national performance measures, which would you adopt, and why?
		Questionnaire	
		1.1.2	Efficient systems - which description suits you best? Minimum affordable systems to facilitate essential operations Multi-disciplinary integrated systems to facilitate growth Unsure, but adequate basic systems to cope with rapid growth <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: data systems, collection, processing, and optimisation</i>
		LINK Interview	
		1.1.2	Efficient systems From your charitable activities, what is the most important data you collect? What processes do you carry out on input data to produce what outputs? How would you use the outputs? (e.g. for decision-making, outcome measurement...)
		Questionnaire	
		1.1.3	Quality service delivery - which description suits you best? Quality is mainly a function of external accreditation (e.g. IIP) Quality is mainly a function of internal perception/satisfaction Unsure, but our mission-driven impact is most important <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding of the costs and potential impacts of quality assurance</i>
		LINK Interview	
		1.1.3	Quality service delivery What elements of quality do you measure (e.g. audit/accreditation criteria, visit response times)? How do you measure and manage them? If you cluster similar service offerings, how do you measure and manage them?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Questions
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	GOVERNANCE	STRAND 1.2	Social Outcome - Social Impact Strategy
		Questionnaire 1.2.1	PIM (Performance Improvement Management) for social outcomes/impacts - which description suits you best? PIM is retrospective - an intuitive and informal process PIM is central to resource allocation for effective social impact Unsure, but may not adopt it if it is not required by statute
		LINK Interview 1.2.1	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: formal governance links between PIM, and VRIO resource optimisation</i> Performance Improvement Management (PIM) for social outcomes/impacts Does the retrospective, intuitive and informal approach to PIM suffice? Are there any areas of activity whose performance you would like to manage as they are undertaken? If PIM could be useful, what advantages (e.g. info, decisions, control) and disadvantages (e.g. time, complexity, cost) are most important?
		STRAND 1.3	Policies & Processes
		Questionnaire 1.3.1	Internal policy input - which description suits you best? Internal policy is handed down from the strategic level Internal policy is developed at all levels for final approval Unsure, but ensuring full policy implementation is critical
		LINK Interview 1.3.1	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: strategic understanding and deployment of policy for mission impact</i> Internal policy input Which policies are most important for spiritual-social impact? What factors within these policies make them important and/or effective? What change, if any, would you like to see in the approach to spiritual-social impact?
		Questionnaire 1.3.2	Government policy input - which description suits you best? We complete mandatory government returns and surveys We proactively engage with the government policy process Unsure, but more engagement would require clear justification
		LINK Interview 1.3.2	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: awareness, access and engagement with critical government policies</i> Government policy input Which government policies are most relevant to you? If no policy areas seem directly relevant, do you feel adequately represented by other bodies? If any policy areas are of particular interest to you, which are they?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Questions
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	STRAND 1.4	Industry & Firm performance for investment
		Questionnaire 1.4.1	Risk management - which description suits you best? Risk is essentially dangerous, and so we seek to avoid it Risk is inevitable, so we systematically assess it and manage it Unsure, but in any case it should be systematically assessed
		<i>LINK</i> Interview 1.4.1	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding of different risks, and potential risk/opportunity balance</i> Risk management How would you describe the current risk management system? Is risk assessment driven by umbrella bodies (e.g. C of E), funders or CTE policy? What changes, if any, would you like to see in the way risk is managed?
		Questionnaire 1.4.2	PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - which description suits you best? PIM results are/would be used for internal improvements PIM results should be used for investment and fundraising Unsure, but would be interested if PIM results could raise cash
		<i>LINK</i> Interview 1.4.2	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding performance-based investment in resources/capabilities</i> PIM for investment/fundraising/bids When needs and opportunities are identified, do you sometimes need to raise funds? If external funds were needed, where would you be looking to raise funds (e.g. govt, donors etc)? If external funds were needed, what performance requirements would you expect?
		Questionnaire 1.4.3	Investment readiness - which description suits you best? Internal investment is primary, and based on past results External investment is primary, and current results matter Unsure, but could develop attractive investment evidence
		<i>LINK</i> Interview 1.4.3	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: optimal approaches to leveraging resources/capabilities for funding</i> Investment readiness Why is internal investment primary? Is this likely to change, and if so why? Can you define your work as a group in a single phrase or sentence (your 'USP')?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Questions
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	STRAND 2.1	Relational Capabilities
		Questionnaire 2.1.1	Proactive engagement - which description suits you best? Stakeholder engagement is conducted on a 'needs' basis Stakeholder engagement is planned and strategically managed Unsure, but any change would have to be cost-effective
		LINK Interview 2.1.1	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding of potential benefits of proactive stakeholder engagement</i> Proactive engagement What criteria in proactivity do you prioritise (e.g. administering, learning, collaboration, cost, benefit)? Most of your engagement is at a strategic level - does this connect fully with social action activities? If you could reorganise your proactive engagements, what would you prioritise?
		Questionnaire 2.1.2	Stakeholders - which description suits you best? Key stakeholders are trustees, management, and some staff Key stakeholders include our beneficiaries, critics and others Unsure, but stakeholder consultation is mainly for research
		LINK Interview 2.1.2	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: strategic stakeholder management to enhance mission effectiveness</i> Stakeholders What value is/could be gained from meetings with your key stakeholders? Do you map and/or manage your stakeholders? How would you like to prioritise existing and potential stakeholders (admin, need, impact, cash-flow, etc..)?
		STRAND 2.2	Alliance-based Capabilities
		Questionnaire 2.2.1	Intra-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? We are quite self-sufficient, so don't seek much collaboration Intra-sector collaboration is essential for survival and growth Unsure, but a clear strategy could be useful if it wasn't costly
		LINK Interview 2.2.1	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding and strategic management of long-term interdependence</i> Intra-sector collaboration What exactly is intra-sector collaboration helping to survive and grow? What benefits do you look for in intra-sector collaboration? What benefits are your intra-sector collaborators/partners looking for?
		Questionnaire 2.2.2	Cross-sector collaboration - which description suits you best? Little or no collaboration, unless for low-risk financial gain Despite mutual misunderstanding, we would like to explore Unsure, but above all we need to protect against mission drift
		LINK Interview 2.2.2	<i>Scoping revealed gaps in: understanding and perceived capabilities for mutually beneficial linkages</i> Cross-sector collaboration What do other sectors have that you would like to access or share? If you were to consider cross-sector collaboration, which economic sector appeals to you most? Collaboration is for mutual benefit - what benefits?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Questions
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP	STRAND 2.3	Social Entrepreneurship
		Questionnaire 2.3.1	Entrepreneurialism - which description suits you best? Entrepreneurialism is unnecessary in charities Entrepreneurialism is useful as ethical, creative opportunism Unsure, but to consider it seriously would be a major change <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: the donor-funded charity mindset in terms of SE, especially risk/trading</i>
		<i>LINK</i> Interview 2.3.1	Entrepreneurialism How do you define entrepreneurialism? What ethical criteria do you consider relevant for entrepreneurialism? Do your respective roles encourage entrepreneurial action?
		Questionnaire 2.3.2	Innovation - which description suits you best? Innovation is gradual and is the responsibility of top executives Innovation demands change, and all staff are responsible Unsure, but innovation is safest when copying proven models <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: the understanding, confidence, appetite for innovative products/services</i>
		<i>LINK</i> 2.3.2	Innovation Do you see your role as leader involving innovation for single or numerous organisations? What known challenges require innovative solutions? What proactive approach (if any) is used to identify potential/unknown innovations (e.g.enquiry, feedback, research)?
		STRAND 2.4	Change Readiness
		Questionnaire 2.4.1	Change readiness - which description suits you best? Change should be incremental, and planned in advance Change management requires reactive and proactive skills Unsure, but for it to be useful it needs to be widely understood <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: systematic planning for exploiting expected and unexpected change</i>
		<i>LINK</i> Interview 2.4.1	Change readiness Are you empowered by your role to identify, recommend, and drive change? How do you recruit support and prepare key stakeholders for change? How are less involved stakeholders' concerns taken into account? What roles/influence do prayer and fellowship play?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LINKED TO QUESTIONNAIRE

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Questions
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	STRAND 2.5.1	Effective Decision making
		Questionnaire 2.5.1	Effective decision-making - which description suits you best? Speed is paramount so only low staff input is needed The objectivity and inclusivity of the process is paramount Unsure, but protect our culture while improving effectiveness <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: grasp and consideration of alternative decision-making for effectiveness</i>
		LINK Interview 2.5.1	Effective decision-making What are the main challenges to effective decision making facing you as a national body? What improvements would you like to see in decision-making, if any? What methods could realise these changes (e.g. structure, culture, communications, etc)?
		STRAND 2.5.2	Social Outcomes & Impacts
		Questionnaire 2.5.2	Social outcomes or impacts - which description suits you best? Beneficial results from the organisation which can be proved Beneficial results which the recipient is known to value Unsure, but some public good aligned with our social mission <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: systematic approaches to assessing mission social outcomes and impacts</i>
		LINK Interview 2.5.2	Social outcomes or impacts How do your beneficiaries identify the outcomes they value most? Do you currently use any outcomes or impacts frameworks? If you don't, what value would you expect them to add to your activity?
		STRAND 2.6	Firm Growth
		Questionnaire 2.6.1	Manageable scaling up - which description suits you best? Moderate, incremental increases in work volumes Flexibility to cope with large stepped increases in volumes Unsure, but sufficient capability to cope without overload <i>Scoping revealed gaps in: capacity to grow as organisations and to scale operations to meet needs</i>
		LINK Interview 2.6.1	Manageable scaling up How do you expect to grow as an organisation in the next 3 years (e.g. more staff, partnerships)? Any alliance involves structure and interdependence - how do you see this? How could you reach more people with existing/new services?

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

The Salvation Army – Employment Plus Department (TSAEP)

Major Ivor Telfer- Director (TSAEP)

Helen Robinson – Deputy Director (TSAEP)

Steve Coles – Social Enterprise Manager (TSAEP)

Sylvia Osaji – Business Development Manager (TSAEP)

Richard Bradbury – Director (Research & Development at TSA)

Churches Together in England (CTE)

Rev Dr David Cornick – General Secretary (CTE)

Rev John Bradley – South-East Co-ordinator (CTE)

Redeeming Our Communities (ROC)

Graham Simmons – Operations Director (ROC)

Questionnaires	Semi-Structured Interviews
✓	✓
✓	
✓	✓
✓	
✓	
✓	✓
✓	✓
✓	✓

CASE STUDY PROTOCOL - OVERVIEW (courtesy of Yin 2009:79-91)

Purpose: for increased CS reliability (based on single cases before aggregation as multiples)

Value: it was used here as a framework and also as a checklist to guide the research enquiry.

Usage: it contains the procedures and general rules for its use, and thus it improves reliability.

Contents:

FOUR SECTIONS:

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CASE STUDY PROJECT
2. FIELD PROCEDURES
3. CASE STUDY QUESTIONS
4. GUIDE FOR CASE STUDY REPORT

FOUR SUB-SECTIONS OF EACH SECTION:

- A. INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE STUDY AND PURPOSE OF PROTOCOL
- B. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES
- C. OUTLINE OF CASE STUDY REPORT
- D. CASE STUDY QUESTIONS

FOUR SECTIONS:

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CASE STUDY PROJECT (p82)

Background information about the project:

The context, availability, perspective, profile, mission statement, introductory letter.

The substantive issues being investigated:

Initially 23 questions were asked covering entrepreneurial management. 4 questions on collaboration were later removed because they provided excess detail.

Relevant reading about the issues:

Reading was broken down by theory, source, theme and specific references.

2. FIELD PROCEDURES (p83)

Gaining access to organisations or interviewees:

Access was gained through direct approaches by the researcher, supported by referees.

Having sufficient resources while in the field:

Dedicated time, space for face-to-face meetings, a computer and email were available.

Developing a procedure for calling for assistance and guidance:

Respondents checked primary data, and the Director of Studies led review sessions.

Making a clear schedule of the data collection activities:

A flexible schedule was compiled and revised to accommodate unanticipated events.

Providing for unanticipated events:

Few such events arose. However, family illness delayed progress in 2010-11. Further, the researcher was offered a senior position at TSAEP, which he declined in order to complete this research.

Appendix 12/c

3. CASE STUDY QUESTIONS (p86)

General orientation of questions: the questions are addressed to you the investigator, as a prompt and to keep you on track; each question should be accompanied by a list of likely sources of evidence (e.g. names, docs, observations); review this crosswalk: questions<>evidence before interview.

This was done in every case. Internal documentation was available but limited.

Levels of questions asked of:

L1: specific interviewees:

Most interviewees were senior managers within the case study. Uniquely, at TSAEP additional managers within and outside the department responded.

L2: the individual case study:

The questionnaires each case were identical, but the semi-structured interviews allowed for minor differences between cases, while maintaining comparability.

L3: the pattern of findings across multiple case studies:

Data patterns within and across cases were matched to provide insights and evidence based on RBT, DCT and SE for mission effectiveness (Section 6.4)

L4: questions asked of an entire study (inc external evidence, literature, data):

Evidence was drawn from a wide range of sources in the public domain, notably literature from theoretical, professional and sector sources, the participant charities' websites, statutory public records, and national and sector news.

L5: normative questions about policy recommendations and conclusions, going beyond the narrow scope of the study:

The question of social service supply and a potentially greater role for CSACs as public funds decreased is the focus of this thesis. It is partially answered in Chapter 7, noting that more research is needed to guide capacity building.

4. GUIDE FOR CASE REPORT (p89)

Consider the outline, format or audience for the report (e.g. journals, feedback)

This thesis is motivated a need to meet practitioners' needs as they serve the most marginalised, and it is written primarily as a contribution to knowledge for examination within academia.

Use an annotated Bibliography in which each relevant source is itemized (referenced)

The Bibliography denotes items referred to in the thesis with an asterisk.

Case study plans can change with data collection, build in this flexibility!

The thematic categorisation of theory-based questions was changed, and 4 of the original 23 questions were removed from the thesis (memo only – Appendix 5).

FOUR SUB-SECTIONS:

A. INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE STUDY AND PURPOSE OF PROTOCOL

1. Case Study questions, hypotheses and propositions

These are shown in Chapter 2.

2. Theoretical framework for the case study (reproduces the logic model)

These are provided mainly in Chapter 3, and supplemented in Chapter 4.

3. Role of the protocol in guiding the CS investigator (NB protocol is a standardised agenda)

The role of the CS Protocol is discussed in Chapter 5.

B. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

1. *Names of sites to be visited, including contact persons*

This was done in every case as a basic requisite for engaged scholarship.

2. *Data collection plan (covers types of evidence to be expected, including the roles of people to be interviewed, the events to be observed, and any other documents to be reviewed when on site)*

This was done in every case to optimise the data quality required from the site visit.

3. *Expected preparation prior to site visits (identifies specific information to be reviewed and issues to be covered, prior to going on site).*

This was done in every case with advance warning, to elicit maximum relevant data.

C. OUTLINE PRIORITIES FOR REPORTING WITHIN THE CASE STUDY REPORT

1. *The CSAC leadership/managerial practices in operation*

Completed in fulfilment of Objective 2, Chapter 6.

2. *Entrepreneurial leadership/management context, and history pertaining to the charity*

Completed in fulfilment of Objective 2, Chapter 6.

3. *Evidence of social entrepreneurship at the charity*

Completed in fulfilment of Objective 3, Chapter 7.

4. *Social Outcomes and Impacts (potential if not actual) from these practices to date*

Completed in fulfilment of Objective 3, Chapter 7.

5. *Exhibits to be developed: i) chronology of events covering the implementation and outcomes of practice at this site; ii) logic model for practice; iii) arrays or presenting outcome or other data; iv) references to relevant documents: v) list of persons interviewed.*

All completed.

D. SAMPLE CASE STUDY QUESTIONS

1. The management practices in operation and its social entrepreneurialism
 - a) *Describe the practice in detail, including the deployment of personnel and technologies, if any.*
 - b) *What is the nature, if any, of collaborative efforts across communities or jurisdictions that have been needed to put the practice in place?*
 - c) *How did the idea of the practice start?*
 - d) *Was there a planning process, and how did it work? What were the original goals and target populations or areas for the practice?*
 - e) *In what ways is the practice innovative, compared to other practices of the same kind or in the same jurisdiction?*
 - f) *Describe whether the practice has been supported from the jurisdiction's regular budget, or as a result of funding from an external source.*

These approximated questions were addressed in the context of CSACs (Chapter 6).

2. Evaluation

- a) *What is the design for evaluating the practice, and who is doing the evaluation?*
- b) *What part of the evaluation has been implemented?*
- c) *What are the outcome measures being used. And what outcomes have been identified to date?*
- d) *What rival explanations have been identified and explored, for attributing the outcomes to the investment of the government/donor/other funds?*

These approximated questions were addressed in the context of CSACs (Chapter 6).

Observation Checklist

The purpose of this Checklist is to ensure validity through a rigorous and comprehensive process ensuring complete coverage of the observed data.

Before conducting research Check if observed

- identifies, narrows, and establishes topic for research

A lengthy process beginning while consulting to TSAEP in 2010

- lists prior knowledge and formulates questions about the topic

Prior knowledge appeared in conference papers. Pilot study determined my questions

- sorts ideas, information, and questions into subtopics

Originally derived from literature and experience, later recategorised per theory constructs

- makes a plan for gathering required information based on purpose and audience for research project

Purposive sample provided information for diverse audiences

Conducting research

- uses a variety of strategies to search for information

Word of mouth, introductions, availability, - then Case Study methods

- locates and collects information from a variety of sources (for example, Internet, CD-ROM, and print sources)

Networking, reading, local personnel, - and Case Study methods

- uses a systematic method of documenting sources

Mainly computer files

- effectively summarizes information gathered (for example, by using graphic organizers, point-form notes, index cards)

Information always written up promptly in case-specific files (Chain of Evidence)

- assesses the information for relevance, accuracy, bias, and completeness

Information reviewed by respondents, tutor, and assessed through conference papers

- organizes ideas and information by subtopic

This is achieved through objectives-based subtopics considered using theoretical themes

- analyses and synthesizes ideas and information by making inferences, generalizations and by drawing conclusions

Observations are combined with other data collection methods to identify inferred causal linkages

After conducting research

- communicates ideas and information through research product (for example, written or oral report or multimedia presentation)

Done routinely at annual and more frequent events, e.g. conferences and research events

- prepares a complete and correct reference list or bibliography

Done routinely to meet RES stage requirements, and reviewed by tutor

- produces an orderly, coherent, and clear research product

Rigorous standards are applied by the university and the researcher

[illegible]

APPENDIX 13/b

Case-specific and Public Information

The purpose of this Checklist is to ensure validity by following a rigorous process of identifying and including relevant secondary information.

