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ABSTRACT

The Role of Leadership in the Formation of Cross-Sector Social Partnerships: Mobilizing Leadership in Collaborative Social Enterprise

Kevin McDermott
University of Guelph, 2016

When faced with complex social and environmental issues, some organizations participate in Cross-Sector Social Partnerships (CSSPs) to attempt to improve the issue through collaboration. Some of these CSSPs are facilitated by formal convening organizations that enable the active participation of stakeholders. This research study contributes to our understanding of the role of leadership in these organizations by exploring the question: what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs? Aligned with the process approach to leadership represented in Relational Leadership Theory, narratives drawn from a variety of CSSP stakeholders are interpreted as social constructions of the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs.

Data was collected from seven CSSP research sites that were in their formation stage and were facilitated by enterprising convening organizations. Data gathering methods included conducting semi-structured interviews, engaging in participant observation and collecting organizational documents. A rigorous process of data interpretation and analysis was undertaken and theoretical coding was informed by insights from Social Movement Theory (SMT). Findings indicate that the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations involve three broad categories: i) identifying political opportunity; ii) creating mobilizing structures and; iii) engaging in framing activities. These activities are conceptualized in terms of a new construct called ‘mobilizing leadership’ that is associated with the fostering of collective action of
Mobilizing leadership involves opportunity recognition and creation, which is linked to the mobilization of stakeholders’ tangible and intangible resources without the expectation of monetary reciprocity.

The contributions of this research are both theoretical and empirical. Concepts from the SMT literature were used to further develop themes on the leadership of convening organizations inductively identified through empirical analysis. This grounded interpretation of leadership at the formation stages of CSSPs is intended to initiate a scholarly discourse related to ‘mobilizing leadership’ in the CSSP literature. The research findings also constitute a novel empirical examination of intentional leadership activities in the formation of CSSPs that are facilitated by enterprising convening organizations. Practitioners may benefit from this as it will inform a deeper understanding of the intentional leadership activities they need to engage in to catalyze the formation of CSSPs. These insights may be particularly useful to those practitioners interested in mobilizing the collective action of stakeholders in CSSPs in the context of limited financial resources.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

Society faces complex social and environmental challenges, including global poverty, increasing energy demand and the associated impact on global climate. Comprehensive solutions to these challenges have not emerged from traditional approaches of government, non-profit and business sectors working in isolation. This failure to make significant progress despite the pressing nature of social and environmental problems has resulted in a growing focus on how deliberate interaction across sector boundaries may give rise to new opportunities. Working collaboratively across sector boundaries necessitates a different approach from organizational leaders (Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Kurucz, Colbert & Wheeler, 2013) in order to enable cross-sector collaboration.

There is a growing body of work described by the term Cross-Sector Social Partnerships, or CSSP, that explores the nature of these interactions (Seitanidi & Crane, 2013; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, 2012b; Laasonen, Fougere & Kourula, 2012; Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005), and how to motivate them (Cobert, Kurucz & McDermott, 2013), but more understanding needs to develop around the role of the leadership, in particular at the formation stages of a CSSPs. Even when stakeholder goals are largely aligned, motivation and support are often required to encourage participation in a potentially resource intensive partnership. In the formation stages of CSSPs, it often falls to an individual or convening organization to offer leadership to ensure the participation of stakeholders and to get the collaboration underway.

The focus of this dissertation research is to explore the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. The formation stage of CSSPs is defined as the stage in the creation of a partnership where participants identify a problem, create common language, generate information, make a
joint commitment to collaborate, identify and legitimate stakeholders, find an appropriate convenor and identify initial resources (Westley & Vredenburg, 1997).

There is a gap in the CSSP literature as it relates to this, and one of the key contributions of this research is to suggest that it is valuable to conceptualize the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs in terms of ‘mobilizing leadership’. Mobilizing leadership is a construct developed through this research that refers to \textit{intentional activities undertaken by individuals or organizations to foster collective action, spanning sector boundaries, to solve complex social issues}. Building on Crosby and Bryson’s (2010) conceptualization of ‘integrative leadership’ and drawing in concepts from the social movement literature (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996), this relational conceptualization of leadership foregrounds the leadership activities in convening organizations that take an integrative approach to facilitating multi-stakeholder collaboration.

To better understand these intentional leadership activities in the formation of CSSPs, insights from the inductive analysis of data suggested that Social Movement Theory (SMT) literature as it relates to collective action, provides a useful conceptual lens to theoretically explore the phenomena. Increasingly SMT has been engaged in organization theory (Davis, 2005; King, 2008; Page, 2010) and is relevant here because it focuses on important motivators for collective action around social issues.

As will be developed in subsequent sections, social movements, specifically collective action social movements, and CSSPs are overlapping concepts. By applying well developed ideas from SMT to underdeveloped aspects of CSSP theory, I develop a theoretical contribution that can be described as synthesized coherence (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007) to the CSSP literature. Two key bodies of literature are enfolded into the data analysis at different points in
the inductive research process, as will be described more fully in the Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Scholarly work drawn from the Social Movement literature is used to help describe what leadership activities are occurring at convening organizations during the formation of CSSPs in Chapters 5 and 6. The Social Entrepreneurship literature is used in Chapter 7 to inform why these activities are occurring. Social entrepreneurship is defined here as “innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, business or government sectors” (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006, p. 2). This conceptualization of social entrepreneurship, involves multi-sector focused organizations that create social value as well as monetary value. Social entrepreneurship blends together these two value creation approaches, where the non-mutually exclusive priorities of profit and social mission coexist. The seven CSSP research sites examined during the course of this research inquiry are enterprising, collaborative convening organizations that facilitated the partnership process by bringing stakeholders together in a collaborative manner to demonstrably improve a social or environmental issue. These convening organizations of the CSSPs primarily operated on a funds-from-operations basis. While grants, donations and sponsorships comprised a portion of their funding strategy, they operated as enterprising organizations that derived the bulk of their funds by offering fee-based services. Given their mission-focused social orientation and their enterprising approach to generating funds, these convening organizations may be classified as social enterprises. It is therefore appropriate to examine these organizations in the context of social entrepreneurship to help us understand why these intentional leadership activities in convening organizations are taking place.

Throughout this manuscript a conceptual framework is developed using extant theory and empirical findings (see Figure 1.1). This framework links concepts related to intentional
leadership activities in CSSPs with the fostering of social movements. Fostering of social movements in collaborative partnerships is described in this research as 'mobilizing leadership' and is primarily associated with creating the conditions that facilitate collective action of stakeholders. This description of the intentional leadership activities observed across the seven research sites demonstrates what activities are associated with mobilizing leadership, specifically: 1) the identification of organization-level and societal-level political opportunity; 2) the creation of interorganizational and process-based mobilizing structures and; 3) the use of diagnostic and prognostic framing activities.

The second contribution of this thesis relates to why mobilizing leadership occurs; for the recognition and creation of social entrepreneurial opportunity. In the entrepreneurship literature, entrepreneurial opportunity is understood to involve a good idea that when successfully implemented, provides a product or a service that fulfills an unmet market demand; this also involves a pragmatic understanding of operational realities (Singh, 2001). Opportunity only exists if thought is put into how the organization will successfully gain the resources necessary to execute on their mission. In the case of collaborative social enterprises, such as the convening organizations of the CSSPs observed in this research, collective action of stakeholders appears to be linked to the mobilization of these resources. Active participation of stakeholder partners was observed to provide both tangible and intangible resources to the convening organizations without the expectation of monetary reciprocity.

The research findings presented in this thesis also provides a practical contribution. Practitioners interested in convening CSSPs may choose to create a formal convening organization to solicit the participation of stakeholders from across sectors. By way of guidance to these practitioners, this thesis describes the intentional leadership activities of convening
organizations from seven successful CSSPs which may be transferable to other practitioner contexts and lead to stakeholder collective action.
Figure 1.1 – Mobilizing leadership in the Formation of CSSPs

Opportunity Recognition
- Identify Organizational Political Opportunity
- Identify Societal Political Opportunity

Collective Action of CSSP Stakeholders

Opportunity Creation
- Interorganizational Mobilizing Structures
- Process Based Mobilizing Structures
- Diagnostic and Prognostic Framing Activities

Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity:
- Mobilization of Resources without Monetary Reciprocity
  - Tangible and Intangible Resources

(* Further data related to this figure can be seen in Figures and Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and Table 7.1)
In Chapter 2, I present a broad literature review of Leadership and CSSP theory and research to highlight our current understanding of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. This review of the literature explores scholarly work related to the chronology of CSSPs, including their formation stage. Theories and research related to convening organizations and their role in facilitating CSSPs will be discussed as well as leadership literature that may be applicable to the intentional leadership activities undertaken in convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. The conclusion of this chapter identifies a significant gap in the Leadership and CSSP literature related to the leadership role of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. The leadership dimensions of this critical period in the development of a CSSP have not been fully articulated the literature. Because the success or failure of the partnership depends in large part on the active participation of stakeholders and the mobilization of resources to support their efforts, this requires further examination and leads to the primary research question of this inquiry: RQ #1) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs?

Chapter 3 includes a detailed account of the methods used to examine the research question. This methods chapter discusses the ontological and epistemological justification for the use of a qualitative, interpretive approach to data collection and analysis to explore this question. Seven CSSP research sites were purposively selected with chain and criterion sampling (Patton, 2002), using a variety of criteria including that: the CSSP was recently, or is currently, in the formation stage; the CSSP is convened by a formal organization, and; the convening organization is enterprising in nature, among other purposive sampling criteria. Data was collected using semi-structured interviews, participant observation and document analysis that contribute to 54 data sources comprising 424 pages of text including 35 high fidelity interviews.
with verbatim transcription, 5 sets of field notes from participant observation sessions of public and private events and meetings, as well as 13 public documents collected from the 7 CSSP research sites (see Table 4.1 and Table 4.2). Data was analyzed throughout the data collection process and extensive post-interview reflective notes were maintained as well as data analysis memoing. Data collection and analysis were completed in parallel, and sensitizing concepts related to the literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 5 informed the evolution of the interview protocol as well as the theoretical coding process described in Chapters 3 and 4 (Charmaz, 2014).

Chapter 4 expands on the data analysis process described in Chapter 3. The process of interpretive data analysis is outlined, providing as much transparency as possible into how substantive codes emerged from the data. The chapter includes sections that discuss the process of interpretive data analysis advocated by Charmaz (2014), detailing the focused coding process, followed by the development of conceptual categories, followed by theoretical coding. This analysis process refined data collection, creating a more parsimonious interview protocol in later rounds of data collection, and combined with a more targeted approach of participant sampling, led to theoretical saturation, or the point at which no new conceptual categories or codes were emerging from the data. Chapter 4 also provides a detailed explanation of how scholarly work from the Social Movement literature contributed to the theoretical categorization of substantive codes. Several visualizations are provided in the form of mind-maps, showing relationships between data incidents, in-vivo codes and substantive codes in the focused coding process. Theoretical coding is also visualized using mind-maps, indicating the progression in the data analysis process from conceptual categorization to theoretical coding. The relatedness of SMT to
the substantive codes that emerged in data analysis necessitated further enfolding of the literature to help conceptualize what was being observed at the seven research sites.

The second literature review in Chapter 5, informed by unfolding insights from the analysis of data, focuses on how the Political Process Model (PPM), a theoretical construct from SMT, can be used to help make sense of the variety of emergent substantive codes. There is a thorough discussion of the appropriateness of conceptualizing convening organizations in CSSPs in terms of SMT, as well as the rationale for selecting the PPM from the multitude of theoretical constructs available in the Social Movement literature. The Social Movement literature provides a wealth of theory and research that is conceptually consistent with convening organizations of CSSPs, so the review of the SMT and the CSSP literatures, using the PPM as a conceptual lens, indicates two gaps in the CSSP literature. The first gap relates to the role of political opportunity recognition by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs, and the second relates to the framing activities engaged in by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. These two gaps in the CSSP literature, uncovered by applying the PPM to the extant scholarly work, led to two new sub research questions: RQ #2) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to the recognition of political opportunity, in the formation of CSSPs?, and; RQ #3) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to framing activities, in the formation of CSSPs?

Chapter 6 includes a description of the conceptual categories and the substantive codes interpreted from data collected from the seven CSSP research sites. This chapter focuses on describing what was interpreted to have occurred in the formation of these CSSPs, as it relates to the leadership role of convening organizations. Following the components of the PPM, substantive codes related to: the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing
structures and engaging in framing activities are described. This chapter attempts to effectively balance *showing* and *telling* (Pratt, 2008), by first providing examples of exemplary data incidents related to substantive codes, and then describing my interpretation of these data incidents in term of their categorization as substantive codes and conceptual categories. This chapter builds on the theoretical contributions developed in Chapter 5 regarding the interrelatedness of social movements and CSSPs, drawing from both literatures to help interpret findings related to the three research questions.

Where Chapter 6 offers a descriptive explanation of *what* convening organization leadership activities occurred in the formation of the seven CSSPs, Chapter 7 provides an explanation of *why* these activities occurred. A core code that emerged in Chapter 6 described leadership activities that helped to foster a social movement through the collective action of CSSP stakeholders. Chapter 7 provides further interpretation of data from the seven CSSP research sites and combines this with the Social Entrepreneurship literature to suggest that fostering social movements through the collective action of CSSP stakeholders affords socially oriented organizations with preferential access to resources not available to purely commercially oriented organizations. Using ideas from the Social Entrepreneurship literature, the explanation of *why* convening organizations engage in mobilizing leadership relates to the construct of Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity (Haugh, 2005). The construct is further developed in this research by conceptualizing it as involving the collective action of stakeholders leading to the mobilization of resources without an expectation of monetary reciprocity. Using examples from the seven CSSP research sites, eleven forms of tangible and intangible resources afforded to the convening organizations of the CSSPs are described, resulting from the active participation of resource-holding stakeholders in the CSSPs.
Chapter 8 includes a discussion section that summarizes the theoretical and empirical contributions made in this dissertation research. It also includes a discussion of which contributions are related to the primary and secondary research questions. This summary of the theoretical and empirical contributions is followed by a section describing future research opportunities. This future research includes discussion of quantitative and qualitative research related to broadening and deepening our scholarly understanding of the role of convening organizations in leading collaboration among stakeholders in CSSPs and, more broadly, in social enterprises. Limitations of this research are then described followed by a brief conclusion. The appendix section of this manuscript includes tables that map the in-vivo codes, substantive codes, and conceptual categories with the underlying data incidents that emerged throughout the course of data analysis to provide more detailed support for the data analysis.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review of Leadership in the Formation of CSSPs

This chapter provides a literature review of the scholarly work that relates to leadership in the formation of CSSPs. The intent of this chapter is to establish what scholarly work already exists related to this phenomenon. By reviewing this literature, sensitizing concepts have emerged and informed the data collection process, including the development of interview protocols and the selection of research sites and participants (Charmaz, 2014). Throughout the CSSP and the Leadership literature scholars have conducted empirical work and theory building related to either leadership in CSSPs, or the formation of CSSPs, or convening organizations and CSSPs, but the literature directly addressing the leadership role of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs is underdeveloped. This chapter will provide a review of the CSSP and the Leadership literature related to: 1) the formation of CSSPs; 2) convening organizations and CSSPs; 3) definitions of leadership in the literature; 4) dominant leadership theories and their ontological and epistemological underpinnings and; 5) leadership in the formation stage of CSSPs.

There are a number of bodies of literature that could be drawn on to conceptualize leadership in the formation of CSSPs, but this chapter will focus specifically on the CSSP and Leadership literature. First there will be a discussion of the scholarly work related to the chronology and formation of CSSPs, followed by an overview of literature related to convening organizations in CSSPs and finally a summary of a subset of the leadership literature that has been linked to collaborative partnerships. This literature review describes the significant amount of scholarly work that has been undertaken regarding these three separate topics and then highlights the lack of theory and research related to the intersection of all three. The results of this literature review indicate that there is a clear gap in our scholarly knowledge related to the
leadership role of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. This gap leads to the primary research question at the heart of this empirical inquiry; *what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs?*

**The Chronology and Formation of CSSPs**

Much has been said in the CSSP literature about the chronology of CSSPs and how these partnerships progress through stages over time (Selsky & Parker, 2005). These phases have been conceptualized in terms of the value exchange relationship (Googins & Rochlin, 2000), as well as problem and direction setting phases (Westly & Vrendenburg, 1997). Similarly Austin and Seitanidi (2012) conceptualize four collaborative stages of CSSP value-creation, which include: philanthropic, transactional, integrative and transformational stages. The chronology of CSSPs has also been examined as the evolution of the structure of CSSPs in terms of the formation, implementation and outcome phases (Selsky & Parker, 2005).

In the formation stage of CSSPs, successful partnerships have been associated with: identifying the focal problem to be solved by the partnership, generating information related to the problem and potential solutions, committing to the collaboration, identifying and legitimating key stakeholders and ensuring the existence of a convenor (Westly & Vrendenburg, 1997). Clarke and Fuller (2010) propose a multi-stage model for collaborative strategic management which includes five stages: the collaborative strategic plan formation and implementation process, the formulation of the strategic plan, two implementation stages and finally the realized collaborative strategy implementation outcomes stage. Their first stage relates to the assessment of stakeholders and their resources and the invitation of stakeholders to work together through the use of a convening organization (Clarke & Fuller, 2010). Bryson, Crosby & Stone (2006) describe the initial conditions of cross-sector partnerships as including: a general environment
with turbulence, recognition that past attempts to solve the problem in a single sector have been failures, the existence of convenor, general agreement on the problem and the existence of relationships or networks. Building coalitions and analyzing the preconditions for partnership are also examined in the formation of CSSPs (Waddock, 1989).

Partnership selection and engagement has been the main focus of some conceptualizations of the formation of CSSPS (Gray, 1985; Waddock, 1989). However, the term formation stage has also been used to describe the time prior to formal partnership selection, rather describing an emergent and tacit pre-selection process prior to the formal creation of partnerships (Seitanidi, Koufopoulos & Palmer, 2010). The last two conceptualizations of the formation stage of CSSPs highlight an important distinction between types of CSSPs, some partnerships are intentionally formed through a planned process of engaging stakeholders and others emerge unplanned based on tacit relationships prior to a formal selection process (Seitanidi, Koufopoulos & Palmer, 2010; Jamali & Keshishian, 2009; Austin, 2000). For the purpose of this research, the formation of CSSPs will be conceptualized in terms similar to Gray (1989), Waddock (1989), Westly & Vredenburg (1997) and Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006), where there is a sense of intentionality in the creation of a successful CSSP. The formation of an intentionally planned CSSP brought together by a convening organization is a particular type of CSSP and contrasts to the more organically initiated, relationship based CSSPs described by Seitanidi, Koufopoulos and Palmer (2010).

**Convening Organizations**

The presence of a convening organization is described as an important part of the formation of some CSSPs (Gray, 1985; Waddock, 1989; Westly & Vredenburg, 1997; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2010; Clarke & Fuller, 2010). The activities of convening organizations include
direction setting, creating processes, instilling a sense of legitimacy, creating a meeting place and motivating stakeholders to participate (Gray, 1985). Similar to convening organizations, bridging organizations are described as agencies that span the gap between diverse constituencies including international and local governments, as well as NGOs and multi-national firms to enable coordinated action (Brown, 1991). These bridging organizations play an important role in a particular type of collaboration known as strategic bridging, in situations where stakeholders have a low degree of motivation to collaborate and where there is a low degree of organization related to the problem (Westley & Vredenburg, 1991).

Bridging organizations have been found to be central to CSSPs related to environmental initiatives (Westley & Vredenburg, 1997) as well as sustainable development initiatives in developing countries (Sharma, Vredenburg & Westley, 1994). The creation of a formal organization that facilitates collective action in stakeholder groups has been linked to successful collective action among stakeholder groups (King, 2008). Bridging, or “convening” organizations as they are referred to in this study, are likely to occur in two situations: the first is when the stakeholders are unlikely to collaborate in the absence of such a convening organization, and the second situation occurs when stakeholders are unaware that they have a role in solving the social issue in question (Westley & Vredenburg, 1997).

Westley and Vredenburg (1997) describe four factors that may affect the former situation. The first relates to contexts where stakeholders believe that they can solve the problem by themselves (Gray & Hay, 1986). The second factor involves stakeholders holding to ideologies and cultural constraints identified by values and precluding compromise (Touval & Zaltman, 1985). The third and fourth factors related to situations where traditional opponents are hesitant
to work together and when legal barriers make collaboration challenging (Westly & Vredenburg, 1997).

