

## **MAN 680: Challenges in Public and Nonprofit Management**

---

### **Case Study Seminar**

*Chair of Business Administration, Public & Nonprofit Management*

1	Module Description .....	2
2	Learning and Qualification Outcome .....	2
3	Organizational Information.....	2
4	Module Details .....	3
	4.1 Proof of Performance .....	4
	4.2 General Requirements of the Students.....	4
	4.3 Requirements for the Case Summary .....	5
	4.4 Requirements for the Case Presentation .....	5
	4.5 Requirements for the Written Seminar Work.....	5
5	Case Studies .....	5
	Case Study 1: Child in Need Institute: Balancing Financial and Social Goals (Hybrid Organizing).....	5
	Case Study 2: The Public-Private Partnership Hurdle Race: The Case of Delhi International Airport (Public-Private Partnerships).....	6
	Case Study 3: The Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths (Partnerships and Network Governance) .....	6
	Case Study 4: Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy (Corporate Philanthropy).....	7
	Case Study 5: International Finance Corporation: Pioneers of Impact Investing (Impact Investing) .....	7
	Case Study 6: Emergency Response to a Long-Term Crisis? Médecins sans Frontières and HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia (Strategic Management).....	7
	Case Study 7: Yangon Bakehouse: Scaling a Social Business in Myanmar (Scaling Social Business) .....	8
	Case Study 8: Acindar and Its Corporate Volunteer Program (Corporate Volunteering) ...	9
	Case Study 9: Measured Approach: TEGV Assesses Its Performance & Impact on Educational Enrichment Programs (Volunteer Management and Performance Measurement) .....	9
	Case Study 10: Megaprojects & the Role of the Public: Germany's Embattled 'Stuttgart 21' Rail Project (Citizen Participation) .....	9
6	Literature .....	10

## 1 Module Description

Public and nonprofit organizations play a significant role in societies worldwide. To address the increasing economization and globalization within these sectors, organizations must professionalize. These trends, combined with the unique purposes of public and nonprofit organizations, pose challenges to their management. This case study seminar highlights these challenges through the discussions of practical cases, the application of scientific papers, and project work.

## 2 Learning and Qualification Outcome

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Explain the specific characteristics of public and nonprofit management.
- Apply general management methods within the public and nonprofit sectors.
- Evaluate the development of tailored concepts for public and nonprofit organizations.
- Discuss hypotheses and findings related to public and nonprofit management.
- Critically analyze scientific papers.

Additionally, students will develop key competencies, including presentation skills, working with academic literature, and team collaboration.

## 3 Organizational Information

Kick-off: ( <i>presence required</i> )	11 February 2025, 10:15 am – 13:30 pm (Room: O 133)
Consultation session ( <i>presence required</i> )	25 February 2025 Individual group sessions of 45 minutes are scheduled between 9:00 am – 15:00 pm
Case sessions (I – X): ( <i>presence required</i> )	11 March – 08 April 2025, weekly 10:15 am – 13:30 pm (Room: O 133)
Written seminar work: ( <i>self-study</i> )	18 May 2025, 23:59 pm (Deadline)
Registration:	Registration is administered via Portal2 (official registration period in January/February 2024). No registration is possible after the binding registration on 14 February 2024, 11:59 pm.

Module materials: Available on ILIAS

Credits: 6 ECTS (= 180 working hours: attendance of seminar (20) + case processing (80) + writing seminar paper (80))

### **Contact Details**

Lecturer:	Jan Vogt	Patrick Schulz
Email:	jan.vogt@uni-mannheim.de	patrick.schulz@uni-mannheim.de
Phone:	+49 621 181-1731	+49 621 181-1723
Office hours:	By appointment	By appointment

## **4 Module Details**

### **Kick-off**

The seminar starts with a kick-off session on 11 February 2025. During this session, the lecturers will introduce briefly the fundamentals of public and nonprofit management, outline the seminar's content, and clarify administrative details. After the session, students must prioritize their preferred case studies using an Excel sheet that they find, fill out, and upload on ILIAS (1: highest priority, 10 lowest priority). The upload of the Excel sheet and the binding registration for the seminar must be completed by 14 February 2025, 11:59 pm via ILIAS.