Pre-thesis case-specific information

See consultancy and pilot study documentation

General information obtained during Pilot Study

From local and national respondents and networking events

Specific information obtained during research

*Limited but useful internal documentation
(e.g. CTE's Review of Intermediate Ecumenical Life)
Case-specific email correspondence*

General information obtained from public sources

From case websites, internet cross-references, news, and academic articles

Specific information obtained during research

Statutory accounts from Charity Commission & Companies House

TSAEP - Case 1	CTE - Case 2	ROC - Case 3
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

Appendix 14/a

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (courtesy of Remenyi 2011)

Item No.	Issue	Detail The Salvation Army, inc Employment Plus (TSAEP)	Notes 23/03/11 & 03/05/11 x 5 staff
1	Research Topic	<i>Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship: Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England</i>	Done originally, but the title has changed subtly
2	Research Question	'How could Christian charities in England play a more effective role in terms of social entrepreneurialism?'	Done, but some minor changes since
3	Informant/s	Maj. Ivor Telfer, Helen Robinson, Steve Coles, Sylvia Osaji, Richard Bradbury,	Professional, articulate
4	Location	UK Territorial Headquarters, 101 Newington Causeway London SE1 6BN	Impressive modern, central
5	Gatekeeper	None	2 helpful PAs
6	Organisation	The Salvation Army www.salvationarmy.org.uk/employmentplus	Major traditional Christian charity
7	Arrival at premises	Arrive early, look for additional data by inspecting the building and watching staff, and make field notes	Done: formal, secure, large, hierarchical
8	Pre-interview	Thank informant/s, restate research topic and question, mention gatekeeper if relevant, check informant is knowledgeable and prepared to offer his knowledge and views, recording permission and equipment, present ethics issues and letter of consent.	Done: transient, inertia, bureaucrat supportive, keen on my work but wary/wantinhouse, 2-way dialogue, some vetting
9	Interview Schedule	Interview schedule presented to informant – copy attached	Done: copies attached
10	Interview	Ideally approximately 50 minutes of careful questions and answers	Most mtgs = 1 hr plus, one e-mailed
11	Post-interview	Thank informant, ask for other contacts if required, ask for permission to ask points of clarification.	Done: helpful & cautious edits esp. pre papers
12	Other Data	Have any reports been offered by the informant? If so, collect them.	Yes, some basic ones collected
13	Reflection	Make post interview field notes.	Done: albeit after 12 months
14	Transcript	Compile all the data obtained and begin production of the transcript.	Done: time poor, but rigorous edits

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (courtesy of Remenyi 2011)

Item No.	Issue	Detail Churches Together in England (CTE)	Notes 20/03/12 & 16/04/12
1	Research Topic	<i>Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship: Insights and case-study evidence from charities in England</i>	Done: high level of interest in the subject matter
2	Research Question	'How could Christian charities in England play a more effective role in terms of social entrepreneurialism?'	Done: some detachment as an umbrella body with advisory role
3	Informant/s	CEO- Rev David Cornick SE Mgr – Rev John Bradley	DC mainly articulated; JB w-chair; engaged
4	Location	27 Tavistock Sq, London WC1H 9HH 020 7529 8131	Central, secure, lose FIEC lease?
5	Gatekeeper	None	Delay due to illness in family
6	Organisation	Churches Together in England (any recent media coverage?)	Not high profile, changing role?
7	Arrival at premises	Arrive early, look for additional data by inspecting the building and watching staff, and make field notes	7 mins early, respondents were waiting
8	Pre-interview	Thank informant/s, restate research topic and question, mention gatekeeper if relevant, check informant is knowledgeable and prepared to offer his knowledge and views, recording permission and equipment, present ethics issues and letter of consent.	Done: no need for second signature on consent, very open, long pensive answers, brainstorming, constructive
9	Interview Schedule	Interview schedule presented to informant – copy attached	Done: see datelines
10	Interview	Ideally approximately 50 minutes of careful questions and answers	1 hr 40 mins
11	Post-interview	Thank informant, ask for other contacts if required, ask for permission to ask points of clarification.	1/3 sections only ongoing – met again on 16 Apr
12	Other Data	Have any reports been offered by the informant? If so, collect them.	Yes: Ecumenical Life 2011
13	Reflection	Make post interview field notes.	Done: snowballing opp.?
14	Transcript	Compile all the data obtained and begin production of the transcript.	Done: Observer Checklist

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (courtesy of Remenyi (2011))

Item No.	Issue	Detail Redeeming Our Communities (ROC)	Notes 03/02/12, 28/02/12
1	Research Topic	<i>Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship: Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England</i>	Done
2	Research Question	'How could Christian charities in England play a more effective role in terms of social entrepreneurialism?'	Done, but some minor changes since
3	Informant/s	Operations Director - Graham Simmons With approval of CEO Debra Green	Intelligent, thirsty for info, engaged
4	Location	Rotherfield St Martin	Relaxed but intense meetings
5	Gatekeeper	None	Graham is good at comms; too busy
6	Organisation	Redeeming Our Communities (ROC) national offices - Manchester	Dynamic/ successful locally; x-s model for rapid hi-profile growth
7	Arrival at premises	Arrive early, look for additional data by inspecting the building and watching staff, and make field notes	Done: from CRJ home to ROC office by Skype
8	Pre-interview	Thank informant/s, restate research topic and question, mention gatekeeper if relevant, check informant is knowledgeable and prepared to offer his knowledge and views, recording permission and equipment, present ethics issues and letter of consent.	Done: passion for godly & semi-autonomous community-based social action on a corporate scale & consent form o/s
9	Interview Schedule	Interview schedule presented to informant – copy attached	Done: copies attached
10	Interview	Ideally approximately 50 minutes of careful questions and answers	Diligent, humble, overstretched
11	Post-interview	Thank informant, ask for other contacts if required, ask for permission to ask points of clarification.	Done: open and co-operative but hard to access
12	Other Data	Have any reports been offered by the informant? If so, collect them.	No
13	Reflection	Make post interview field notes.	Done:
14	Transcript	Compile all the data obtained and begin production of the transcript.	Done: with helpful edits

**Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England**

PROPOSAL for PhD ENGAGEMENT

To: Major Ivor Telfer
From: Charles Jardine
Date: 13 December 2010
Subject: PhD proposal to develop social impact through the Salvation Army

Background

In-depth research into the strategic goals and capacity for growth at the Employment Plus department of the Salvation Army (TSAEP) was carried out from January to April 2010, by invitation of the then director, Roland Sewell. The researcher, Charles Jardine (a management consultant/accountant/researcher), recommended far-reaching changes to achieve the goals established. A recently submitted research proposal which involves extending the earlier work at TSA was accepted in principle.

The Benefits to TSA

The overarching AIM of this research is to explore how social impact can be optimised through entrepreneurial approaches available to churches (generically grouped as the Church) in the UK. This aim is supported by 4 key research OBJECTIVES to examine, discuss and test the following:- 1) **social outcomes and impacts frameworks** – to facilitate modeling with stakeholders; 2) **performance improvement management** – to ascertain investment priorities and readiness 3) **management for cross-sector and intra-sector collaboration** - to inform evidence-based generic modeling for specific policy recommendations – to increase knowledge impact in practice. The main benefits for the Salvation Army are as follows:-

1. Expertise to help develop outcome & impact measurement – which will add value to **marketing & fund-raising, facilitate resource allocation, influence policy reporting**
2. Help to *develop capacity* infrastructure through performance improvement management
3. Researched recommendations into intra-sector and cross-sector **growth opportunities**
4. Prior knowledge of the Salvation Army and a vision to assist it to explore a leadership role **in bringing the Gospel into the centre of British society** through social impact.
5. A close working relationship with TSAEP, which could **spearhead social initiatives**.
6. **Expertise** in senior management, finance and research positions across the sectors.
7. The dissemination of conference papers and other publications will **build TSA's profile**.

The Costs to TSA

This research must be finished by July 2012 in order to meet deadlines for third sector capacity building research under the Third Sector Research Centre, commissioned by the Cabinet Office for Civil Society. The author's university (London South Bank) is a member of a capacity building cluster with TSRC, and so enjoys significant voice in the ongoing UK policy debate.

1. As with the previous research, there is **no cost** for conducting and reporting research
2. For max value 1-1.5 days **access is needed** per month, in TSAEP and across TSA
3. As with previously, access is arranged in advance with **no disruption to workflows...**

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

APPENDIX 15/b

SAMPLE INVITATION LETTER

From: Charles Jardine [crjardine@btinternet.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 1:57 PM
To: 'david.cornick@cte.org.uk'
Cc: 'john.bradley@cte.org.uk'
Subject: Research opportunity
Attachments: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET & Consent Form.docx

Dear David,

I have had the pleasure of talking with John Bradley this morning about some research I am doing for a Phd. It concerns optimising social impact through the work of Christian social action groups, to step into the gap as government provision recedes. As such it holds potential for the faith-based sub-sector of the voluntary or third sector. It is related to the agenda of the Third Sector Research Centre (funded by the Cabinet Office for Civil Society).

I have been working alongside our local Churches Together in Eastbourne, and have known its leader Rev Martyn Relf well for many years. My university, London South Bank, is a member of a 3rd Sector Capacity Building Cluster Earlier working under the TSRC. Research at CTfE and their related charity network ECAN (Eastbourne Christian Agencies Network) has been fruitful and provided a lot of useful information.

If you are willing, I would like to conduct some research at Churches Together for England. The enquiry is split into two stages: 1) a multiple choice Questionnaire, and b) a semi-structured Interview. I would be happy to deliver both in person, and would always conduct the interview face to face with a senior officer.

I hope you feel able to help with this effort, but please do not feel in any way obliged to do so. If you are inclined to participate, please would you read the attached Consent Form and confirm that you are happy to proceed.

Many thanks,

Charles Jardine FCCA, MBA, DChA, FCMI, FIC
Visiting Research Fellow,
London South Bank University
103 Borough Road, London SE1 0AA

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

APPENDIX I5/c

From: Sandy Medway [Sandy.Medway@Diochi.org.uk]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2012 1:15 PM
To: Jennie Cloherty
Cc: Debra Green; paul.wilson@roc.uk.com; Charles Jardine
Subject: Introducing Charles Jardine

Dear Jennie, Debra and Paul

The ROC Eastbourne meet tomorrow at 12noon for a time of prayer on the way forward locally and we are looking forward to God leading and guiding us.

My purpose in writing is to introduce to you Charles Jardine who is a friend living in East Sussex and a godly man undertaking PHD research about sustainable, socially responsible organisations, particularly within Christian faith communities. He is a university lecturer at London South Bank University with expertise in finance/social enterprise and is keen to interview Debra to learn more about ROC and its methodology, influence and national development. I commend Charles to you and hope ROC might be included in this important research which we trust will influence key government thinkers and policy makers. See <http://uk.linkedin.com/pub/charles-jardine/b/37/a00> for further information....

I have copied Charles in on this email to link him to you and the team.

[Charles,Jennie is Debra's Executive PA and Paul is National Officer for External Partnerships and lives in Lindfield]

kind regards
Sandy Medway (Mrs)
Personal Assistant to Wallace Benn

From the office of the Bishop of Lewes, The Rt Revd Wallace Benn,
Bishop's Lodge, 16a Prideaux Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN21 2NB.
Email Bishop's PA: sandy.medway@diochi.org.uk | Telephone: 01323 648462 | Fax: 01323 641514
Office hours normally Monday to Thursday 9-4.30pm

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET & CONSENT FORM

London South Bank University Research Ethics Committee

Code of Practice for Research Involving Human Participants

Introduction

London South Bank University is committed to maintaining the highest standards of research governance. All staff, students and those wishing to conduct research with members of our university community must adhere to this Code. The Code sets out the conduct that is expected and indicates the sanctions that will be applied should individuals be found to have deliberately circumvented or ignored this code. We acknowledge that we have a range of professional associations and groups with differing ethical traditions and guidance. This professional Code upholds the principles of:

Autonomy – every individual has the right to think independently and act freely to decide to participate, continue or withdraw from a research study without hindrance. This includes researchers ensuring that participants are fully informed prior to their giving consent to participate, maintaining confidentiality and respecting their decisions.

Beneficence - research must have value to individuals, groups, communities or to add to the knowledge base. It is unethical to conduct research that cannot be demonstrated to be of benefit or have a purpose.

Non-Maleficence – participants and researchers should be protected at all times. Associated risks and how these will be minimised must be considered and articulated.

Justice – all research is conducted fairly and with respect for the human rights of all involved.

It is the duty of every researcher, supervisor, line manager, Head of Department and Executive Dean of each faculty to ensure compliance with all legal obligations in relation to each research project being undertaken within their jurisdiction and approved by the University or Faculty Research Ethics Committee. This includes compliance with:

- Human Rights Act 1998: http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/Governmentcitizensandrights/Yourrightsandresponsibilities/DG_4002951?cids=Google_PPC&cre=Government_Citizens_Rights
- Data Protection Act 1998; <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>
- Mental Capacity Act 2005: <http://www.publicguardian.gov.uk/mca/mca.htm>
- Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and related Regulations: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/legislation/index.htm>

- Freedom of Information Act 2000:

http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/Governmentcitizensandrights/Yourrightsandresponsibilities/DG4003239?cids=Google_PPC&cre=Government_Citizens_Rights?

Consent to Participate

Researchers have an obligation to protect participants from any possible harm and to preserve their rights. This includes providing potential participants with enough and appropriate information about the research project for them to make an informed decision whether to participate. In some sorts of research, however, it is not appropriate or possible for full information to be provided. Where this is the case, the reasons should be explained in the application for ethical approval.

Voluntary consent must be obtained from participants before the research begins, except where this is not feasible or appropriate such as participant observation in public settings. Each participant must be given details of the nature, object and duration of the proposed research, unless this is inappropriate or not possible. The participant should be told what the research will involve as well as the potential risks. Consent should usually be obtained in writing. If implied or verbal consent will be sought, justification must be given in the application for ethical approval. Researchers are advised to indicate to the Committee how they will record having obtained non-written consent.

Where applicable, participants must be informed and advised about any foreseeable risks to health to which they may be exposed. Safeguards regarding communicable diseases and personal safety should be taken to protect the participant, the researcher and others involved in the work, where appropriate. Where there might be a risk of causing distress including the discussion of sensitive issues, this must be clearly identified along with sources of support that would be available to the participant.

Participants must be free to withdraw from the research at any stage without having to give a reason, and should be told they have this right. An opportunity should be provided for participants to discuss privately their wish to withdraw. Where participants are students, they should be informed that non-participation or subsequent withdrawal will have no effect on their course marks.

Where partial information or concealment of the purpose of the study is necessary, participants should not be exposed to any risk, such as unexpected anxiety or distress, lowering of self-esteem, or any form of psychological or physical harm. ***Participants should be given as much information as possible as to the scope of the research. Where placebos are to be used in a drugs trial, for example, it must be clearly explained to participants that this is part of the process of effective monitoring of the impact of the trial drug.*** Upon completion

of the participants' involvement, researchers should normally provide a debriefing explaining the full purpose of the study. If this is not appropriate, the reasons why must be explained in the application for ethical approval.

Participant Recruitment, Selection and Rewards

Applications for ethical approval should include full details of the selection of participants and any questionnaire to be used in the selection process should accompany the application. If the questionnaire is drawn from a battery of pre-validated tests, it is helpful to indicate the source to the Committee.

Wherever possible, researchers should recruit participants via a notice or if verbally, through a group approach. If requests to specific individuals are required by the research, the reason for this should be explained in the application for ethical approval.

Staff or students may be invited to volunteer to take part. Students in close contact with staff or student researchers should not normally be recruited. They may feel vulnerable to pressure from someone in a position to influence their careers. It is recognised, however, that it is normally reasonable for students to be recruited to take part in teaching exercises where one of the primary objectives is to enable them to make their own observations.

Global recruitment emails are prohibited by the University's Email policy. However, university staff lists can be accessed with the approval of line managers and student group lists with the approval of the appropriate Head of Department and Course Director. When recruiting outside of the university, email policies of the organisations with potential participants need to be followed.

Coercion (perceived or actual) should not be used to persuade people to participate in a research study.

Any payment made to participants normally should only be for expenses, time, inconvenience or discomfort. Researchers must decide for themselves whether such payment should be in the form of cash or vouchers, and must be able to defend that decision. Academic rewards in the form of course credit can be given for students where the process has been agreed within the faculty or department and is overseen. All proposed payments to participants including course credit must be approved by either the University Research Ethics Committee or a Faculty Ethics Committee.

Data Management and Storage

Data, and especially personal data, collected from investigations must comply with the Data Protection Act 1998: <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>.

The researcher should keep full records of all procedures carried out in an appropriate form for review by the University Research Ethics Committee or Faculty Ethics Committee, and – where relevant – keep a register of participants. Details of how this information will be used, stored and the length of time held should be included in the application form.

Location

The locations of investigations should be appropriate to the type of study and the risk involved. The University Research Ethics Committee may, at its discretion, request an inspection of the proposed premises.

Online or web based research is increasing. Particular care needs to be taken with ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of information obtained.

Safeguarding

Appropriate action must be taken to safeguard the participants' health and to respect their privacy and psychological well being. If a participant drops out of a research study the researcher should take reasonable steps to find out if any harm has come to the individual as a result of participation in the study and take appropriate action.

Caution should be exercised in any cases where a participant seeks advice from the researcher as a result of participation in a research study and the Participant should generally be guided to appropriate professional advice.

If any potential participant, or their legal representative, is unwilling or unable for any reason to give his/her informed consent that person must not be included as a participant in the research.

Insurance

Insurers accept that research is part of the normal activities of a university. Consequently the University's liability insurances will in general cover incidents arising out of the proper conduct of research. Policy terms, conditions and exclusions will apply.

Clinical research requiring a clinical trials authorisation from the Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency under the Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulations 2004 is not covered by the University's existing policies. Insurers will require full details of the proposed research in order to quote for cover. Cover must be obtained before the research commences. The University's insurer may be contacted in the first instance via the University Secretary's Office or the Corporate Procurement Unit.

The fields in the table below are not covered by the University's insurances. It may be possible to obtain cover for an additional premium. Insurers will require full details of the proposed research.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pregnant research subjects • Research subjects under 5 years of age • Hepatitis • Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease • Genetic engineering • The process of conception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where an ABPI indemnity is <u>not</u> in place for research sponsored/funded by a pharmaceutical company (or equivalent) • where the substance under investigation has been designed, manufactured or modified by the University • research being conducted in the USA, Canada or places subject to their jurisdiction
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Details of existing insurance policy terms, conditions and exclusions are available on request from the Corporate Procurement Unit or the University Secretary's Office. Requests for additional cover should be directed to the Corporate Procurement Unit in the first instance.

Researchers are reminded that insurance cover is not a substitute for carrying out appropriate risk assessments or for getting all necessary ethical approvals into place before commencing fieldwork.

CONSENT FORM

I/we the undersigned, have read the information sheet and hereby consent to participate in the research as explained and documented.