Dorado and Vaz (2003) examine the role of convenors in facilitating interorganizational collaborations from a public administration perspective. They highlight the leadership role undertaken by convening organizations to champion innovation and use influence techniques such as politics, salesmanship, personal appeal and persuasion (Dorado & Vaz, 2003). Hundal (2013) writes about the important place of partnership brokers in the successful creation of cross-sector collaborations. These studies of collaborative partnerships that operate in the presence of a formal convening organization highlight the nature and efficacy of convening organizations as well as when they are necessary for the success of CSSPs.

**Definitions of Leadership**

The previous section provides an overview of the relevant literature that relates to convening organizations and the formation of CSSPs. This section examines the salient scholarly work related to leadership studies. When examining the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs, it is important to be clear what we mean by the term “leadership.” “What is leadership” is a question that has provided a wide spectrum of answers, while at the same time many do not realize that the issue is even contested. That is, “we all know what leadership is until someone asks us to define it specifically” (Barker, 2001, p. 475). Business practitioners, society and most leadership scholars accept that leadership exists and is a universal phenomenon (Bass, 2008), but there is little consensus on a single conceptualization, or even a definition of leadership.
Leadership scholars have examined leaders and followers for a century or more, but not all leadership theorists have thought to define the term they are examining (Rost, 1991). Examining 212 different definitions of leadership in book chapters, and non-academic writings, Rost (1991) describes the increase in leadership writing and the number of definitions in the later part of the twentieth century as “incredible”. But even with the increase in the number of definitions of leadership, two-thirds of the leadership works examined by Rost (1991) did not provide a definition of leadership. He described two reasons for the lack of definitions in published works: the first is a “laissez-faire attitude” that assumes that everyone knows what leadership is, so there is no need to define it, and the second reason is an apprehensiveness to even attempt to define it because it is such a difficult concept to define (Rost, 1991). For those who do attempt to define leadership, a broad spectrum of opinions emerge, and as Bass (2008) puts it, there are “almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 11).

The etymological origin of the term leadership is relatively recent, with reputable dictionaries from as late as the nineteenth century including definitions for leader and lead, but not for leadership (Rost, 1991). The word leader has been used in the English language as early as the twelfth century but the term leadership did not come into common parlance until nineteenth century when it was used to refer to political influence in the British parliamentary system (Bass, 2008). Perhaps because of the term’s relative lack of historical incumbency, “leadership is a word that has come to mean all things to all people” (Rost, 1991, p. 7), and assumptions are made about a shared understanding of what leadership means.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2014) defines leadership as “the office or position of a leader, the capacity to lead or the act or instance of leading”. The term “lead” is defined: “to
guide on a way, especially by going in advance” (Merriam-Webster, 2014). In many cases this non-scholarly definition of leadership is similar to many scholarly definitions, but by defining leadership exclusively in terms of its root word “leader”, logically disallows the conceptual disassociation of leadership from a leader. This emphasizes a personification of leadership in the traditional sense as an act exhibited by a single individual, rather than leadership from some other entity including a group or organization, or leadership as a process. This section describes the multitude of leadership definitions from extant literature and highlights the need to be conceptually clear about what is meant by “leadership” in this study. The following section will clarify the assumptions about leadership used throughout this research and will explore leadership literature that is either drawn on by CSSP scholars, or leadership literature that may be of theoretical value to this research inquiry.

**Dominant Leadership Theories**

Scholarly leadership theories explicate the phenomena of leadership from a variety of perspectives. Uhl-Bien’s (2006) Relational Leadership Theory (RLT) is used in this research to guide the ontological assumptions about leadership and the related epistemic approach to knowledge creation. This section will examine related leadership theories, derived from different ontological and epistemological assumptions and at the end of the chapter these theories will be discussed in relation with the RLT approach used in this research.

**Characteristics Approaches to Understanding Leadership - Traits and Skills**

**Approaches**

One stream of leadership research relates to examining what traits are possessed by great leaders. An important ontological assumption that is shared by many these studies relates to the
idea that individuals are born with certain innate traits that predisposes them to being a great leader (Bass, 1990). Given that assumption, the associated epistemology typically relates to understanding the follower perception of these traits and associating those traits with leadership outcomes (Stogdill, 1948, 1974). There are a number of traits, or “characteristics” that are positively associated with good leadership, through meta-analysis of leadership trait studies. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) indicate that leaders differ from non-leaders in six ways; leaders show increased drive, motivation, integrity, confidence, cognitive ability and task knowledge. Several other important meta-analysis of trait theories of leadership indicate that leaders differ from non-leaders in terms of semi-permanent and intractable aspects of their personality, each highlighting salient characteristics such as those mentioned above (Mann, 1959; Lord, DeVader & Alliger, 1986; Zaccaro, Kemp & Bader, 2004).

Characteristic based theories also encompass theory and research related to Charismatic Leadership (Bass, 1990; Zaccaro, 2007). Charisma has been described as something that only some individuals exhibit that allows them to perform in extraordinary ways (Weber, 1947). Charismatic Leadership describes characteristics of individuals who motivate others using rhetorical devices and actions that illicit an emotional response from followers (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Charismatic leaders are associated with traits such as high self-monitoring, desire to achieve power, impression management and a desire to become self-actualized (Jung & Sosik, 2006).

While trait theories of leadership conceptualize innate characteristics as antecedents of good leadership, skills based leadership theories approach the ontology of good leadership in terms of learnable skills that may be developed through experience and education. The epistemology of skills theories involves the examination of learnable skills that are associated
with positive leadership outcomes. Early work on leadership skills was developed by Katz (1955), suggesting that leaders at various levels of the organization, such as supervisory, middle and top management, require different leadership skills. These skills may be categorized in terms of their technical, human and conceptual nature. Technical skills involve the contextually specific operations of the organization, human involve the appropriate social interaction with employees and conceptual skills relate to strategic decision making and big-picture thinking (Katz, 1955). Another skills-based model of leadership associates leaders’ skills and knowledge with positive leadership outcomes. Mumford, Zaccaro, Connelly, et al. (2000) describe these skills and knowledge in terms of: environmental influences, career experiences, competencies such as problem-solving and social judgment skills, individual attributes such as general cognitive and crystallized ability as well as how they are related to leadership outcomes. The research examining the traits and skills of leaders differ from the research presented in the subsequent section in that they associate unitary characteristics of individuals and associate them with leadership outcomes.

**Behavioural Approaches to Understanding Leadership - Styles, Situational and Contingency Approaches**

Theories and research related to styles, situational and contingency approaches to leadership can be categorized together based on their focus on leadership behaviour rather than underlying characteristics. The styles approach to understanding leadership examines only “what leaders do.” The ontology of leadership here may be described in terms of the actions that leaders exhibit and the epistemology related to understanding good leadership involves the observing these behaviours and associating them with positive leadership outcomes. This research approach is commonly associated with Hemphill & Coons (1957), who developed a
questionnaire asking leaders and followers to describe behaviours associated with good or bad leaders. Refined by Stogdill (1974), this questionnaire indicated that good leaders typically display behaviours that may be thought of in terms of initiating structure, or providing operational guidance to followers, and consideration, or offering emotional-level support and developing follower rapport. Similar findings emerged from Cartwright and Zander (1960), describing leadership styles that exhibit behaviour related to being employee oriented, where leadership effort is spent nurturing employees at an emotional level, and production oriented where leaders focus on the technical aspects of the job. These style dimensions have been associated and studied in a model known as the managerial grid, which attempts to explain how leaders achieve their purpose through concern for people and concern for production (Blake & Mouton, 1985; Black & McCanse, 1991).

The style approach focuses solely on leadership behaviours and how they relate to leadership outcomes, but situational approaches to understanding leadership examine behaviours and context. Situational leadership approaches suggest that good leadership involves the matching of certain leadership behaviours with different situations. Hersey and Blanchard (1969) developed the situational approach that was later modified by Blanchard (1985) in a model that prescriptively suggests that leaders must change behaviour based on the development level of followers. This model holds that leaders should increase supportive behaviour (i.e. coaching) when followers are at a moderate level of development, but should decrease supportive behaviour when followers are high or low in development. Similarly, it holds that leaders should linearly decrease directive behaviour towards followers as their developmental level increases (Blanchard, et al, 1985). Situational leadership theories suggest that good leadership relates to changing leadership styles depending on the situation, but contingency theories of leadership
suggest that leaders should be matched to situations where their static style of leadership is best suited (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). Similar to trait theories, this leader-match theory assumes that leadership behaviours do not change over time and that good leadership outcomes depend on the appropriateness of the leadership-situation match. One example of a contingency theory of leadership is described by Fiedler (1964), which links three situational variables: 1) the nature of the relationship between the leader and the follower; 2) is the structure of the task being performed, and; 3) the positional power of the leader. By measuring the situation along those three variables, and the leader’s propensity to be either task oriented or relationship oriented, Fiedler’s (1964) contingency model suggests that a good or a bad leader-situation match may be established.

**Influence as Leadership – Power Bases, Transformational Leadership, Charismatic Leadership**

Another popular ontological view of leadership involves the conceptualization of leadership in terms of influence. The epistemology of this view of leadership holds that we may understand leadership through studying influence as the outcome of good leadership. The antecedents of influence involve a broad range of scholarly theories and research. Leaders may be thought of as those who influence followers through personal or positional power (Kotter, 1990). Positional power includes a leader’s ability to offer rewards, and coerce followers due to their authority within an organization, while personal power relates to a leader’s expert knowledge or referent relationship with followers (French & Raven, 1962).

Influence is also an important aspect of Transformational Leadership, which has evolved in the leadership literature over the past 35 years, progressing from conceptualizations described by
House (1976) and Burns (1978) through to more modern versions described by Bass (1985) and Avolio (1999). Generally, transformational leadership is thought to involve leadership activities that include: *idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration* of followers (Bass, 1999). Transformational leadership has been contrasted with another conceptualization of leadership influence known as Transactional Leadership, which is often associated with general management activities including offering reward contingent on work-place achievement and providing management intervention only when necessary. It is theorized that Transformational Leadership augments Transactional Leadership in that it influences followers to perform above and beyond expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

While Charismatic Leadership has already been described above as a characteristic based theory of leadership, it has also been conceptualized in terms of influence. House (1976), focuses not only on the characteristics possessed by charismatic leaders, but also on the influence effects these characteristics and their corresponding behaviours have on followers. Charismatic Leadership has been observed to impact followers in terms of: creating trust, acceptance, affection, obedience towards the leader as well as emotional involvement, heightened goals and confidence toward the task at hand (House, 1976).

**Morality and Values as a Means of Understanding Leadership – Servant Leadership**

Several approaches to understanding leadership foreground an epistemological approach that involves the examination of leadership behaviours and outcomes in terms of their ethics and morality. These approaches pull from a variety of the ontological assumptions of leadership, but
they are similar in that they focus on ethical leadership activities and behaviours that influence followers to act in a way that aligns with a set of moral values.

Servant Leadership research involves several parallel tracks of theory building. Theories of Servant Leadership have a strong practitioner following and have some empirical support (Walumbwa, Harnell, & Oke, 2010; Spears, 2010), but there is no consensus among scholars related to a single construct that explicates the extant Servant Leadership literature (van Dierendonck, 2011). A variety of antecedent conditions and leadership behaviours have been observed to be associated with outcomes that include increased performance and growth of followers, improved societal impact as well as improved organizational performance (van Dierendonck, 2011).

Authentic Leadership theories study leader behaviour in terms their authenticity. Focusing on behaviours that are associated with genuineness and honesty, Authentic Leadership relates to ethical leadership and organizational outcomes. As a fairly new theoretical construct, Authentic Leadership has several parallel modes of theorizing. Walumbwa, et al (2008) describe Authentic Leaders as those who exhibit self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, display balanced processing of different viewpoints and exhibit transparency in all of their relationships. To be able to exhibit those four aspects of Authentic Leadership, Luthans and Avolio (2003) describe factors that affect a leaders’ ability to be authentic, including possessing high psychological capital, and moral reasoning. Psychological capital refers to having high self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience (Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

**A Process Approach to Understanding Leadership – LMX, Relational, Complexity Leadership**
The previous sections have described theory and research that explicate the phenomena of leadership from a variety of ontological perspectives. An alternative ontological perspective transcends the preceding assumptions by describing leadership as a process. This broad understanding of leadership describes an umbrella-like ontology that allows for congruence between many of the dominant leadership theories described above. Leadership as a process may be thought of in terms of influence, relationships, interactions, behaviours and characteristics, combining to offer value to some constituency.

One of the most common process-based theoretical paradigms in leadership studies is known as Leader-Member Exchange theory, or LMX. Focusing on the process of interaction between leader and follower, the unit of measurement of LMX is this dyadic relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). These relationships have been observed to be categorized into two groups: the first being those relationships where the leader and the follower choose to expand their roles together, known as in-group; and second, relationships characterized by formal defined roles are known as out-group relationships. Dansereau, et al. (1975) observed that followers in the in-group have more influence over, and receive more information from the leader. They also have more confidence and are more dependable, involved and communicative than followers in the out-group. The process of interaction depends on the nature of the relationship between the leader and the follower; this also affects leadership outcomes (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Prescriptively, LMX purports to suggest that leaders who promote effective relational dyads that include expanding the in-group and minimizing the out-group play a role in positive leadership outcomes (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) such as the successful achievement of organizational goals.

Building on the relationship focused nature of LMX, another process based approach to understanding leadership has been described as Relational Leadership Theory. Rather than
focusing on the relationship between the leader and the follower as the unit of measurement, as is in the case in LMX, Relational Leadership Theory focuses on the process of the social construction of knowledge related to leadership (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Describing this process, Uhl-Bien (2006) describes a key ontological assumption of Relational Leadership: “All social realities – all knowledge of self and other people and things – are viewed as individual or co-dependent constructions existing and known only in relation” (p. 665). This ontological assumption suggests that the epistemology associated with understanding leadership involves examining the social realities of several individuals associated with a leadership context. Only through the aggregation of many narratives can we begin to understand leadership as realities that relate to each other. Relational Leadership is an umbrella concept that is unlike many other conceptualizations of leadership. Its primary purpose is to provide ontological guidance, to aid in the understanding of leadership as a phenomenon, to guide research philosophy and to eventually lead to a broader conceptualization of leadership.

Using some of the ontological assumptions described above, Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) takes a process approach to understanding leadership. CLT suggests that leadership may be thought of as “an emergent, interactive dynamic” where new behaviours and actions develop (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007: 299). This approach to leadership stems from a recognition that leadership activities only enable positive organizational outcomes rather than guiding or determining those outcomes (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002). Uhl-Bien, Marion and McKelvey (2007) create a framework for CLT that describes three congruent modes of thinking about leadership in complex organizations. The first is called adaptive leadership which describes emergent actions related to creativity or learning that develop from an organizational context. Administrative leadership refers to actions typically carried out by managers with
positional power, similar to Transactional Leadership, related to the ongoing operations of an organization. Finally, *enabling leadership* relates to the creation of the correct enabling conditions within an organization to allow for the occurrence of adaptive leadership. Enabling leadership is also associated with the transfer of knowledge between more adaptive parts of an organization and the administration.

Having provided an overview of the relevant leadership literature related to their ontological and epistemological approach to conceptualizing leadership, the next section of this literature review will examine how leadership has been drawn into the scholarly work related to organizational collaboration, prior to situating my own approach in this research.

**Leadership and Collaboration**

Because of the collaborative nature of convening organizations of CSSPs, theories and research that focus more broadly on collaboration between organizations will be examined from a leadership perspective in this section. In general, leadership theories and research related to collaboration between organizations are not well developed (Conelly, 2007). What theories and research do exist span a variety of literatures and are not centred on any one particular discipline. Scholarly work from public administration, leadership studies and non-profit research are the primary sources of the collaboration-related theories and research described in this section.

Huxham and Vangen (2005) describe the advantages of taking a collaborative approach to initiating partnerships across a variety of sectors. Described as the “collaborative advantage,” this approach foregrounds the importance of working closely across “organizational boundaries” to produce “positive ends” (Huxham & Vangen, 2005, p. 3). Described as *contextual leadership* this describes three elements of structure, processes and participants as establishing emergent,
shared and informal collaboration (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Drawing from this conceptualization of the collaborative advantage of seeking multi-organizational solutions to organizational problems, scholars from the public administration literature have conceptualized collaborative leadership in terms of integrative public leadership. This umbrella concept categorizes theory and research related to leadership endeavours that span organizational boundaries (Morse, 2010). Crosby and Bryson (2010) present a theoretical framework that conceptualizes the creation and the maintenance of cross-sector collaborations based on propositions from Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006). Described as integrative leadership, Crosby and Bryson’s (2010) framework explicates leadership of cross-sector partnerships from six perspectives. First the initial conditions of the partnership are described in terms of environmental antecedents. Then processes, practices and governance structures are described including contingencies and constraints and finally outcomes and accountabilities are proposed.

Pless and Maak (2011) describe a form of collaborative leadership they describe as relational leadership. Not to be confused with the broader umbrella construct of Relational Leadership Theory described earlier that encompasses a number of different conceptualizations of leadership, Pless and Maak’s (2011) specific description foregrounds the relational aspects of leadership not only at the leader-follower level of analysis, but also at the leader-stakeholder level. Described as a “multilevel theory that connects individuals, organizations and institutional factors” (Pless & Maak, 2011, p. 5), it is a construct that is said to connect leaders and stakeholders “through a shared sense of meaning and purpose through which they raise one another to higher levels of motivation and commitment for achieving sustainable value creation and social change” (Pless, 2007, p. 438). Differing from other conceptualizations of moral or values-based leadership, relational leadership scholars theorize that leadership activities
explicitly include contributions to society that result in creating positive societal change (Pless, 2007; Pless & Maak, 2011).

Describing leadership in terms of emphasizing the need to ensure that followers become advocates of a shared goal, and leaders unto themselves, Brown and Gioia (2002) describe distributed leadership. This conceptualization of a leadership style that empowers followers to lead others has also been described as dispersed and shared leadership by Pearce and Conger (2003). Using a relational understanding of leadership, distributed leadership approaches view leadership activities as dynamic and multi-level in nature (Sullivan, Williams & Jeffares, 2012). While distributed leadership is typically associated with collaborative leadership approaches, this is not always the case; depending on the situation, distributive leadership may not be collaborative (Spillane, 2006).

**Leadership Theories Drawn into the CSSP Literature**

Having provided a broad background of the scholarly work related to the chronology of the formation of CSSPs, convening organizations in CSSPs, leadership studies in general, as well as collaboration and leadership, this section will examine how leadership literature has been drawn into the CSSP literature to date.

When examining leadership and employee motivations in CSSPs, Kolk, van Dolen and Vock (2010) draw on two forms of leadership described in the leadership literature, as they pertain to micro-level employee interactions related to partnerships. First they suggest that participative leadership is positively related to employees actively engaging in partnership related conversations with superiors, peers and subordinates (Kolk, van Dolen & Vock, 2010). Participative leadership refers to leadership activities that include joint decision making between
supervisors and employees, where decisions include some level of influence from employees to supervisors (Koopman & Wierdsma, 1998). Participative decision making is a popular area of research in the leadership discipline (Yukl, 2002; Koopman & Wierdsma, 1998; Somech, 2003; Durham, Knight & Locke, 1997) that has been show to improve the quality of decision making (Scully, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1995) and to improve employee satisfaction (Smylie, Lazarus, & Brownlee-Conyers, 1996), motivation (Locke & Latham, 1990) and commitment (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993). Participative leadership may be particularly salient to convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs in relation to Benford and Snow’s (2000) three core framing tasks in the context of CSSPs because of the need for democratic decision making for CSSPs to be successful (Haxham & Vangen, 1996).

The second form of leadership used by Kolk, van Dolen and Vock (2010) is transformational leadership, suggesting that leaders within CSSPs using a transformational leadership style may increase active engagement in partnership-related conversations with superiors, peers and subordinates. Transformational leadership may be particularly well suited for framing activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs because this style is primarily concerned with moving others beyond self-interest towards “self-actualization and the well-being of others, the organization, and society” (Bass, 1999, p. 11). Reast, et al (2010) found that learning processes within CSSPs were aided in the context of a visionary leader. Describing an influential leader of a CSSP as charismatic and transformational, this individual was associated with successful organizational learning outcomes in a CSSP (Reast, et al., 2010).

Selsky and Parker (2010) describe the creation of cognitive frames as a prospective sensemaking device to ensure alignment between stakeholders’ understanding of CSSPs. Sensemaking has been examined in terms of a leader’s ability to aid organizational sensemaking
via sensegiving and framing (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Smerek, 2010; Smircich & Morgan, 1982). The literature describes sensemaking as the process through which organizational constituents make sense of their environments in the context of organizational change (Weick, 1995; Smerek, 2011). Sensegiving is the process through which strategic decision makers and leaders frame organizational change to affect sensemaking (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Whetten, 1984). Framing literature is frequently drawn on by organizational studies and leadership scholars in the context of aiding the sensemaking of others, (Fiss & Zajac, 2006; Fiol & Merrill, 2000; Bolman & Deal, 1999; Heimovics, Herman & Jurkiewicz Coughlin, 1993), especially as it pertains to individual-level leadership and charisma (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Hartog & Verburg, 1997). Framing as it pertains specifically to the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs will be addressed at length in Chapter 5.