### **Case Preparation and Analysis**

Students will be assigned to case studies based on their prioritization and work in groups to prepare their assigned cases. A **consultation session** on 25 February 2025 will provide students with the opportunity to ask their open questions on their case study and receive individualized feedback and guidance. The groups should send to the respective lecturers their work-in-progress presentation, case summary, and open questions by 23 February 2025, 11:59 pm via mail. The consultation session does not need to be attended by all group members; however, we recommend the attendance of the whole team so that they can ask all relevant questions. Final slides for the case presentations and the up to three-page case summaries (in PDF format) must be submitted via ILIAS by **9 March 2025**.

### **Weekly Case Presentations**

Case presentations will take place weekly from **11 March to 8 April 2025**, with two case studies covered in each session. For each case study, the lecturers will provide a **brief introduction** to a central academic topic related to the case study (5–15 minutes). Then all students are expected to read the prepared up to **three-page case summaries** (5–10 minutes). Following the introduction, the assigned group will present their **case analysis** based on the general lead questions for 30 minutes, followed by a 10–15-minute **moderated discussion** facilitated by the presenting group. A general Q&A session may follow each presentation.

### **Schedule for Case Presentations:**

- **11 March 2025:** Case studies 1 and 2

- **18 March 2025:** Case studies 3 and 4
- **25 March 2025:** Case studies 5 and 6
- **1 April 2025:** Case studies 7 and 8
- **8 April 2025:** Case studies 9 and 10

### Written Seminar Work

After their case presentations, students will collaborate within their groups to write a **seminar thesis**. The thesis must critically analyze the case study assigned to the group, incorporating theoretical and conceptual frameworks introduced in the seminar, the feedback received from fellow students, and the given and further identified relevant scientific papers. Students must adhere to the guidelines for scientific writing provided by the Chair for Public and Nonprofit Management. The **deadline for submission is 18 May 2025, 11:59 pm**, via ILIAS in PDF format.

#### 4.1 Proof of Performance

Students will prepare in groups the written case summary, the case presentation, and the written seminar work. However, since the grading is individual, they should highlight who has created which part of the case summary and seminar work. The students can achieve the following points for each part of the case study seminar:

	Achievable points
Written case summary	10 points
Case presentation	40 points
Written seminar work	50 points
<b>Total</b>	<b>100 points</b>

#### 4.2 General Requirements of the Students

The seminar content will be developed through case studies based on academic literature in the field of public and nonprofit management. In addition to the input of the lecturers, the presentation and critical discussion of cases will play a central role during the compulsory sessions. Therefore, students are expected to be well-prepared and actively participate in all seminar sessions.

Since the case studies and most of the relevant academic literature are in English, **proficiency in English is essential**. Students should also be prepared to critically engage with topic-specific practical challenges and scientific literature. These are prerequisites for participation in the seminar.

Regular attendance is mandatory for successful seminar completion. Excused absences are permitted for a maximum of 180 minutes, provided that no proof of performance is required during the missed sessions.

#### 4.3 Requirements for the Case Summary

To prepare the case presentation and ensure a shared understanding of the relevant content, each group must create a case summary of up to three pages. This summary should include all essential information about the case for the presentation. The students have to highlight who has created which part. The case summary will be read individually in the sessions after the theoretical input and before the case presentation by the group.

#### 4.4 Requirements for the Case Presentation

The students are required to present a case study focusing on specific challenges in public and nonprofit management. They should report key aspects of their case, critically reflect on them, and engage in discussions based on guiding questions about the central problems. To aid their presentations, the use of PowerPoint is highly recommended. Presentations are limited to a duration of 30 minutes each. After this, the group that presented will lead a 10–15-minute discussion on the case and the broader topic. Following specific discussions, there can be a general Q&A session. The assessment criteria will include the content, structure, and delivery of the presentation, as well as the handling of questions and feedback.

In the presentation, three **general lead questions** should be addressed:

1. In how far did the organization / responsible persons do a good/bad job?
2. What challenges is the organization / are the responsible persons confronted with?
3. If you were in the position of the management: How would you act? How would you have acted?