Name Dr. J. A. Brown Position Director TRAC Date 15.11.2010
 Within two weeks, using the enclosed s.a.e., please return a signed copy of this form to Charles Jardine, London South Bank University, 103 Borough Road, London SE1 0AA

27 Tavistock Square
London WC1H 9HH

Tel: 02075298 131
Fax: 02075298134
Email: firstname.surname@cte.org.uk
Web: www.churches-together.net

ⓑ 12/4/12

Revd Dr David Cornick, General Secretary

Mr Charles Jardine

This is to confirm that the above gentleman has spoken with officers of the organisation on some previous occasions in relation to matters of mutual interest in the Third Sector in the United Kingdom. Further, we hereby convey our consent to him employing data and/or information conveyed to him on these occasions within the body of his doctoral (PhD) research. We wish him every success in obtaining his PhD award.

Yours faithfully



The Revd Dr David Cornick MA BO MBA
General Secretary



REDEEMING

OUR COMMUNITIES

Mr Charles Jardine

This is to confirm that the above gentleman has spoken with officers of the organisation on some previous occasions in relation to matters of mutual interest in the Third Sector in the United Kingdom. Further, we hereby convey our consent to him employing data and/or information conveyed to him on these occasions within the body of his doctoral (PhD) research.

We wish him every success in obtaining his PhD award.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G.A.' followed by a stylized flourish.

Graham Simmons
Operations Director

REDEEMING OUR COMMUNITIES - Lancaster House - Harper Road - Sharston - Manchester - M22 4RG

T: 0161 946 2373 E: info@roc.uk.com W: www.rocuk.com

Registered charity number 1139817 - Registered company number 7327258

London South Bank
University

Direct line: 020-7815 6024
E-mail: dippenas@lsbu.ac.uk
Ref: UREC 1243

Charles Jardine
1-2 Cricketing Lane
East Sussex
BN27 1QL

Dear Charles,

**Re: Entrepreneurialism and social impact in Christian charities:
Evidence from three case studies in England (UREC 1243)**

Thank you for submitting this proposal and for your response to the reviewers' comments.

I am pleased to inform you that your application to the University Research Ethics Committee for the above study has been reviewed. The Chair is able to confirm that the study was completed in keeping with the London South Bank University Code of Practice for Research with Human Participants.

I wish you every success with your research.

Yours sincerely,



Sharon Dippenaar
Secretary, LSBU Research Ethics Committee

cc:

Prof Joan Curzio, Chair, LSBU Research Ethics Committee

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Theoretical insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

APPENDIX 18

Methodological aspects employed in fulfilling research sub-objectives

SUB-OBJ	PHILOSOPHY	APPROACH	STRATEGY	METHOD	TIME HORIZON	DATA COLLECTION	ANALYTIC STRATEGY	ANALYTIC TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS
1.1 Performance Management	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 1.1	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
1.2 Strategy	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 1.2	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional & Longitudinal	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview 3. Public Records	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
1.3 Policy & Process	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 1.3	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional & Longitudinal	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview 3. Public Records	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
1.4 Performance & Investment	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 1.4	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional & Longitudinal	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview 3. Public Records	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.1 Relational Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.1	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.2 Collaborative Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.2	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.3 Social Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.3	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.4 Change Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.4	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.5 Social Outcome & Impact Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.5	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional & Longitudinal	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview 3. Public Records	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC
2.6 Growth & Scale Capability	Interpretivism & Critical Realism	Inductive: Proposition 2.6	Case Study	Qualitative	Cross - Sectional & Longitudinal	1. Questionnaire 2. Interview 3. Public Records	Propositions Descriptions Rival Views	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK
employed in building new theory

APPENDIX 19/a

<i>THEORISE</i>	<i>DESCRIBE</i>				<i>DETERMINE/INTERPRET</i>		<i>CONCLUDE</i>
SUB-OBJECTIVE	DATA COLLECTION	ANALYTIC STRATEGY	ANALYTIC TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS	DATA FINDINGS	DATA INTERPRET- ATION	CONCLUSIONS
1.1 Performance Management	Questionnaire Interview	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
1.2 Strategy	Questionnaire Interview Public Records	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 – ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
1.3 Policy & Process	Questionnaire Interview Public Records	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
1.4 Performance & Investment	Questionnaire Interview Public Records	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions

Mission Effectiveness and Social Entrepreneurship:
Insights and case-study evidence from three Christian charities in England

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK
employed in building new theory

APPENDIX 19/b

<i>THEORISE</i>	<i>DESCRIBE</i>				<i>DETERMINE/INTERPRET</i>		<i>CONCLUDE</i>
SUB-OBJECTIVE	DATA COLLECTION	ANALYTIC STRATEGY	ANALYTIC TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS	DATA FINDINGS	DATA INTERPRET-ATION	CONCLUSIONS
2.1 Relational Capability	Questionnaire Interview	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 – ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
2.2 Collaborative Capability	Questionnaire Interview	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
2.3 Social Capability	Questionnaire Interview	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 – ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
2.4 Change Capability	Questionnaire Interview	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
2.5 Social Outcome & Impact Capability	Questionnaire Interview Public Records	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 – ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions
2.6 Growth & Scale Capability	Questionnaire Interview Public Records	Propositions & Descriptions	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	6.3 - TSAEP 6.3 - CTE 6.3 - ROC	6.4.1RBT-DCT 6.4.2 SE 6.4.3 Mission	7.3.7 - TSAEP 7.3.14 - CTE 7.3.21 – ROC	7.7 Conclusions

CASE-SPECIFIC PUBLIC & INTERNAL DOCUMENTS

The purpose of this appendix is to reveal the stages and types of case information obtained via a systematic approach

Case-specific and Public Information

Pre-thesis case-specific information

See adjacent consultancy documentation

General information obtained during Pilot Study

From local and national respondents and networking events

Specific information obtained during research

*Limited but useful internal documentation
(e.g. CTE's Review of Intermediate Ecumenical Life)
Case-specific email correspondence*

General information obtained from public sources

From case websites, internet cross-references, news, and academic articles

Specific information obtained during research

Statutory accounts from Charity Commission & Companies House

TSAEP - Case 1	CTE - Case 2	ROC - Case 3
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓
✓	✓	✓

Pre-thesis consultancy documentation (information for reports & conference papers)

Sample Internal Documentation – from The Salvation Army Employment Plus Department (TSAEP)

Sewell. R (2010) *Employment Plus – Five Year Goals*
 Delbridge.C (2010) *TSAEP Quality Assurance Research*
 Coles. S (Dec 09) *TSSSC Presentation*
 Finance Dept (Nov 09) *EZ810 cost centre report*
 Coles. S (Apr 09) *TSA – An Introduction for BT*
 Robinson. H (2009) *E+ Strategic Plan a w-i-p*
 Sewell et al (2009) *E+ - A Review*
 Bonner et al (2008/9) *Seeds of Exclusion*
 Matear. J (2008) *Kingdom Ambition*
 Matear. J et al (2008.v1) *Disposition of Forces*

TSAEP departmental strategy document
 TSAEP QA draft report, Feb 2010
 TSAEP/SE & SS Dept Strawberry Plant strat. ppt
 TSAEP/SE and Crisis contract only – historical
 TSA/TSAEP/SE presentation – overview
 TSAEP prioritised analysis of 5 Year Goals
 TSAEP departmental overview brochure
 TSA research reports – 5 deliverables
 TSA organisational strategy document
 TSA organisational lexicon

QUESTIONNAIRE & INTERVIEW FRAMEWORK

APPENDIX 21/a

participant	respondents	job title	questionnaire	interview
THE SALVATION ARMY - EMPLOYMENT PLUS (TSA-EP - GROUP 1)				
	Major Ivor Telfer	Director - TSAEP	25-Mar-11	3-May-11
	Helen Robinson	Deputy Director - TSAEP	23-Mar-11	
	Steve Coles	SE Development Mgr - TSAEP	20-Mar-11	9-May-11
	Sylvia Osaji	Business Development Mgr - TSAEP	24-Mar-11	
	Richard Bradbury	Research Director - TSA	27-Mar-11	
CHURCHES TOGETHER IN ENGLAND (CTE - GROUP 2)				
	Rev Dr David Cornick	General Secretary	24-Oct-11	20-Mar-12
	Rev Dr John R Bradley	Field Officer, South		16-Apr-12
REDEEMING OUR COMMUNITIES (ROC - GROUP 3)				
	Graham Simmons (with approval of Debra Green, National Director)	Operations Director	3-Dec-11	28-Feb-12
CHRISTIAN ACTION & RESEARCH EDUCATION - (CARE - GROUP 4)				
	Nola Margaret Leach	CEO	25-Oct-11	13-Dec-11
CHURCHES TOGETHER FOR EASTBOURNE (CTfE - GROUPS 5-8)				
Leaders of CTfE, Eastbourne Christian Agencies Network and Seaside (Help) Centre				
	Rev Martyn Relf, John Soars, Ray Allaway	Leaders of CTfE, ECAN and Seaside Centre	22-Mar-11	13-Jul-11
	Rev Martyn Relf	Leader of CTfE		7-Sep-11
Ellel Ministries International				
	Rev John Berry (JB)	Manager	18-Apr-11	
Beachy Head Chaplaincy Team				
	Ross Hardy	CEO	25-Apr-11	
	Capt Ben Russell	Team - from TSA-EB)		
Fegans				
	Mary Dicker	East Sussex Development Officers	26-Apr-11	
CHURCHES TOGETHER FOR HAILSHAM (CTfH - GROUP 9)				
	Rev Dan Henderson	Curate - St Mary's Hailsham	18-Apr-11	16-Aug-11
THE SALVATION ARMY - EASTBOURNE (TSA-EB - GROUP 10)				
	Major David Squirrell	Corps Officer at Eastbourne Citadel	7-Oct-11	13-Oct-11
YOUNG MENS' CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION - EASTBOURNE 7 WEALDEN (YMCA-EB - GROUP 11)				
	Steve Puttock	Chief Executive Officer	21-Jun-11	
	Steve Puttock and Vanessa Ring	Chief Executive and Deputy CEO		20-Jul-11
ROTHERFIELD ST MARTIN (GROUP 12)				
	Jo Evans and Andrew Miller	Project Manager and Chair of the Trustees	13-May-11	22-Jul-11
ASHBURNHAM CHRISTIAN TRUST (ACT - GROUP 13)				
	Rev Andrew Wooding-Jones MBA	Director - ACT	26-Jun-11	25-Aug-11
GREENWICH PENINSULA CHAPLAINCY (GROUP 14)				
	Rev Canon Malcolm Torry	Co-ordinating Chaplain	7-Jun-11	11-Jul-11

QUESTIONNAIRE & INTERVIEW FRAMEWORK

APPENDIX 21/b

participant	respondents	job title	questionnaire	interview
YOUNG MENS' CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION - ENGLAND		(YMCA-ENG - GROUP 15)		
	Jason Stacey	Head of Policy, Media and Research	8-Nov-11	
COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK (CAN-MEZZANINE - GROUP 16)				
	Kate Markey	Deputy CEO	9-May-11	
	Andrew Croft	Chief Executive Officer		26-Jul-11
	Andrew Croft & Kate Markey (s 3, s August)	Chief Executive Officer and Deputy CEO		26-Jul-11 3-Aug-11
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE UK (SE-UK - GROUP 17)				
	Peter Holbrook and Andrew Croft	Chief Executives - SE-UK and CAN	7-Mar-12	7-Mar-12
CHURCH OF ENGLAND - DIOCESE OF CHICHESTER (GROUP 18)				
	Wallace Benn	Bishop of Lewes		4-Jul-12

WITHIN-CASE DATA ANALYSIS OVERVIEW - TSAEP

Ref	Research Objectives	Questionnaire Comments - Directors Questionnaire Comments - SE Manager	Interview Comments - Directors Interview Comments - SE Manager	Other Information & Summary Comments	Pattern Matching	Explanation Building
	BUSINESS SERVICES 1.1 Performance Management	Weakly proactive ASSERTIONS Strongish reactive assertions	Forward-looking, upbeat Current reality view	Toolkit & monitor funder-driven responses	Data patterns match propositions within aspiration & existing bounds	Insufficient market/regulatory incentive/compulsion to upgrade
	GOVERNANCE 1.2 Strategy 1.3 Policies & Processes	Weak to clear proactivity Strong (mod) reactivity & proactivity	Executive planning Operational potential	Comprehensive heirarchical governance processes	Data patterns match propositions within rank & role view differences	Complex internal structure encourages a policy-practice gap
	RESOURCE INVESTMENT 1.4 Performance & Investment	Limited but clear mgt concepts Limited engagement & clarity	Clear CSA principles Supports evolution	Solid market- following top down responses	Data patterns match propns within engagement level differences	High risk aversion based in solid risk routines & internal & external funding
	COLLABORATION 2.1 Relational Capabilities 2.2 Collaborative Capability	Weak to clear proactivity Internal focus, proactive & reactive	Strategic, clear, holistic Organic, cautious, keen	Growing structured collaborative initiatives	Data patterns match propns within role determined perspectives	Developing collaborative goals reveals challenges & rewards
	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE 2.3 Social Capability 2.4 Change Capability	Weakly proactive Change planning & uncertain innovation	Structural, analytic, progressive Operational, progressive	Innovation is structural - growing in importance	Data patterns match propns within clarity of different org implications	SE innovation & change is difficult in large charity heirarchies
	GROWTH 2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability 2.6 Growth & Scale	Weak (mod) proactive & reactive Clear (mod), proactive & reactive	Structural, top-down Structural, bottom-up	Growing social impact priority	Data patterns show good aspirational propn match within structure	DCT approaches to growth via SE means is context-constrained

WITHIN-CASE DATA ANALYSIS OVERVIEW - CTE

APPENDIX 22/b

Ref	Research Objectives	Questionnaire Comments	Interview Comments	Other Info & Summary Comments	Pattern Matching	Explanation Building
BUSINESS SERVICES						
1.1	Performance Management	Proactive quality, reactive PM & systems	Under-developed VRIO resources	Basic business services - limited recognition of developmental potential	Data patterns (including rival explanations) support propositions within the firm's objectives	Performance management is not prioritised in a trust-based relational monopoly
GOVERNANCE						
1.2	Strategy					
1.3	Policies & Processes	Proactive policy, reactive strategy	Weak strategy-VRIO resource links	Complex, wide mission objects deploying only minimum resource analysis	Data patterns match propositions within broad tertiary policy objectives for social impact	Suboptimal VRIO performance, and focus may be dissipated within wide remit
RESOURCE INVESTMENT						
1.4	Performance & Investment	Reactive and unsure (relational)	Strong vision & policy, risk tolerant	Legally compliant reports lack RBT developmental points	Data patterns match with rival explanations specific to this tertiary within the firm's culture	Weak reactive links between PIMM, funding and risk management strategies
COLLABORATION						
2.1	Relational Capabilities					
2.2	Collaborative Capability	Reactive-coordinative collaboration only partially empowers leaders	Constrained collaborative scenario High & complex DCT potential	Subsector collaborative raison d'être, visionary, very broad remit	Data patterns do not closely match proposed SE means, but also do not negate them	General and specialised collaborations reveal strategic tension & promise
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE						
2.3	Social Capability					
2.4	Change Capability	Reactive, unsure, (relational)	Soft DCs evident, but no SE	Some change precipitators alluded to in reporting, but no DCT drivers for SE	Data patterns match the propositions, within tertiary constraints and monopolistic conditions	A context-specific patient and reactive set of DCs explain non-SE propensity
GROWTH						
2.5	Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability	Proact-inclusive, unsure of social impacts for growth	Complex focus-DCT scenario	Goals include effective joint decision-making for social impacts	Data patterns weakly match propositions, within strategies that do not recognise SE <i>per se</i>	Direct or strong links with social impact-driven growth are structurally unlikely
2.6	Growth & Scale	Proact-inclusive, unsure of social impacts for growth	Complex focus-DCT scenario	Goals include effective joint decision-making for social impacts	Data patterns weakly match propositions, within strategies that do not recognise SE <i>per se</i>	Direct or strong links with social impact-driven growth are structurally unlikely

WITHIN-CASE DATA ANALYSIS OVERVIEW - ROC

APPENDIX 22c

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Research Objectives</u>	<u>Questionnaire Comments</u>	<u>Interview Comments</u>	<u>Other Info & Summary Comments</u>	<u>Pattern Matching</u>	<u>Explanation Building</u>
	BUSINESS SERVICES					
1.1	Performance Management	Proactive and cost-focused	VRIO awareness & development	Market responsive progression	Data patterns match propositions closely within growth-predicated affordability limits	PMs used directly to inform social outcomes & impacts
	GOVERNANCE					
1.2	Strategy					
1.3	Policies & Processes	Proactive & top-down	VRIO fit to value proposition	Customer-centric VRIO policy for development	Data patterns match propns, but within entrepreneurial top down SO-SI initial development	Well governed & policy congruent, early-stage PIM mgt reduces risk & increases social impact
	RESOURCE INVESTMENT					
1.4	Performance & Investment	Strongly proactive overall	Clear links with performance	Optimised VRIO resources for SO-SI reports	Data patterns match propositions closely, within the context of risk-aware startup funding	Robust SE impact investment has contributed to increased funding
	COLLABORATION					
2.1	Relational Capabilities					
2.2	Collaborative Capability	Proactive strategic collaboration	Clear DCT collaborative deployment	Typical cross-sector collaborative interdependence	Data patterns match propns, noting that collaboration for low risk financial gain is normative for SCA in SE	Collaboration/co-operation is strong, independent, mainly built on internal relationships
	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE					
2.3	Social Capability					
2.4	Change Capability	Strong, proactive SE means	Clear dynamic SE leadership	Innovative, market-responsive products promote change	Data patterns fit closely with propns, within the dynamic capabilities deployed by SE means	Good fit between strands & propositions - clear CSAC mission effectiveness via SE dynamic capabilities
	GROWTH					
2.5	Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability	Proactive growth, top down	Strong DCs evident in early rapid growth	Strong & increasing SO-SI results and scale	Data patterns match propositions within startup rapid growth parameters, confirming SE means	SE means shown in effective (top-down) decision-making, improving SO-SI results & growth
2.6	Growth & Scale					

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Respondent: Graham Simmons
Job Title: Operations Director
Organisation: ROC
Date submitted: 3.2.12

RBT Theme	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers						
BUSINESS SERVICES	1.1	Resource Performance Measurement & Management							
	1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs) - which description suits you best?							
		PMs are set by the umbrella/strategic body and funders	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		PMs are set at our level based on our beneficiaries' needs	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but recognised national measures could be useful	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	1.1.2	Efficient systems - which description suits you best?							
		Minimum affordable systems to facilitate essential operations	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Multi-disciplinary integrated systems to facilitate growth	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but adequate basic systems to cope with rapid growth	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	1.1.3	Quality service delivery - which description suits you best?							
		Quality is mainly a function of external accreditation (e.g. IIP)	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Quality is mainly a function of internal perception/satisfaction	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but our mission-driven impact is most important	c	1	2	3	4	5	