Complexity science has informed the leadership literature and may be relevant to the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. These leadership theories highlight a need for dynamism and complexity absorbing strategies and decision making among organizational leaders (Boisot & Child, 1999). Drawing on concepts related to complexity and systems theory, Page (2010) hypothesizes that leadership of CSSPs requires “iterative adjustments in leadership tactics over time,” related to changing relations between stakeholders and the legacy created by prior phases of the collaboration (p. 261).

**Situating the Approach to Leadership in this Research and Establishing a Gap in the Literature**

In the sections above, a variety of literature is discussed that relates to the leadership role of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. In the first part of this chapter, scholarly work related to the conceptualization of CSSPs as a chronological set of stages was presented to
provide context for the formation of CSSPs as described by Selsky and Parker (2005). The second section of this chapter examined theories and research that specifically looked at CSSPs that operate with the aid of a formal convening organization tasked with bringing stakeholders together with the collective aim of solving a social or environmental issue. The language related to “convening” stems from a variety of sources including Westley and Vredenburg (1997). The third and fourth sections of this chapter explore definitions of the word leadership and provide a broad explanation of the dominant theories of leadership that guide current scholarly research. This discussion of dominant theories of leadership is offered to ensure that there is a clear understanding of how this research is situated in the broader set of leadership theories. This research is designed using ontological assumptions about leadership that align with the understanding that leadership may be thought of as a process of relating between those leading and those following, and thus fits best with the section above described as a process approach to understanding leadership. This ontological assumption draws from Uhl-Bien’s (2006) Relational Leadership Theory to provide an epistemological approach to allow for knowledge creation related to this relational leadership process by examining the social construction of leadership that exists in the relation of individuals, organizations and society.

In the sections above, five approaches of conceptualizing leadership have been described from an ontological and an epistemological perspective. Understanding leadership in terms of characteristics, behaviour, influence, morality and values are all important aspect of understanding the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, but unto themselves they provide an incomplete picture and do not offer adequate epistemic guidance to encompass the entirety of the phenomena being explored in this study. The role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs involves more than individual activities, it also includes organizational-level activities and is
affected by relationships and societal-level factors. The collaborative nature of CSSPs requires a broader ontological conceptualization of leadership because there is more than a simple leader-follower dyad at play here. Leadership must be conceptualized in a way that foregrounds the socially-constructed nature of the phenomenon in a context where the goals and desires of variety of stakeholders must be negotiated. Undoubtedly, certain leadership characteristics or behaviours will be related to the formation of CSSPs, but to whom are these characteristics or behaviours preferential? Some stakeholders will likely appreciate certain morals or values while others will not. Drawing from the epistemic approach purported by RLT, it is only in the relating of narratives from a variety of stakeholders and recognizing that leadership is a social construction developed through the interaction of stakeholder opinions can we learn about the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs.

In the fifth section of this chapter, literature related to leadership and collaboration was examined. This literature was not specific to CSSPs but because of the collaborative nature of CSSPs, these theories are relevant from a conceptual and empirical perspective. Section six of this chapter reviews instances within the CSSP literature where leadership theory has been drawn into theory or research related to the leadership of CSSPs. From the literature review provided in this chapter, we can see that there is some theory related to either leadership in CSSPs, or the formation of CSSPs, or convenors and CSSPs, but a clear gap exists in the literature related to the leadership role of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. This gap leads to the primary research question at the heart of this empirical inquiry: what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs? The following chapter will discuss the research methodology used to collect and analyze data aimed at answering this question.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

The purpose of this research is to explore the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of cross-sector social partnerships. What follows in this chapter is a description of the methodological design used to investigate this research question. The sections that follow include a discussion of the ontological and epistemological assumptions that underlie the research methods. This is followed by a section describing the rationale for using an inductive approach. Next, the procedures section will describe how data was collected, including sampling, forms of data collection, level of analysis, participant contact and consent, interview schedules and protocols, as well as data security. The final section will describe how data was analyzed and how this analysis iteratively informed the data collection process.

Ontological and Epistemological Assumptions

Research traditions in the field of organizational theory and leadership are guided by a variety of philosophical viewpoints that manifest themselves as research paradigms (Shah & Corley, 2006). The building blocks of research philosophies are the ontological and epistemological views we have of the world around us, where ontology describes the nature of reality that is under research scrutiny and epistemology describes how we are able to understand that reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The ontological and epistemological views of researchers vary within and between research disciplines, with research paradigms extending across a spectrum of opinion about the ability of research to accurately describe what is understood to be reality (Gephart, 2004). At one end of the spectrum, logical positivists hold that a single, objective, knowable reality exists, and through proper methodological rigor this reality can be understood in terms of theory and empirical research (Van de Ven, 2007). At the other end of the spectrum, relativists and social constructionists hold that social reality is subject to contextual...
and social factors; therefore reality varies, is subjective and is non-singular (Van de Ven, 2007). More broadly, these two seemingly incommensurate research philosophies can be described as functionalism and interpretivism respectively (Shah & Corley, 2006). Interpretivism will be the guiding research philosophy utilized in the context of this research for reasons outlined below.

**Ontological Assumptions**

Organizations that work together in CSSPs are complex entities made up of a number of constituent parts including assets, processes and procedures which are largely quantifiable from a functionalist perspective. Other interesting constituent parts are the people, conversations, relationships and knowledge contained within organizations and partnerships. These make up the socially constructed aspects of organizations that are connected with the interpretation of social interaction (Scott, 1987). From this perspective each organization can be understood as a unique social system, that is subjectively understood by the observer based on the observer’s limited knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of the complex social makeup that comprises the organization or social system. It is difficult and perhaps impossible to objectively decouple an organization from the observer’s interpretation of an organization based on the observer’s previous life experiences. As such, this research assumes multiple versions of reality depending on those describing and those interpreting the organization. This can be described as a relativist ontology, where “diverse meanings are assumed to exist and to influence how people understand and respond to the objective world” (Gephart, 2004, p. 454).

**Epistemological Assumptions**

Assuming a relativist, subjective ontology, researchers describe a myriad of realities held by social actors to produce a shared sense of truth (Gephart, 2004). So the “truth” described in this research relates to an aggregate of shared meaning across participants, which will be
interpreted by myself, as the researcher, with self-reflexivity related my own biases and viewpoints. This interpretivist epistemological viewpoint poses important implications for the generalizability of research findings.

Examining phenomena with an interpretivist epistemological perspective, in many cases, limits the generalizability of research findings, as understood in the positivistic sense, to contextually similar (perhaps identical) organizational situations. It is likely that the data and their theoretical explanation uncovered in this study will differ from situations in different sectors, countries, industries and time-periods, whose actors are experiencing different economic realities and have different access to resources. Therefore, support for theory or new findings may conceivably be limited to the organizations participating in the research. But the validity claims related to objective knowledge produced within the positivistic tradition differ from the criteria used to justify interpretive knowledge claims associated with a social constructionist view of social reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1991). When we understand that the social “world is never a world in itself; it is always an experienced world,” and that knowledge creation related to phenomena that exist only in the shared thoughts and conversations of groups of people, then an interpretivist epistemology is appropriate (Sandberg, 2005: 43). So to scholars from research traditions that are better acquainted with positivistic epistemological understanding on knowledge creation, the knowledge produced in this interpretivist research inquiry requires specific justification and claims of validity (Sandberg, 2005).

Justification of Knowledge Claims with Validity and Reliability

Using a relativist ontology and an interpretivist epistemology to guide the basic assumptions for this research inquiry, statements on the validity of the knowledge created using these methods can be made. Sandberg (2005) offers three criteria for justifying knowledge
created in this manner: i) *communicative validity* as a criterion for establishing truth as perceived fulfillment and coherence of a researcher's interpretation of what participants say; ii. *pragmatic validity* as a criterion for establishing truth as fulfillment in practice, which relates to avoiding, or at least being aware of, the discrepancies between what individuals and organizations say and what they actually do in practice; iii) *transgressive validity* as an appropriate criterion for establishing that truth may be indeterminate and that the assumptions used to establish communicative and pragmatic validity may in fact be inappropriate to the situation at hand, and that irresolvable conflicts may exist as they relate to the collection of data for the phenomena in question (Sandberg, 2005). These three criteria influence many of the aspects of this methodology chapter and will inform the procedure described in subsequent sections.

Reliability in traditional terms is frequently associated with concepts such as replicability and multiple objective assessments of results. In the case of interpretive research, reliability relates to the *interpretive awareness* of the researcher (Sandberg, 1994, 1995). Interpretive awareness describes the consistent and frequent acknowledgement of the subjectivity of data, codes, categories and themes. This interpretive awareness includes the understanding and acceptance of the researchers’ own role in subjectively interpreting data in a transparent and self-reflexive way (Sandberg, 2005). This concept of interpretive awareness will also be included in the research procedure described below.

**Broad Methodological Approach**

Throughout the course of this inquiry, explicit and implicit information has been used to create a narrative of the phenomena under investigation. Tacit knowledge that exists within CSSPs is integral to our understanding of how individuals and organizations relate to each other and how we mutually understand reality; tacit knowledge guides behaviours and organizational
outcomes as much as explicit organizational knowledge (Lam, 2000). Accessing this tacit knowledge can pose a challenge for quantitative researchers using tools such as surveys, because respondents are frequently unable to describe knowledge that is implicitly part of their everyday routine within the organization (Stenmark, 2000). Qualitative research methodologies can be effective in accessing tacit knowledge or behaviours within organizations; they are also frequently associated with an interpretivist research approach (Shah & Corley, 2006). Because of the lack of previous scholarly work related to the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, this research is exploratory in nature. Theories, constructs and scales explicitly related to the phenomena under investigation do not exist, and even if they did, their use may not be commensurate with the epistemological assumptions of this inquiry. It is for these reasons that a qualitative approach to data gathering is appropriate to explore the research question identified in Chapter 2.

Further to using qualitative methods, an inductive approach as described by Charmaz (2014) was used to investigate the research questions. The approach used in this inquiry is considered to be inductive in that it fits with the broad description of this method as a set of principles and practices that iterates back and forth between gathering/analyzing rich data, comparing with existing data analysis and extant theory and then further focusing data analysis, which in-turn focuses further chain and criterion sampling for more data gathering (Charmaz, 2014). As a mode of inquiry, inductive research can include a variety of approaches, including the avoidance of using existing theory to inform data gathering, where a tabula-rasa mindset is used at the outset of collecting data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
Inductive research methods have also been used to describe approaches that are more accepting of verification and integration of existing theory into criterion sampling (Strauss, 1987; Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Charmaz, 2014). The initial literature review informed my data collection and analysis by providing sensitizing concepts that guided the development of the research design and data collection (Charmaz, 2014). These sensitizing concepts offered insight into the interpretation of data and the evolution of interview protocols and decisions related to participant selection.

I incorporated existing theory in the later stages of sampling, interviewing and data analysis, while at the same time being cognizant that “categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 3). This approach is being utilized with interpretive awareness and a self-reflexive understanding that examining phenomena with theories decided upon a priori may influence the outcome of the research through a desire to validate popular constructs or to support bias in the researcher’s thinking (Gergen & Thachenkery, 1996; Patton, 2014). To guard against this influence, the researcher has endeavored to critically analyze empirical findings with interpretive awareness, not with the goal to support these theories, but rather to add, enhance and revise in the hope of better conceptualizing the phenomenon in question. This conceptualization acknowledges the subjective of the invivo, substantive and theoretical codes generated in data analysis, it also accepts the researcher’s own role in subjectively interpreting data in a self-reflexive way. The later section of this chapter will provide a more detailed explanation of the process of data collection, data analysis and the literature review, and how these three processes iteratively informed each other throughout the course of this research. The execution of a literature review before data collection and during data collection, allowed for opportunities for “creative
interplay among the processes of data collection, literature review, and researcher introspection” (Patton, 2002, p. 226).

Procedure

The procedure section describes how data was collected, including sampling, forms of data collection, level of analysis, participant contact and consent, interview schedules and protocols, as well as data security. First there will be a discussion of the sampling method, including the rationale behind purposively selecting the seven CSSP research sites included in this research and why individual interviewees were selected for semi-structured interviews.

Sampling Method

CSSP Research Sites

At the CSSP level, research sites were solicited for their inclusion in this research based on some initial tentative substantive codes that emerged from the data obtained in initial rounds of data collection and analysis. The sampling method used can be categorized both in terms of ‘chain’ and ‘criterion’ sampling. Both chain and criterion sampling are purposive sampling methods that are frequently used in the context of qualitative research “to increase the scope or range of data exposed (random or representative sampling is likely to suppress more deviant cases) as well as to uncover the full array of multiple perspectives” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 40). Criterion sampling was used at the individual level to select leaders within organizations who were involved with the CSSP in their formation stage. In addition to leaders, individuals who played a role in the format of the CSSP were also solicited for interviews. Similarly, at the organizational level, partnering organizations that were involved with the CSSP during the formation stage were targeted for potential interview participants. In the case of non-convening
organization partners, the individual or individuals who were most closely associated with the partnership were solicited for interviews. Chain (or snowball) sampling describes situations where key research participants provide recommendations related to other individuals or organizations who may provide useful information related to the topic being examined. Patton (2002) describes this method as “the chain of recommended informants would typically diverge initially as many possible sources are recommended, then converge as a few key names get mentioned over and over” (p. 237). In this research, all interviews ended with a discussion about other potentially useful individuals or sources of information. These recommendations led to valuable data gathering opportunities.

In addition to chain sampling, criterion sampling was also used. Patton (2002) describes criterion sampling as “all cases that meet some predetermined criterion of importance” (p. 238). The sampling criteria used in later rounds of data collection in this research inquiry were the following: i) the CSSP must consist of a partnership among at least three societal sectors, most likely government, non-profit and for profit sectors, otherwise known as “arena 4” partnerships (Selsky & Parker, 2005); ii) the goals of the partnership must be primarily to create social or environmental benefit, where intersectoral blurring of roles begin to emerge (Selsky & Parker, 2005), for example when roles or functions typically associated with one sector are adopted by another; iii) the geographic proximity of the partnering organizations must be within commuting distance from the primary research institution (approximately 200km) and; iv) the partnership must include an enterprising convening organization that acts as a focal actor for the CSSP and operates primarily on a “funds from operations” basis, that is the convening organizations all monetize their own products and services and use the revenue from the selling of these products or services to fund their operations related to the execution of the mission of the CSSP; v) the
CSSP must either be in the formation stage and/or individuals who were instrumental in the creation of the partnership were still available for participation in the study and; vi) each CSSP must have been afforded some form of external recognition indicating credibility or success, e.g. external funding, or a retrospective assessment that they will continue to be an ongoing, semi-permanent partnership for the foreseeable future.

The first two sampling criteria mentioned above were selected to bring clarity to the types of CSSPs under investigation, and to clearly situate the contributions of this research into an existing conversation within CSSP literature. CSSP scholars build theory and empirically examine a broad spectrum of CSSPs that differ in stakeholder forms, intended outcomes, processes and procedures, so being very specific about the type of CSSP included in this research assists with the conceptual clarity of any theoretical contributions. Selsky and Parker (2005) offer a framework that aims to categorize types of CSSPs that are examined in the literature. This framework includes a description of the types of arenas and platforms for categorizing CSSPs.

In this methodology section, the first two sampling criteria are tied to this framework; specifically, those first two criteria aim to include only CSSPs that can be categorized as arena 4, societal sector platform CSSPs as described by Selsky and Parker (2005). The third sampling criterion relates to the geographic proximity of participant CSSPs. The rationale for this criterion is partly related to the resource constraints of the researcher related to time and funding limits, necessitating careful thought when travelling to participant organizations for data collection. This geographic boundary condition also offers further specificity related to the type of partnerships under examination in this study. The fourth criterion for selection necessitates that the CSSPs have a convening organization that takes a leadership role in championing the formation of the CSSP. Convening organizations are, by definition, an entity that will engage in leadership
activities in the formation of CSSPs. This criterion was included because the issue of leadership in the formation of the CSSP and convening organizations emerged as an important category in the first round of data collection and analysis.

This theme was important enough to inform the underlying research question that guides this study to include “the role of leadership of convening organizations” rather than more broadly, “the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs.” This is not to say that leadership only exists in the context of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs, but the first round of data collection and analysis made it quite evident that valuable data related to leadership in the formation of CSSPs could be gleaned from CSSPs with convening organizations. The next sampling criterion related to the enterprising nature of the convening organizations. This criterion emerged in the later stage of data collection, as a commonality among successful CSSP convenors. The theoretical significance of this will be discussed later in Chapter 7. Next, only CSSPs in their formation stage, and/or CSSPs with individuals who played a direct role in their formation, were included as participant partnerships in this research.

**Individual Interviewees**

Within the CSSP research sites, individual interviewees were initially solicited for semi-structured interviews using a purposive sampling techniques, to ensure that initial participants had some knowledge about the phenomenon under investigation (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Specifically, individuals who had a direct knowledge of the creation of the CSSP were solicited for interviews. These individuals were known to the researcher through existing relationships and through association with colleagues, so their contact information was accessible. Initial contact was initiated by email in most cases, and subsequent face-to-face or telephone interviews were conducted there-after. After the first round of interviews, *chain sampling*, otherwise known
as snowball sampling was used, as long as the criterion sampling criteria were met. Chain sampling continued through referrals from interviewees to continually focus in on the individuals who hold the most relevant knowledge for this study (Teddlie & Yu, 2007; Patton, 2002).

Data Collection

Over the period of four years, from 2011 until 2015, data was collected from seven CSSP research sites using multiple qualitative data collection methods including semi-structured interviews, participant observation and document analysis and fifty-three data sources were collected and analyzed (see Table 4.1), comprising 424 pages of text that was analyzed. When possible, data was collected from each research site during their formation stage or within twelve months of their formation. Interviews and participant observation sessions were completed at each research site in quick succession, in most cases within a period of one month. These data sources may be thought of as a collection of narratives describing the social constructions held by individuals related to leadership in the formation of the CSSP research sites. With that in mind, the use of multiple qualitative methods here was not intended to test the accuracy of data, or to clarify my own understanding of “a correct version” of participants’ perception of the phenomena, but was instead used for two primary reasons. First, using multiple sources of data examines phenomena from different perspectives, to develop multiple lines of inquiry and bring to the fore-front, “many voices, many meanings.” (Symon & Cassell, 2012). Multiple methods generate a broader set of narratives to the aggregated collection of perceptions of participants and researchers. Interviews are only one way to examine the formation of CSSPs and using other methods offers alternative perspectives that may provide salient information missed in discussions with interview participants. Second, the use of multiple methods of data collection was used opportunistically to collect data that was unique to the researcher/CSSP relationship.
For example, in research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), the primary researcher was responsible for convening the CSSP and was uniquely positioned to offer an opinion based on participant observation, but interviews in that particular context would have been inappropriate due to the dual role played as researcher and convenor.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were used in the cases where the researcher had no affiliation with the CSSP under investigation. Interviewees were asked a series of high level questions that guided conversation based on an interview protocol that progressed over time. This interview protocol evolved as tentative categories began to emerge after the first and second rounds of interviews, following Charmaz’ (2014) process for inductive data collection and analysis. The interview protocol began with very high level questions related to the role of leadership in the formation of the CSSP, but over time progressed into three, more specific lines of inquiry as substantive codes began to emerge. These lines of questioning included: questions related to opportunism and leadership (often perceived as luck) and how this may have been related to the successful formation of the CSSP. The second line of inquiry included questions related to whether the creation of structures such as policies, procedures and relationships were important in the formation of the CSSP. Third were questions examining what conversations were occurring in the formation of the CSSPs between the convening organization and its stakeholders. High level questions were used by the interviewer to stimulate conversation without leading or significantly directing the conversation (Creswell, 2013).

In the case where sufficient information was not forthcoming from interview participants, secondary “prompting” questions were used to encourage further elaboration around a topic area. These prompting questions were used with an eye to ensuring *pragmatic validity*; being aware of
discrepancies between what individuals and organizations say and what they actually do in practice (Sandberg, 2005). Interviews were between thirty and eighty minutes in length, allowing adequate time to explore thoughts related to the interview questions, while still respecting the busy schedules of interviewees. Interviews were held primarily at the place of work of interviewees, in a private room where conversations could occur without the fear of being interrupted or overheard by colleagues and co-workers. Other interviews were conducted at coffee shops and restaurants, but quiet and private locations were typically sought to ensure that participants felt comfortable speaking privately and to maximize the quality of the interview audio recordings.