#### 4.5 Requirements for the Written Seminar Work

The goal of the seminar thesis is to reflect the student's ability to critically – and in a written form – discuss the practical challenges of public and nonprofit management through case studies based on topic-specific theoretical-conceptual foundations. To support this process, students can make use of existing scientific management literature. The structure of the seminar thesis follows the general lead questions. The allocation of the respective parts is to be highlighted. The outline for the thesis can be discussed in the consultation session.

Assessment criteria are the content, systematic approach, scientific language, and formal aspects of the thesis. The theses must follow the guidelines provided by the Chair for Public and Nonprofit Management (see homepage).

## 5 Case Studies

### *Case Study 1: Child in Need Institute: Balancing Financial and Social Goals (Hybrid Organizing)*

In February 2009, the additional director at the Child In Need Institute (CINI) received the most challenging assignment that CINI's board of governors had ever given him - to prepare a com-

prehensive proposal recommending whether the organization should continue as a non-government organization (NGO) driven primarily by donations and grants, or should venture into social business. He had a month to give his recommendations. CINI was a reputable 37-year-old NGO from Kolkata (Calcutta), India, with a mission of "sustainable development in education, protection, health and nutrition of child, adolescent and woman in need." Over the years, CINI had fought child malnutrition through health clinics and educating mothers, and had provided shelters and a path to betterment for street children. Despite recognition at CINI that donor funding was becoming scarce, any proposed social business was controversial because it ran the risk of alienating existing donors and replacing CINI's existing purpose with a profit motive.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/child-in-need-institute-non-profit-or-hybrid/W13228>

*Case Study 2: The Public-Private Partnership Hurdle Race: The Case of Delhi International Airport (Public-Private Partnerships)*

The case "The Public-Private Partnership Hurdle Race: The Case of Delhi International Airport" is about the various challenges faced by the GMR Group who was the private partner in the Delhi Airport Modernization project. The modernization of the Delhi international airport was done under a public-private partnership (PPP). The GMR Group won this bid for the development and modernization, becoming the first private player to work with the government on an airport development venture under the PPP model. Through the experience of the GMR Group, related by its Chairman, G. M. Rao, the case explores the various setbacks and challenges to project implementation posed by the nascent and evolving PPP policy environment in the country. At the same time, the case also presents the government's viewpoint and efforts to deal with the evolution of the aviation sector in India by strengthening the PPP framework. Further, the case underlines the importance of having a strong, well-defined, unambiguous and forward looking policy environment for the successful implementation of PPP projects in India. The case also presents the complexities of making policy decisions in a democratic political system such as India's.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/the-public-private-partnership-hurdle-race-the-case-of-delhi-international-airport/ISB224>

*Case Study 3: The Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths (Partnerships and Network Governance)*

"The Mosquito Network" describes the appointment and work of Ray Chambers, a retired private equity entrepreneur, as the United Nations' Special Envoy for Malaria. The A case covers the modern history of efforts to combat malaria and the beginnings of Chambers's in-

volvement in the cause. The case is about leadership skills and techniques required for organizing a complex network of private, non-profit, and for-profit enterprises in a combined effort to solve a global health problem.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/the-mosquito-network-collaborative-entrepreneurship-in-the-fight-to-eliminate-malaria-deaths-a/KS1191>

*Case Study 4: Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy (Corporate Philanthropy)*

The Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy case introduces a distinct social enterprise structure, a combination of a philanthropic division of a for-profit corporation and a nonprofit foundation. The case provides an up-to-date, in-depth description of Google.org, one such hybrid, and a brief overview of Salesforce.org, a comparable hybrid. This case provides an opportunity to explore the tensions between the for-profit and nonprofit entities that inevitably arise in such structures, as well as factors that contribute to these tensions and solutions that have been attempted to address them. The case revolves around the tension caused when a non-entrepreneurial entity, Google.org, is created within the entrepreneurial culture of Google. Unlike most entrepreneurial ventures, Google.org is flush with cash; like many, it lacks cohesion around mission and vision.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/google-org-for-profit-philanthropy/HKS699>