ROC INTERVIEW

Name of Respondent: Graham Simmons
Job Title: Operations Director (with approval of Debra Green, National Director)
Organisation: ROC
Date submitted: 28.02.12 & 11.04.12

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Resource Performance Measurement & Management	
Performance measures (PMs) (B3)	
In your role, what would be useful to measure, if anything (e.g. time at meetings, decisions implemented, etc)?	Outputs and outcomes must be clearly measured, and - e.g. frequency of attendance at ROC Cafes, number of new volunteers, new friends for the elderly at luncheon clubs, average reduction in anti-social
If you were to use new/different performance measures, what value could they add to the way you work and your results?	Renewed emphasis on outcomes, we are working on simple measures for the Scorecard re outcomes that relate to lives being positively changed, communities regenerated etc. Incidences of crime, youth
If you used national performance measures, which would you adopt, and why?	Incidences of crime, youth provision, average volunteer hours etc
Efficient systems (A4)	
From your charitable activities, what is the most important data you collect?	Contact details of all our individual and corporate supporters, professional connections and agencies
What processes do you carry out on input data to produce what outputs (e.g. reports)?	Quite basic manipulation/use of data - limited mainly to geographic segmentation
How would you use the outputs? (e.g. for decision-making, outcome measurement, resource allocation,...)	Identifying project development opportunities; we are currently analysing our data and information needs. Lots of important contacts, but not optimised.
Quality service delivery (B3)	
What elements of quality do you measure (e.g. audit/accreditation criteria, visit response times)?	Very limited forms of measurement - with some exceptions, currently quality is mainly reflected in anecdotal outcomes; we are planning much more e.g. use of scorecard, a benchmarking exercise with 2 or
How do you measure and manage them?	Not much at the moment, but we invite some questionnaire, survey feedback
If you cluster similar service offerings, how do you measure and manage them?	No real clustering

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

RBT Theme	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers						
GOVERNANCE	1.2	Strategy							
	1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts - which description suits you best?							
		PIM is retrospective - an intuitive and informal process	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		PIM is central to resource allocation for effective social impact	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but may not adopt it if it is not required by statute	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	1.3	Policies & Processes							
	1.3.1	Internal policy input - which description suits you best?							
		Internal policy is handed down from the strategic level	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Internal policy is developed at all levels for final approval	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but ensuring full policy implementation is critical	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	1.3.2	Government policy input - which description suits you best?							
		We complete mandatory government returns and surveys	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		We proactively engage with the government policy process	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but more engagement would require clear justification	c	1	2	3	4	5	

ROC INTERVIEW

APPENDIX 23/b

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Strategy Performance Improvement Management (<i>PIM for social outcomes/impacts</i> (B3)) Which measures are most important to you, and why did you select them? Are there any areas of activity whose performance you would like to manage as they are undertaken? To make PIM more useful, what advantages (e.g. info, decisions, control) and disadvantages (e.g. time, complexity, cost) are most important?	
	We are developing a Balance Scorecard; project development; operations/systems; employees; finance/fundraising. Visibility index, contacts log, budgeting. No - devolve wherever possible with suitable forms of reporting Light touch control and vital to keep simple and fine tune with experience
Policies & Processes <i>Internal policy input</i> (A4) Which policies are most important for spiritual-social impact? What factors within these policies make them important and/or effective? What change, if any, would you like to see in the approach to spiritual-social impact?	
	Our values - they should act as a touchstone or litmus paper test for all we do The fact that they are fundamental i.e. underpinning in the true sense Churches understanding the power of this link - that it results in the deepest level of transformation in individuals and communities
Government policy input (B4) Which government policies are most relevant to you? How do you represent yourselves, do you use representation through other bodies, if so which bodies? What are the critical success factors, and how do you avoid fruitless engagement?	
	Big Society, local government funding, charitable donations Mainly directly when opportunities present; no strategic use of umbrella bodies Being very clear about shared objectives at the outset

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

RESOURCE INVESTMENT	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers					
	1.4.1	Risk management - which description suits you best?						
		Risk is essentially dangerous, and so we seek to avoid it	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk is inevitable, so we systematically assess it and manage it	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but in any case it should be systematically assessed	c	1	2	3	4	5
	1.4.2	PIM for investment/fundraising/bids - which suits?						
		PIM results are/would be used for internal improvements	a	1	2	3	4	5
		PIM results should be used for investment and fundraising	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but would be interested if PIM results could raise cash	c	1	2	3	4	5
	1.4.3	Investment readiness - which description suits you best?						
		Internal investment is primary, and based on past results	a	1	2	3	4	5
		External investment is primary, and current results matter	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but could develop attractive investment evidence	c	1	2	3	4	5

ROC INTERVIEW

APPENDIX 23/c

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Risk management (B2)	
How would you describe the current risk management system?	We use a traffic light system
Is risk assessment driven by umbrella bodies (e.g. churches), funders or ROC policy?	ROC's policy but clearly affected by external factors
What changes, if any, would you like to see in the way risk is managed?	Our existing system needs to be more widely understood, endorsed and applied
PIM for investment/fundraising/bids (B3)	
When needs and opportunities are identified, do you sometimes need to raise funds?	Yes, frequently, mainly restricted funds raised for specific development projects
If external funds were needed, where would you be looking to raise funds (e.g. govt, donors, etc)?	Initially with individual donors (we cover general costs from unrestricted/general funds) then local govt and trusts for specific projects
If external funds were needed, what performance requirements would you expect?	Reporting against outcomes (not so much outputs) signposted in original application - need to provide clear evidence
Investment readiness (B3)	
Why is external investment primary?	We are enjoying a popular groundswell, a sense of ownership across a wide constituency (e.g. supportive
Is this likely to change, and if so why?	Not likely to change
Can you define your work as a group in a single phrase or sentence (your 'USP')?	Building strong healthy communities through strategic partnerships

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

DCT Theme	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers					
COLLABORATION	2.1	Relational Capabilities						
	2.1.1	Proactive engagement - which description suits you best?						
		Stakeholder engagement is conducted on a 'needs' basis	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Stakeholder engagement is planned and strategically managed	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but any change would have to be cost-effective	c	1	2	3	4	5
	2.1.2	Stakeholders - which description suits you best?						
		Key stakeholders are trustees, management, and some staff	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Key stakeholders include our beneficiaries , critics and others	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but stakeholder consultation is mainly for research	c	1	2	3	4	5
	2.2	Collaborative Capability						
	2.2.2	Intra-sector collaboration - which description suits you best?						
		We are quite self-sufficient, so don't seek much collaboration	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Intra-sector collaboration is essential for survival and growth	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but a clear strategy could be useful if it wasn't costly	c	1	2	3	4	5
	2.2.3	Cross-sector collaboration - which description suits you best?						
		Little or no collaboration, unless for low-risk financial gain	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Despite mutual misunderstanding, we would like to explore	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but above all we need to protect against mission drift	c	1	2	3	4	5

ROC INTERVIEW

APPENDIX 23/d

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Relational Capabilities	
Proactive engagement (B4)	
What criteria in proactivity do you prioritise (e.g. administering, learning, collaboration, cost, benefit)?	Trying to think ahead to see the big organisational picture, not getting bogged down in the minutiae; spending large amounts of time supporting and facilitating our agents Co-ordinators (R.A.s)/t, paid)) and
Most of your engagement is at a strategic level - does this connect fully with social action activities?	We try to ensure that we keep our first love for people/communities as paramount, the rest is means
If you could reorganise your proactive engagements, what would you prioritise?	Our beneficiaries, our employees (esp. training and development), and building strategic alliances/partnerships
Stakeholders (B4)	
What value is/could be gained from meetings with your key stakeholders?	The initial ROC conversations are consultative with local Christians for their communities, therefore they are accurate and based on a 5 year vision for that community. Our follow-up is not structured or robust
Do you map and/or manage your stakeholders?	Not at the present time - we are building a database to do this
How would you like to prioritise existing and potential stakeholders (admin, need, impact, cash-flow, etc...)?	Main customers - ambassadors, supporters and the people they are serving;
Collaborative Capability	
Intra-sector collaboration (B4)	
What exactly is intra-sector collaboration helping to survive and grow?	Charitable aims
What benefits do you look for in intra-sector collaboration?	Shared aims and objectives; good synergy and shared values; reduced costs and economies with resource sharing and expenditure
What benefits are your intra-sector collaborators/partners looking for?	Generally the above
Cross-sector collaboration (A3)	
What do other sectors have that you would like to access or share?	Financial and people resources; occasionally business support systems/equipment
If you were to consider cross-sector collaboration, which economic sector appeals to you most?	Private
Collaboration is for mutual benefit - what benefits?	Vital to see the link through to beneficiaries - that is where the benefit must be

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

DCT Theme	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers						
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	2.3	Social Entrepreneurship							
	2.3.1	Entrepreneurialism - which description suits you best?							
		Entrepreneurialism is unnecessary in charities	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Entrepreneurialism is useful as ethical, creative opportunism	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but to consider it seriously would be a major change	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	2.3.2	Innovation - which description suits you best?							
		Innovation is gradual and is the responsibility of top executives	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Innovation demands change, and all staff are responsible	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but innovation is safest when copying proven models	c	1	2	3	4	5	
	2.4	Change							
	2.4.1	Change readiness - which description suits you best?							
		Change should be incremental, and planned in advance	a	1	2	3	4	5	
		Change management requires reactive and proactive skills	b	1	2	3	4	5	
		Unsure, but for it to be useful it needs to be widely understood	c	1	2	3	4	5	

ROC INTERVIEW

APPENDIX 23/e

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Social Entrepreneurship	
Entrepreneurialism (B4)	
How do you define entrepreneurialism?	Creativity, risk taking, asking God to refresh the vision
What ethical criteria do you consider relevant for entrepreneurialism?	Acting responsibly, protecting ROC from mission drift, retaining focus, testing our heart motivations regularly
Does your role encourage entrepreneurial action?	Yes, strongly linked to innovation (The CEO, Debra, is a 'big picture' person, hard to keep up with at times -
Innovation (B4)	
Do you see your role as leader involving innovation for single or numerous organisations?	Big issue for us; we aim to support from the centre with a light touch - encouraging our agents (regions/branches) to be linked in to the centre but creatively independent in meeting local needs, at
What known challenges require innovative solutions?	The relationship between ROC at the centre with the initiatives in the regions - we need a clear model (looking at CAP and Alpha course)
What proactive approach (if any) is used to identify potential/unknown innovations (e.g.enquiry, feedback, research)?	Innovation has to be an important part of our culture; the Balanced Scorecard will help to promote this area
Change	
Change readiness (B3)	
Are you empowered by your role to identify, recommend, and drive change?	Yes, absolutely
How do you recruit support and prepare key stakeholders for change?	Done mainly unconsciously and informally, but we have started to plan meetings thoughtfully in advance - understanding the other party's position and aiming for a 'win-win' results
How are less involved stakeholders' concerns taken into account?	More thought needs to be given to this, to avoid disenfranchisement, we need to affirm less prominent stakeholders
What roles/influence do prayer and fellowship play?	Very important, it was the bedrock of God's move across the UK when we began in 2004; need to avoid it

ROC QUESTIONNAIRE

DCT Theme	Ref.	QUESTIONNAIRE - questions	QUESTIONNAIRE - answers					
GROWTH	2.5	Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability						
	2.5.1	Effective decision-making - which description suits you best?						
		Speed is paramount so only low staff input is needed	a	1	2	3	4	5
		The objectivity and inclusivity of the process is paramount	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but protect our culture while improving effectiveness	c	1	2	3	4	5
	2.5.2	Social outcomes or impacts - which description suits you best?						
		Beneficial results from the organisation which can be proved	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Beneficial results which the recipient is known to value	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but some public good aligned with our social mission	c	1	2	3	4	5
	2.6	Firm Growth						
	2.6.1	Manageable scaling up - which description suits you best?						
		Moderate, incremental increases in work volumes	a	1	2	3	4	5
		Flexibility to cope with large stepped increases in volumes	b	1	2	3	4	5
		Unsure, but sufficient capability to cope without overload	c	1	2	3	4	5

ROC INTERVIEW

APPENDIX 23/f

INTERVIEW - questions	INTERVIEW - answers
Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability	
Effective decision-making (A4)	
What are the main challenges to effective decision making facing you as a national body?	Having a clear org structure with roles and responsibilities; taking on too much and making decisions too quickly, often at a tactical level
What improvements would you like to see in decision-making, if any?	Senior managers taking the time to think and act more strategically
What methods could realise these changes (e.g. structure, culture, communications, etc)?	Better structure, more clearly defined an understood roles across the organisation; more considered use of email
Social outcomes or impacts (A4)	
How do your beneficiaries identify the outcomes they value most?	Varies between beneficiaries, local people often respond via the framework of a 'conversation', agencies plan in advance, the Police record comprehensive data and are normally very clear about their objectives
Do you currently use any outcomes or impacts frameworks?	No, we support the idea, but do not use them much yet - our partners and funders are keen to measure
If you don't, what value would you expect them to add to your activity?	We would use them to identify where our resources could be most effectively allocated (in terms of outcomes). We need to test our results with our beneficiaries (end-users)
Firm Growth	
Manageable scaling up (B2)	
How do you expect to grow as an organisation in the next 3 years (e.g. more staff, partnerships, mergers & acquisitions)?	Mainly organic - but avoiding just adding more activities; being alive to potential for partnerships; need to set ambitious vision-linked goals that support the evolving vision; avoid simply increasing staff numbers.
Any alliance/combination involves structure and interdependence - how do you see this?	Ensure clarity and openness from the start on all aspects, e.g. resources, HR, activities, nailing the single joint objective
How could you reach more people with existing/new services?	Nothing succeeds like success - people are coming to us at present, we are trying to identify the high

SE = proactivity, innovation, risk-taking (a = 5, b = 10, c = 1) - these scores inform SE propensity in CSACs

Agreement = Likert reactivity (a) - proactivity (b) scale agreement strengths (e.g. b1, where b scores 10) inform interviews and interpretation

TSAEP Director & Deputy Director			TSAEP SE & Business Development Managers			TSAEP - Av. of Directors and Managers			CTE CEO & Regional Director			ROC COO - Chief Operating Officer			CROSS CASE SUMMARY		
Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement
BUSINESS SERVICES			BUSINESS SERVICES			BUSINESS SERVICES			BUSINESS SERVICES			BUSINESS SERVICES			BUSINESS SERVICES		
1.1	Performance Management		1.1	Performance Management		1.1	Performance Management		1.1	Performance Management		1.1	Performance Management		1.1	Performance Management	
1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)		1.1.1	Performance measures (PMs)	
b1/b2	20	3	a4	10	8	a4	10	8	a4	5	4	b3	10	3	a	15	12
1.1.2	Efficient systems		1.1.2	Efficient systems		1.1.2	Efficient systems		1.1.2	Efficient systems		1.1.2	Efficient systems		1.1.2	Efficient systems	
a1	5	1	a3/a4	10	7	a3/a4	15	8	a5	5	5	a4	5	4	a	25	17
b1	10	1	no answer			no answer	10	1							b	10	1
1.1.3	Quality service delivery		1.1.3	Quality service delivery		1.1.3	Quality service delivery		1.1.3	Quality service delivery		1.1.3	Quality service delivery		1.1.3	Quality service delivery	
b1	20	2	a2	5	2	a2	5	2	b4	10	4	b3	10	3	a	5	2
						b1	20	2							b	40	9
						actual	80	24							c	0	0
							120	60							actual	125	47
						% actual	67%	40%							possible	180	90
															% actual	69%	52%
															% av act	72%	64%
GOVERNANCE			GOVERNANCE			GOVERNANCE			GOVERNANCE			GOVERNANCE			GOVERNANCE		
1.2	Strategy		1.2	Strategy		1.2	Strategy		1.2	Strategy		1.2	Strategy		1.2	Strategy	
1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts		1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts		1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts		1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts		1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts		1.2.1	PIM for social outcomes/impacts	
b1	20	2	a1/a3	10	4	a1/a3	10	4	a2	5	2	b3	10	3	a	15	6
1.3	Policies & Processes		1.3	Policies & Processes		1.3	Policies & Processes		1.3	Policies & Processes		1.3	Policies & Processes		1.3	Policies & Processes	
1.3.1	Internal policy input		1.3.1	Internal policy input		1.3.1	Internal policy input		1.3.1	Internal policy input		1.3.1	Internal policy input		1.3.1	Internal policy input	
b2	20	4	a4	5	4	a4	5	4	b4	10	4	a4	5	4	a	10	8
1.3.2	Government policy input		1.3.2	Government policy input		1.3.2	Government policy input		1.3.2	Government policy input		1.3.2	Government policy input		1.3.2	Government policy input	
b3	20	6	c2	1	2	c2	1	2	b3	10	3	b3	10	3	b	30	8
			b3/b4	20	7	b3/b4	40	13							c	1	2
						actual	96	29							1.3.2	Government policy input	
							120	60							a	0	0
						% actual	80%	48%							b	60	20
															c	0	0
															actual	146	49
															possible	180	90
															% actual	81%	54%
															% av act	82%	61%
RESOURCE INVESTMENT			RESOURCE INVESTMENT			RESOURCE INVESTMENT			RESOURCE INVESTMENT			RESOURCE INVESTMENT			RESOURCE INVESTMENT		
1.4	Performance & Investment		1.4	Performance & Investment		1.4	Performance & Investment		1.4	Performance & Investment		1.4	Performance & Investment		1.4	Performance & Investment	
1.4.1	Risk management		1.4.1	Risk management		1.4.1	Risk management		1.4.1	Risk management		1.4.1	Risk management		1.4.1	Risk management	
b3/b4	20	7	a2	5	2	a2	5	2	c2	1	2	b2	10	2	a	5	2
1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/bids		1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/l		1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/bids		1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/bids		1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/bids		1.4.2	PIM: investment/fundraising/bids	
b2/b3	20	5	a3	10	6	a3	10	6	b3	10	3	a4	5	4	b	40	11
1.4.3	Investment readiness		1.4.3	Investment readiness		1.4.3	Investment readiness		1.4.3	Investment readiness		1.4.3	Investment readiness		1.4.3	Investment readiness	
b2	20	4	c1/c2	2	3	b2	20	5	a4	5	4	b3	10	3	c	0	0
						b2	20	4							a	5	4
						c1/c2	2	3							b	30	7
						actual	87	29							c	2	3
							120	60							actual	133	46
						% actual	73%	48%							possible	180	90
															% actual	74%	51%
															% av act	75%	54%
Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement	Ref	SE	agreement

SUMMARY CROSS CASE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

APPENDIX 24/b

TSAEP

TSAEP Director & Deputy Director

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
b1/b2	20	3
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
b3	20	6
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
b2/b3	20	5
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
b2	20	4

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

b1/b2	20	3
2.3.2 Innovation		
b2	20	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

b1/b2	20	3
-------	----	---

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

b2	20	4
2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts		
b1/b3	20	4

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

a2	5	2
b1	10	1

#REF!		#REF!
a's	#REF!	#REF!
b's	#REF!	#REF!
c's	#REF!	#REF!
questions	#REF!	#REF!