In the cases where travel was not possible and a face to face meeting was deemed out of the realm of possibility, telephone interviews were used. Notes were taken during most interviews, either to ensure that lines of questions were picked up once the current train of thought was completed, but more formal reflections on each interview were completed shortly after each interview. These post-interview notes became part of an ongoing reflective journal that maintained a detailed chronology of the researcher’s thinking related to data collection and themes emerging from the data. This reflective journal was used in conjunction with memo-writing, to iteratively refine interview questions as tentative categories emerged in initial rounds of interviews.

**Participant Observation**

Participant observation was used in this research in two rather different ways. In the first case, participant observation was used as it is commonly conceptualized in organizational studies, where the researcher acts as a participant in a brief engagement. This “observer as participant” modality typically involves that the role of researcher is known to at least some
participants, and that one or more participants facilitate the partial participation of the researcher (Symon & Cassell, 2012: 298). Participant observation, using the observer as participant approach was used at noteworthy public events where the presence of the researcher was either fully welcome, or deemed to not be intrusive. At these public events, voice recordings were not feasible so detailed notes were maintained chronicling the activities of the researcher and the other participants. There was a concerted effort to understand who were the participants, what their motivations were for attending, what were the processes and procedures used to engage stakeholders and what were the framing activities used by the convening organization to encourage the participation of stakeholders. Printed material, including handouts, agendas and promotional material were retained for later document analysis.

The second mode of participant observation undertaken in this research study was specific to the examination of research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), where the primary researcher in this study had the opportunity to initiate a partnership between a non-profit organization and a for-profit business for the purposes of building organizational development capacity in the local non-profit sector. For this one case study, the “participant as observer” role was used, where the primary researcher “fully participates in the social situations,” developing relationships and undertaking work related to the convening role for the CSSP (Symon & Cassell, 2012). This data collection method has also been called “active membership” participant observation (Adler & Adler, 1987). This approach commits to participating in the phenomena as well as to the analysis of the phenomena in the spirit of critical social science research, examining the language used by participants as well as the critical examination of the action researcher’s own perceptions. In the case of CSSP research, participant as observer, or active membership data collection methods are particularly
appropriate given the cross-sector collaborative nature of CSSP, which frequently include academic participants. An academic partner in a CSSP that is also studying the formation of the CSSP is unlikely to be a distraction for the relevant stakeholders. The primary sources of data for the active member case were longitudinal personal reflections of the primary researcher which included deep explanations of the events and processes used in the day-to-day operations of the CSSP (Woodside, 2010).

**Confidentiality, Anonymity, Data Security and Consent**

All data collected in this research study will remain both confidential and anonymous at the individual and organizational level as per the research ethics board approval. Full names have been avoided within interviews as much as possible, and they have been either abbreviated or changed to first-name only in transcripts. Filenames related to voice recordings and interview transcripts were coded using a numbering scheme where a password protected index spreadsheet file link the numbered data files to the interview participants’ names. Similarly, in any academic outputs created from this research study, no names of individuals will be specified. Instead non-identifiable positional titles will be used to describe individuals within organizations. In the case of smaller participant organizations, positional titles may be left out entirely as they may be used to uniquely identify individuals. Instead exact titles will be replaced with terms such as “strategic decision maker” or “project leader” to provide the necessary context to the case while at the same time maintaining the anonymity of individual participants.

Confidentiality and anonymity are only as effective as the data security used to keep participants’ information safe. All data has been stored on a password-protected cloud-based data storage facility. Two-step authentication is used to control access to this cloud-based data storage facility which includes: i) the use of a password that follows security best practices for length
and use of mixed characters, and; ii) the use of a designated mobile device for text-message verification of authentication. If the password becomes known to a third party, they will also require the use of the designated mobile device to gain access to the data. Similarly, if the password-protected mobile device falls into the hands of someone intent on accessing the research data, they will need to determine the device password as well as the separate password for the cloud-based data storage facility. Audio files recorded using a digital voice recorder or a cloud-based conference call system were wiped immediately after the audio files were copied into the secured cloud-based data storage facility.

In the case of semi-structured interviews, participant consent was solicited prior to the interview. Following the research ethics proposal that was agreed to by the primary research institution, interview participants were asked to sign a consent form that notified them of their rights to confidentiality and anonymity as well as their ability to withdraw from the research study at any time during the interview or there-after. In the case of participant observation of public events related to the CSSP cases, no consent was solicited from event participants as no personally identifiable information was recorded, nor were photos taken, and these events were open to the public so participants should have no expectation that their behaviour and activities should not be examined by a third party at an aggregate level.

**Overview of the Data Analysis**

Primary data consisted of two sources: semi-structured interview recordings in an MP3 digital audio file format, and reflective notes from participant observation and from a reflective journal related to interviews and participant observation activities. Data was transcribed into text format using a combination of third-party transcription services and manual transcription by the primary researcher.
Data analysis and data collection overlap chronologically throughout this research study. Using the constant comparative method of data collection and analysis, a systematic approach to interpreting the data informed both the data collection process, categories of coding and the theoretical approaches and contribution of this research. As new data sources were created, they were immediately analyzed and comparisons were made between the new data, and existing codes and categories generated by analyzing previous sources of data. These comparisons of new data and old codes and categories led to numerous changes in thinking about the existence of, and the relationship between, codes and categories as well as the approach to data collection. This feedback loop was an iterative process that refined the types of questions asked in semi-structured interviews, the types of activities looked for in participant observation, as well as the items commented upon in reflective journals and manuscript drafts. “In the constant comparative method the researcher simultaneously codes and analyses data in order to develop concepts; by continually comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a coherent explanatory model” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984: 126). This approach is very similar to the process described by Charmaz (2014), and relies on the constant comparison process originally described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Glaser (1978).

Data analysis was aided by use of the qualitative research software package NVivo. Discrete “incidents” as described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) or “units” as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were identified in data sources and these incidents or units were coded as “nodes” using the NVivo software. When these nodes were coded a sufficient number of times within the various sources of data, or if the nodes were deemed to be of sufficient salience despite a lower frequency of coding, these codes were grouped as a substantive codes, sometimes
referred to as themes (Charmaz, 2014). These substantive codes were conceptualized in terms of categories that may or may not relate to new or existing theory, and the nodes related to these themes and categories were grouped together in the NVivo software as parent and child nodes indicating that the nodes are conceptually linked. As substantive codes emerged from the data, it became evident that some themes and categories became more relevant than others, so some lines of questioning and analysis were dropped in favour of other increasingly more relevant lines of questioning.

In later stages of the data analysis and data collection process, emerging themes and categories were used to guide the "creative interplay" between the emerging data and the existing theoretical constructs from the CSSP, Social Entrepreneurship, Social Movement Theory and Leadership literatures in order to extend the significance of the emergent categories in relation to existing theory (Patton, 2002: 226). Themes and categories emerged around the participants’ language and customs and around the constructs deemed theoretically relevant by the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), but in the process used in this research study, existing theory iteratively informed data analysis in the later stages of data analysis and collection. The aim of the data analysis process was to find and identify the intersection of CSSP participants’ language, activities and customs with relevant theoretical constructs, whether they are new or existing. The initial coding scheme used in data analysis was very broad, but as categories emerged, coding revolved around nodes related to three broad categories that will be described in greater details in subsequent chapters: the identification political opportunity for the formation of CSSPs, the creation of mobilizing structures for the formation of CSSPs and the framing activities related to the formation of CSSPs. The following chapter will include an in depth description of the data
analysis process, detailing how substantive and theoretical codes were developed throughout the data collection and analysis process.
Chapter 4 - Detailed Data Analysis

In this chapter I will outline the process that I used to analyze and interpret the data described in this and in subsequent chapters. The purpose of dedicating a dissertation chapter to data analysis is to provide transparency into several aspects of this research that may not otherwise be brought to light in other chapters. These items include: offering details about the research sites and data sources, describing how substantive codes emerged from the data, and clarifying how these initial substantive codes moved into theoretical concepts. In the sections that follow, I will first describe the research sites and provide details about the sources of data. Next I will chronologically describe the processes that I used to make sense of the data, which will include five sections. As part of this chronology, I will first describe the composition of the seven research sites. Second I will discuss the initial coding process, including the creation of in-vivo/descriptive, first-order codes and the constant comparison of incidents to generate substantive, second-order codes. Third I will outline the process that I followed, post-interview, for recording my immediate reflections on each interview as well as my memoing process during data analysis. Fourth, I present the focused coding procedure, where I studied the emerging substantive codes and combined these into initial conceptual categories, drawing on my field notes, memos, various bodies of literature and my initial chapter drafts. Fifth, I will describe how these initial conceptual categories informed and modified my interview protocol and how this led to the saturation of conceptual categories. Finally, I will discuss how delving into literature helped me to refine my high level categories and zero in on the core category of my key theoretical contributions. Figure 4.1 provides a visual summary of the broad components of my data analysis, following the process for interpretive research described by Charmaz (2014).
Research Sites and Data Sources

A brief overview of the research sites examined throughout the course of this research inquiry are included here to offer context for the data analysis and data sources. The research sites examined in this inquiry are CSSPs that share a number of similarities; some of the similarities were selected by way of criterion sampling. As was discussed in detail in the methods chapter, these sampling criteria include: 1) partnerships comprised of participants from at least three sectors or ‘arena 4’ partnerships (Selsky & Parker, 2010); 2) partnerships where cross-sector stakeholders collaboratively partner to address emergent societal issues, or ‘societal sector platforms’ (Selsky & Parker, 2010); 3) partnerships geographically proximate to the

* Adapted from Figure 1.1, in Charmaz (2014, p. 18)
primary research institution; 4) a formal convening organization involved in facilitating the partnership; 5) convening organizations that are enterprising in nature and; 6) the existence of institutional knowledge related to the formation of the CSSP. These research site sampling criteria for inclusion in the research study created a pool of partnerships from which data was collected. The data was analyzed using an across-case approach, where data was pooled together into a single set of data (Ayres, Kavanaugh & Knafl, 2003). This approach contrasts with a comparative case analysis where data sources are compared and contrasted between research sites (Perrow, 1967). From this single across-case data set, data is interpreted and thematic analysis occurs across all research sites. Other information related to the research sites is provided in Table 4.1. The columns in Table 4.1 provide a description of each of the research sites along with relevant information related to their goals and operations. Each of the columns will be described in detail in the next section of this chapter. The first column in Table 4.1 provides a pseudonym for each research site, which is referred to throughout the document. The second column offers an overview of the broad social issue being addressed by each CSSP. The research sites can be broken down into two categories related to their key social issues: 1) research sites 1, 2, 3 and 4 are engaged in work that collaboratively engages across sectors to improve social or environmental issues at the local level and; 2) research sites 5, 6 and 7 work with partners across sectors to increase the organizational development capacity of organizations that are socially-oriented, including improving their entrepreneurial, financial, governance or leadership capacities. In column four, I provide some clarity related to institutional knowledge of the formation of the CSSP. The final column provides a count of the number of data sources collected from each research site showing that some research sites account for more data sources than others. This unequal weighting of data sources between research sites is appropriate given
that data is pooled together from all research sites and an across-case data analysis approach is used for analysis (Ayres, Kavanaugh & Knafl, 2003). In some cases interviewees described retrospective accounts of the formation of the CSSP and in other cases, the first-hand accounts were describing what was actually going on at the time of data-collection. In all cases, the research sites were arena 4, societal-sector partnerships, but participation from key sectors varied; column six provides information about the key sectors represented in each CSSP. There is also a column that indicates the total number of data sources related to each research site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Site Pseudonym</th>
<th>Partnership Goals</th>
<th>Nature of Convener and Funding</th>
<th>Access to Information about Formation</th>
<th>External Recognition of Credibility or Success</th>
<th>Key Sector Participation</th>
<th>Number of Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site #1 Large Local Sustainability Partnership</td>
<td>Reduction of Atmospheric Carbon Emissions</td>
<td>Formal Org, Non-Profit, Funds Mainly from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Retrospective</td>
<td>External Funding, high-legitimacy early partners.</td>
<td>Municipality, Insurance Companies, Various Local Businesses</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #2 Established Environmental Issue Partnership</td>
<td>Improved Transit, Energy Usage Reduction</td>
<td>Formal Org, Non-Profit, Funds Mainly from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Retrospective</td>
<td>External Funding, High-Profile Founder</td>
<td>Commercial Landlords, Municipalities, Financial Sector</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #3 Medium Sized Local Sustainability Partnership</td>
<td>Reduction of Atmospheric Carbon Emissions</td>
<td>Formal Org, Non-Profit, Funds Mainly from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Currently in formation stage.</td>
<td>High-legitimacy early partners</td>
<td>Municipalities, Various Local Businesses,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #4 Social Startup Incubator</td>
<td>Fostering Social Innovation</td>
<td>Formal Org, Non-Profit, Funds Mainly from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Retrospective</td>
<td>External Funding</td>
<td>Provincial Government, Various social enterprises</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #5 Angel and Venture Capital Funding Match-Maker</td>
<td>Generate Funding to Promising Social Enterprises, Accreditation for Social Enterprises</td>
<td>Division within Formal Organization, Non-Profit, Funds Intended to be from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Data collection occurred in the formation stage</td>
<td>External funding, and legitimate parent organization.</td>
<td>Securities Regulators, Stock Exchange, Legal Partner, Accreditation Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #6 Non-Profit Organizational Capacity Building Partnership</td>
<td>Build Organizational Capacity in the Non-Profit Sector</td>
<td>Formal Partnership, Non-Profit, Funds Intended to be from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. Data collection in the formation stage.</td>
<td>External funding and legitimate partnering organizations.</td>
<td>Funding agencies, Non-profit resource organizations, High-tech Company</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #7 Small Sized Local Sustainability Partnership</td>
<td>Reduction of Atmospheric Carbon Emissions</td>
<td>Formal Org, Non-Profit, Funds Mainly from Operations</td>
<td>Participants with firsthand experience. In formation stage.</td>
<td>High-legitimacy early partners</td>
<td>Municipalities, Various Local Businesses,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 provides details on each data source included in the analysis. Thirty-five of the data sources were semi-structured interviews, thirty-four of which were high-fidelity, voice recorded conversations that varied in duration up to 80 minutes in length. In one case, low-fidelity retrospective field notes were utilized for data analysis in a situation where voice recording was not possible. In the case of participant observation sessions, data sources included both retrospective and on-site field notes detailing impressions of participants and the broader events occurring during each participant observation session. These sessions varied in the level of engagement of the researcher, including passive observation of CSSP participants interacting in a shared co-working environment, interacting with participants in workshop settings as well as acting as a paid contract partnership broker for a convening organization. Finally the third type of primary data source included public documents that provide transparency into the formation of each partnership. These documents were hard-copies of handouts from participant observation sessions that were collected from convening organizations’ and partners’ websites and, later in the course of this research, were selected with an eye to substantive and thematic codes as theoretical saturation began to take place. In total, fifty-four primary data sources were included in this research inquiry, not counting supplementary documents supporting the data analysis including memos, notes and drafts, which also informed the data analysis. Table 4.3 provides an overview of the types of participants interviewed. The table indicates whether the interviewee was from a convening organization or a partnering organization, which sector they represent and whether or not they may be deemed a leader or an employee within their respective organizations. It is important to note that in this case, the word “leader” refers to someone with significant formal positional authority within their organization, while the “employees” do not hold significant formal positional authority within their organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Fidelity</th>
<th>Research Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source 01</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 02</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 03</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 04</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 05</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 06</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 07</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 08</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 09</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 10</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 11</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 12</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 13</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 14</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 15</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 16</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 17</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 18</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 19</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 20</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 21</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 22</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 23</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 24</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 25</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 26</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 27</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 28</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 29</td>
<td>Unstructured Conversation Low (field notes, written retrospectively)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 30</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 31</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 32</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 33</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 34</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 35</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview High (recording, verbatim transcription)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 36</td>
<td>Participant Observation Low (field notes during observation of field site)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 37</td>
<td>Participant Observation Low (field notes during public event)</td>
<td>Site #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 38</td>
<td>Participant Observation Low (field notes during public event)</td>
<td>Site #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 40</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 41</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 42</td>
<td>Participant Observation Low (field notes, retrospective obs. of field site)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 43</td>
<td>Participant Observation Low (field notes, retrospective obs. of field site)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 44</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 45</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 46</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 47</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 48</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 49</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 50</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 51</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 52</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 53</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 54</td>
<td>Document Review High (public documents describing the organization)</td>
<td>Site #7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.3 – Description of the Types of Participants Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convening or Partner Organization</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Leader or Employee</th>
<th>Number of Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convening Organization</td>
<td>Non Profit</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening Organization</td>
<td>Non Profit</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>Non Profit</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>Non Profit</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organization</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Broad Research Question

The process of conducting good interpretive research includes the analysis of data where researchers approach the data with an “insider’s view”, rather than presupposing an “outsider’s view” on what appears to be happening at research sites (Charmaz, 2014; Glaser, 1978, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This involves staying close to the data and studying emerging ideas and themes to make sense of what is really going on (Glaser, 1978). That does not entirely preclude researchers from having preexisting conceptualizations of what is happening at a research site prior to engaging in a qualitative inquiry. In the case of my perspective as a PhD student, the process of conceptualizing the phenomena at the heart of this inquiry began before I defended my dissertation proposal. I had an idea that leadership played an important role in partnerships; this drew me into this work and informed my thinking as I developed my research focus. My career history as a person who brokered strategic partnerships provided a background in this regard and primed my thinking as it relates to partnerships between goal-aligned organizations. Also, acting as a research assistant on another similar research project further informed my
thinking and heightened my theoretical sensitivity related to the leadership of organizations that encourage collaboration across sectors towards a social or environmental goal.

In some respects, having a background in the field of research could impede a researchers’ ability to avoid imposing meaning on the data rather than allow it to emerge with an “insider’s” perspective. With that in mind, I believe that self-reflexivity in my approach to data analysis allowed me this dilemma. However, preexisting theoretical constructs informed data collection and analysis in the form of sensitizing concepts (Bowen, 2006; Charmaz, 2014). Blumer (1954, p. 7) defines sensitizing concepts as something that “gives the user a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances”. Sensitizing concepts suggest directions along which to look when collecting and analyzing research data (Blumer, 1954). They are devices used in interpretive research that act as a starting point (Glaser, 1978). They are not hypotheses, but instead are concepts around which researchers can inductively “discover, understand and interpret what is happening in a research context” (Bowen, 2006, p. 3). As part of this self-reflexive approach I am also cognizant that while these sensitizing concepts may aid my research and data analysis, they may equally mislead a researcher’s attention away from other important meanings that could emerge from data.

**Initial Data Gathering and Initial Coding**

Initial interview protocols, informed by the sensitizing concepts, focused my questioning in the following manner. The interview would start with more open questions such as: “Think back to when [the partnership] first started. Please tell me about how you came to be a part of it.” Through further review of the literature and analysis of the data, my subsequent probing questions, moved in the direction of initial substantive codes emerging from early data analysis, as well as sensitizing concepts that emerged from some of the concepts derived from Social
Movement Theory, which is described in detail in the next chapter. With the help of my supervisory committee I was able to gather approximately eighteen interviews in quick succession at the beginning of my data gathering period. These interviews followed the interview protocol found in Appendix E. Interviews 19 – 35 followed a revised interview protocol found in Appendix E.

Informed by Charmaz’s (2014) process for inductive data analysis, and using the NVivo qualitative data analysis software, I began the open coding process of looking for descriptive, first-order (in-vivo) codes. Staying as close to the language of the interviewees as I could, my first-order, in-vivo codes were plentiful and varied. During open coding, I had many dozens of different codes that used an entire sentence to describe incidents. Some codes may have only been associated with one or two incidents in the transcripts, others were used more frequently. Using this approach, I coded all of my initial interviews with a descriptive set of first-order codes. It was at this stage that I began to think about how these first-order codes could be further developed into substantive codes (Glaser, 1978).

Many of the in-vivo codes were similar, and without imposing much of an outsider perspective on the analysis, I could combine these first-order codes into substantive codes that were named using language similar, but not exactly the same as what interviewees used in their own statements. As an example, see Figure 4.1 to see how interview quotes, related to the importance of relationships and trust between partners, were associated with descriptive in-vivo codes, which were then grouped with similar codes into a substantial code that I named “personal fit between collaborators.” This substantive code seemed to have importance for the interviewees, both in terms of the frequency of use and in terms of its perceived importance. This example of a substantive code included in-vivo codes related to both trust and personal
relationships that either existed or were fostered through deliberate processes by the convening organization. Much of this thought process was documented in my memoing in EverNote.

