

## **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 Wiki article .....	4
4.4	Requirements for the Case Presentation .....	4
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 Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths (Partnerships & Network Governance).....	6
	Case Study 3: Political Leadership in South Africa: HIV (Public Service Motivation) .....	6
	Case Study 4: Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy (Corporate Philanthropy).....	6
	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) ...	8
	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 (for Wiki Articles) .....	10

## 1 Module Description

Worldwide public and nonprofit organizations make an important contribution to society. To face the increasing economization and globalization in the public and nonprofit sectors, organizations need to professionalize. Combined with the public and nonprofit-specific organizational purpose, these tendencies pose challenges to public and nonprofit management. These will be highlighted by analyzing scientific papers and by discussing practical cases and project work.

## 2 Learning and Qualification Outcome

By the end of the module students will be able to:

- explain the particularities of public and nonprofit management,
- apply general management methods in the public and nonprofit sectors,
- evaluate the development of specific concepts for public and nonprofit organizations,
- discuss hypotheses and findings in the field of public and nonprofit management,
- critically analyze scientific papers.

Moreover, key competencies such as presentation competence, working with academic papers, and team competencies shall be acquired.

## 3 Organizational Information

Kick-off: ( <i>presence required</i> )	13 February 2024, 10:15 am – 13:30 pm (Room: O 133)
Case sessions (I – X): ( <i>presence required</i> )	27 February – 16 April 2024, weekly (except 05 March 2024) 10:15 am – 13:30 pm (Room: O 133)
Written seminar work: ( <i>self-study</i> )	31 May 2024, noon (Deadline)
Form of assessment:	Wiki article (individual work; 10 points); case presentation (group work; 40 points); written seminar work (group work, individually written chapters; 50 points)
Registration:	Registration is administered centrally via the Portal2 (official registration period in January/February 2024); no registration is possible after the kick-off on 13 February 2024.
Module materials:	ILIAS

Credits: 6 ECTS (= 180 working hours: attendance of seminar (20) + case processing (60) + preparation for Wiki article (20) + writing seminar paper (80))

#### **Contact Details**

Lecturer:	Ludwig Uhl	Jan Vogt
Email:	<a href="mailto:ludwig.uhl@uni-mannheim.de">ludwig.uhl@uni-mannheim.de</a>	<a href="mailto:jan.vogt@uni-mannheim.de">jan.vogt@uni-mannheim.de</a>
Phone:	+49 621 181-1723	+49 621 181-1731
Office hours:	by appointment	by appointment

#### **4 Module Details**

There will be a kick-off session to start the seminar MAN 680 on 13 February 2024. The lecturers will introduce the fundamentals of public and nonprofit management. Moreover, they will clarify the seminar content and administrative details. In the kick-off session, students will be assigned to a case study and scientific paper for the wiki article. Before the kick-off, students may opt for their prioritized case study until 12 February, noon. (Excel sheet with prioritization on ILIAS; upload of prioritization also on ILIAS; 1: highest priority, 10 lowest priority).

The seminar is held as a weekly seminar from 13 February until 16 April 2024 (10:15 am – 13:30 pm). Every week after the kick-off, two case studies will be presented and discussed. Each group will be offered an in-person consultation hour before presenting the case. The final slides for the case presentations need to be provided before the case presentation on ILIAS (pdf file). During the seminar days, we will discuss several different challenges of public and nonprofit management and listen to the case presentations and discussions of the groups. The order of presentations will follow the module schedule for all seminar dates (case studies 1 and 2 on 27 February 2024; case studies 3 and 4 on 12 March 2024, and so on). The maximum presenting time allowed is 30 minutes. Each presentation will be followed by a general Q&A session. Afterwards, the presentation group will moderate 10 to 15 minutes discussion on the case and the general topic.

Following the seminar sessions, the students will compose a seminar thesis in their respective groups, in which they will discuss the cases based on the particular theoretical-conceptual foundations of the respective content areas (please view chair-specific guidelines for the composition of scientific work). The written seminar work is due on 31 May 2024 (noon) via ILIAS (pdf file).