Ref	SE	agreement
-----	----	-----------

treat as one response, from two people

TSAEP

TSAEP SE & Business Development Managers

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
a3	5	3
c3	1	3
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
a3	5	3
b5	10	5
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
b1/b4	20	5
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
a2	5	2
b2	10	2

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

b3	10	3
c4	1	4
2.3.2 Innovation		
a2	5	2
c4	1	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

b1/b2	20	3
-------	----	---

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

a3	5	3
b4	10	4
2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts		
b4	10	4
c3	1	3

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

b2	10	2
c1	1	1

#REF!		#REF!
a's	#REF!	#REF!
b's	#REF!	#REF!
c's	#REF!	#REF!
questions	#REF!	#REF!

Ref	SE	agreement
-----	----	-----------

treat as one response, from two people

TSAEP

TSAEP - Av. of Directors and Managers

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
a3	5	3
b1/b2	20	3
c3	1	3
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
a3	5	3
b5	30	11
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
b1/b4	40	10
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
a2	5	2
b2	30	6
actual	136	41
possible	160	80
% actual	85%	51%

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

b1/b2/b3	30	6
c4	1	4
2.3.2 Innovation		
a2	5	2
b2	20	4
c4	1	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

b1/b2	40	6
-------	----	---

actual	97	26
--------	----	----

possible	120	60
----------	-----	----

% actual	81%	43%
----------	-----	-----

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

a3	5	3
----	---	---

b2/b4	30	8
-------	----	---

2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts

b4	30	8
----	----	---

c3	1	3
----	---	---

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

a2	5	2
b2	20	3
c1	1	1

actual	92	28
--------	----	----

possible	120	60
----------	-----	----

% actual	77%	47%
----------	-----	-----

% actual	#REF!	#REF!
----------	-------	-------

#REF!		#REF!
-------	--	-------

a's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

b's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

c's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

questions	#REF!	#REF!
-----------	-------	-------

Ref	SE	agreement
-----	----	-----------

CTE

CEO & Regional Director

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
a4	5	4
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
b4	10	4
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
b5	10	5
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
a4	5	5
actual	30	18
possible	40	20
% actual	75%	90%

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

c3	1	3
2.3.2 Innovation		
a4	5	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

b3	10	3
----	----	---

actual	16	10
--------	----	----

possible	30	15
----------	----	----

% actual	53%	67%
----------	-----	-----

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

b5	10	5
----	----	---

2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts

c3	1	3
----	---	---

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

c4	1	4
----	---	---

actual	12	12
--------	----	----

possible	30	15
----------	----	----

% actual	40%	80%
----------	-----	-----

% actual	#REF!	#REF!
----------	-------	-------

#REF!		#REF!
-------	--	-------

a's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

b's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

c's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

questions	#REF!	#REF!
-----------	-------	-------

Ref	SE	agreement
-----	----	-----------

treat as one response, from two people who agreed scores

ROC

COO - Chief Operating Officer

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
b4	10	4
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
b4	10	4
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
b4	10	4
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
a3	5	3
actual	35	15
possible	40	20
% actual	88%	75%

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

b4	10	4
2.3.2 Innovation		
b4	10	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

b3	10	3
----	----	---

actual	30	11
--------	----	----

possible	30	15
----------	----	----

% actual	100%	73%
----------	------	-----

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts Capability

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

a4	5	4
----	---	---

2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts

a4	5	4
----	---	---

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

b2	10	2
----	----	---

actual	20	10
--------	----	----

possible	30	15
----------	----	----

% actual	67%	67%
----------	-----	-----

% actual	#REF!	#REF!
----------	-------	-------

#REF!		#REF!
-------	--	-------

a's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

b's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

c's	#REF!	#REF!
-----	-------	-------

questions	#REF!	#REF!
-----------	-------	-------

Ref	SE	agreement
-----	----	-----------

CROSS CASE SUMMARY

Seven Respondents

Ref	SE	agreement
COLLABORATION		
2.1 Relational Capabilities		
2.1.1 Proactive engagement		
a	10	7
b	30	7
c	1	3
2.1.2 Stakeholders		
a	5	3
b	50	19
c	0	0
2.2 Alliance-based Capabilities		
2.2.2 Intra-sector collaboration		
a	0	0
b	60	19
c	0	0
2.2.3 Cross-sector collaboration		
a	15	10
b	30	6
c	0	0
actual	201	74
possible	240	120
% actual	84%	62%
% av act	83%	72%

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

2.3 Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Entrepreneurialism

a	0	0
b	40	10
c	2	7
2.3.2 Innovation		
a	10	6
b	30	8
c	1	4

2.4 Change readiness

2.4.1 Change readiness

a	0	0
---	---	---

b	60	12
---	----	----

c	0	0
---	---	---

actual	143	47
--------	-----	----

possible	180	90
----------	-----	----

% actual	79%	52%
----------	-----	-----

% av act	78%	61%
----------	-----	-----

GROWTH

2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts

2.5.1 Effective decision-making

a	10	7
---	----	---

b	40	13
---	----	----

c	0	0
---	---	---

2.5.2 Social outcomes or impacts

a	5	4
---	---	---

b	30	8
---	----	---

c	2	6
---	---	---

2.6 Firm Growth

2.6.1 Manageable scaling up

a	5	2
b	30	5
c	2	5

actual

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	Research Strands & Questions		
		1.1 Performance Management	TSAEP	Business services required significant investment to deliver efficient, effective support
			CTE	Business services could provide vital integrated strategic stewardship information
			ROC	Business services could provide stronger support through evolving PIM measures
		1.1.1 <i>Performance measures (PMs)</i>		
		1.1.2 <i>Efficient systems</i>	Patterns	<i>Efficiency in all cases could be improved by prioritising measurable performance</i>
		1.1.3 <i>Quality service delivery</i>		<i>Resource-based performance could be universally improved if it was better measured and managed</i>
			Explanations	These cases all developed unique performance measurement and management methods . All were proactively or reactively responding to environmental stimuli, especially from key stakeholders (internal and external) and markets. Where PIM was closely linked to missional economic and social rents , performance improved.
			Synthesis	Traditional prevalent low cost priority for PIM in charities results in suboptimal resource allocation to achieve SCA . SE means achieved comparatively higher rents, and direct mission effectiveness .

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	GOVERNANCE	Research Strands & Questions		
		1.2 Strategy	TSAEP	Governance for strategic agility in turbulent markets needs a flatter/responsive structure
		1.2.1 <i>PIM for social outcomes/impacts</i>	CTE	Governance has the potential to enhance missional performance via VRIO resources
			ROC	Governance is becoming more professional and targeted on greater impacts
		1.3 Policies & Processes	Patterns	<i>In all cases firm governance formally managed the performance of VRIO resources, at least for regulatory compliance, and at best for SCA. Impacts on risk reduction and long-term performance could only be inferred from financial results.</i>
		1.3.1 <i>Internal policy input</i>		<i>Where mission-based strategy was clearly linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts were realised.</i>
		1.3.2 <i>Government policy input</i>		<i>CSACs' appreciation of their unique resource position governance varied, and different policy and process priorities yielded commensurate performance results</i>
			Explanations	In the absence of clear understanding of the value-creating importance of VRIO resources , they were not optimally employed through the governance policy and process to maximise social impacts . Where directly linked through strategy , results were improved.
			Synthesis	Unlike SE governance , bureaucratic structures and tertiary multistakeholder constraints militate against resource optimisation for strategic SO-SI. However, they may still achieve their missions effectively in the short-term, but are unlikely to achieve SCA .

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	Research Strands & Questions		
		1.4 Performance & Investment	TSAEP	Resource investment needs a VRIO performance base to achieve mission and SCA
		1.4.1 <i>Risk management</i>	CTE	Resource investment should identify and assess low risk innovations for growth
		1.4.2 <i>PIM for investment/fund-raising/bids</i>	ROC	Resource investment could be enhanced by resource analysis and VRIO valuation
		1.4.3 <i>Investment readiness</i>		
			Patterns	Where the firms' resource investment was based on social performance evidence, SE income and investment resources increased. However, other performance results could also have elicited income and investment resources.
				Although inferred by comparative income and growth results, the positive impact of relevant firm and industry results on resource investment decisions was not directly linked through research data.
			Explanations	Competition for results-based contracts is increasing, contract performance criteria are becoming more tightly prescribed, and investors from all sectors link investment-readiness to risk management and auditable returns on investment
			Synthesis	The links between VRIO resource performance and investment readiness are poorly understood in all cases. Where SE means are most directly deployed, these links are most clearly inferred by relatively higher external investment and more SO-SI projects

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	Research Strands & Questions		
		2.1 Relational Capabilities	TSAEP	Collaboration suggests major opportunities within an empowered/devolved structure
		2.1.1 <i>Proactive engagement</i>	CTE	Collaboration would benefit from stakeholder mapping, evaluation and management
		2.1.2 <i>Stakeholders</i>	ROC	Collaboration can benefit from systematic management of complex relationships
		2.2 Alliance-based Capability	Patterns	<i>The cases confirm that where growth and scalability have been achieved in turbulent markets, SE models involving relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities have been deployed.</i>
		2.2.1 <i>Intra-sector collaboration</i>		<i>The cases confirm that where relational capabilities have been proactively and strategically developed and deployed, competitive advantage followed</i>
				<i>In some cases where firms have shown the capability to collaborate through alliances, they have seized optimal market opportunities.</i>
		2.2.2 <i>Cross-sector collaboration</i>	Explanations	Turbulent thin markets reward dynamic collaborative capabilities to achieve SCA. Embedded traditional and cultural attitudes to collaboration affect managers' ability to recognise firm needs and market opportunities. Strong internal and intra-sector trust and mutual interests have not always been optimised, probably due to independent missional views. Entrepreneurial, dynamic collaboration alone does not explain successful market ventures.
			Synthesis	All senior executives showed an interest in firm dynamic capabilities for developing technical and evolutionary fitness . Most revealed knowledge was context-specific and not systematically managed for relational and alliance-based advantage. Mission effectiveness was most clearly enhanced where collaboration was dynamic and entrepreneurial .

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Research Strands & Questions 2.3 Social Capability 2.3.1 <i>Entrepreneurialism</i> 2.3.2 <i>Innovation</i>		
			TSAEP	Social Enterprise demands counter-cultural approaches to proactivity, innovation, and risk-taking
			CTE	Social Enterprise means and methods could be usefully considered for adaptation
			ROC	Social Enterprise risk-opportunity methods can optimise life cycle risks-reward opportunities
		2.4 Change Readiness 2.4.1 <i>Change readiness</i>	Patterns	<i>Where SE principles were adopted (and dynamic strategic management was deployed) in universally complex and unstable market conditions, innovation and change were prioritised for planning and later implementation.</i>
				<i>Where SE dynamic capabilities were most evident, new products, processes, structures and business models were created. By inference these probably contributed to increased income.</i>
				<i>All the case charities sought to exploit their current positions, paths and processes, albeit with different levels of dynamic capability and strategic freedom. Structural and cultural resistance to change was highest in the firms least open to SE means.</i>
				All respondents faced turbulent markets, some more directly through engagement with social services than others. Changing social markets are risky, and demand product and market innovations to meet excess social demand and to create demand for high impact services. Recognition of potential need to generate trading income in competitive markets was patchy, suggesting scope for adapting SE means.
			Explanations	
			Synthesis	Overall, strategic dynamic capabilities for scalability through SE means were underdeveloped. This is not surprising given the traditional charity legal form and risk-averse culture. If firm viability was threatened, resistance to changes would be reduced where improved mission effectiveness could be anticipated.

CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Case & Analytic Technique	Thematic Narrative
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	Research Strands & Questions		
		2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts	TSAEP	Growth for scalability based on SO-SI capability are manageable but challenging
		2.5.1 <i>Effective decision-making</i>	CTE	Growth for scalability may be advisable given undersupply, within a manageable remit
		2.5.2 <i>Social outcomes or impacts</i>	ROC	Growth is mission effective because it is underpinned by prayer and Biblical values
		2.6 Firm growth	Patterns	<i>The case data confirms that relevant strategic management capabilities are required for each of their very different specific firm and industry settings. Manageable, non-random and size-independent growth was most clearly evident where SE means were used.</i>
			Explanations	The proactivity and urgency with which firms responded to perceived needs and opportunities was reflected in the the effectiveness of their decision-making processes, their demonstrable social performance results, and their recorded scalable growth. In undersupplied local social markets which attract government funding, SE means promoted rapid growth. Where these thin markets are large and centralised, competition from business is intense in order to exploit existing economies of scale using plentiful corporate working capital. In monopolistic supply-driven markets where results to beneficiaries are intangible and weakly linked to resource investment returns, market shaping and product alignment suggest means to growth and scale.
		2.6.1 <i>Manageable scaling up</i>	Synthesis	All cases demonstrated a growing awareness of the centrality of mission-centric impacts . Notwithstanding, priorities for verifiable SO-SI varied, making causal inferences context-specific. Likewise, the dynamic capabilities deployed to optimise resources and capabilities in order to maintain firm size or achieve persistent growth also varied. However, evaluation of these capabilities and the market opportunities available to participants are beyond the scope of this research. Nonetheless, the limited data revealed that growth and scalability for mission effectiveness were most clearly linked to SE means in current markets.

**A CHARGE
TO THE VERY REVD JUSTIN WELBY
CONFIRMED ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY**

**FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK
The Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Tucker Mugabi Sentamu**

To our well-beloved brother in Christ, Justin, now Archbishop of Canterbury

Recalling God's mission entrusted by Christ to His Church to proclaim God's Kingdom, to heal the sick and to make disciples of all nations, I now set before you the key tasks identified for you by the Crown Nominations Commission, to guide you as you prepare to take up your new office and ministry

- to lead the Church of England as we seek to grow and welcome new members; to inspire us in our exploration of the Christian faith and of the many possibilities for sharing the gospel across the different communities we serve; to embolden us in confident expression of our faith; and to encourage us in creative mission;
- to enable us to celebrate what we share in the diversity of our Anglican tradition and to draw us together in the common bonds that unite; to deepen our dialogue and understanding of each other; to empower us in valuing the gift of our breadth as we share the gospel;
- to provide moral and spiritual leadership for the nation; to ensure that the prophetic Christian voice is heard and respected in public discourse and debate; and to develop our transforming ministry in socially and economically deprived communities;
- to build up a sense of shared responsibility for our mission and ministry across the Church structures and to encourage mutual respect and shared endeavour; to enable the Church to be better equipped to deliver effective mission and growth through appropriate organisational change and by encouraging and challenging clergy in their ministry and lay people as they live out their Christian witness in the world;
- to encourage the Anglican Communion as it explores the next stages of its journey in Christian fellowship; to build relationships with fellow primates and to draw the quiet voices into debate and discussion; to enable the Church in England in developing a deeper understanding of the potential of the Anglican Communion as a worldwide Christian family within which we can all learn and grow;
- to deepen relationships with longstanding and new ecumenical partners seeking possibilities for practical outworking of a shared gospel at local, national and international level;
- to deepen relationships with leaders of other faiths and to provide a voice for "faith" in a developing secularist agenda; to work with other faith leaders to encourage active partnership in working for the common good, especially for enhanced community cohesion.

So may the Lord of heaven, who gives you the will to undertake these things, give you also the strength to perform them, and by his divine providence may his holy angels succour and defend you on earth; and may his Grace and Blessing be with you at all times. Amen

The Lord Archbishop of York

***Gilbert, Founder of the Glibertine Order, 1189
4th February 2013***

RBT CROSS-CASE SYNTHESIS (EVIDENCE in the light of PROPOSITIONS)

RBT argues that when resources are controlled according to particular criteria, then firms perform more effectively in competitive markets.

RESOURCE-BASED THEORY (RBT) - RBT alone is NOT adequate to produce MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

<i>P1/a</i>	<i>That when a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm effectiveness will be improved.</i> <i>Found:</i> All the cases revealed the importance of systems to measure and manage performance in order to improve the efficient delivery of quality mission-centric services. Thus P1/a was supported.
1.1	<i>That when business services identify, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.</i>

RBT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see Section 4.6.2)

1. It identifies core resource and capability *categories* ;
RBT identifies core categories for performance measurement and management, which improve efficiency and effectiveness

RBT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 4.6.2)

1. ***No guidance given on how to identify and prioritise specific VRIO resources;***
RBT links resources to profits, not fundable social impacts for NFPs

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

APPENDIX 27/b (RBT)

P1/b *That when firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.*

Found: None of the cases managed resources through specific VRIO frameworks to reduce risk and improve long-term performance. One case linked resources directly to social impacts with positive results. Thus P1/b was partially supported.

1.2 *That when mission-based strategy is linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.*

RBT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see Section 4.6.2)

3. It **contextualises** operations in a widely defined competitive
RBT enhances **competitive sustainability in strategic factor markets** - where the cost of product/market resources is determined

4. It **facilitates PIMM by prioritising VRIO resources within strategy**;
RBT seeks **efficiency via strategic performance of VRIO resources**, by **better understanding of the value of product/market resources**

6. It provides guidance on **vertical integration, diversification and**
RBT draws on transaction cost economics to determine **firm boundaries**, which enable it to assess **relative costs/profits of creating-accessing new competitive resources affordably**

RBT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 4.6.2)

valuing nonprofit VRIO capabilities and leveraging them

RBT does not advise how to identify and rank VRIO resources in support of strategy

4. **No guidance on assessing/comparing resource heterogeneity and immobility**;
RBT provides general, not ME, guidance on journey factors, nor internal and external perceptions (e.g. Value, impact)

6. **Little guidance on mixed cooperative-competitive resource relationships**;
RBT focuses on the individual firm, and does not address cooperative-collaborative relationships in nonprofits

1.3 *That when a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that take due regard of*

RBT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see Section 4.6.2)

3. It **contextualises** operations in a widely defined competitive
RBT addresses firms' **unique circumstances to deliver rent/profits**

5. It promotes **SCA via capabilities in IT, culture, trust, and human**
RBT's optimisation of resources **depends on intl/extl policies** to exploit its unique resource position where **heterogenous expectations** in strategic factor markets are **not over/underpriced**

RBT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 4.6.2)

3. **No guidance given on how to link financial and social performance**;
RBT does not advise how to value and leverage VRIO resources through policy

5. **Little guidance on path dependency, causal ambiguity, and social complexity**;
RBT seeks competitive differentiation for SCA, whereas social services favour some homogeneity and immobility

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

APPENDIX 27/c (RBT)

P1/c

That when firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.