*Case Study 5: International Finance Corporation: Pioneers of Impact Investing (Impact Investing)*

In 2017, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) faced the first big investment decision in its new Scaling Solar project. Founded in 1956, IFC was an international investment body with national governments as shareholders, whose mission was to promote economic development. It achieved this primarily through debt financing, which allowed the organization to use covenants to exercise close stewardship of its investments. Beginning in the late 1990s, the organization's mission had evolved to foreground environmental and social sustainability in its development projects. Scaling Solar, launched in collaboration with the World Bank, would be one of IFC's marquis projects in promoting a sustainable energy future.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/making-impact-investing-markets-ifc-a/221061>

*Case Study 6: Emergency Response to a Long-Term Crisis? Médecins sans Frontières and HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia (Strategic Management)*

Medecins sans Frontieres (MSF, Doctors without Borders) is an organization that responds to humanitarian crises throughout the world with medical staff and supplies. The organization also acts as an advocate for those it serves, providing “testimony” (temoignage) about the

plight of those caught up in humanitarian crises. In the late 1990s MSF began caring for people with HIV/AIDS and in 2000 began the first efforts to provide anti-retroviral (ARV) drugs to HIV-infected people in developing countries. The case describes these efforts, and, in particular, an initiative in Ethiopia by MSF Holland. The discussion of the situation in Holland focuses on the reasons why MSF began an ARV program in Ethiopia and what its future was likely to be. The case highlights the problems facing a highly decentralized organization oriented towards emergency response, which is, nevertheless, engaged in a long-term intervention. As such, it raises questions about the alignment between the organization's mission, structure, and the requirements of a particular program. It also highlights questions about organizational decision making both in terms of entry into a new initiative and exit from it. Finally, it provides an example of organizational effectiveness as advocacy – how proving the impossible is possible moves policy makers to act. The case is appropriate for classes on strategic management and operations management.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/emergency-response-to-a-long-term-crisis-medecins-sans-frontieres-and-hiv-aids-in-ethiopia/HKS099>

*Case Study 7: Yangon Bakehouse: Scaling a Social Business in Myanmar (Scaling Social Business)*

Based in 2017, the case describes the entrepreneurial journey of a social enterprise (SE), Yangon Bakehouse (YBH), in Myanmar. Established in 2012, YBH's primary objective was to address the socio-economic development issues of disadvantaged women in Myanmar. The enterprise was based on a self-sustaining model, and ran a revenue-generating restaurant and catering business to help support its social mission. YBH recruited minimally educated women who lacked stable income for a seven-month multiskilling training programme that provided culinary skills for employability, and life skills related to healthcare and financial decision-making. The apprentices were also assisted in securing placement across cafes, restaurants and bakeries. The restaurant and catering business served a dual purpose by providing on-the-job training in a practical setting, and generating income to sustain the training program. The enterprise was a success, and by 2017, YBH had managed to train and place 91 women. Additionally, it ran two kiosks, one café, a centralised kitchen, a training centre and an office. However, sustaining this growth was proving to be a challenge given the highly skewed real estate market, restrictive loan policies, and lack of legal recognition of SEs in Myanmar. Furthermore, with three of its four partners' being expatriates, the longevity of the enterprise was under question. Would YBH be able to transition to local leadership and management? Most importantly, would the social enterprise model continue to be relevant in the changing Myanmar?

<https://store.hbr.org/product/yangon-bakehouse-a-social-enterprise-in-myanmar/SMU306>



*Case Study 8: Acindar and Its Corporate Volunteer Program (Corporate Volunteering)*

A family-owned business, Acindar was one of the most important steel companies in Argentina. After the 2001-2002 Argentine economic crisis, it yielded its controlling stake to a new investor--Belgo Mineira, a Brazilian company of Austrian origin. Arturo Acevedo Jr., the founder's grandson, kept his managerial position as company CEO and president. Acindar Foundation, through the initiative of the company's founder Arturo Acevedo (grandfather) and in its capacity as corporate social policy enforcer, engaged in comprehensive educational, health, and environmental activities for 40 years. Depicts the changes resulting from the incorporation of the new shareholders to the company and how they reflected on the foundation's management and the corporate HR area. The triggering factor was an initiative to develop a corporate volunteer program similar to the one Belgo Mineira had implemented in Brazil--a project that integrated foundation, corporate, and HR management efforts at each production plant.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/acindar-and-its-corporate-volunteer-program/SKE065>