Another example of the constant comparison process that I utilized in my descriptive, in-vivo codes is related to the importance of the perception of legitimacy of the partnership among stakeholders. A wealth of in-vivo codes described the importance of being taken seriously in the formation stage CSSPS. These included things such as a noteworthy physical location or organizational certifications such as ISO 14001 or 26000, professionalism or affiliation with credible organizations. In-vivo codes related to “being taken seriously,” seemed to indicate that the legitimacy of the collaboration was an important substantive code. Figure 4.2 provides a visual example of the outcome of constantly comparing incidents in the data, in-vivo codes and eventually the substantive code “legitimacy of the collaboration.” Table 4.4 provides a list of all of the substantive codes eventually adopted in the data analysis process as well as the in-vivo codes that were categorized together based on the related emergent theme. All of the substantive codes listed in this table were created using this constant comparative process. Appendix A provides a table that links each of the in-vivo codes described below with a sample of the data incidents from which they were derived.
### Table 4.4 – List of Initial Substantive Codes and their Related In-Vivo Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Building legitimacy to motivate stakeholders to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Legitimacy is critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Credibility with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Value of the collaboration is only as much as they trust the convenor participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carbon reporting validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physical structure as legitimacy among collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legitimacy equated to something real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Getting participation in the collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual-level influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Champions driving collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Champions define the entire collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relationships define the entire collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flavor of partnership is based on personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Champions bring personality and passion to the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Look for people with the same values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seek out sustainability personnel at stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Look for people with the same vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Perception of goal alignment between social cause and business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Alignment between personal values and their workplace (sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in employees asking about sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High engagement of employees in sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retention of employees associated with sustainability activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attraction of new employees associated with sustainability initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business care about reducing carbon impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding of policy or supply chain risk related to carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Government regulation as a motivator for participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Upcoming government regulation was a chance to jump on stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education related to upcoming government regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education of organizational requirements of government regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mandatory carbon emission reporting as a precursor to participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government regulation directly associated with participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reaching out to stakeholders using government regulations as business development talking points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Good relationships exist between stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Personalize organizations by having people work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People rather than symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal fit between collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working towards a common goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working through competing opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effective partnerships are relationship based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing relationship between collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishing trust between collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working together involves good relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relationships between a couple of people become the collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Substantive Code: Work with a notable partner to build credibility early-on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage credible partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educate new partners about existing notable partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partners commit to participate because of association with credible partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage credible partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bring in “big-brands”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Build legitimacy through association with notable partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leaders from stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Powerful stakeholders convene meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders encourage participation of other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuring Ownership and Accountability to Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Funds-from-operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Revenue generated by monetizing products or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enterprising non-profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Effective communication mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Soliciting participation through shared governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholder input into how the partnership works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allow stakeholders to make governance decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seating arrangements to create interactions between stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Using partners’ core capabilities for the benefit of the CSSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use partners’ business consulting capabilities for other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Free professional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional services extremely important to other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business capabilities for the benefit of other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Industry knowledge from business sector offered to the CSSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Awareness building and advocacy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Offering imagery of an ideal future state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creating a vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Clarify mutual benefit of stakeholders working together.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Co-benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listening to stakeholder needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding how we can all benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process for motivating stakeholder participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Government cannot solve the issue on their own.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Failure of government policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local level action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reason for participation in the partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Taking a collaborative approach rather than a combative approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There is value in a diversity of tactics to make social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is need for a diversity of tactics, including a collaborative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bring different strengths to create impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Stakeholders participate to be associated with other high-profile stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage new partnership with high profile partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High profile partner leads to other stakeholders participating in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ways to encourage participation in the partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Stakeholders have a shared ownership of the social or environmental issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Shared leadership and empowerment leading to ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Telling stakeholders that the partnership is “theirs”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Taking a collaborative approach rather than a combative approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Comfort with collaborating with a polluter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Celebrate the incremental achievements of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making change from within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keeping polluters engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Celebrating rather than shaming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Stakeholders participate to be associated with other high-profile stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Explicitly articulate that only the most reputable stakeholders are solicited to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highlight the experience of other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Substantive Code: Ownership to embed sustainable practices in stakeholders’ work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Figure 4.2 – Example of Substantive Code Emerging from Interview Data – “Personal fit between collaborators”

**Interview Quotes**

"I think they're [challenges] often relationship based. Two that come to mind would be, one idea of having, this is related to organizations work together, but you build relationships usually with a person or a couple of people that become that collaboration. So in a few cases I think we've built relationships with the wrong people."

"I think a condition that really helped this be successful was the three people involved. [...] Those three people had a very good relationship and a collaborative relationship."

"The person who had originally launched the [...] program, there was a high degree of trust there [with other stakeholder], as well. In terms of the relationship, he had been on one of the working groups during the launch [...], so there's a background relationship there, a high degree of trust established."

"At the end of the day people, so even if your mission is the same, it helps, but personalities are different. Especially, the one-on-one partnerships are okay it's the bringing three partners together that, and we have to manage that relationship that could be a little bit challenging."

"I think the word is trust right? A trusting relationship will actually allow us to get in, to talk to them, once were in then we can sort of sell it."

**In-Vivo Codes**

Existing relationships between collaborators

Managing relationships among collaborators

Establishing trust between collaborators

**Initial Substantive Code**

Ensuring good relationships exist between stakeholders
Figure 4.3 – Example of Substantive Code Emerging from Interview Data – “Legitimacy of the Collaboration”

Interview Quotes

“I think the legitimacy is a big piece, we also have a building that you can look at. Which doesn’t sound that great but when you think most people operate out of their basement, when they have meetings they come in there is this thing that clicks and they are like ‘oh wow this is real’

“[...] well the very first phone call we got was from [reputable university], and they said we are joining, and that was a big monkey off my back, and they said but not until January 1, 2012 and I think it was March at the time, so it was bittersweet. We were able to leverage that, we went straight to those [stakeholders] that we had been talking to before that, and it didn’t take long before, actually it was a matter of weeks before, [resistant stakeholder] had written us a cheque and [another resistant stakeholder] had verbally committed too.”

“It’s been difficult to get our ISO 14001, or ISO 25000

“Sometimes you need a key-lead stakeholder, a supportive one, who’s involved. Or, periphery ones, so, identifying those. But, you need, at some point, the organizations that have the authority to implement something, or to approve it, or to pull the lever, whatever it is. If you don’t have that amongst you, then, you can’t get them to the table, it doesn’t happen.”

“Everything that you see from [research site #1] is clearly well thought-through, well structured, very professional. I just see such a contrast with most NGOs in that sense. Also, the clear emphasis on the business case for sustainability I think just helps to build that sense of credibility with a business audience. That may have been part of what made that organization particularly attractive.”

“[...] we learned in the early days that if you put together a coherent email, generally speaking most people write back to you. It was even easier when somebody like [credible academic partner] was willing to make a warm introduction or if you met somebody at an event that connected at a human level with you, but city planner ABC. If you wrote that person an email that we’ve got this idea that we would like to talk about they would generally say yes would like to talk about it.”

In-Vivo Codes

Physical structure as legitimacy among collaborators

External certifications (ISO) to gain legitimacy perception from collaborators

Building legitimacy to motivate stakeholders to participate

Credible early partner lends legitimacy to the collaboration

Importance of business professionalism to a sense of credibility among collaborators

Initial Substantive Code
Post-Interview Reflective Notes and Memoing

Post-interview reflections were documented in electronic notes in the online note taking service EverNote. Most of the post-interview notes were completed when I got back to a laptop on the same day as the interview, but sometimes brief notes were typed on my mobile phone or tablet when a laptop was unavailable. These point-form notes included a variety of reflections such as my thoughts on the suitability of the physical location of interviews, important themes that I believed were emerging, distractions, my personal mood and a general sense of “how the interview went.” I also made notes that described ideas for future prompting questions and lines of conversation. If interviews were cut short due to time constraints I made note of follow up questions that might be valuable if the opportunity presented itself to talk to the interviewee again.

The post-interview notes became shorter and more parsimonious as data collection and analysis progressed. Specifically, my later notes usually only included two or three point-form items that were intended to provide reminders to me during the data analysis. These reminders sometimes highlighted what I believed to be important topics covered in the interview and how they might relate to substantive codes and conceptual categories. I also made note of people that were mentioned in the interviews if I felt that they may be good candidates for future interviews.

Memoing was formal part of my data analysis process. Charmaz (2014) advocates the use of methodological journals to detail “dilemmas, directions and decisions.” (p. 165). These memos informed my analysis process by providing a mental cue that, when re-read, would shift my into a mode of thinking about how I was interpreting incidents in previous data analysis sessions. By writing and reading my memos from previous data analysis sessions, I was able to associate incidents with codes in a more consistent way. I made note of how I planned to code
data each time I sat down to code data sources, then as the reality of how I actually made sense of the data revealed itself, I would add a point about what I did, especially if it contrasted with what I expected to do during that coding session.

**Focused Coding**

The substantive codes listed in Figure 4.3 were not a finished product coming out of my open coding process but iterated through revisions in focused and theoretical coding. In the focused coding process I began to categorize these substantive codes into conceptual categories. Charmaz (2014) describes the importance of memo writing and reading as part of this process, in an attempt to reveal patterns and “make phenomena explicit” (p. 140). Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1994) describe focused coding in terms of “axial coding” which represents analysis that helps us in “understanding the central phenomenon in the data in terms of the conditions that give rise to it, the context in which it is embedded, the action/interaction strategies by which it is handled, managed or carried out and the consequences of those strategies” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 99). Strauss & Corbin (1990) describe the interactionist coding paradigm for this stage of data analysis. This coding paradigm involves the grouping of substantive codes in terms of the examination of: causal conditions, phenomenon, context, intervening conditions, action/interaction strategies and consequences. Similarly, Glaser (1978) discusses connecting substantive codes during focused coding – which he describes as theoretical coding – based on a number of coding families, including: different properties of something, common categories, parts or stages of a process and stimulus-response association, among others.

My approach to focused coding involved linking substantive codes based on their common categories and context. My focused coding process drew heavily from my post-interview reflective notes and memos from previous data analysis sessions. Specifically, upon reviewing
my post-interview reflective notes, memos and node hierarchy in NVivo, I categorized substantive codes within three broad contexts: 1) the conditions within the local community that allowed for collaboration on the social issue to occur; 2) the processes that existed to aid collaboration on the social issue and; 3) ways of motivating participation in the collaboration on the social issue. These three contextual categories created inclusive baskets within which all relevant substantive codes could fit. I found that these contextual categories acted to “weave the fractured story back together” (Glaser, 1978, p. 72). These contextual categories (purple) and their associated substantive codes (green) are visualized in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.4 – Conceptual Categories and Related Substantive Codes
**Conceptual Categories Revising Interview Protocol**

These three conceptual categories did not emerge in a clear moment of understanding. The language describing them changed and was refined over a period of time that spanned several months. The interview questions always included discussion of collaboration, processes and leadership, among other topics. As I focused in on what I felt were the conceptual categories that best encompassed the substantive codes that emerged from my initial round of data collection, I began to revise my interview protocol.

After the emergence of these three conceptual categories, I structured my interview around three questions. The exact wording of these questions and subsequent prompting questions would vary depending on whether the formation of the CSSP was retrospective or current, whether the interviewee was an employee or a volunteer of the convening organization, or whether they were a stakeholder participant in the CSSP. However, the core of each question asked interviewees to reflect on their perceptions related to each of the three core categories uncovered in my focused coding process. The essence of these three conceptual categories is reflected in my finalized interview protocol which was a guide for all of my later-stage interviews. The purpose of narrowing the interview protocol was to get a deeper understanding of the phenomena of interest by exploring more fully the essence of the core categories that were emerging from the data. Despite this narrower focus, I was still attentive to new insights that emerged from the interview and followed those up with prompts to explore if there was anything substantially different than what I was hearing with regard to emerging conceptual categories.

Appendix E shows the broad lines of questioning that were followed in the initial round of interviews, interviews 1 - 18. Appendix E shows the interview questions used as the basis of my subsequent round of interviews, interviews 19 - 35. Near interview 20, I began to observe that
interviewee responses were becoming repetitive and I was seeing fewer new incidents that were not well described by the substantive codes already in the node hierarchy. It was at this point that I began to suspect that saturation of the conceptual categories and substantive codes was beginning to occur.

**Theoretical Coding and the Extant Literature**

As I saw that no new relevant data regarding substantive codes emerged from new data and that the current substantive codes were well developed and supported by subsequent data, I decided that I had reached theoretical saturation (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). It was at this point that I conducted a thorough literature review, seeking a theoretical approach that may help me to explain what the data seemed to be showing in the form of the conceptual categories and substantive codes. The literature review was done in large part, after the majority of my data collection and focused coding was complete. Therefore, it was undertaken with an eye to help generate an explanation as to why the narratives that I collected and analyzed seemed to indicate empirical connections between the substantive codes and conceptual categories.

The third conceptual category involved encouraging or motivating stakeholders to participate in CSSPs. Almost all of the substantive codes related to this conceptual category referenced language that was aimed at encouraging or motivating others. These substantive codes appeared to represent the theoretical concept of “framing”, which is also one of the sensitizing concepts that was mentioned above. Chapter 5 describes the framing literature in detail, and a significant amount of the framing literature cited in that chapter came from Social Movement Theory (SMT). The core framing tasks offered by Benford and Snow (2000) became the theoretical lens through which I began to formulate explanations for connections between the substantive codes and the conceptual category related to the encouragement and motivation of
stakeholders to participate in the CSSP. I examined the incidents within the data that were associated with the substantive codes that made up the third conceptual category and asked myself if “framing activities” would be a better way of describing the conceptual category. I found that framing acted as an ideal theoretical code to parsimoniously represent this conceptual category. As I investigated further, I found that I could use Benford and Snow’s (2000) three core framing tasks to act as sub conceptual categories for the framing theoretical code, which are: diagnostic (highlighting the problem), prognostic (highlighting the solution) and motivational (the “call to arms”) framing. As an example of how this process worked, Figure 4.5 offers a visual representation of the mappings between the substantial codes derived through initial and focused coding, and the theoretical coding hierarchy that I developed during this phase. The nomenclature used in the lower-order theoretical codes on the right side of Figure 4.5 is derived from the framing literature, and from the node hierarchy where no relevant theoretical constructs exist. This section will not offer a theoretical explanation of the selection of these extant constructs; further discussion about the theoretical codes and their meaning in the literature are described in Chapter 5. The intent of this section is to highlight how focused coding moved into theoretical coding, and how this informed theory development.
Figure 4.5 – Example of Substantive to Theoretical Code Mapping - Framing Activities
The three core framing tasks described by Benford and Snow (2000) are not unto themselves explanatory theories. They are descriptive categories used to represent activities in this research that mobilize the collective action of stakeholders in CSSPs. To help me understand why these three core framing tasks are associated with the mobilization of collective action in social movements, I looked more broadly into the SMT literature. This body of literature is not homogenous, and a variety of research and theoretical paradigms exist. While investigating the SMT literature related to framing, I encountered the concept of Social Movement Organizations (SMO) (McAdam & Scott, 2005). The SMO literature is unique in SMT scholarly work in that it focuses on the processes and structures of organizations that are associated with social movements. This literature is aligned with the bulk of the theory and research in the CSSP literature, but SMOs were later drawn into a unifying amalgamation of three broad paradigms in the SMT literature by McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996). This amalgamation categorized three salient streams of SMT theory and research that represent important aspects of social movements: 1) political opportunity, 2) mobilizing structures and 3) framing activities. In this thesis I describe this amalgamated construct as the revised political process model (PPM) and explore this further in Chapter 5.

Starting from an examination of the framing literature, I expanded my theoretical sensitivity related to CSSPs to think about CSSPs as being conceptualized as a form of social movements. As will be elaborated in subsequent chapters, this understanding informed how I examined and reexamined my data. Recognizing that CSSPs and social movements share characteristics changed my theoretical coding process. It also shifted my own thinking related to the contribution that this research could make to the discussion of leadership in CSSPs by using SMT as a lens to highlight important constructs that have not traditionally been examined by
CSSP scholars. Drawing on the PPM as a conceptual framework, I continued my theoretical coding process. As with the “framing” conceptual category (visually depicted in Figure 4.4), my other two main conceptual categories were informed by the three theoretical concepts from the PPM. In addition to the PPM, a number of other constructs from both SMT and CSSP continued to help me reframe some of the substantive codes and conceptual categories that emerged from my focused coding. Using the PPM and other theoretical constructs as inspiration, I uncovered two new ways of making sense of the data. First, I began to think about “political opportunity” as a concrete construct, both at the organizational and at the societal level. Previously, I had been thinking about this core category in terms of “what is going on in the community,” without much conceptual clarity. It appeared that organizing political opportunity related incidents and substantive nodes at the organizational and societal levels offered more clarity into what was going on at the research sites.

The second insight that my examination of SMT and other literature provided, was a way of thinking about the processes and structures that were associated with the CSSPs. Previously, in my initial coding process, I put together a list of how the CSSPs made decisions, brought people together and built relationships, which are commonly examined in the CSSP literature. Huxham and Vangen (2000) offered a description of leadership of collaborative partnerships that conceptualized leadership as processes that make things happen. They described interorganizational structures, process based structures and lead organizations as categories that relate to what SMT conceptualizes as “mobilizing structures.” In my analysis process, the deliberate conceptualizing of processes and structures that enable connections and decision making between organizations were very important, and differentiating these from those structures that are more process-based was an idea that fit closely with what I was seeing at a
number of the research sites. This idea helped me to make sense of the list of processes that I had previously coded. Figure 4.5 visualizes the mapping between the substantive codes and conceptual categories from the initial and focused coding, to the theoretical categories and codes that evolved from this.
Figure 4.6 – Substantive Code and Conceptual Category Mapping to Theoretical Codes and Categories – All Three Theoretical Categories
Analysis of the Core Category

Strauss and Corbin (1990) describe the choice of the core category in inductive data analysis as the selection of one central construct that unifies the theoretical codes and categories. They describe the uncovering of a core category as the final stage of inductive data analysis, using “selective coding” as a process to deliberately bring together the highest levels of abstraction of theoretical codes. Strauss and Corbin’s (1990, 1999) inductive data analysis approach has been described as post-positivist (Charmaz, 2014). My approach has been decidedly constructivist, but the concept of a core category is meaningful in the context of my theoretical explanation of the data because it appears through my interpretative process that there is a central construct that unifies the theoretical codes and categories. Ultimately at the highest level of theoretical abstraction the data indicates to me that: the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing structures and the engagement in framing activities, are actions that are undertaken in convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. When this is further informed by literature, there appears to be theoretical value in conceptualizing leadership in the formation of CSSPs as the fostering of social movements. These topics will be expanded upon in subsequent chapters, but for the purpose of describing the data analysis, the core category of “mobilizing leadership: leadership as the fostering of social movements” is the unifying code that ties together the other three highest level theoretical codes as depicted in blue in Figure 4.7.
Figure 4.7 – Map of Core Code, Theoretical Categories and Codes
Chapter 5 - Focused Literature Review - Leadership in the Formation of CSSPs as the Fostering of Social Movements

The previous chapter foregrounded the process through which the unifying, core code emerged from the data incidents uncovered during the course of this research. It was through a secondary round of literature review that these theoretical categories and their applicability to the substantive codes was developed. The contents of this secondary literature review focuses on theory and research from the Social Movement Theory (SMT) literature that is relevant to the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. This chapter contributes to the theoretical understanding of the initial conceptual categories that emerged from the data. As described by Patton (2002), it was the “creative interplay among the processes of data collection, literature review, and researcher introspection” (p. 226) – specifically the literature from SMT – that provided much of the theoretical contribution of this thesis. In this chapter, I will include discussions highlighting the conceptual overlap of Social Movement Organizations (SMO) and convening organizations of Cross-Sector Social Partnerships (CSSP). There will then be a review of the SMT literature as it pertains to Political Process Model (PPM) including sections describing the extant SMT literature related to political opportunity, mobilizing structures and framing activities in social movements.

How Social Movements Can Inform Theory and Research of Cross-Sector Social Partnerships

The linkages between social movement theory (SMT) and organizational studies (OS) have been conceptualized as “complementary” rather than “competing” by McAdam and Scott (2005). They suggest that OS tend to focus on structure, established organizations, institutionalized authority and sectors, whereas social movement research focuses on process, emergent
organizations, transgressive contention and societal regimes. McAdam and Scott’s (2005) description of the complementary aspects of the two literatures highlights a relative lack of redundancy and an opportunity to draw from each literature as appropriate when organizations become more like social movements, or when a social movement becomes more like an established organization. Described as a “division of labor” between the two fields, OS research has traditionally been associated with “established organizations” at the “sector-specific” scope-of-inquiry (level of analysis), while social movement theorists are more known for research related to “emergent organizations” at the “society-wide” scope of inquiry (Davis, et al., 2005, p. 13). The distinctive yet complementary areas of focus of OS and SMT is particularly salient to this research inquiry because CSSPs involve organizational partners that span sectors, that are established as well as emerging and that are sector focused as well as society-focused (Seitanidi, 2008; Selsky & Parker, 2005). Conceptually, McAdam and Scott’s (2005) description of the intersection between OS and SMT would indicate that CSSPs tend to operate entirely across the theoretical boundaries of the two literatures, spanning “established versus emergent power and society-wide versus sector-specific arenas” (p. 12). Heuer (2011), when theorizing about ecosystem management, suggests that “social movements are a necessary condition for cross-sector collaboration” (p. 218).