Found: Only one of the cases deployed social outcomes metrics to successfully manage the acquisition of investment resources. Thus P1/c is tentatively supported.

1.4

That when the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.

RBT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see Section 4.6.2)

2. It prioritises **financial returns which can be related to social results**; **2.** *RBT promotes efficiency, essential for ME, by increasing operational profits using financial analysis. By monetising social results (e.g. SROI), SE/trading profitability can be increased.*

7. It illuminates **critical success factors for social investment** in the *RBT* prioritises resource-based performance, notably for CSACs from **reputation, trust and human resources**. **Market share** is affected by yield and expense ratios, (Barney 244), and economies of scale are affected by **firm specific learning speeds**. *RBT* emphasises **HR, IT, Marketing and Entrepreneurship disciplines**.

RBT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 4.6.2)

No guidance on valuing nonprofit VRIO capabilities and leveraging them;

RBT does not directly link resource investment (e.g. In IT) to social performance

7. Little guidance on resource-specific approaches to external service investors.

RBT prioritises aspects of resource-based investment (e.g. In IT systems) with no reference to rigorous external criteria

DCT CROSS-CASE SYNTHESIS (EVIDENCE in the light of PROPOSITIONS)

DCT argues that when organisations can effectively develop and deploy their capabilities in a certain manner, then they will grow strategically in turbulent markets.

DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT) - DCT alone is NOT adequate to produce MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

P2/a

Collaboration: - That when firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the **strategic collaboration growth** option is

Found: Only one case recognised a need for SE-type relational and alliance based capabilities, and successfully scaled up. Thus

P2/a is only tentatively supported.

2.1

That when relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.

DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)

1. It explains the role of relational capabilities in key stakeholder networks;

DCT achieves relational advantage from: creating relationship-specific assets, access to complementary capabilities, interfirm knowledge-sharing, effective governance which limits costs

2. It proactively deploys relational capabilities to exploit market opportunities;

DCT prepares the ground for alliances through relational capabilities, notably knowledge management processes

2.2

That when firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.

DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)

3. It facilitates inter and cross-sector alliances to optimise asset orchestration;

DCT frames alliances in terms of resource acquisition for SCA and growth in markets.

DCT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 5.6.2)

1. Overlap with alternative constructs, e.g. first mover advantage and absorptive capacity;

DCT seeks growth and scale by developing and deploying strategic relational capabilities which overlap with relevant but unspecified alternative constructs

3. Little guidance on the prioritisation and costs of new capabilities in changing situations;

DCT more correctly offers a general quasi-commercial approach, but it does address thin markets (e.g. Social) e.g. Helfat 24)

P2/b

SE: - That when firms adopt **social entrepreneurship principles and practices** in their deployment of strategic management**Found:** Only one case deployed SE means to innovate and change for success in turbulent markets. In the others where innovation and change were slow, their results clearly suffered. Thus P2/b is supported.

2.3

That when charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.**DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)**

4. It promotes SE via innovative products, processes and business models;

DCT advocates evolutionary fitness influenced by: technical fitness, market demand and competition. It is executive led via DCs [tech fitness] to achieve org perf/strat outcomes [evolutionary fitness] (Helfat: 8, 47)

DCT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 5.6.2)

7. Little guidance on potential links between firm product/market growth and sector scale.

DCT is commercial/forprofit, primarily addressing consumer markets where demand can be stimulated, rather than under-supplied thin markets undergoing change

2.4

That when charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.**DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)**

5. It facilitates strategic change for operations in volatile competitive markets;
- DCT requires the 'orchestration' of assets in thin markets faced by CSACs. Resource allocation works for thin markets, but volatile markets require reconfiguration that goes beyond coordination and adaptation. Co & Mkt shape each other

DCT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 5.6.2)

5. Little guidance on assessing a firm's readiness to collaborate, innovate, or change;
- DCT provides only general guidance for organisations that are entirely market-centric, unlike charities and SEs.

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

APPENDIX 27/f (DCT)

P2/c

Growth: - That when firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve **mission-centric social outcomes and**
Found: Only one case purposefully connected social results directly to growth to achieve missional growth. Thus P2/c is only tentatively supported.

2.5

That when firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts, then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.

DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)

6. It enhances capabilities to create strategic value via social outcomes/impacts;
DCT show innovation (new combinations) as central to growth. Management skills & Org structures are central to entrepreneurial DC performance.

DCT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 5.6.2)

4. Little guidance on leverage to influence decision-makers on the need for change;
DCT assumes, or rather implies that top executive leadership will somehow grasp the potential for dynamic responses to thin, undersupplied, volatile social markets

2.6

That when manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.

DCT SUPPORTS THIS PROPOSITION (strengths - see 5.6.2)

2. It proactively deploys relational capabilities to exploit market opportunities;
DCT accepts higher knowledge/managerial costs where necessary, through the employment of talented professionals
7. It harnesses product/market potential for firm growth and operational scale.
DCTs are applied to promote persistent growth and also maintaining firm size (Helfat 108) via DCs (inc org processes), but more research needed.

DCT DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION (weaknesses - see Section 5.6.2)

2. Some alternatives may offer cheaper (sunk cost) ad-hoc solutions e.g. intrapreneurship;
DCT is expensive to implement if formalised
3. Little guidance on the prioritisation and costs of new capabilities in changing situations;
DCT does not provide specific pointers concerning new capabilities, rather it argues for a range of capabilities that can be adapted to face change.

DRT CROSS-CASE SYNTHESIS (EVIDENCE in the light of PROPOSITIONS)

DRT argues that when the use of ordinary resources and capabilities is optimised and developed through strategic dynamic capabilities - then social and economic sustainability will be achieved, enabling effective mission.

DYNAMIC RESOURCE THEORY (DRT) - hybrid RBT-DCT theory IS adequate to produce MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

DRT SUPPORTS RBT PROPOSITION 1.1 (e.g. Section 8.3.1.1)

1.1 DRT requires VRIN resources to be identified and optimised (e.g. Using PIMM) within a firm-specific, market-responsive, multidisciplinary mission-effective VRIO framework.

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.1 (e.g. Section 8.3.1.2)

2.1 DRT achieves strategic relational advantage from: creating relationship-specific assets, access to complementary capabilities, interfirm knowledge-sharing, effective governance which limits (transaction) costs.

2.1 DRT develops relational capabilities for alliances based on knowledge management processes, i.e. knowledge- articulation; codification; sharing; and internalisation.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 1.1 Basic technical fitness parity in non-competitive simple/stable markets is insufficient to maintain SCA in turbulent markets. Relevant, affordable PIMM is increasingly required to achieve quality service delivery using efficient integrated systems.

Argument: 2.1 Proactive capabilities are theoretically central to multistakeholder mission effectiveness.

DRT Theory: 1.1 When key resources and capabilities and their results are strategically aligned and systematically measured and managed, auditable performance improves.

DRT Theory: 2.1 When firm-based relational capabilities are developed and deployed, alliance-based scalability potential improves.

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

APPENDIX 27/h (DRT)

DRT SUPPORTS RBT PROPOSITION 1.2

1.2 DRT enshrines strategic, responsive links between the economic cost of social product market resources and sustainable spiritual-social mission.

1.2 DRT defines performance in spiritual-social as well as economic terms, for measurement and management through tailored mission-centric PIMM systems for optimal impacts.

1.2 DRT guides strategic resource-based performance and growth for scalable (often partnership-based) operations based mainly on competitive social outcomes and impacts.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 1.2 Strategic value-creation depends on VRIO resources, notably key stakeholders.

DRT Theory

1.2 That if SO-SI are prioritised in strategy and linked to resources and 1.2 - 1.3 Good governance for SCA in turbulent markets demands

DRT SUPPORTS RBT PROPOSITION 1.3

1.3 DRT embeds the VRIO framework in the decision-making strategic development of unique resource positions, using policies and processes to achieve missional strategic objectives.

1.3 DRT identifies, evaluates and leverages firm resources and capabilities for SCA to optimise the performance of essential social impacts via unique products/services.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 1.3 Professional skills are required to design and implement appropriate firm policies and processes which optimise opportunities in complex multistakeholder markets.

DRT Theory

1.3 That if internal policy/process is aligned with critical external policy/process, firm performance improves.

1.2 - 1.3 Good governance for SCA in turbulent markets demands information-driven, knowledge-based optimisation of VRIO resources and capabilities, which in turn favour governance means and methods.

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.2

2.2 DRT facilitates alliance management via knowledge management in: improving knowledge management; providing internal coordination, facilitating intervention and accountability; maintaining external visibility.

2.2 DRT adopts the DCT approach to resource acquisition either discretely, in alliances or by acquisition. Acquisition potential is screened through: selection, identification, reconfiguration.

2.2 DRT adopts DCT's approach to 'sensing' market opportunities via analytical systems and individual capacities to learn and to sense, filter, shape, and calibrate opportunities.

Argument: 2.2 Complex, multistakeholder markets reward well-run collaborative alliances in which reconfigured and orchestrated assets add strategic value and promote growth.

2.2 When appropriate SE approaches are utilised, firms are empowered to innovate and

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.3

2.3 DRT promotes DCT top-down innovative, risk-aware evolutionary fitness to: processes to sense opportunities; enterprise structures, procedures, designs and incentives for seizing opportunities; new products, business models, and continuous alignment and realignment of specific tangible and intangible assets.

Argument: 2.3 Where entrepreneurialism is acceptable to charities, it may require counter-cultural change to innovate and engage in competitive trading.

2.3 That if appropriate SE approaches are utilised, then firms are empowered to innovate and scalability improves.

DRT SUPPORTS RBT PROPOSITION 1.4

1.4 DRT takes into account rigorous external investment criteria in the strategic decision-making and policy processes which promote optimal, (e.g. risk-opportunity) missional social results.

1.4 DRT facilitates industry, competitor and funder analysis for resource allocation and investor approaches. Increased benchmarking and professionalisation assist this process.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 1.4 Internal investment can induce myopic self-sufficiency, but CSACs whose risk-managed performance results meet higher external funding criteria are investment-ready.

DRT Theory

1.4 When robust SO-SI results are linked to optimal resource use, fundability and investability improve.

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.4

2.4 DRT adapts entrepreneurial DCT for continuous change by: combining asset 'orchestration' with processes and relational-alliance capabilities to achieve SCA via search & selection and configuration & deployment capabilities to SO-SI.

2.4 DRT adopts DCT change management guidance whereby: initial positions can be altered to proceed along new strategic paths by means of dynamic capabilities resident in the firm's organisational processes.

Argument: 2.4 Professional change management skills are required to exploit complex market opportunities and strategically develop scale.

2.4 When firms acquire the necessary strategic dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions and embed market-responsive continuous change, then scalability improves.

PROPOSITIONS ASSESSED

APPENDIX 27/j (DRT)

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.5

2.5 DRT bases growth on integrating superior SO-SI performance and market opportunities, enabled by dynamic skills and appropriate structures to optimise the value of resources and capabilities, thus enabling SCA.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 2.5 Funders and service users require hard evidence of SO-SI results that charities may assume take for granted, as a consequence of effective strategic decision making.

DRT Theory

2.5 That if CSACs deploy well-informed and decisive dynamic strategic SE capabilities to demonstrably and verifiably increase SO-SI, then scalability improves.

DRT SUPPORTS DCT PROPOSITION 2.6

2.6 DRT encourages adaptation and learning DCs to acquire necessary firm-specific capabilities, within and guided by the DCT framework. It also advocates professional internal and external support.

2.6 DRT seeks to prioritise the 5 DCT skills for non-random, size-independent growth: 1) learning & innovation processes; 2) business modelling competence; 3) investment allocation decision heuristics; 4) asset orchestration, bargaining and transactional competence; and 5) efficient governance and incentive alignment.

Why and how DRT is adequate (Appendix 28):

Argument: 2.6 With a common vision and professional guidance, the CSAC subsector can achieve SCA and manageable growth and scale based on competitive SO-SI results.

DRT Theory

2.6 That if CSACs exercise those mission-centric SE capabilities which drive SCA in turbulent competitive markets, then they grow individually and increase subsector scalability.

THEORY BUILDING from Management Orientations for SE-related MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

APPENDIX 28/a

THEORY	RBT Theme	RESOURCE BASED THEMES	Priorities for SE-Related Management		Key Stakeholders recognised in CSAC Management Practice								
					INTERNAL			INTERNAL & EXTERNAL	EXTERNAL				
		PREMISE: current markets prioritised as fundable for performance-based scalability are competitive and turbulent	Market priority (trends)	SE priority (av.)	CSAC priority (SE)	Individual	Dept.	Firm	Policies & Processes	Customer & Consumer	Interfirm	Cross-sector	
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	BUSINESS SERVICES (inputs)											
		Performance Management (findings)	mod-high	↑		Mgt	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt & Govt	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	
		Finding: Low cost PIM systems' potential was suboptimal for strategic value creation and for achieving mission as effectively as possible											
	GOVERNANCE	Performance Management (proposed)	mod-high	↑	↑	Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff- Govt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	
		THEORY: Where key resources and capabilities and their results are strategically aligned and systematically measured and managed, performance improves											
	GOVERNANCE	GOVERNANCE (processes)											
		Strategy - PIM for SO-SI (findings)	high	↑		Board-Mgt	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt & Govt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	
		Finding: In CSACs, VRIO resource links to SO-SI are generally not prioritised as verifiable measures for development											
		Strategy - PIM for SO-SI (proposed)	high	↑	↑	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff- Govt	Board-Mgt Staff- Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff- Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff- Stkhld	
		THEORY: Where SO-SI are prioritised in strategy and linked to resources and capabilities via PIMM, performance improves											
	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	Policies & Processes (findings)	mod-high	↑		Board-Mgt	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt & Govt				
		Finding: CSACs demonstrated low SE/democratic policy-process engagement with knowlegeable staff, but government policy is recognised as a specialism											
		Policies & Processes (proposed)	mod-high	↑	↑	Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff- Govt				
THEORY: Where internal policy/process is aligned with critical external policy/process, firm performance improves													
RESOURCE INVESTMENT	RESOURCE INVESTMENT (outputs & outcomes)												
	Performance & Investment (findings)	mod-high	↑		Board-Mgt	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt		
	Finding: Overall, links between risk, PIM, funding, and investment readiness lacked connectivity and integration for optimal strategic investment planning												
	Performance & Investment (proposed)	mod-high	↑	↑	Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt Staff- Prof	Board-Mgt Prof- Stkhld	Board-Mgt Prof- Stkhld	Board-Mgt Prof- Stkhld		
THEORY: That if robust SO-SI results are linked to optimal resource use, then fundability and investability improve													
Key to directional symbols (applied to CSAC Findings):													
↑ progressing quickly													
→ progressing moderately													
↔ progressing steadily													
↔ mixed results (e.g. strategic change)													

THEORY BUILDING from Management Orientations for SE-related MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

APPENDIX 28/b

THEORY	DCT Theme	DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEMES	Priorities for SE-Related Management		Key Stakeholders recognised in CSAC Management Practice								
					INTERNAL			INTERNAL & EXTERNAL	EXTERNAL				
		PREMISE: current markets prioritised as fundable for performance-based scalability are competitive and turbulent	Market priority (trends)	SE priority (av.)	CSAC priority (SE)	Individual	Dept.	Firm	Policies & Processes	Customer & Consumer	Interfirm	Cross-sector	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	COLLABORATION (inputs)											
		Relational Capability (findings)	high	↑	→	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	
		Finding: In CSACs, relational capabilities were not widely prioritised or strategically managed, but they were exercised individually and informally											
		Relational Capability (proposed)	high	↑	↑	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	
		THEORY: Where firm-based relational capabilities are developed and deployed, then alliance-based scalability potential improves											
		Alliance-based Capability (findings)	low-high		→	Mgt	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	
	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Finding: SCA gains may be available through existing and new stakeholder links with staff and external stakeholders which could facilitate partnerships											
		Alliance-based Capability (proposed)	low-high			Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	
		THEORY: Where strategic alliance-based capabilities are developed and deployed, market opportunities and scalability improve											
		SOCIAL ENTERPRISE (processes)											
		Social Entrepreneurship (findings)	mod-high	↑	↔	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	
		Finding: SE means and methods were poorly understood overall, in particular their potential to improve surpluses and SCA in volatile markets											
		Social Entrepreneurship (proposed)	mod-high	↑		Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	
THEORY: Where appropriate SE approaches are utilised, firms are empowered to become innovative and scalability improves													
Change readiness (findings)	mod-high	↑	→	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt			
Finding: Change-readiness varied. NB: high interest/low voice stakeholders are most vulnerable to top-down management													
Change readiness (proposed)	mod-high	↑		Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Prof-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Prof-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Prof-Stkhld			
THEORY: Where firms acquire the necessary strategic dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions and embed market-responsive continuous change, scalability improves													

THEORY BUILDING from Management Orientations for SE-related MISSION EFFECTIVENESS

APPENDIX 28/c

THEORY	DCT Theme	DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEMES	Priorities for SE-Related Management		Key Stakeholders recognised in CSAC Management Practice								
					INTERNAL			INTERNAL & EXTERNAL	EXTERNAL				
		PREMISE: current markets prioritised as fundable for performance-based scalability are competitive and turbulent	Market priority (trends)	SE priority (av.)	CSAC priority (SE)	Individual	Dept.	Firm	Policies & Processes	Customer & Consumer	Interfirm	Cross-sector	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	GROWTH (outcomes & impacts)											
		Social Outcomes & Impacts (findings)	high	↑		Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	
		Finding: CSACs demonstrated some lack of SO-SI focus, strategic agility and professionalism to design, implement and develop firm growth for scale											
		Social Outcomes & Impacts (proposed)	high	↑	↑	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	Board-Mgt Staff-Stkhld	
		THEORY: Where CSACs deploy well-informed and decisive dynamic capabilities which drive SCA in turbulent markets, then they grow individually and increase subsetcor scalability											
		Firm growth (findings)	low-mod		↔	Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt	Board-Mgt
		Finding: In some cases, structural, cultural and positional challenges to SE means and methods probably hinder growth in volatile markets											
		Firm growth (proposed)	low-mod			Board-Mgt & Staff	Mgt	Board-Mgt & Staff	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof	Board-Mgt Staff-Prof
		THEORY: Where CSACs exercise those mission-centric SE capabilities which drive SCA in turbulent competitive markets, then they grow individually and increase subsector scalability.											
		Key to directional symbols (applied to CSAC Findings):											
↑ progressing quickly													
→ progressing moderately													
↔ mixed results (e.g. strategic change)													

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

The purpose of this appendix is to systematically link theory, objectives and findings to elicit arguments.