*Case Study 9: Measured Approach: TEGV Assesses Its Performance & Impact on Educational Enrichment Programs (Volunteer Management and Performance Measurement)*

This case traces the evolution of thinking about, and the implementation of, performance assessment at one of Turkey's largest and most respected nonprofit organizations, the Educational Volunteers Foundation of Turkey (TEGV). TEGV delivers a broad array of educational enrichment programs to low-income children across Turkey through a team of volunteers. In contrast to many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) across the world, which have adopted performance measurement reluctantly, as a necessary but onerous condition of receiving grant funds, TEGV embraced the idea early, for its own organizational purposes. In the course of telling TEGV's performance assessment story, the case includes detailed descriptions of two different approaches to program review and two broader impact studies. It includes 17 pages of exhibits--most of which provide samples of study results for students to review and discuss. TEGV's approach to assessment has been varied, creative and has evolved over time. Students of performance evaluation will likely see both pluses and minuses in the nature of each assessment described in this case, ensuring a rich and lively discussion.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/measured-approach-tegv-assesses-its-performance-impact-on-educational-enrichment-programs/KS1042>

*Case Study 10: Megaprojects & the Role of the Public: Germany's Embattled 'Stuttgart 21' Rail Project (Citizen Participation)*

In February 2010, Germany's national railway broke ground on a project that had been under negotiation for more than 20 years, the Stuttgart segment of the European Magistrale, a

930-mile cross-Europe high-speed rail line that would one day extend from Paris through Munich and Vienna to Budapest and Bratislava. At long last, the German national railway, the state of Baden-Württemberg, and the city of Stuttgart had come to agreement on the routing and station design of the megaproject. Yet within the year, the project would spark the largest citizen demonstrations Germany had seen since the reunification of the country. The Stuttgart 21 opponents were diverse, and so were their concerns, but nearly all were united by one overriding contention: that political elites had conceived the plan without public input and had later refused to take citizen objections seriously. The case provides basic background and context for this controversy, then describes four kinds of public participation that took place in the course of developing the project: (1) a city-sponsored open-participation process in 1997 allowing citizens to weigh in on the neighborhood redevelopment portions of the project; (2) a petition drive by opponents to hold a city referendum on the project, later followed by mass demonstrations; (3) a state-sponsored mediation process between supporters and opponents of the project; and (4) a state election followed by a state referendum on the project.

<https://store.hbr.org/product/megaprojects-the-role-of-the-public-germany-s-embattled-stuttgart-21-rail-project/KS1130>

## 6 Literature

### *Case Study 1: Hybrid Organizing*

- Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing Research on Hybrid Organizing – Insights from the Study of Social Enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.893615>
- Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C., & Model, J. (2014). Harnessing Productive Tensions in Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Work Integration Social Enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1658–1685. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0903>
- Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 364–381. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0431>
- Hustinx, L., & De Waele, E. (2015). Managing Hybridity in a Changing Welfare Mix: Everyday Practices in an Entrepreneurial Nonprofit in Belgium. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(5), 1666–1689. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9625-8>
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 30(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x>

Gümüşay, A. A., Smets, M. & Morris, T. (2020). "God at work": Engaging Central and Incompatible Institutional Logics through Elastic Hybridity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 124-154. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0481>

### *Case Study 2: Public-Private Partnerships*

- George, G., Fewer, T. J., Lazzarini, S., McGahan, A. M., & Puranam, P. (2024). Partnering for Grand Challenges: A Review of Organizational Design Considerations in Public–Private Collaborations. *Journal of Management*, 50(1), 10–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221148992>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. *Public administration review*, 75(5), 647-663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12432>
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-Private Partnerships: Perspectives on Purposes, Publicness, and Good Governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.584>
- Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2007). Public–private partnerships: an international performance review. *Public administration review*, 67(3), 545-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00736.x>
- Quelin, B. V., Cabral, S., Lazzarini, S., & Kivleniece, I. (2019). The private scope in public–private collaborations: An institutional and capability-based perspective. *Organization Science*, 30(4), 831-846.