Increasingly SMT has been drawn on, not only in OS (King & Soule, 2007; Davis, McAdam, Scott & Zald, 2005), but also directly in the CSSP literature (King, 2008; Page, 2010; Heuer, 2011) because social movements and CSSPs are overlapping concepts with a number of similarities, including: decentralized authority, seeking mutually desirable outcomes from different stakeholder perspectives and a focus on working together to enable positive social change when facing complex issues, among others. “Public-private-partnerships”, “strategic
alliances”, “community development” and “co-ordinated service delivery” are all types of partnerships associated with CSSPs, whereas “grassroots initiatives”, “political movements”, “advocacy groups” and “change makers” are terms often used to describe social movements. While the connections between these ideas are not often explicitly made in the literature, in practice there are clearly linkages: for example, successful PPPs are often grassroots in nature and co-ordinated service delivery initiatives may involve a significant political narrative. Given the implications of these real world connections for the success of CSSPs, the literature in this domain would benefit from considering more closely the theoretical implications of social movement theory, a well-established field of inquiry, for constructs that are still at the nascent stage of development in the CSSP literature.

The study of social movements has a history of theory building and empirical investigation in the field of sociology for well over 100 years (Garner & Tenuto, 1997) and has moved through several phases of inquiry that have been categorized in numerous ways by a variety of scholars (Snow and Soule, 2010; Crossley, 2002). Crossley (2002) characterizes four main traditions of social movement analysis in the USA and Europe which have dominated the literature at various times: collective behaviour, Marxism, resource mobilization/political process and new social movements. A synthesis of the broader streams of theory in the social movement literature emerged when McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996) attempted to synthesize three of the more dominant areas of research: the political process model, resource mobilization theory and framing processes. This synthesis has been called a revised Political Process Model (PPM) and has been used in the CSSP literature (King, 2008). The synthesis offered by McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996) has no definitive and agreed-upon name within the social movement literature, but will be referred to here as the PPM, reflecting the nomenclature used in King (2008). While
there are critiques among social movement scholars of the PPM as a unifying construct for social movement research (Buehler, 2011), it maintains its position as the dominant perspective in social movement theory because it provides predictions that have established strong empirical support and these three factors have been useful at explaining social movement outcomes (King, 2008).

The PPM, as it relates to collective action, focuses on the successful emergence of social movements and not necessarily on the emphasis of the use of conflict to achievement collective aims, as is common in SMT. Contentious collective action, such as the use of protests, riots, strikes and revolutions are a frequent topic of study in the social movement literature (Della Porta, 2009; Diani, 2009). These types of contentious, or adversarial collective action are more relevant to the CSSP literature as an antecedent to CSSPs or an outcome of inaction or failure of CSSPs, but they are not a useful focus at the formation stages of CSSPs as they are counterproductive in the context of collaborative partnerships. The PPM describes collective action in situations where there are strong voluntary associations, where government is open to collaboration outside of the scope of elections and where mass media exists and is free to voice a broad range of opinions (Zald & McCarthy, 2002), consistent with the context of CSSP formation.

**Political Process Model and Leadership of Convening Organizations in the Formation of CSSPs**

Having suggested that the PPM can inform our thinking about what constituent parts of social movements are salient to their success, it is now important to link the PPM with the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. In SMT, theorists frequently refer to, encouraging “agency” in collective action (Benford & Snow, 2000) when talking about bringing people and
groups together to work together in a social movement. In OS, bringing people and groups
together across sectors to work towards a social outcome has similarly been called “facilitating
the emergence of collective agency” (Koschmann, Kuhn & Pfarrer, 2012: 334). The
nomenclature is similar because the phenomenon of interest is similar. Collective action can be
encouraged by some event that motivates others to participate; this event could be any number of
things including: a particularly impactful interaction between individuals or groups, an
environmental disaster, an economic downturn, or the bringing to light of some new information
relevant to a social issue. Some of these motivators for collective action may be attributable to
the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs, and some may not.

Encouraging participation is an important part of leadership in the formation of CSSPs
(Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2010), but there are other aspects of
leadership that should be considered, including the creation of structural elements of the CSSP
(Huxham & Vangen, 2000) and aiding the way stakeholders think and make sense of CSSPs
(Selsky & Parker, 2010). So the problem exists that we do not have a good framework that
encompasses all of the salient concepts related to the leadership of convening organizations in
the formation of CSSPs. As is mentioned above, the PPM is used to categorize factors related to
successful outcomes of social movements in SMT, especially in their formation stage (Kutz-
Flamenbaum, 2012). Similarly, in this chapter the PPM will be used as a framework to help
organize theories and research related to leadership of convening organizations in the formation
of CSSPs.

In the sections that follow I will categorize studies and theories from social movement
theory, CSSP using the PPM as a conceptual framework. These broad literary categories will be
organized into the three conceptual buckets that the PPM uses to describe the structure of
collective action and social movements: political opportunity, mobilizing structures and framing
activities. CSSP literature will be the term used to describe scholarly work from organizational
studies literatures, including: stakeholder theory, public administration, business ethics and
cross-sector social interaction. Gaps in the scholarly works discussed in this literature review will
logically lead to research questions that will direct the inquiry that will be investigated in the
subsequent chapter.

Political Opportunity and Leadership of Convening Organizations in the Formation of
CSSPs

SMT theorists describe political opportunity as changes in the balance of power between
parties as a precursor to collective action (Tilly, 1978; McAdam, 1982; Tarrow, 1983). Social
movements can take advantage of political opportunity to affect change in the status quo
(Buehler, 2011). McAdam (1982) describes three factors that are related to the efficacy of social
movements: the structure of political opportunity, organizational strength and cognitive
liberation. The structure of political opportunity relates to the stability of a political system
where a particular group increases or decreases leverage in relation to rivals (McAdam, 1982).
Second, McAdam (1982) describes organizational strength, which speaks to the existence of
existing organizational structures within social movements, consisting of: members, incentives
that encourage recruitment and create cohesion, communication networks and finally leaders that
direct collective action. Third, cognitive liberation refers to individual and group level subjective
perception that there exists an injustice, that change is possible and that they themselves can
actually affect the outcome of change (McAdam, 1982).

In SMT, it was the opportunity associated with the political processes surrounding the
social movement that has become a phenomenon of interest as it relates to the successful
emergence of movements, and the differences in the success of movements between jurisdictions (Buehler, 2011). As the first of three constituent parts of the PPM, these political opportunities, and how they relate to social movements and CSSPs, will be examined below.

**Political Opportunity: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Social Movement Literature**

Political opportunity and leadership are not explicitly discussed in SMT literature, but constructs relevant to the identification of political opportunity exist, especially as these political opportunities may be identified by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. The SMT literature includes individual historical case studies of social movements and protests taking a political opportunity perspective (Costain, 1992; McAdam, 1982; Tarrow, 1989) as well as research examining similar social movements in geographically diverse locations (Joppke, 1991; Kriesi et al., 1992) comparing political opportunity across a series of jurisdictional contexts, contrasting and comparing how these structures affected social movements. Social movement organizations may be able to identify political opportunity in terms of potential allies by utilizing a framework developed by della Porta and Diani, (1991) that compares organizations along two axis: level of competition between organizations and propensity to cooperate. Organizations that are low in competition and high in cooperation have the potential for working together (non-competitive cooperation), while those that are low in cooperation and high in competition offer littler opportunity for allegiances (factionalism) (della Porta & Diani, 2009). As opportunities for cooperation seem more limited, the criteria for inclusion into cooperative partnerships become more inclusive (Diani, 1995). Furthermore, cooperation on joint initiatives between social movement organizations can lead to stable relationships and information exchange (Zald & McCarthy, 1980).
Political factors in social movements, such as the social position of individuals or groups, the links derived from past experiences, and the symbolic systems used by members are cyclical over time (Fantasia, 1988). These factors may present opportunity or may have the effect of disconnecting members from the movement (Rucht, 1989; Lichterman, 1995). Political “origins” are of particular importance to sustain the interest of members, collaborators and the public (Tarrow, 1990).

Political Opportunity: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Cross-Sector Social Partnerships and Organizational Studies Literatures

CSSP scholars describe how partnerships occur at the organizational and societal level of analysis, with a particular focus at the societal level (Selsky & Parker, 2005). To help conceptualize leadership of convening organizations as it relates to political opportunity in the formation stage of CSSPs, relevant CSSP theory will be split into two groups: organizational level political opportunity and societal level political opportunity.

Starting with political opportunity at the organizational level, King (2008) offers a series of propositions related to the corporate and industrial opportunity that instigate stakeholder collective action. He suggests that changes in the corporate structure of an important stakeholder, such as merger and acquisition activity, changes during the process of organizational change initiatives including leadership change or organizational restructuring, may increase the probability of stakeholder collective action. He also highlights the importance of the emergence of internal allies, or champions (Crosby & Bryson, 2010) who support the CSSP within organizations. Similar to internal champions is the concept of internal representatives; those individuals or groups who are perceived to be legitimate representatives of a broader community
and whose engagement in CSSPs may be necessary for adequate stakeholder representation (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). The existence of champions and legitimate representatives maybe provide political opportunity salient to convening organizations.

Political opportunity may exist when the stakeholders have goal-alignment with the social goals of the CSSP. Collective agency may be based on opportunism related to the timing of stakeholder goals, which change over time. Understanding these goals is conceptualized here as an important part of identifying political opportunity by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. Reast, et al, (2010) found that organizational learning among partners of a CSSP can be enhanced by “understanding partners’ needs and priorities” (p. 207). Doh and Boddewyn (2013) describe two key motivators for engaging on socially responsible initiatives: strategic CSR, where it is determined that socially responsible activities are integral to the business priorities, and altruistic CSR, where engagement in CSR activities are motivated by altruism and a moral philosophy.

At the societal level, political opportunity for the successful formation of CSSPs include changes in popular normative and political views, changes in levels of trust between stakeholder groups and the existence of existing group-level network ties (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). The existence of shared meaning and a collective identity between stakeholder groups is also identified as important to collective action (King, 2008), which is similar to the existence of “meta-goals” or a common cause among partners (Huxham & Vangen, 1996). It has also been suggested that the spectre of government regulation, as well as increases in competitiveness or the failure of incumbent businesses within an industry are also opportunities for collective action (King, 2008).
There is a noticeable lack of scholarly work that examines how political opportunity relates to the formation of CSSPs. While SMT scholars have conceptualized phenomena in terms of political opportunity at great length, CSSP scholars have tended to eschew the broader political context of social partnerships, instead focusing mainly on the structural aspects of the partnerships that will be discussed in the next section. Similar to political opportunity, Clarke and Fuller (2010) describe the importance of partnership context when driving the formation of a CSSP. They note that “additional research needs to clarify which elements of context serve as better motivators to stimulate the creation of multi-sector social partnerships and the means by which the contextual stimuli impact upon the intent to form such partnerships” (p. 99).

Waddock (2009, 2008) describe “difference makers” related to social responsibility, these individuals and groups “tend to be politically savvy”, and are “often in the right place at the right time with the right idea” (Waddock, 2009, p. 283). While Waddock (2009) uses the tongue-in-cheek term “luck” to describe how difference makers tend to be in the right place at the right time, she goes on to talk about how luck involves “synchronicity” and how they “laid the groundwork for the idea through their hard work” (Waddock, 2009, p. 283). In Waddock (2010), she later draws on a quote from the Roman philosopher Seneca to illustrate this point, “luck is what happens when preparation meets opportunity” (p. 10). But what specifically is this synchronicity between preparation and opportunity that Waddock (2009) describes? The CSSP literature has little to say on that front, and it is this lack of empirical and theoretical attention that drives the second research question for this inquiry: what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to the recognition of political opportunity, in the formation of CSSPs? By examining this question this research inquiry will contribute towards filling the above mentioned gap in the CSSP literature.
Mobilizing Structures and Leadership of Convening Organizations in the Formation of CSSPs

Mobilizing structures refer to “those collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action” (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 3) and were frequently identified with resource mobilization theory, before being subsumed into the PPM (Buehler, 2011). Applying the mobilizing structures construct to the context of the formation of CSSPs, the “formal and informal” vehicles can include a variety of phenomena and theoretical constructs, such as the direction and frequency of deliberate communication between stakeholders, individual and organizational-level network ties, mechanisms to generate external and internal awareness of an issue, group decision making processes, governance and by-laws and formal convening organizations, among others. The section below examines theories and research related to these mobilizing structures.

Mobilizing Structures: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Social Movement Literature

Social movement theorists have faced the dilemma of understanding grassroots social movements that have formal leadership roles (Della Porta & Diani, 2009). Leadership roles in social movements vary in their centrality and levels of power and control (Janda, 1970), but social movements have traditionally been associated with a decentralized leadership structure (Gerlach, 1971). SMT theorists tend to focus more on the outcomes of leadership rather than the structural aspects of leadership itself. “Ownership” of initiatives and projects has been described in terms of leadership in social movement research, examining leadership of initiatives either as informal network strategies or formal bureaucracies (Taylor, 1995; Scholsberg, 2002). When examining the characteristics of professional social movement organizations, McCarthy and Zald
(1987) describe full-time leadership as an important structural characteristic. Della Porta and Rucht, (1995) describe the process disintegration and structural realignment of social movements, and their effect on loyalty to leaders. They describe bottom-up, or democratic loyalty to the social movement; as long as there is alignment between the utility of the leader and the goals of the social movement then the leaders and organizations themselves may be thought of as temporary instruments (della Porta & Rucht, 1995). Structural connections between organizations associated with movements are also described in terms of the duality of leadership roles, where social movement participants occupy a role within the social movement while at the same time occupying a leadership role within the community (Schmitt-Beck, 1989). Another structural function of social movements, which is sometimes attributed to leadership, is that of strategic decision making. Decisions that affect the movement as a whole are sometimes explicitly or implicitly made through consensus or a formal vote (Rosenthal & Schwartz, 1989). These types of processes relegate the role of leadership away from that of a decision maker to the facilitator of these decision making structures, or into an advocacy role to frame topics to aid the sensemaking activities of social movement members (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Concepts similar to convening organizations as they are defined in this chapter, are alluded to in SMT. Wilson (1973) investigates the structural differences between primary organizations, who facilitate democratic decision making between social movement participants and caucus organizations that hold a higher degree of active leaders that make decisions on behalf of large but inactive memberships. McCarthy and Zald (1987) also describe professional social movement organizations as formal organizations mobilizing collective action. These convening-type organizations exhibit four characteristics: full time leadership, small or non-existent membership, portraying an image of speaking for a broader group, attempt to make
change and influence policy. Professional SMOs as described by McCarthy and Zald (1987) differ from convening organizations as conceptualized in this research inquiry in that they do not explicitly encourage collective action of other similarly minded stakeholders.

Social movement theorists use social network analysis (SNA) to examine the structures that exist in and between social movements. These research inquiries focus on three types of networks, including: those that bring together organizations through consultation, those that link organizations through common participants, and those that bring new participants into the social movement (della Porta & Diani, 2009). The structure of social networks is essential to social movements for the purpose of recruitment; social networks account for 75% of recruitment to American religious organizations (Snow, et al., 1980) and 66% of university political activists were recruited via social networks (Diani, 1995). Erikson (1982) examined the structure of social movement networks and found that the denser the networks (the more connections between individuals and groups) the greater the likelihood that members derive inspiration from the group and stronger conviction of their own points of view. It is interesting to point out though that organizational affiliation and personal ties are not unto themselves linked with generating individual mobilization in a social movement; these need to be coupled with a strong identification with the identity of the social movement to foster agency (McAdam & Paulsen, 1993). Creating linkages between organizations through members with multiple affiliations also seems to be a commonality among social movements. Carroll and Ratner (1996) found that nearly three quarters of members of social movements were also affiliated with other social movements, and that a core group of members were included in a variety of social movements. These overlapping memberships contribute to the circulating of information between groups and account for the informal links among social movements (Killian, 1964).
Mobilizing Structures: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Cross-Sector Social Partnerships and Organizational Studies Literatures

This section will discuss theory and research from the CSSP literature that can be conceptually categorized as “mobilizing structures” as it is understood in the SMT literature. While the term “mobilizing structures” is not directly used in the literature examined in this section - with one exception (King, 2008) - concepts related to mobilizing structures are a main point of focus in CSSP and in the broader OS literature. CSSP scholars describe these mobilizing structures as processes, policies, leadership and institutional activities; in this section I will highlight some of these concepts that are relevant to the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs.

Huxham and Vangen (2000) describe three mechanisms that lead to collaborative agendas and policy, they include: interorganizational structures, the formal and informal processes through which communications take place and finally the leadership role of a participant individual or organization. Huxham and Vangen’s (2000) three mechanisms focus on the leadership actions associated with the creation and implementation of collaboration, and similar to the concept of mobilizing structures in SMT, they focus on the organizational level, providing specificity around the structural and process instruments used for groups and individuals to collaborate. The first leadership mechanisms described by Huxham and Vangen (2000) are interorganizational structures, which describe how individuals and organizations connect within a collaborative partnership. The second leadership mechanisms are formal and informal instruments through which collaborative communication occurs (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). The third leadership mechanisms offered by Huxham and Vangen (2000) describe the leadership outcomes that emerge from participants in a non-hierarchical partnership. This
emergent leadership rarely comes from direct positional power (French & Raven, 1959), but rather through deliberate leadership activities that aim to influence peers either in a formal or informal leadership role (Huxham & Vangen, 2000).

Page (2010) talks about three leadership tactics for structured deliberation within stakeholder groups to allow for collaborative governance, they include: the need to effectively communicate to exchange views and ideas, the skill of considering alternative viewpoints and solutions and the ability to make joint-decisions. These structured deliberation opportunities that encourage dialogue and group decision making, including convening processes such as town halls or community meetings, but these processes should include the scope of stakeholder participation, the exclusivity of the venue, decision making authority and also ensure fit among capabilities, agenda and decision authority (Page, 2010). Processes that build cross-cultural understanding (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006), initial agreement, deal with power imbalances and conflict, leverage sector strengths, formalize assessments to track inputs and outcomes should also be created early-on in CSSPs to increase their likelihood for success (Selsky & Parker, 2005). Berger, Cunningham and Drumwright (2004) examined the structural characteristics of organizations that impact partnerships between nonprofit organizations and business partners. These structures of the business as well as the nonprofit organizations were evaluated along with structural characteristics of the social alliance itself (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright, 2004).

Processes and structures and governance of cross-sector collaborations have been examined in terms of their likelihood to contribute to a successful outcome (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2010). In their framework for understanding cross-sector collaborations and the leadership of successful, semi-permanent cross-sector collaborations,
several structural components are identified including: building leadership, legitimacy, agreement and trust, as well as managing conflict, planning and the creation of appropriate governance structures (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Crosby and Bryson (2010) describe a structural model that brings together “diverse groups and organizations together in semi-permanent ways, and typically across sector boundaries, to remedy complex public problems and achieve the common good” (p. 211).

Structures that encourage the creation of trust between stakeholders participating in CSSPs are also examined by CSSP scholars. Waddock (1989) suggests that a lack of trust contributes to the demise of collaborations as stakeholders hold strong and frequently negative stereotypes about other stakeholders from different sectors. Selsky and Parker (2005) suggest that trust in partnerships is perceived differently across sectors, with businesses attributing trust to risk reduction and nonprofits applying trust to the social contract that exists between stakeholders in the CSSP. Structures that encourage trust between stakeholders are therefore important for the success of CSSPs (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). Reast, et al. (2010) found a number of structural elements that contributed to organizational learning in CSSPs including: the development of “long-term, deep, trusting relationships” and the construction of communication infrastructure. Among other things, Rivera-Santos and Rufin (2010) describe the importance of trust in governance of CSSPs including non-profit and for-profit organizations. Trust is particularly important in partnerships between non-profits and business when compared with B2B partnerships; trust will initially be scarcer, the negotiation stage will be particularly important for trust building, mechanisms will be to build ongoing trust will frequently be used, and outside-of-alliance behaviour will be more impactful (Rivera-Santos & Rufin, 2010).
Using concepts from non-linear theorizing and complex systems, Heuer (2011) describes “adaptive governance structures” as a prerequisite for sustained cross-sector collaboration (p. 216). This prerequisite stems from the complex and dynamic institutional arrangements of many of these partnerships, and that the need for adaptive governance structures is challenging because organizations tend to be isomorphic in their institutional environments to maintain legitimacy, which can be a barrier for CSSPs (Heuer, 2011). In addition to governance structures, Huxham and Vangen (1996) describe six themes commonly raised as important issues in working together in CSSPs. These themes include: managing and agreeing on the aims of the CSSP, willingness to compromise, establishing good communication between members, democracy and equality in decision making, managing tension related to power and trust in the partnership and ensuring determination, commitment and the necessary stamina to make the partnership work (Haxham & Vangen, 1996). Similarly, Seitanidi (2008) presents a way of thinking about responsibilities within a CSSP as an adaptive process, rather than as reactive or proactive processes. If responsibilities are explicitly acknowledged to be flexible and change over time, then CSSPs themselves can be more flexible to address social issues at multiple levels of analysis (micro, meso and macro) (Seitanidi, 2008).