#### 4.1 Proof of Performance

The proof of performance is composed of the following parts: Wiki article (individual work; up to 10 points); case presentation (group work; up to 40 points); written seminar work (group work, individually written chapters; up to 50 points).

	Contribution to final grade (maximum achievable points)
Wiki article	10 points
Case presentation	40 points
Written seminar work	50 points
Total	100 points

#### 4.2 General Requirements of the Students

The content of the seminar will be developed through case studies based on scholarly literature in the field of public and nonprofit management. In addition to the input from instructors, the presentation and critical discussion of cases will play a significant role during the compulsory sessions. Consequently, we expect students to be well-prepared and actively participate in all seminar sessions.

Since the case studies and most of the scholarly literature on the topics are in English, **proficiency in the English language is crucial**. Students should also be ready to critically engage with topic-specific practical challenges and scientific literature. These are prerequisites for participating in the seminar.

A prerequisite for a successful completion of the seminar is regular attendance. Excused absence during seminar sessions is allowed for a maximum of 180 minutes if no proof of performance is to be delivered during these sessions.

#### 4.3 Requirements for the Wiki article

To lay the conceptual basis for the subsequent case discussion, each student creates a wiki article on a scientific article. The scientific article belongs to the subject area of the case study to be worked on. In the wiki article, the problem, research question, conceptual basis and central findings are to be presented. Assessment criteria are the critical reflection of the scientific article, clear and transparent presentation of results, consistency, and relevance.

#### 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 these cases, 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. Following each presentation, there will be a general Q&A session. After this, the group that presented will lead a 10–15-minute discussion on the case and the broader topic. 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 guiding 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 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 (use insights from Wiki articles). The structure of the seminar thesis follows the provided guiding questions. The allocation of the respective parts is to be highlighted. The outline for the thesis can be discussed throughout the consultation hours.

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 comprehensive 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 Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths (Partnerships & 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 case covers the modern history of efforts to combat malaria and the beginnings of Chambers’s involvement 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 3: Political Leadership in South Africa: HIV (Public Service Motivation)*

This case describes the rapid scale-up of South Africa's national HIV/AIDS response from 2009 until 2015. After providing background on apartheid, the impact of HIV/AIDS denialism, and an overview of the health system in South Africa, the case follows Minister of Health Aaron Motsoaledi's leadership of the national department of health's HIV/AIDS program. The response included four key components: a countrywide counseling and testing campaign, capacity building to increase access to treatment, an overhaul of the ARV bidding and procurement processes, and promotion of voluntary male medical circumcision. The case highlights how Motsoaledi and his team leveraged expertise and resources from domestic and international organizations to support ambitious testing and treatment goals. It focuses on Motsoaledi's communication strategies and the factors that influenced his planning and implementation decisions. The case ends with Motsoaledi considering how to advance the national HIV/AIDS program amid larger health system issues, including overcrowding and limited monitoring capacity.

[Political Leadership in South Africa: HIV | Harvard Business Publishing Education](#)

*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 re-development 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 (for Wiki Articles)

### *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: Partnerships & Network Governance*

- 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 3: Public Service Motivation

- Schott, C., Neumann, O., Baertschi, M., & Adrian Ritz, A. (2019) Public Service Motivation, Prosocial Motivation and Altruism: Towards Disentanglement and Conceptual Clarity, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(14), 1200-1211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1588302>
- Gould-Williams, J. S., Mostafa, A. M. S., & Bottomley, P. (2015). Public Service Motivation and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Person-Organization Fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(2), 597–622. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut053>
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 414–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12505>
- Wright, B. E., Christensen, R. K., & Pandey, S. K. (2013). Measuring Public Service Motivation: Exploring the Equivalence of Existing Global Measures. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(2), 197–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.817242>
- Robichau, R. W., & Sandberg, B. (2022). Creating Meaningfulness in Public Service Work: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Public and Nonprofit Managers' Experience of Work. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 52(2), 122–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740211050363>
- Hue, T. H. H., Vo Thai, H. C., & Tran, M. L. (2022). A link between public service motivation, employee outcomes, and person–organization fit: Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45(5), 379-398.

#### 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. *Nonprofit 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. *Nonprofit 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>