### *Case Study 3: Partnerships and Network Governance*

- George, G., Fewer, T. J., Lazzarini, S., McGahan, A. M., & Puranam, P. (2024). Partnering for Grand Challenges: A Review of Organizational Design Considerations in Public–Private Collaborations. *Journal of Management*, 50(1), 10–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221148992>
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-Private Partnerships: Perspectives on Purposes, Publicness, and Good Governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.584>
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2007). Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015>
- Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR Through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design and Institutionalisation of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(S2), 413–429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9743-y>

- Van Ham, H., & Koppenjan, J. (2001). Building Public-Private Partnerships: Assessing and Managing Risks in Port Development. *Public Management Review*, 3(4), 593–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616670110070622>
- Spitz, G., van Kranenburg, H., & Korzilius, H. (2021). Motives matter: The relation between motives and interpartner involvement in nonprofit–business partnerships. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 32(2), 287-306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21462>
- Atouba, Y. C., & Shumate, M. D. (2020). Meeting the challenge of effectiveness in nonprofit partnerships: Examining the roles of partner selection, trust, and communication. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31, 301-315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00143-2>

#### *Case Study 4: Corporate Philanthropy*

- Besharov, M. L. (2014). The Relational Ecology of Identification: How Organizational Identification Emerges When Individuals Hold Divergent Values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1485–1512. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0761>
- Davies, I. A., & Doherty, B. (2019). Balancing a Hybrid Business Model: The Search for Equilibrium at Cafédirect. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(4), 1043–1066. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3960-9>
- Gautier, A., & Pache, A.-C. (2015). Research on Corporate Philanthropy: A Review and Assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(3), 343–369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1969-7>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating Shared Value: How to Reinvent Capitalism - and Unleash a Wave of Innovation and Growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77.
- Seo, H., Luo, J., & Kaul, A. (2021). Giving a little to many or a lot to a few? The returns to variety in corporate philanthropy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 42(9), 1734-1764. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3309>
- Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2016). Institutional equivalence: How industry and community peers influence corporate philanthropy. *Organization Science*, 27(5), 1325-1341. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2016.1083>

#### *Case Study 5: Impact Investing*

- Barnett, M. L., & Salomon, R. M. (2003). Throwing a Curve at Socially Responsible Investing Research: A New Pitch at an Old Debate. *Organization & Environment*, 16(3), 381–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026603256285>

- Glänzel, G., & Scheuerle, T. (2016). Social Impact Investing in Germany: Current Impediments from Investors' and Social Entrepreneurs' Perspectives. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1638–1668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9621-z>
- Höchstädter, A. K., & Scheck, B. (2015). What's in a Name: An Analysis of Impact Investing Understandings by Academics and Practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132(2), 449–475. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2327-0>
- Martin, M. (2015). Building Impact Businesses through Hybrid Financing. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2015-0005>
- Roundy, P. T. (2020). Regional differences in impact investment: A theory of impact investing ecosystems. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 16(4), 467–485. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-11-2018-0302>

#### *Case Study 6: Strategic Management*

- Hudson, B. A., & Bielefeld, W. (1997). Structures of Multinational Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 8(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.4130080105>
- Johansen, M. S., & Sowa, J. E. (2019). Human Resource Management, Employee Engagement, and Nonprofit Hospital Performance. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 29(4), 549–567. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21352>
- Jones, M. B. (2007). The Multiple Sources of Mission Drift. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2), 299–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764007300385>
- Lindenberg, M. (1999). Declining State Capacity, Voluntarism, and the Globalization of the Not-for-Profit Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1\_suppl), 147–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089976499773746492>
- Cabral, S., Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Potoski, M. (2019). Value creation and value appropriation in public and nonprofit organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(4), 465–475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3008>
- Michaud, V., & Tello - Rozas, S. (2020). Integrating normative values and/in value creation: A strategic management decision aid tool for social enterprises' values practices. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(3), 377–398. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21392>