Another approach used by CSSP scholars to conceptualize mobilizing structures in the context of CSSPs is structuration theory (Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Pentland & Feldman, 2007; Levina & Orlikowski, 2009). Structuration theory examines the link between process and practices as a bi-directional relationship, where practices inform processes in addition to the traditional understanding of processes informing practice (Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Structuration theory may be relevant to leadership of convening organizations because it
highlights the differences between stated processes and those that are actually used within organizations (Giddens, 1984).

Other CSSP scholars have examined the structure of partnerships from the perspective of value and value creation. Koschmann, Kuhn and Pfaffer (2012) examine cross-sector partnerships using a perspective that examines partnerships in terms of the "co-orientation" of communication including the "authoritative texts" of the partnerships (p. 335). They describe a model of the partnership value that can create a trajectory that includes: the potential for collective agency, ability to influence subsequent efforts and the capacity to create value (Koschmann, Kuhn and Pfaffer, 2012). Austin and Seitanidi (2012b) describe components of a collaborative value creation framework that includes four types of value creation that have already been described above, but they also describe four sources of co-created value in cross-sector partnership, these include: association, transferred resource, interaction and synergistic value. Le Ber and Branzei (2010b) offer a framework that describes the process that CSSPs utilize related to changes in framing of social value related to the partnership. Their process is described in more detail in subsequent sections of this chapter. Le Ber and Branzei (2010) examine the structure of cross-sector partnership, focusing on relational processes that moderate the trajectory towards success or failure. In their relational model, they describe three factors: relational attachment, partner complacency, and partner disillusionment (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010).

The CSSP literature described above offers a subset of the CSSP and OS literature that focuses specifically on the structural elements of organizations as they relate to CSSPs. This area of research and theory building is what OS scholars are frequently known for. SMT often looks to OS for theoretical and empirical guidance in relation to mobilizing structures (Davis,
McAdam, Scott & Zald, 2005). While there is significant room for further inquiry related to processes and organizational structures as they pertain to the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs, there does not appear to be a significant gap in the CSSP literature in this regard.

**Framing Activities and Leadership of Convening Organizations in the Formation of CSSPs**

Leadership is frequently associated with the ability to exert power and influence over followers (French & Ravens, 1959), and framing relates to aiding others to build or modify new or existing cognitive frames (Dewulf, et al. 2009), which is a form of influence. Framing, as it is conceptualized in the PPM, brings in the cultural considerations of social movements, including “the schemata of interpretation” that people use to “identify and label” their surroundings (Snow, et al., 1986, p. 464). Framing has an inherent top-down bias (Benford, 1997) and can be construed as being non-collaborative and even manipulative. However, political opportunity is subject to the framing processes (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996) that occur inside of groups associated with CSSPs. Examining political opportunity and resource mobilization through structures in the absence of framing ignores the conversations that exist within and between organizations.

Cognitive frames or interpretive frames (Goffman, 1974), are the objects of interest in the act of framing. Cognitive frames (or simply “frames”) describe the knowledge structures, mental models or cognitive representations that people hold about the world around them (Dewulf, et al., 2009). At an individual level, the creation of frames is guided by pre-existing interests, values and beliefs of individual and group (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). They are memory structures that aid in understanding perceptual information by categorizing it into our existing knowledge base about the perceived world around us. These frames can throw an individual or a
group into a state of cognitive dissonance if a new frame contradicts pre-existing frames (Bacharach, Bamberger & Sonnenstuhl, 1996). Individuals' tendency to try to reduce levels of cognitive dissonance is particularly relevant when introducing new frames to organizations composed of individuals holding contradictory frames, because the framing process may be met with resistance at the organizational level (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). This resistance to changing existing frames has implications for leaders when attempting to present new information to others.

Framing is the act of persuading others to make meaning through interactions (Dewulf, et al., 2009). It is an iterative process where those involved negotiate a shared understanding of their shared social-construction of reality (Stokes & Hewitt, 1976; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). It is a process where new information is amalgamated into new and existing frames that would minimize cognitive dissonance (Bacharach, Bamberger & Sonnenstuhl, 1996). Central to framing activities is conflict resolution in the form of alignment interaction between those involved (Dewulf, et al., 2009); this alignment is of key importance to leaders concerned with framing processes. Individuals within organizations retrospectively make sense of their organizational environment through the creation of frames; this process is known as sensemaking (Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005).

**Framing Activities: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Social Movement Literature**

SMT theorists rarely write explicitly about framing as a leadership activity, but framing activities within social movements is a topic of frequent study (Snow, et al., 1986; Benford & Snow, 2000). Frames emerge in social movements as the social construction of problems; the
perceived severity of problems increases or decreases in severity as frames change in society (Hilgartner & Bosk, 1988; Best, 1989). These frames are related to culture and the sections of public opinion that may improve or hinder the efficacy of social movements and collective action (Tarrow, 1994).

Benford and Snow (2000) have identified three core framing tasks that can be used to help others build frames which include: diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing. *Diagnostic framing* involves the identification and attribution of the problem, focusing on the cause and those responsible. *Prognostic framing* is the discussion of a proposed solution to the issue articulated through diagnostic framing. *Motivational framing* deals with the key motivations of those engaged in collective action; it is the “call to arms” that encourages agency rather than free-riding in collective action. The social movement literature delineates between those stakeholders who actively engage in collective action (agency) and those who have goal alignment with the collective action but choose not to dedicate resources to the collective action (free-riding) (McAdam & Scott, 2005). To avoid free-riding, the three core framing tasks as well as other processes have been suggested as encouraging collective action (Benford & Snow, 2000). Similarly, frame alignment (or “bridging”) is described as a linking a “set of individual interests, values and believes” and showing that “activities, goals and ideologies are congruent and complementary” between actors in collective action (Snow, et al., 1986). Frame alignment is made up of three activities: 1) frame amplification which is framing that seeks clarify vague and confusing frames; 2) frame extension which extends existing frames to encompass new information and; 3) frame transformation which is framing with the intent of changing the dominant frame held by an individual, group or society (Benford & Snow, 2000).
The ontological perspective of recognizing the social construction of reality as frames is common in SMT theory and research. The three core framing tasks have been used by SMT researchers to conduct frame analysis and to help understand the process of attribution of meaning that is an important part of any social movement (della Porta & Diani, 2009). Frames related to political ideologies in the USA have been examined over the years (Alberoni, 1984; Wallis & Bruce, 1986; Oberschall, 1993). Similarly, changing cultural frames have been applied to SMT research in the investigation of the civil rights movement in the USA (McAdam, 1994; Eyerman & Jamison, 1991).

Leadership of social movements, when explicitly discussed in SMT, is often framed in terms of skills, but the skills described are often linked to leadership framing tasks. For example, Alberoni, (1984) describes the role of charismatic leadership in social movements related to repressive regimes such as WWII era Nazis. This charismatic leadership centres on the creation of frames related to a sense of collective identity (Alberoni, 1984). Other skills-based leadership approaches related to framing activities in SMT include leaders who act as: intellectuals and pose rational arguments (Killian, 1964), agitators, prophets and administrators who speak to particular sensibilities of social movement members (Lang & Lang, 1961), or are ideological or pragmatic in their rhetoric (Wilson, 1973).

**Framing Activities: Theories and Research Relevant to Leadership from the Cross-Sector Social Partnerships and Organizational Studies Literatures**

Benford and Snow’s (2000) three core framing tasks offer theoretical guidance to help leaders conceptualize framing activities. Some diagnostic framing processes that would be of use to convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs include: amplification of the social issue at
the heart of the proposed CSSP, highlighting for stakeholders that individual sectors that have tried and failed to solve the social issue, and articulating the overlap of stakeholder motivation and goals as they relate to the social issue (Selsky & Parker, 2005). As part of their examination of the way that social value is framed in CSSPs, Le Ber and Branzei (2010b) studied framing techniques used by non-profit and for-profit partners looking at diagnostic and prognostic framing activities. Diagnostic framing activities related to social value in CSSPs occur in the context of frame negotiation, which includes frame rifts, which occur when "the joint recognition that some changes are taking the partnership in a different direction, at a different pace, or produce a different magnitude of social change than either – and often both – partners desire" as well as frame contrast, which is the "deliberate juxtaposition and comparison of each partner’s frame against the other" (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b, p. 179). Taking a leadership approach, Page (2010) suggests that leadership tactics, including creating “new frames for problems”, may create changes in stakeholders’ interpretations related to the partnership (p. 260).

Prognostic framing activities relevant to the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs include: identifying the type (platform) of partnership that is most appropriate for the current CSSP as well as which sectors are involved in CSSPs (arenas) (Selsky & Parker, 2010). The four arenas include partnerships between: non-profits and businesses (arena 1), government and businesses (arena 2), government and non-profits (arena 3) and tri-sectoral partnerships (arena 4) (Selsky & Parker, 2010). The platforms they describe include: resource dependence platform, where organizational needs are solved; social issue platform, where partnerships focus on identifying, analyzing and responding to social needs and; societal-sector platform, where sectors understand the limitations and opportunities afforded to solving a social issue by partnering with stakeholders across sectors (Selsky & Parker, 2010). Similar to
Selsky and Parker’s (2010) prospective sensemaking approach to framing platforms and arenas for CSSPs, Vurro, Dacin and Perrini (2010) suggest four ways of framing CSSPs. These four ways of framing CSSPs include: instrumental CSSPs, where motivation for participating relate to increasing one’s own legitimacy in a new market; transactional CSSPs, where motives relate to increasing legitimacy as a good partner; transformational CSSP, where improving internal commitment and acquiring knowledge is the key motivator for participation and; participative CSSP, where the main motivation for participation is to improve legitimacy as a socially responsible company (Vurro, Dacin & Perrini, 2010). Le Ber and Branzei (2010b) also examine framing of social value from the non-profit and for-profit, prognostic framing perspective. Prognostic framing of social value in cross-sector interactions include frame elasticity (expanding existing prognostic frames to include, or tolerate other prognostic frames), frame plasticity (efforts to incorporate newly obtained understanding and letting go of others) and finally frame fusion, which is "the construction of a new and evolving prognostic frame that motivates and disciplines partners” cross sector interactions while preserving their distinct contribution to value creation" (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b, p. 164).

Finally, motivational framing may be appropriate when rallying stakeholders around a collective identity (King, 2008; Benford & Snow, 2000) and when highlighting the failures of the past in solving the social issue (Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Kolk, van Dolen and Vock (2010) highlight the importance of micro-level “trickle-effects” (p. 124) between employees, and between managers and employees in motivating CSSPs. They point out a lack of research related to how interactions within organizations occur, but suggest that leadership interactions may be positively associated with engagement in partnership related conversations (Kolk, van Dolen & Vock, 2010).
From the SMT literature, it is clear that framing has a role to play in encouraging collective agency in social movements. Given the linkages that have been discussed in previous sections of this chapter, encouraging collective agency is an important concept in the formation of CSSPs, so it is clear that framing plays a role in leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. CSSP scholars have drawn on concepts informed by framing and cognitive frames as they relate broadly to CSSPs, but there has been no discussion of how framing relates directly to the phenomena of interest in this research inquiry and is indicative of a gap in the literature. This gap leads to the second research question of this research inquiry: what role does framing have in the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs?

In this chapter a secondary review of the literature has provided an exploration of the SMT and the CSSP literatures using the framework of the PPM. Guided by alignment between the three conceptual categories developed during the initial data collection and analysis, and the three categories of the PPM, this secondary review of the literature indicates that there are at least two gaps in the CSSP literature related to the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. The first gap relates to a lack of scholarly work examining the role of political opportunity recognition by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs and the second gap relates to the role of framing in the leadership of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. These two gaps in the CSSP literature were identified through a synthesis coherence contribution of complementary theoretical constructs from the SMT literature to the CSSP literature (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2006). By using SMT to guide this review of the CSSP literature, these two gaps lead to two sub-research questions, namely: 1) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to the recognition of political opportunity, in the formation of
CSSPs? And 2) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to framing activities, in the formation of CSSPs?
Chapter 6 - Research Findings – The Role of Leadership in the Formation of CSSPs

The previous chapter provided a review of the Cross-Sector Social Partnership (CSSP) literature as well as the Social Movement Theory (SMT) literature related to the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing structures and the framing activities engaged in social movements and in CSSPs. This review, in combination with the original review of the Leadership and CSSP literatures in Chapter 2, allowed me to identify a gap in the CSSP literature related to the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. This chapter presents an interpretation of the data collected throughout the course of this research that aims to explore the following three questions: the primary research question: 1) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs?; and two sub research questions: 2) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to the recognition of political opportunity, in the formation of CSSPs?; and 3) what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to framing activities, in the formation of CSSPs? This chapter provides a summary of the key findings related to these research questions using exemplary data incidents to illustrate the substantive codes that emerged from the data collected at the seven CSSP research sites. Throughout this chapter, substantive codes describing the researcher’s interpretation of the nature of the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, will be presented. In the subsequent chapter, an interpretation of the data related to why convening organizations take on these roles will be discussed. The sections that follow in this chapter will include a discussion of the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing structures and the framing activities engaged in by the convening organizations of the CSSPs. Finally a section is offered that links the role of leadership in the
formation of CSSPs with the collective action of stakeholders in CSSPs and the instrumental value that this affords the CSSPs in terms of their ability to execute on their mission.

**Identification of Political Opportunity**

SMT theorists describe political opportunity as changes in the balance of power between parties as a precursor to collective action (Tilly, 1978; McAdam, 1982; Tarrow, 1983). Social movements can take advantage of political opportunity to affect change in the status quo. In SMT, it is the opportunity associated with the political processes surrounding the social movement that has become a phenomenon of interest as it relates to the successful emergence of movements, and the differences in the success of movements between jurisdictions (Buehler, 2011). Political opportunity is not the same as political or contextual change in general; political opportunity refers to political or contextual changes that may lead collective action towards a social or environmental goal. As is described in detail in Chapter 5, a broad range of conceptualizations of political opportunity exist in SMT, but here I will conceptualize political opportunity as described by McAdam, McCarthy and Zald’s (1996) in the Political Process Model (PPM) because of its conceptual clarity and its increasing prominence in SMT literature. McAdam, McCarthy and Zald’s (1996) conceptualization of political opportunity includes situations where: 1) conventional social practices contrast with new cultural values, 2) suddenly imposed grievances exist, 3) vulnerabilities or illegitimacy of systems present themselves, and 4) where innovative ways of thinking, or “master frames” become available.

Applying the PPM to our conceptualization of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, necessitates that we think about the role played by the identification of political opportunity. If political opportunity exists during the formation of CSSPs, leaders may identify these opportunities and incorporate them into leadership activities, strategic decision making and
operational activities. SMT scholars have examined political opportunities as emergent factors that contribute to the context of the successful formation of social movements; this is a retrospective viewpoint that sees political opportunity as a serendipitous occurrence, not necessarily something that is incorporated into leadership activities. SMT scholars have not focused on the intentionality of the identification of political opportunity in motivating collective action, rather their attention tends to focus on the nature of political opportunities (della Porta & Diani, 2009; Joppke, 1991; Kriesi et al., 1992; Rucht, 1989; Lichterman, 1995). The nature of political opportunity is one component of understanding the role of political opportunity in leadership during the formation of CSSPs, but the intentional leadership activities that relate to these political opportunities constitute the focus of this section.

During this research inquiry, political opportunity emerged as an important conceptual category. Descriptive explanations of contextual factors that were associated with the formation of each CSSP were clearly expressed, though leadership activities related to these contextual factors were frequently tacit and difficult to understand. Initially I understood these opportunities as something to do with “community readiness” and “popular zeitgeists” that aligned with the goals of the CSSPs. Through multiple rounds of data gathering and the ongoing process of focused and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2014), groups of related substantive codes were identified which led to the introduction of a new, separate research question, RQ #2: what is the role of the recognition of political opportunity by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs?

CSSP phenomena need to be explored at multiple levels of analysis because they operate in, and are directly affected by both organizations and societal factors (Seitanidi, 2008; Seitanidi, Koufopoulos & Palmer, 2011). Organizational (meso) level contrasts with societal (macro) level
political opportunity in terms of the scale of shared social constructions that exist among stakeholders. By aligning with a Relational Leadership Theory perspective, understanding social reality requires knowledge of the underlying relationships that exist in the context of the phenomena under investigation. Epistemologically, we can understand organizational level political opportunity through a researcher’s interpretation of the aggregated narratives of individuals within an organization and within a broader society. Categorizing aggregated narratives related to political opportunity as meso or macro is an artificial distinction, informative only at a conceptual level; in reality meso and macro level political opportunities are inexorably linked. They inform each other and are interdependent, with societal political opportunity being conceptually inclusive of organizational political opportunity. Seitanidi (2008) explains this interdependence of the levels of analysis and describes interactions between micro, meso and macro levels of CSSPs. When using the inductive analysis of data to explain the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, saturation of conceptual categories was only achieved when political opportunity was examined from both meso and macro levels.

This section explores the empirical data related to the role of political opportunity recognition by leaders in the formation of CSSPs. Data incidents related to political opportunities are categorized according to: 1) the identification of organizational level political opportunities, and 2) the identification of societal level political opportunities. Figure 6.1, provides a visual overview of the theoretical conceptual categories and substantive codes that will be described in the following section.
Table 6.1 summarizes the conceptual categories, substantive codes and exemplary data incidents. Appendix B provides a more comprehensive table linking data incidents with the substantive codes related to the identification of political opportunity. Throughout this manuscript, interview participants are referred to by their Interview Participant Code, which is a series of three numbers, related to their interviewee number, research site number, and organizational number, respectively. For example, the interview participant code P2-S4-O4 would indicate that this interviewee is interview participant number two for research site number four, and they are employed by organization number four. For a complete mapping of all interview participants see Appendix F.
Table 6.1 – Identification of Political Opportunity Categories: Substantive Codes and Exemplary Quotes/Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Substantive Code</th>
<th>Research Sites</th>
<th>Exemplary Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>External legitimacy of the convenor</td>
<td>Sites #1-7</td>
<td>Legitimacy is critical to us, I mean who would come out to [CSSP event] if we didn’t have that legitimacy? The value of the reporting to the community is only as much as they trust the validity of the body who is reporting. P6-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Existence of internal champions</td>
<td>Sites #1, #2, #3, #5, #6</td>
<td>It's such a minor thing, but those champions or those relationships define the entire collaboration between two organizations. You're not working with all 200 of their employees. You're usually working with one or two. The flavor of it can go in one direction or another based on that person, in both the role or job that they play and also the personality or passion that they bring to it. P8-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal</td>
<td>Alignment between Popular Normative Views and the Goals of the CSSP</td>
<td>Sites #1-4, #7</td>
<td>In our sector, talent is key to our success and we see consistently from employees a keen interest in having some alignment between their personal values and interests and those of an organization that they choose to work for. Over the years, we've definitely seen an increase in the questions that interview candidates ask about what the company's doing under that broad umbrella of sustainability. We see a high degree of engagement from existing employees and so it contributes to the engagement our existing employees, retention of existing employees, and attraction of new employees. P4-S1-O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal</td>
<td>Perceived Risk of Regulators Intervening in the Status Quo</td>
<td>Sites #1-4, #6, #7</td>
<td>Under the Green Energy Act... We thought that that was our chance to jump on them again, and we put on a little workshop in the spring to try to tell them about it what was required of them [under the law]. P1-S3-O1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying Organizational Level Political Opportunity

Substantive codes related to community and organizational “readiness” and “acceptance” to support the social or environmental goal of each research site related to a broad range of organizational level issues. McAdam’s (1996) four-part description of political opportunity informed the categorization of substantive codes that related to these organizational level issues, specifically: emergent cultural values, grievances, systemic vulnerabilities and innovative thinking. The political opportunities identified as incidents within the data were categorized at the organizational level if they related directly to actors within each CSSP research site. Organizational boundaries can blur in CSSPs because of the frequent interaction of cross-organizational teams. So organizational level political opportunity, as it is conceptualized here, may exist within and between formal or informal participating organizations within each CSSP. The substantive codes that have emerged as organizational level political opportunities identified by leaders in the formation of CSSPs include: 1) perceived external legitimacy of the convenor, and 2) the existence of internal champions within stakeholders.