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE
		THEME	<i>BUSINESS SERVICES</i>
		MACRO PROP'N <i>P1/a</i>	<i>That when a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm effectiveness will be improved.</i>
		STRAND 1.1	Resource performance—measurement and management
		SUB-OBJ 1.1	To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services
		SUB-PROP'N 1.1	<i>That when business services identify, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.</i>
		FINDINGS	1.1.1 Funder priorities influence measurement, and PIM is a growing funder priority
			1.1.2 The historical low emphasis on IT investment is changing as costs reduce
			1.1.3 External quality accreditation is becoming more highly prioritised by key stakeholders
		CASES	TSAEP Business services required significant investment to deliver efficient, effective support
			CTE Business services could provide vital integrated strategic stewardship information
			ROC Business services could provide stronger support through evolving PIM measures
		ANALYSES	
			<i>Patterns</i> Efficiency in all cases could be improved by prioritising measurable performance Resource-based performance could be universally improved if it was better measured and managed
			<i>Explanations</i> These cases all developed unique performance measurement and management methods . All were proactively or reactively responding to environmental stimuli, especially from key stakeholders (internal and external) and markets. Where PIM was closely linked to missional economic and social rents , performance improved.
			<i>Synthesis</i> Traditional prevalent low cost priority for PIM in charities results in suboptimal resource allocation to achieve SCA . SE means achieved comparatively higher RBT rents, and direct mission effectiveness .
		ARGUMENT	<i>Basic technical fitness parity in non-competitive simple/stable markets is insufficient to maintain SCA in turbulent markets. Relevant, affordable PIMM is increasingly required to achieve quality service delivery using efficient integrated systems.</i>

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments	
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	GOVERNANCE	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE	
		THEME	GOVERNANCE	
		MACRO PROP'N	P1/b	That when firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.
		STRAND	1.2	Social outcome and impact strategies
		SUB-OBJ	1.2	To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts.
		SUB-PROP'N	1.2	That when mission-based strategy is linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.
		FINDINGS	1.2.1	PIM for SO-SI was weak overall, but most developed where external funding was vital
		SUB-ARGUMENT		Strategic value-creation depends on VRIO resources, notably key stakeholders.
		STRAND	1.3	Policies and processes
		SUB-OBJ	1.3	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in formulating internal policy and process in relation to external policy and process.
		SUB-PROP'N	1.3	That when a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that take due regard of key external policy and process, then the firm performs better than if it does not.
		FINDINGS	1.3.1 1.3.2	Internal policy making is typically top down in charities, and more inclusive in SEs Government policies and processes affect CSACs significantly
		SUB-ARGUMENT		Professional skills are required to design and implement appropriate firm policies and processes which optimise opportunities in complex multistakeholder markets.
		CASES		
			TSAEP	Governance for strategic agility in turbulent markets needs a flatter/responsive structure
			CTE	Governance has the potential to enhance spiritual performance via VRIO resources
			ROC	Governance is becoming more professional and targeted on greater impacts
	ANALYSES			
		Patterns	In all cases firm governance formally managed the performance of VRIO resources, at least for regulatory compliance, and at best for SCA. Impacts on risk reduction and long-term performance could only be inferred from financial results. Where mission-based strategy was clearly linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts were realised. CSACs' governance appreciation of their unique resource position varied, and different policy and process priorities yielded commensurate performance results	
		Explanations	In the absence of clear understanding of the value-creating importance of VRIO resources, they were not optimally employed through the governance policy and process to optimise social impacts. Where directly linked through strategy, results improved.	
		Synthesis	Unlike SE governance, bureaucratic structures and tertiary multistakeholder constraints militate against resource optimisation for strategic SO-SI. However, they may still achieve their missions effectively in the short-term, but are unlikely to achieve SCA.	
	ARGUMENT		Good governance for SCA in turbulent markets demands information-driven, knowledge-based optimisation of VRIO resources and capabilities, which in turn favour SE governance means and methods	

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE
		THEME	RESOURCE INVESTMENT
		MACRO PROP'N P1/c	<i>That when firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.</i>
		STRAND 1.4	Industry and firm performance for investment
		SUB-OBJ 1.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of industry and firm performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing
		SUB-PROP'N 1.4	<i>That when the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.</i>
		FINDINGS	1.4.1 Skilled risk management is essential for CSA in operating in competitive environments
			1.4.2 Where robust PIM results are available, fundraising and investment prospects improve
			1.4.3 Funding criteria significantly affect PIM and reporting, and firm/industry perceptions
		CASES	TSAEP Resource investment needs a VRIO performance base to achieve mission and SCA
			CTE Resource investment should identify and assess low risk innovations for growth
			ROC Resource investment could be enhanced by resource analysis and VRIO valuation
		ANALYSES	<i>Where the firms' resource investment was based on social performance evidence, SE income and investment resources increased. However, other performance results could also have elicited income and investment resources.</i>
			<i>Although inferred by comparative income and growth results, the positive impact of relevant firm and industry results on resource investment decisions was not directly linked through research data.</i>
			Competition for results-based contracts is increasing, contract performance criteria are becoming more more tightly prescribed, and investors from all sectors link investment-readiness to risk management and auditable returns on investment.
			The links between VRIO resource performance and investment readiness are poorly understood in all cases. Where SE means are most directly deployed, these links are most clearly inferred by relatively higher external investment and more SO-SI projects .
		ARGUMENT	<i>Internal investment can induce myopic self-sufficiency, but CSACs whose risk-managed performance results meet higher external funding criteria are investment-ready.</i>

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY
		THEME	COLLABORATION
		MACRO PROP'N P2/a	<i>That when firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the strategic collaboration growth option is facilitated by SE models deploying relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities.</i>
		STRAND 2.1	Relational capabilities
		SUB-OBJ 2.1	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of proactive relational capabilities in the strategic management of organisational collaboration.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.1	<i>That when relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.</i>
		FINDINGS 2.1.1	From all accounts proactivity was recognised as essential for SO-SI and SCA
		2.1.2	Firm perceptions of key stakeholding vary with voice, funding, legal form and structure
		SUB-ARGUMENT	<i>Proactive capabilities are theoretically central to multistakeholder mission effectiveness.</i>
		STRAND 2.2	Alliance-based capabilities
		SUB-OBJ 2.2	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in a firm's readiness to sense, seize and shape opportunities for collaborative alliances.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.2	<i>That when firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.</i>
		FINDINGS 2.2.1	Intra-sector collaboration was often prioritised, but not always optimised
		2.2.2	Enthusiasm for rather than understanding of cross-sector collaboration was evident
		SUB-ARGUMENT	<i>Complex, multistakeholder markets reward well-run collaborative alliances in which reconfigured and orchestrated assets add strategic value and promote growth.</i>
		CASES	
		TSAEP	Collaboration suggests major opportunities within an empowered/devolved structure
		CTE	Collaboration would benefit from stakeholder mapping, evaluation and management
		ROC	Collaboration can benefit from systematic management of complex relationships
		ANALYSES	
		Patterns	The cases confirm that where growth and scalability have been achieved in turbulent markets, SE models involving relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities have been deployed. The cases confirm that where relational capabilities have been proactively and strategically developed and deployed, competitive advantage followed. In some cases where firms have shown the capability to collaborate through alliances, they have seized optimal market opportunities.
		Explanations	Turbulent thin markets reward dynamic collaborative capabilities to achieve SCA. Embedded traditional and cultural attitudes to collaboration affect managers ability to recognise firm needs and market opportunities. Strong internal and intra-sector trust and mutual interests have not always been optimised, probably due to independent missional views. Entrepreneurial, dynamic collaboration alone does not explain successful market ventures.
		Synthesis	All senior executives showed an interest in firm dynamic capabilities for developing technical and evolutionary fitness . Most revealed knowledge was context-specific and not systematically managed for relational and alliance-based advantage. Mission effectiveness was most clearly enhanced where collaboration was dynamic and entrepreneurial .
		ARGUMENT	<i>Collaboration is 'the only game in town' which can scale up sufficiently to stand in the widening public services gap, but collaboration favours SE dynamic capabilities.</i>

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY
		THEME	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE
		MACRO PROP'N P2/b	<i>That when firms adopt social entrepreneurship principles and practices in their deployment of strategic management dynamic capabilities, then they will innovate and change so as to succeed in complex unstable market conditions.</i>
		STRAND 2.3	Social entrepreneurship
		SUB-OBJ 2.3	To identify, explain and evaluate management's social entrepreneurship capability for social enterprise approaches to sector scalability.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.3	<i>That when charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.</i>
		FINDINGS 2.3.1 2.3.2	Entrepreneurialism was generally seen as ethical, creative opportunism. The responsibility for innovation was mainly seen as a senior management issue, requiring full staff support but notably not direct staff participation (subject to question deficiencies).
		SUB-ARGUMENT	<i>Where entrepreneurialism is acceptable to charities, it may require counter-cultural change to innovate and engage in competitive trading.</i>
		STRAND 2.4	Change readiness
		SUB-OBJ 2.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of social enterprise dynamic capabilities in readiness for organisational change.
		SUB-PROP'N 2.4	<i>That when charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.</i>
		FINDINGS 2.4.1	Manageable change was seen as paramount by all: cautious attitudes were most prevalent.
		SUB-ARGUMENT	<i>Professional change management skills are required to exploit complex market opportunities and strategically develop scale.</i>
		CASES	
		TSAEP	Social Enterprise demands counter-cultural approaches to proactivity, innovation, and risk
		CTE	Social Enterprise means and methods could be usefully considered for adaptation
		ROC	Social Enterprise risk-opportunity methods can optimise life cycle risks-reward opportunities
		ANALYSES	
		Patterns	Where SE principles were adopted (and dynamic strategic management was deployed) in universally complex and unstable market conditions, innovation and change were prioritised for planning and later implementation. Where SE dynamic capabilities were most evident, new products, processes, structures and business models were created. By inference these probably contributed to increased income. All the case charities sought to exploit their current positions, paths and processes, albeit with different levels of dynamic capability and strategic freedom. Structural and cultural resistance to change was highest in the firms least open to SE means.
		Explanations	All respondents faced turbulent markets, some more directly through engagement with social services than others. Changing social markets are risky, and demand product and market innovations to meet excess social demand and create demand for high impact services. Recognition of potential need to generate trading income in competitive markets was patchy, suggesting scope for adapting SE means.
		Synthesis	Overall, strategic dynamic capabilities for scalability through SE means were underdeveloped. This is not surprising given the traditional charity legal form and risk-averse culture. If firm viability was threatened, resistance to changes would be reduced where improved mission effectiveness could be anticipated.
		ARGUMENT	<i>As donor income shrinks and results-based contracts grow, SE capabilities are deployed which increasingly demand change in order to generate trading income.</i>

THEORY BASED ARGUMENTS FOR NEW THEORY

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY	
		THEME	GROWTH	
		MACRO PROP'N	P2/c	<i>That when firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve mission-centric social outcomes and impacts, then they facilitate organisational growth and sector scalability.</i>
		STRAND	2.5	Social outcomes and impacts
		SUB-OBJ	2.5	To identify, explain and evaluate the contribution of dynamic capabilities (inc decision-making and sensing, seizing and shaping) to achieving social outcomes and impacts in terms of organisational growth.
		SUB-PROP'N	2.5	<i>That when firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts, then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.5.1 2.5.2	CSAC decision-making is mainly top-down, and typically seeks speed and rapid implementation Firm mission for public good was central, but stakeholder SO-SI approval priorities varied
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>Funders and service users require hard evidence of SO-SI results that charities may assume take for granted, as a consequence of effective strategic decision making.</i>
		STRAND	2.6	Growth (of the organisation)
		SUB-OBJ	2.6	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in the strategic management of firm growth as a measure of performance (and as a means to scalability).
		SUB-PROP'N	2.6	<i>That when manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.6.1	All sought manageable growth, but with different perceptions of what that would mean
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>With a common vision and professional guidance, the CSAC subsector can achieve SCA and manageable growth and scale based on competitive SO-SI results.</i>
		CASES		
			TSAEP	Growth for scalability based on SO-SI capability is manageable but challenging
			CTE	Growth for scalability may be advisable given undersupply, within a manageable remit
			ROC	Growth is mission effective because it is underpinned by prayer and Biblical values
		ANALYSES	Patterns	<i>The case data confirms that relevant strategic management capabilities are required for each of their very different specific firm and industry settings. Manageable, non-random and size-independent growth was most evident where SE means were used.</i>
			Explanations	The proactivity and urgency with which firms responded to perceived needs and opportunities was reflected in the the effectiveness of their decision-making processes, their demonstrable social performance results, and their recorded scalable growth. In undersupplied localised social needs markets which attract government funding, SE means promote rapid growth. Where these thin markets are large and centralised, competition from business is intense in order to exploit existing economies of scale using plentiful corporate working capital. In supply-driven markets where results to beneficiaries are intangible and weakly linked to resource investment returns, market shaping and product alignment suggest means to growth and scale.
			Synthesis	All cases demonstrated a growing awareness of the centrality of mission-centric impacts . The priority for demonstrable SO-SI varied, making causal inferences context-specific. Likewise, the dynamic capabilities deployed to optimise resources and capabilities in order to maintain firm size or achieve persistent growth also varied. However, evaluation of these capabilities and the market opportunities available to participants are beyond the scope of this research. Nonetheless, the limited data revealed that growth and scalability for mission effectiveness were most clearly linked to SE means in current markets.
		ARGUMENT		<i>The capabilities required for mission-centric growth are predicated mainly on the paths, processes and positions of CSACs, and deficits can be remedied</i>

THEORY BUILDING

The purpose of this appendix is to extend arguments found in RBT and DCT to build new theory.

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	BUSINESS SERVICES	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE
		THEME	BUSINESS SERVICES
		MACRO PROP'N	<i>P1/a</i> That when a firm's business services functions prioritise measurable performance, then firm effectiveness will be improved.
		STRAND	1.1 Resource performance–measurement and management
		SUB-OBJ	1.1 To identify, explain and evaluate the use of VRIO resource-based performance measurement and management by firms' business services
		SUB-PROP'N	1.1 That if business services <u>identify</u>, measure and manage firm performance appropriately, then resource-based performance improves.
		FINDINGS	1.1.1 Funder priorities influence measurement, and PIM is a growing funder priority 1.1.2 The historical low emphasis on IT investment is changing as costs reduce 1.1.3 External quality accreditation is becoming more highly prioritised by key stakeholders
		CASES	TSAEP Business services required significant investment to deliver efficient, effective support
			CTE Business services could provide vital integrated strategic stewardship information
			ROC Business services could provide stronger support through evolving PIM measures
		ANALYSES	Patterns Efficiency in all cases could be improved by prioritising measurable performance Resource-based performance could be universally improved if it was better measured and managed.
			Explanations These cases all developed unique performance measurement and management methods . All were proactively or reactively responding to environmental stimuli, especially from key stakeholders (internal and external) and markets. Where PIM was closely linked to missional economic and social rents , performance improved.
			Synthesis Traditional prevalent low cost priority for PIM in charities results in suboptimal resource allocation to achieve SCA . SE means achieved comparatively higher RBT rents, and direct mission effectiveness .
		ARGUMENT	Basic technical fitness parity in non-competitive simple/stable markets is insufficient to maintain SCA in turbulent markets. Relevant, affordable PIMM is increasingly required to achieve quality service delivery using efficient integrated systems.
		RBT THEORY	Firm approaches to measurement and management of VRIO resources as a function of internal business services affect performance and SCA.
		NEW THEORY	When key resources and capabilities and their results are strategically aligned and systematically measured and managed, auditable performance improves.

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments	
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	GOVERNANCE	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE	
		THEME	GOVERNANCE	
		MACRO PROP'N	P1/b	That when firm governance formally manages the performance of VRIO resources, then risks will be reduced and long-term performance will be improved.
		STRAND	1.2	Social outcome and impact strategies
		SUB-OBJ	1.2	To identify, explain and evaluate strategy in terms of governance aspects of VRIO resource performance to achieve mission-driven social outcomes and impacts.
		SUB-PROP'N	1.2	That when mission-based strategy is linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts will result.
		FINDINGS	1.2.1	PIM for SO-SI was weak overall, but most developed where external funding was vital
		SUB-ARGUMENT		Strategic value-creation depends on VRIO resources, notably key stakeholders.
		RBT THEORY		Firm strategy in support of mission through the governance process is a key determinant in its deployment of VRIO resources.
		NEW THEORY		That if SO-SI are prioritised in strategy and linked to resources and capabilities via PIM, performance improves.
		STRAND	1.3	Policies and processes
		SUB-OBJ	1.3	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of governance in formulating internal policy and process in relation to external policy and process.
		SUB-PROP'N	1.3	That when a firm's governance optimises its unique resource position through internal policy and process that take due regard of key external policy and process, then the firm performs better than if it does not.
		FINDINGS	1.3.1 1.3.2	Internal policy making is typically top down in charities, and more inclusive in SEs Government policies and processes affect CSACs significantly
		SUB-ARGUMENT		Professional skills are required to design and implement appropriate firm policies and processes which optimise opportunities in complex multistakeholder markets.
		RBT THEORY		The importance of internal and external policy and process to the effective governance of unique firm resources to achieve SCA in external markets shaped by business and government policies.
		NEW THEORY		That if internal policy/process is aligned with critical external policy/process, firm performance improves
		CASES	TSAEP CTE ROC	Governance for strategic agility in turbulent markets needs a flatter/responsive structure Governance has the potential to enhance spiritual performance via VRIO resources Governance is becoming more professional and targeted on greater impacts
		ANALYSES	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	In all cases firm governance formally managed the performance of VRIO resources, at least for regulatory compliance, and at best for SCA. Impacts on risk reduction and long-term performance could only be inferred from financial results. Where mission-based strategy was clearly linked to the performance of VRIO resources, then improved social outcomes and impacts were realised. CSACs' appreciation of their unique resource position governance varied, and different policy and process priorities yielded commensurate performance results. In the absence of clear understanding of the value-creating importance of VRIO resources, they were not optimally employed through the governance policy and process to optimise social impacts. Where directly linked through strategy, results improved. Unlike SE governance, bureaucratic structures and tertiary multistakeholder constraints militate against resource optimisation for strategic SO-SI. However, they may still achieve their missions effectively in the short-term, but are unlikely to achieve SCA.
		ARGUMENT		Good governance for SCA in turbulent markets demands information-driven, knowelege-based optimisation of VRIO resources and capabilities, which in turn favour SE governance means and methods