#### *Case Study 7: Scaling Social Business*

- Bloom, P. N., & Chatterji, A. K. (2009). Scaling Social Entrepreneurial Impact. *California Management Review*, 51(3), 114–133. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166496>
- Cannatelli, B. (2017). Exploring the Contingencies of Scaling Social Impact: A Replication and Extension of the SCALERS Model. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of*

- Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 28(6), 2707–2733.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-016-9789-x>
- Heinecke, A., & Mayer, J. (2012). Strategies for Scaling in Social Entrepreneurship. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Hrsg.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business* (S. 191–209). Gabler Verlag. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-7093-0\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-7093-0_10)
- Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Cardenas, J. (2012). Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneurial Models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 353–373.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1414-3>
- Han, J., & Shah, S. (2020). The ecosystem of scaling social impact: A new theoretical framework and two case studies. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 215–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2019.1624273>
- Kannampuzha, M., & Hockerts, K. (2019). Organizational social entrepreneurship: scale development and validation. *Social Enterprise Journal*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-06-2018-0047>

#### *Case Study 8: Corporate Volunteering*

- Rodell, J. B., Booth, J. E., Lynch, J. W., & Zipay, K. P. (2017). Corporate Volunteering Climate: Mobilizing Employee Passion for Societal Causes and Inspiring Future Charitable Action. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1662–1681.  
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0726>
- Rodell, J. B., Breitsohl, H., Schröder, M., & Keating, D. J. (2016). Employee Volunteering: A Review and Framework for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 55–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315614374>
- Rodell, J. B., & Lynch, J. W. (2016). Perceptions of Employee Volunteering: Is It “Credited” or “Stigmatized” by Colleagues? *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 611–635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0566>
- Samuel, O., Wolf, P., & Schilling, A. (2013). Corporate Volunteering: Benefits and Challenges for Nonprofits: Corporate Volunteering. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(2), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21089>
- Schneider, H., & Neumayr, M. (2022). How Nonprofits Make Sense of Corporate Volunteering: Explaining Different Forms of Nonprofit-Business Collaboration. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 51(5), 1184–1206.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640211057410>
- Hamilton Skurak, H., Malinen, S., Kuntz, J.C. & Näswall, K. (2019). The Relevance of Self-Determination for Corporate Volunteering Intentions. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30, 1054–1068 (2019).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00140-5>

*Case Study 9: Volunteer Management and Performance Measurement*

- Bagnoli, L., & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring Performance in Social Enterprises. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009351111>
- Englert, B., Thaler, J., & Helmig, B. (2020). Fit Themes in Volunteering: How Do Volunteers Perceive Person–Environment Fit? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(2), 336–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019872005>
- Speckbacher, G. (2013). The Use of Incentives in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5), 1006–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012447896>
- Studer, S. (2016). Volunteer Management: Responding to the Uniqueness of Volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(4), 688–714. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015597786>
- Morinière, A., & Georgescu, I. (2022). Hybridity and the use of performance measurement: facilitating compromises or creating moral struggles? Insights from healthcare organizations. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 35(3), 801-829. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-12-2019-4309>
- Lee, I. H. I., Kim, S. M., & Green, S. (2021). Social enterprises and market performance: The moderating roles of innovativeness, sectoral alignment, and geographic localization. *Journal of Business Research*, 132, 491-506. <https://doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.033>

*Case Study 10: Citizen Participation*

- Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2016). Distinguishing Different Types of Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12465>
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x>
- Thomsen, M. K., Baekgaard, M., & Jensen, U. T. (2020). The Psychological Costs of Citizen Coproduction. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(4), 656–673. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa001>
- Walters, L. C., Aydelotte, J., & Miller, J. (2000). Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00097>
- Holum, M. (2022). Citizen participation: Linking government efforts, actual participation, and trust in local politicians. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2022.2048667>

Lee, Y., & Schachter, H. L. (2019). Exploring the relationship between trust in government and citizen participation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(5), 405-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1465956>