THEORY BUILDING

THEORY	RBT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments
RESOURCE BASED THEORY (RBT)	RESOURCE INVESTMENT	RBT DIMENSION	PERFORMANCE
		THEME	RESOURCE INVESTMENT
		MACRO PROP'N	<i>P1/c</i> <i>That when firms' resource investment is based on robust evidence which demonstrates social performance, then investment resources increase.</i>
		STRAND	1.4 Industry and firm performance for investment
		SUB-OBJ	1.4 To identify, explain and evaluate the role of industry and firm performance in resource investment priorities and sourcing.
		SUB-PROP'N	1.4 <i>That when the relevant firm and industry performance results are available for resource investment decisions then funding will be forthcoming.</i>
		FINDINGS	1.4.1 1.4.2 1.4.3 Skilled risk management is essential for CSA in operating in competitive environments Where robust PIM results are available, fundraising and investment prospects improve Funding criteria significantly affect PIM and reporting, and firm/industry perceptions
		CASES	TSAEP Resource investment needs a VRIO performance base to achieve mission and SCA
			CTE Resource investment should identify and assess low risk innovations for growth
			ROC Resource investment could be enhanced by resource analysis and VRIO valuation
		ANALYSES	Patterns <i>Where the firms' resource investment was based on social performance evidence, SE income and investment resources increased. However, other performance results could also have elicited income and investment resources.</i>
			<i>Although inferred by comparative income and growth results, the positive impact of relevant firm and industry results on resource investment decisions was not directly linked through research data.</i>
		Explanations	Competition for results-based contracts is increasing, contract performance criteria are becoming more more tightly prescribed, and investors from all sectors link investment-readiness to risk management and auditable returns on investment
		Synthesis	The links between VRIO resource performance and investment readiness are poorly understood in all cases. Where SE means are most directly deployed, these links are most clearly inferred by relatively higher external investment and more SO-SI projects
		ARGUMENT	<i>Internal investment can induce myopic self-sufficiency, but CSACs whose risk-managed performance results meet higher external funding criteria are investment-ready.</i>
		RBT THEORY	Firm and industry performance and attractiveness are heavily dependent on social, economic and environmental performance results to guide resource investment decisions.
		NEW THEORY	<i>When robust SO-SI results are linked to optimal resource use, fundability and investability improve</i>

THEORY BUILDING

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	COLLABORATION	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY	
		THEME	COLLABORATION	
		MACRO PROP'N	P2/a	<i>That when firms are seeking scalability in turbulent markets, then the strategic collaboration growth option is facilitated by SE models deploying relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities.</i>
		STRAND	2.1	<i>Relational capabilities</i>
		SUB-OBJ	2.1	<i>To identify, explain and evaluate the role of proactive relational capabilities in the strategic management of organisational collaboration.</i>
		SUB-PROP'N	2.1	<i>That when relational capabilities are proactively and strategically developed and deployed, then relationship-based competitive advantage is achieved.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.1.1 2.1.2	From all accounts proactivity was recognised as essential for SO-SI and SCA Firm perceptions of key stakeholding vary with voice, funding, legal form and structure
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>Proactive capabilities are theoretically central to multistakeholder mission effectiveness.</i>
		DCT THEORY		<i>Relational capabilities</i> for collaborative purposes involve the proactive dynamic management of interpersonal relationships through relationship-specific assets, effective governance, interfirm knowledge-sharing and complementary capabilities.
		NEW THEORY		<i>When firm-based relational capabilities are developed and deployed, alliance-based scalability potential improves.</i>
		STRAND	2.2	<i>Alliance-based capabilities</i>
		SUB-OBJ	2.2	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in a firm's readiness to sense, seize and shape opportunities for collaborative alliances.
		SUB-PROP'N	2.2	<i>That when firms have the capability to collaborate through alliances then they seize optimal market opportunities.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.2.1 2.2.2	Intra-sector collaboration was often prioritised, but not always optimised Enthusiasm for rather than understanding of cross-sector collaboration was evident
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>Complex, multistakeholder markets reward well-run collaborative alliances in which reconfigured and orchestrated assets add strategic value and promote growth.</i>
		DCT THEORY		The capability to collaborate through <i>alliances</i> draws upon managerial dynamic capabilities which enable the combination, reconfiguration and protection of assets.
		NEW THEORY		<i>When appropriate SE approaches are utilised, firms are empowered to innovate and scalability improves.</i>
		CASES	TSAEP CTE ROC	Collaboration suggests major opportunities within an empowered/devolved structure Collaboration would benefit from stakeholder mapping, evaluation and management Collaboration can benefit from systematic management of complex relationships
		ANALYSES	Patterns Explanations Synthesis	The cases confirm that where growth and scalability have been achieved in turbulent markets, SE models involving relational and alliance-based dynamic capabilities have been deployed. The cases confirm that where relational capabilities have been proactively and strategically developed and deployed, competitive advantage followed In some cases where firms have shown the capability to collaborate through alliances, they have seized optimal market opportunities. Turbulent thin markets reward dynamic collaborative capabilities to achieve SCA. Embedded traditional and cultural attitudes to collaboration affect managers ability to recognise firm needs and market opportunities. Strong internal and intra-sector trust and mutual interests have not always been optimised, probably due to independent missional views. Entrepreneurial, dynamic collaboration alone does not explain successful market ventures. All senior executives showed an interest in firm dynamic capabilities for developing technical and evolutionary fitness. Most revealed knowledge was context-specific and not systematically managed for relational and alliance-based advantage. Mission effectiveness was most clearly enhanced where collaboration was dynamic and entrepreneurial.
		ARGUMENT		<i>Collaboration is 'the only game in town' which can scale up sufficiently to stand in the widening public services gap, but collaboration favours SE dynamic capabilities.</i>

THEORY BUILDING

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments	
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY	
		THEME	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	
		MACRO PROP'N	P2/b	<i>That when firms adopt social entrepreneurship principles and practices in their deployment of strategic management dynamic capabilities, then they will innovate and change so as to succeed in complex unstable market conditions.</i>
		STRAND	2.3	<i>Social entrepreneurship</i>
		SUB-OBJ	2.3	To identify, explain and evaluate management's social entrepreneurship capability for social enterprise approaches to sector scalability.
		SUB-PROP'N	2.3	<i>That when charities wish to generate income in changing social service markets then social entrepreneurship capability for the creation of new products, processes, structures and business models provides a means to scalability.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.3.1	Entrepreneurialism was generally seen as ethical, creative opportunism
			2.3.2	The responsibility for innovation was mainly seen as a senior management issue, requiring full staff support but notably not direct staff participation (subject to question deficiencies).
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>Where entrepreneurialism is acceptable to charities, it may require counter-cultural change to innovate and engage in competitive trading.</i>
		DCT THEORY		The capability of managers to practice social entrepreneurship ,which identifies suitable opportunities in markets, technologies and business models, and seizes and shapes them for SCA.
		NEW THEORY		<i>That if appropriate SE approaches are utilised, then firms are empowered to innovate and scalability improves.</i>
		STRAND	2.4	<i>Change readiness</i>
		SUB-OBJ	2.4	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of social enterprise dynamic capabilities in readiness for organisational change.
		SUB-PROP'N	2.4	<i>That when charities possess the dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions, processes and paths then they are ready to accommodate the change required to become social enterprises.</i>
		FINDINGS	2.4.1	Manageable change was seen as paramount by all: cautious attitudes were most prevalent
		SUB-ARGUMENT		<i>Professional change management skills are required to exploit complex market opportunities and strategically develop scale.</i>
		DCT THEORY		The social entrepreneurship capabilities to help a firm create, extend or modify its resource base so as to compete in an external environment which demands continual organisational change .
		NEW THEORY		<i>When firms acquire the necessary strategic dynamic capabilities to exploit current positions and embed market-responsive continuous change, then scalability improves.</i>
		CASES	TSAEP	Social Enterprise demands counter-cultural approaches to proactivity, innovation, and risk
			CTE	Social Enterprise means and methods could be usefully considered for adaptation
			ROC	Social Enterprise risk-opportunity methods can optimise life cycle risks-reward opportunities
		ANALYSES	Patterns	Where SE principles were adopted (and dynamic strategic management was deployed) in universally complex and unstable market conditions, innovation and change were prioritised for planning and later implementation. Where SE dynamic capabilities were most evident, new products, processs, structures and business models were created. By inference these probably contributed to increased income. All the case charities sought to exploit their current positions, paths and processes, albeit with different levels of dynamic capability and strategic freedom. Structural and cultural resistance to change was highest in the firms least open to SE means.
			Explanations	All respondents faced turbulent markets, some more directly through engagement with social services than others. Changing social markets are risky, and demand product and market innovations to meet excess social demand and create demand for high impact services. Recognition of potential need to generate trading income in competitive markets was patchy, suggesting scope for adapting SE means.
			Synthesis	Overall, strategic dynamic capabilities for scalability through SE means were underdeveloped. This is not surprising given the traditional charity legal form and risk-averse culture. If firm viability was threatened, resistance to changes would be reduced where improved mission effectiveness could be anticipated .
		ARGUMENT		<i>As donor income shrinks and results-based contracts grow, SE capabilities are deployed which increasingly demand change in order to generate trading income.</i>

THEORY BUILDING

THEORY	DCT Theme	Ref.	Summarised Within and Cross-Case Analyses, Findings and Arguments							
DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES THEORY (DCT)	GROWTH	DCT DIMENSION	SCALABILITY							
		THEME	GROWTH							
		MACRO PROP'N	P2/c	That when firms deploy dynamic strategic management capabilities to achieve mission-centric social outcomes and impacts, then they facilitate organisational growth and sector scalability.						
		STRAND	2.5	Social outcomes and impacts						
		SUB-OBJ	2.5	To identify, explain and evaluate the contribution of dynamic capabilities (inc decision-making and sensing, seizing and shaping) to achieving social outcomes and impacts in terms of organisational growth.						
		SUB-PROP'N	2.5	That when firms' missions require them to achieve social outcomes and impacts, then dynamic managerial capabilities must be exercised to achieve growth in changing markets.						
		FINDINGS	2.5.1 2.5.2	CSAC decision-making is mainly top-down, and typically seeks speed and rapid implementation Firm mission for public good was central, but stakeholder SO-SI approval priorities varied						
		SUB-ARGUMENT		Funders and service users require hard evidence of SO-SI results that charities may assume take for granted, as a consequence of effective strategic decision making.						
		DCT THEORY		The capabilities within an organisation to sense, seize and shape opportunities for optimising its social outcomes and impacts, so as to ensure the firm's survival and growth in changing markets.						
		NEW THEORY		That if CSACs deploy well-informed and decisive dynamic strategic SE capabilities to demonstrably and verifiably increase SO-SI, then scalability improves.						
		STRAND	2.6	Firm growth						
		SUB-OBJ	2.6	To identify, explain and evaluate the role of dynamic capabilities in the strategic management of firm growth as a measure of performance (and as a means to scalability).						
		SUB-PROP'N	2.6	That when manageable, non-random and size-independent organisational growth is to be achieved, then relevant strategic management capabilities are required for specific firm and industry settings.						
		FINDINGS	2.6.1	All sought manageable growth, but with different perceptions of what that would mean						
		SUB-ARGUMENT		With a common vision and professional guidance, the CSAC subsector can achieve SCA and manageable growth and scale based on competitive SO-SI results.						
		DCT THEORY		Organisations measure the performance of their dynamic capabilities through firm growth - which usually takes the form of expansion through new and/or existing products and markets, and/or joint working or merger with other firms.						
		NEW THEORY		That if CSACs exercise those mission-centric SE capabilities which drive SCA in turbulent competitive markets, then they grow individually and increase subsector scalability.						
		CASES		<table><tr><td>TSAEP</td><td>Growth for scalability based on SO-SI capability is manageable but challenging</td></tr><tr><td>CTE</td><td>Growth for scalability may be advisable given undersupply, within a manageable remit</td></tr><tr><td>ROC</td><td>Growth is mission effective because it is underpinned by prayer and Biblical values</td></tr></table>	TSAEP	Growth for scalability based on SO-SI capability is manageable but challenging	CTE	Growth for scalability may be advisable given undersupply, within a manageable remit	ROC	Growth is mission effective because it is underpinned by prayer and Biblical values
		TSAEP	Growth for scalability based on SO-SI capability is manageable but challenging							
		CTE	Growth for scalability may be advisable given undersupply, within a manageable remit							
		ROC	Growth is mission effective because it is underpinned by prayer and Biblical values							
		ANALYSES								
			Patterns	The case data confirms that relevant strategic management capabilities are required for each of their very different specific firm and industry settings. Manageable, non-random and size-independent growth was most evident where SE means were used.						
			Explanations	The proactivity and urgency with which firms responded to perceived needs and opportunities was reflected in the the effectiveness of their decision-making processes, their demonstrable social performance results, and their recorded scalable growth. In undersupplied localised social needs markets which attract government funding, SE means promote rapid growth. Where these thin markets are large and centralised, competition from business is intense in order to exploit existing economies of scale using plentiful corporate working capital. In supply-driven markets where results to beneficiaries are intangible and weakly linked to resource investment returns, market shaping and product alignment suggest means to growth and scale.						
			Synthesis	All cases demonstrated a growing awareness of the centrality of mission-centric impacts. The priority for demonstrable SO-SI varied, making causal inferences context-specific. Likewise, the dynamic capabilities deployed to optimise resources and capabilities in order to maintain firm size or achieve persistent growth also varied. However, evaluation of these capabilities and the market opportunities available to participants are beyond the scope of this research. Nonetheless, the limited data revealed that growth and scalability for mission effectiveness were most clearly linked to SE means in current markets.						
		ARGUMENT		The capabilities required for mission-centric growth are predicated mainly on the paths, processes and positions of CSACs, and deficits can be remedied						
		NEW THEORY		CSAC paths, processes and positions affect strategic options and choices for mission-centric growth.						

DYNAMIC RESOURCE THEORY (DRT) - THEMES and STRANDS

DRT - THEMES and STRANDS	Technical Fitness (Performance)	Evolutionary Fitness (Scale)	SE priority (av.)	CSAC priority (av.)	DRT Mission Effectiveness
BUSINESS SERVICES (inputs) 1.1 Performance Management 1.1.1 <i>Performance measures (PMs)</i> 1.1.2 <i>Efficient systems</i> 1.1.3 <i>Quality service delivery</i>	mod high mod	high high high	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑		high high high
GOVERNANCE (processes) 1.2 Strategy 1.2.1 <i>PIM for social outcomes/impacts</i> 1.3 Policies & Processes 1.3.1 <i>Internal policy input</i> 1.3.2 <i>Government policy input</i>	mod mod mod	high high high	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑		high high high
RESOURCE INVESTMENT (outputs and outcomes) 1.4 Performance & Investment 1.4.1 <i>Risk management</i> 1.4.2 <i>PIM for investment/fundraising/bids</i> 1.4.3 <i>Investment readiness</i>	mod mod mod	high high high	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑	↗ ↗	high high high

Key to directional symbols (applied to CSAC Findings):

- ↑ progressing quickly
- progressing moderately
- progressing steadily
- ↔ mixed results (e.g. strategic change)

DYNAMIC RESOURCE THEORY (DRT) - THEMES and STRANDS

DRT - THEMES and STRANDS	Technical Fitness (Performance)	Evolutionary Fitness (Scale)	SE priority (av.)	CSAC priority (av.)	DRT Mission Effectiveness
COLLABORATION (inputs) 2.1 Relational Capabilities 2.1.1 <i>Proactive engagement</i> 2.1.2 <i>Stakeholders</i> 2.2 Collaborative Capability 2.2.2 <i>Intra-sector collaboration</i> 2.2.3 <i>Cross-sector collaboration</i>	low low	high high	↑ ↑ ↗	↗ → ↔	↑ high high
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE (processes) 2.3 Social Capability 2.3.1 <i>Entrepreneurialism</i> 2.3.2 <i>Innovation</i> 2.4 Change Capability 2.4.1 <i>Change readiness</i>	low low	high high	↑ ↑ ↑	↔ ↔ ↔	↑ high high
GROWTH (outcomes & impacts) 2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts 2.5.1 <i>Effective decision-making</i> 2.5.2 <i>Social outcomes or impacts</i> 2.6 Growth & Scale 2.6.1 <i>Manageable scaling up</i>	mod mod	high high	↑ ↑ ↗	↗ ↗ ↔ ↔	↑ high high

Key to directional symbols (applied to CSAC Findings):

- ↑ progressing quickly
- progressing moderately
- ↔ progressing steadily
- ↔ mixed results (e.g. strategic change)

DRT PRIORITIES APPLIED TO STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

DRT - THEMES and STRANDS	Vision & Mission	Values & Culture	Strategy & Objectives	External & Internal Analyses (Market Fit)	Strategic Analyses & Choices	DRT Means & Methods	DRT Implementation priorities
BUSINESS SERVICES (inputs) 1.1 Performance Management 1.1.1 <i>Performance measures (PMs)</i> 1.1.2 <i>Efficient systems</i> 1.1.3 <i>Quality service delivery</i>	low low low	low low low	high high high	high high mod	high high high	urgent & important urgent urgent	now soon soon
GOVERNANCE (processes) 1.2 Strategy 1.2.1 <i>PIM for social outcomes/impacts</i> 1.3 Policies & Processes 1.3.1 <i>Internal policy input</i> 1.3.2 <i>Government policy input</i>	mod mod mod	high high high	high high high	high high mod-high	high high high	urgent & important important important	now think & plan think & plan
RESOURCE INVESTMENT (outputs and outcomes) 1.4 Performance & Investment 1.4.1 <i>Risk management</i> 1.4.2 <i>PIM for investment/fundraising/bids</i> 1.4.3 <i>Investment readiness</i>	mod mod mod	high high high	high high high	high high mod-high	high high high	urgent & important important important	now think & plan think & plan

DRT PRIORITIES APPLIED TO STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

DRT - THEMES and STRANDS	Vision & Mission	Values & Culture	Strategy & Objectives	External & Internal Analyses (Market Fit)	Strategic Analyses & Choices	DRT Means & Methods	DRT Implementation priorities
COLLABORATION (inputs) 2.1 Relational Capabilities 2.1.1 <i>Proactive engagement</i> 2.1.2 <i>Stakeholders</i> 2.2 Collaborative Capability 2.2.2 <i>Intra-sector collaboration</i> 2.2.3 <i>Cross-sector collaboration</i>	low low low low	high high high high	high high high high	high high mod-high low-mod	high high high high	important important important important	think & plan think & plan think & plan think & plan
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE (processes) 2.3 Social Capability 2.3.1 <i>Entrepreneurialism</i> 2.3.2 <i>Innovation</i> 2.4 Change Capability 2.4.1 <i>Change readiness</i>	low low mod	high high high	high high high	mod-high mod-high mod-high	high high high	important important urgent & important	think & plan think & plan now
GROWTH (outcomes & impacts) 2.5 Social Outcomes & Impacts 2.5.1 <i>Effective decision-making</i> 2.5.2 <i>Social outcomes or impacts</i> 2.6 Growth & Scale 2.6.1 <i>Manageable scaling up</i>	mod mod mod	high high high	high high high	mod-high high low-mod	high high high	important urgent important	think & plan plan soon think & plan