External Perception of Legitimacy of the Convenor

The perception of legitimacy of the convening organization of the CSSP emerged as a substantive code early in this research inquiry. Primarily this perception was deemed to be valuable when legitimacy perceptions existed among stakeholders immediately associated with the CSSP, but it was also mentioned in terms of the broader communities and media. Often this external legitimacy was explicitly identified as a valuable asset to be fostered for the instrumental value of the CSSP. Perceptions of legitimacy among stakeholders of the convening organization have been described as a facilitative condition for collaboration by Gray (1985). Legitimacy of the leader of a cross-sector partnership is also highlighted as an important
component of Integrative Leadership (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Understanding and increasing legitimacy perceptions of a CSSP through framing activities is described by Vurro, Dacin and Perrini (2010), while Heuer (2011) touch on the importance of the perception of external legitimacy of CSSPs and how this can be achieved through isomorphic institutional environments.

The difference between the scholarly works described above and in the data incidents show below, is that in this case legitimacy is identified as extant political opportunity that may be used for instrumental purposes in the successful formation of a CSSP in terms of fostering collective action of stakeholders.

*Legitimacy is critical to us, I mean who would come out to [CSSP event] if we didn’t have that legitimacy? The value of the reporting to the community is only as much as they trust the validity of the body who is reporting.*  P6-S1-O5

In another case, this legitimacy was fostered through leveraging well-connected organizational actors to perform important leadership functions, such as motivating stakeholders to participate in CSSP events.

*[organizational actor] would personally call someone and say I'm doing this and I really want you to be part of it and lots of people said “you can never say no to [organizational actor],” with stars in their eyes.*  P1-S2-O1

By being a part of the CSSP, this particular organizational actor was able to lend associative legitimacy to the CSSP because of the existing external notoriety and legitimacy that
followed this individual. The creation of external legitimacy appeared to be the explicit goal of leaders in the formation of CSSPs, external legitimacy of the convening organization is either explicitly fostered or identified in the formation of the CSSP to encourage collective action by key stakeholders.

**Existence of Internal Champions**

In the formation of CSSPs, leaders within convening organizations identified individuals within key stakeholder organizations who support the CSSP. These individuals frequently acted as internal advocates within their organizations, encouraging participation in the CSSP and soliciting support to dedicate resources. Crosby and Bryson (2010, p. 217) define champions as “a person who is a tireless, process-savvy organizer and promoter of the change effort.” By identifying internal champions with key stakeholder organizations, leaders may be afforded personal introductions to strategic decision makers and may be associated with a level of trust that would not otherwise exist without an internal organizational advocate. In discussion with an interviewee from research site #5 (the angel and venture capital funding match-maker) regarding who is typically engaged with when soliciting partners, this topic of internal champions was an important issue. A common theme within the research sites related to intentionally seeking out like-minded internal champions within stakeholder organizations, for example:

*We often look at [their] sustainability person, so who is the community director who, in that company, has the same values as we do? Who has the same vision? Who is the intrapreneur in that company that wants to make the change? Can we work with them to help provide a convincing argument to management.*  
P6-S5-O5
Similarly, at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), interviewees described why it was important to establish relationships with these champions, and how relationships with these champions can affect the nature of the relationship between the convening organization and the partnering organization within the CSSP:

*It's such a minor thing, but those champions or those relationships define the entire collaboration between two organizations. You're not working with all 200 of their employees. You're usually working with one or two. The flavor of it can go in one direction or another based on that person, in both the role or job that they play and also the personality or passion that they bring to it.* P8-S1-O5

From the perspective of partnering organizations, internal champions indicated that they felt supported by CSSP convening organizations in their own personal pursuit of creating change within their own organization. From an internal champion within a partnering municipal government, it appears that internal champions perceive that the CSSP offers reciprocal value in achieving their social or environmental goal.

*I really believe in the mandate of their program. I think what they're doing is absolutely tremendous. The level of interest, and practical engagement that they're doing, I'm fully supportive of it, because there's no way I could achieve that myself. They're at a far better position to do that kind of engagement.* P1-S1-O1

In the CSSP literature there is some scholarly discussion of champions within partnering organizations. For example Crosby and Bryson (2010, p. 217) explicate the need for leaders to
“seek sponsors of and champions for the change effort” during the initial conditions of a cross-sector collaborations. Haxham and Vangen (2000) describe the importance of internal representatives as a legitimate representative from a particular stakeholder group. This speaks not only to individuals who may advocate within their own organizations, but those who also hold the requisite decision making authority to adequately speak for their organization as a whole.

The act of identifying the existence of legitimacy of the convening organization and internal champions within key stakeholders were the two substantive codes related to organizational level political opportunity that were identified within this research inquiry. Next I will discuss societal level political opportunities that were identified by leaders in the formation of CSSPs.

**Identifying Societal Level Political Opportunity**

Much like political opportunities at the organizational level, these political opportunities may also present themselves from sources outside of the confines of the organizations associated with the CSSP. Once again, McAdam’s (1996) four-part description of political opportunity informed how substantive codes related to emergent cultural values, grievances, systemic vulnerabilities and innovative thinking, were categorized into the political opportunity conceptual category, but this time at a societal level. Specifically, if these political opportunities emerged from sources outside of stakeholders formally or informally associated with the CSSP, the data incidents were deemed to be societal level political opportunity.
Alignment between Popular Normative Views and the Goals of the CSSP

The seven research sites examined in this inquiry had social and environmental goals that aligned along two general paths: 1) improving local environmental outcomes and 2) building organizational capacity within the community benefit (non-profit) sector. In the case of both of these broad social and environmental goals, leaders within the convening organizations identified alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP; the broader community seemed to understand and largely agree with what they were doing. Data incidents from research sites #1 – 4 and #7 all explicitly describe “awareness” of the social or environmental issues as something that is growing within society. When this awareness exists and it is associated with alignment between the popular normative views of the broader community and the goals of the CSSP, the formation of CSSPs appeared to be afforded more resources than if this alignment did not exist. For example, at the time of data collection, issues related to sustainability and the reduction of atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions was an issue that that resonated positively with the local communities. In the case of research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), this positive resonance seemed to contribute towards corporate partners, external funders and media outlets committing to reducing their carbon footprint, granting money and promoting the CSSP respectively.

The identification of alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP by leaders in the formation of CSSPs resulted in leadership decisions including framing activities that encouraged collective action among key stakeholders, and other leadership activities. By way of example, one interviewee, a representative from a formal corporate partner of site #1, described their desire to participate in the CSSP to show to their current and potential future employees that the company is making efforts towards being sustainable:
In our sector, talent is key to our success and we see consistently from employees a keen interest in having some alignment between their personal values and interests and those of an organization that they choose to work for. Over the years, we've definitely seen an increase in the questions that interview candidates ask about what the company's doing under that broad umbrella of sustainability. We see a high degree of engagement from existing employees and so it contributes to the engagement our existing employees, retention of existing employees, and attraction of new employees. P4-S1-O4

Likewise, on the leadership side of the convening organization for research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), we see that a leader from the convening organization explicitly talks about identifying this alignment between the CSSP goals and societal normative views related to reducing their carbon footprint. The issue of Generation Y retention is presented as an example below and was also highlighted above by the interviewee from one of the corporate partners above:

... why does a business care about reducing their carbon impact?
They want to mitigate risk that is either policy or supply chain risk, they want to improve their brand in light of other green wash and rise above that, they want to attract Gen Ys that have an interest in organizations having a true environmental strategy. P6-S1-O5

The substantive code of popular alignment with the CSSP goals also played an important role in the research sites that focused on organizational capacity building. During the formation
of the research sites #4 and #6, leaders recognized that funding agencies seemed to be favouring initiatives that suggested organizational capacity building through “social innovation.” Through document analysis, the term “social innovation” is used prolifically and prominently throughout public documents, including websites and promotional materials at research site #4 (the social startup incubator). The name of nearly all projects include the term “innovation” or “innovative” and, as at least one employee of a partnering organization of the site #4 CSSP acknowledges, “right now social innovation is a buzz word and hopefully it's around to stay.” Through my own firsthand experience with grant writing initiatives related to organizational capacity building at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), I noted that grant application submissions were specifically timed to coincide with this particular “social innovation” zeitgeist within two key funding bodies. The identification of the existence of this societal alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP offer an example of what Waddock (2009: 283) describes as “politically savvy” difference makers, intentionally being “in the right place at the right time with the right idea.”

**Perceived Risk of Regulators Intervening in the Status Quo**

In the formation of the seven CSSPs examined in this inquiry, leaders identified that regulators intervening in the status quo may offer potential political opportunity for creating collective action. Intervening in the status quo emerged as two main themes: 1) changing of funding models for the non-profit sector and 2) the introduction of legislation that required organizations to adhere to sustainability related initiatives. The former theme emerged from research sites #4 and #6, which focused on organizational development initiatives in the non-profit sector, while the later theme emerged from three of the sustainability related CSSPs, research sites #1, #2 and #3. The potential for disruption of the status quo by regulators was
identified as political opportunity at the societal level because these changes acted as a catalyst for action for some key stakeholders within the CSSPs, and the political opportunity itself emerged from parties external to the CSSP.

At the time of data collection, the Ontario Provincial Government passed an amendment to the Green Energy Act, known as regulation 397/11, which required that at a future date, public agencies, including municipalities, universities, hospitals and schools, must publicly disclose sustainability initiatives, forecast reduction of energy consumption, and report on actual results achieved and future sustainability initiatives and targets. In the case of research site #4 (the social startup incubator), this legislation motivated the participation of one of their first key partners.

[Important public agency] signed on almost immediately, I'd say within six weeks of us reaching out to them, they saw an opportunity, they also knew that mandatory reporting was coming. I'm not sure if you're familiar with 397... P1-S3-O1

Regulation 397 was identified as a political opportunity in the formation of this CSSP and was utilized as a catalyst to encourage participation in the CSSP. This is illustrated in the subsequent activities undertaken by this same leader from site #4. Referring to other public agencies, this leader describes how regulation 397 was used as a tool to create dialogue with stakeholders.

Under the Green Energy Act... We thought that that was our chance to jump on them again, and we put on a little workshop in the spring to try to tell them about it what was required of them [under the law]. P1-S3-O1
The release of the 2008 Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy was described as the impetus for the initial idea generation for research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership). As was described in the previous quote, this new government strategy was identified and opportunistically leveraged both for initial financing and for the creation of CSSP legitimacy.

*It [the CSSP] began as a simple paper that designed a concept for a social stock market that was a part of the Government of Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Submission. We wrote that paper, added it to our Poverty Reduction Submission. Then, that was ultimately adopted, by the Province of Ontario, as one of their strategies that they wanted to support. They became a partner in the initiative, at first, as someone that endorsed the concept because it aligned with their mission of reducing poverty in Ontario, and driving social innovation, and now ultimately driving social enterprise and impact investing as of 2013.*  

P7-S5-O5

The change in the status quo by government in this case provided a political opportunity that was identified and then utilized by the Leader/Founder of site #2. This political opportunity was positive in nature, affording additional resources to initiatives related to poverty reduction in Ontario. The societal level political opportunities gained from regulators changing the status quo may not be such a clearly positive situation. The need for the creation of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) stemmed from a significant reduction in funding from government agencies. This CSSP manifested itself as an adaption to the new financial realities imposed upon the non-profit sector. At the time of the formation of this CSSP, it was understood that government led funding initiatives favoured projects that
emphasized a sustainable business plan that included “funds from operations” as the primary source of ongoing funding after initial startup financing was allocated. Recognizing that this shift in funding was coming, three leaders from similarly-focused non-profit organizations agreed to partner together to offer organizational development workshops and consulting services to the local non-profit sector. These workshops and consulting services were previously offered separately through each of the three agencies, funded largely by government grants. The three founding partners of the CSSP recognized that Ontario Government funding agencies were favouring initiatives that approached social value creation in new and potentially disruptive ways. Leaders of the nascent, unfunded CSSP prepared a grant application that proposed a “funds from operations” based CSSP to a funding body controlled by the Government of Ontario. The grant application was fully funded from the government agency, and in this case it was the explicit recognition by leadership within the CSSP, of the changes occurring in the status quo at the Ontario Government, and the subsequent actions that led to the successful formation of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership).

During the formation of CSSPs, leaders in the research sites examined during the course of this research identified alignment between the goals of the CSSP and popular normative opinion as well as regulators intervening in the status quo, as political opportunity at the societal level.

In the next chapter, these descriptive observations of what convening organizations identified as political opportunity, will combined with extant literature to answer why these observations occurred. The what from this chapter and the why from the next chapter will address the sub-research question, what is the role of the identification of political opportunity by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs.
Creation of Mobilizing Structures

In SMT, these structural elements of social movements are often associated with formal organizations that set about encouraging collective action among stakeholders and are known as social movement organizations (McAdam & Scott, 2005). Mobilizing structures encompass the second component of the PPM and include the examination of these social movement organizations. Mobilizing structures refer to “those collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action” (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996: 3). Those “collective vehicles” that are described by McAdam, et al. (1996) are, more frequently than not, the phenomena of interest to CSSP researchers. In CSSP scholarship, researchers have frequently sought to understand the organizational nature of these partnerships, including concepts related to the processes, policies, governance structures and organizational forms, among others (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright, 2004; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006; Heuer, 2011; Pentland & Feldman, 2007; Levina & Orlikowski, 2009). From this perspective, SMT researchers have drawn from organizational studies to inform their own theory and research and as they relate to mobilizing structures, though the reverse happens with less frequency (McAdam & Scott, 2005). It is therefore not surprising that this research inquiry, examining the leadership of CSSPs in their formation, observed the intentional creation of formal and informal mobilizing structures to foster collective action among stakeholders.

The intentional creation of mobilizing structures by those taking a leadership role within the formation of CSSPs may manifest itself in a variety of ways, and in this research inquiry these mobilizing structures centered on two broad conceptual categories: 1) the creation of interorganizational mobilizing structures and 2) the creation of process-based mobilizing
structures. These findings are similar to the significant amount of theory and research related to process-based examinations of CSSPs, and while they do not directly address a sub research question, like the findings discussed in the section above and below, these findings do contribute to the primary research question of this inquiry. That is, the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs involves the creation of interorganizational and process-based mobilizing structures. Figure 6.2, provides a visual overview of the theoretical conceptual categories and substantive codes that will be described in the following section.

**Figure 6.2 – Mobilizing Structures Theoretical and Sub-Categories and Substantive Codes**

Table 6.2 summarizes the conceptual categories, substantive codes and exemplary data incidents. Appendix C provides a more comprehensive table linking data incidents with the substantive codes related to the creation of mobilizing structures.
Table 6.2 – Creation of Mobilizing Structures Categories: Substantive Codes and Exemplary Data Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Category</th>
<th>Substantive Code</th>
<th>Research Sites</th>
<th>Exemplary Data Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interorganizational</td>
<td>Creation of network ties between stakeholders</td>
<td>Sites #1-6</td>
<td>… you actually put people together and have them working together and that in unto itself, they become people as opposed to symbols, and they're working towards a common goal and they are breaking through, and not every single project comes to a successful resolution, sometimes there is still competing opinions, that can just never be completely aligned, but for the most part we do get there P1-S2-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganizational</td>
<td>Creating Relationships with Legitimate First Follower</td>
<td>Sites #1, #3, #4, #6</td>
<td>… it was when our first building was about half empty that we finally convinced [high profile tenant] to occupy most of the fifth floor, we could see our that we were a place to be. [Small startup] and [established organization] leased an office in addition to their main offices so that they could be part of the action. [High profile tenant] got a deal on rent, but definitely brought in more tenants. P4-S4-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganizational</td>
<td>Assigning Ownership and Accountability to Stakeholders</td>
<td>Sites #1-7</td>
<td>At research Sites #1, #3 and #7 accountability is quite public, in the form of annual evenings of recognitions where all participants in the CSSP and the broader community including local politicians and media are invited to celebrate the achievements CSSP members related to their carbon footprint reduction. Accountability is an explicit part of this process, where participants are noteworthy by their absence, either from the CSSP itself or from their lack of carbon emission reduction. (Description written by Researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Process-Based | Funds-from-operations | Sites #1-7 | - Research Sites #1, #2, #3, #7 are membership fee based  
- research site #4 generates revenue from rent charged to tenants, issues community bonds  
- research site #5 charges transaction fees  
- research site #6 charges for consulting and training services (Description by Researcher) |
| Process-Based | Effective exchange of views | Sites #1, #2, #4, #6 | Today of the 25 participants [of the external working group], 22 are part of [the CSSP] members and so that was the story - where the guy says let me connect you with my management team, we actually allowed them to |
have a decision about how the framework operates and then they want to be more part of it. P6-S1-O5

| Process Based | Leverage Sector Strengths | Sites #2, #4, #5 and #6 | So we have partnerships with a series of vendors like [business consulting company #1], and [business consulting company #2] and a number of others who provide us with reports which we then offer to our clients at no cost, [ … ] so that our clients are able to understand basic things like the competitive landscape, the size of the market for the product that I'm in and therefore gauge potential returns, and this is extremely important for potential investors. P5-S5-O5 |
Creation of Interorganizational Mobilizing Structures

Interorganizational structures are described by Huxham and Vangen (2000) as structures that enable connections within collaborative partnerships. These interorganizational structures, can be viewed in terms of their potential for relational leadership in collaborative partnerships (Murrell, 1997), or in terms of how they may affect outcomes of a partnership (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Drawing from Huxham and Vangen (2000), substantive codes were categorized around the conceptual category if they formed connections within the CSSP that enabled collective action. These connections between stakeholders were intentionally enabled by leaders through the creation of structures that: 1) created network ties and trust, 2) created relationships with legitimate first followers, and 3) assigned ownership and accountability to stakeholders.

Creation of Network Ties and Trust between Stakeholders

Throughout the course of this research, organizational level network ties refer to the direction and frequency of deliberate communication between individual from two or more stakeholders participating in the CSSP. Network ties are a frequent unit of analysis in SMT, and are often quantitatively analyzed in terms of their strength, centrality and directionality (della Porta & Diani, 2009). When examining the data collected from the CSSP research sites in this inquiry, the network ties are examined only in terms of their existence and the intentionality behind their creation, because this research is primarily focused on intentional leadership activities. These network ties appear to act as mechanisms to generate external and internal awareness of an issue, provide vehicles for group decision making processes, governance and by-laws and, ultimately, to open the door for trusting relationships.
Trust between CSSP partners emerged as an observation by leaders as an important precursor to the successful formation of CSSPs, but it became evident that this trust between individuals from two or more stakeholders was directly linked to the existence of network ties between these individuals. CSSP Scholars highlight the importance trustful relationships in collaborative partnerships (Waddock, 1989; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006) and trust and network ties are often theoretically linked elsewhere in Organizational Studies (Coleman, 1998; Burt, 2000; Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Granovetter, 1992). What was observed in the formation of the CSSP research sites examined in this research appeared to be aligned with these theories.

The deliberate creation of network ties between CSSP participants emerged as a substantive code primarily because it occurred at each of the CSSP research sites. An exemplary observation of this came from an interviewee at research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership). This CSSP was engaged in facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogues related to the environmental sustainability of commercial real-estate. These dialogues frequently put individuals from organizations with antipodal values and ideologies in the same room, tasked with working together to solve this complex issue. The interviewee describes the importance of simply making connections between stakeholder adversaries.

... you actually put people together and have them working together

and that in unto itself, they become people as opposed to symbols, and

they're working towards a common goal and they are breaking through, and

not every single project comes to a successful resolution, sometimes there is

still competing opinions, that can just never be completely aligned, but for

the most part we do get there  P1-S2-O1
The act of simply putting people together in this case appeared to humanize other stakeholder groups who were previously stigmatized in terms of the image of their broader organization. It seemed that there was a sense that trust can only be built at the human level, so the creation of human-level ties was essential for working groups to function effectively. Similarly, it is quite evident at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), that trust and the creation of trust through relationship building, were explicitly part of the formation of that CSSP. Two staff members separately commented on the importance of trust between stakeholders: “I think, from the get-go, trust is the top … I think just this element of trust creates the accountability … I think it's so important in terms of effective collaboration.” The second staff member separately described the importance of relationships in collaborations. When asked about some of the biggest challenges to collaboration in the CSSP, this staff member offered this response.

*I think they're [(partnerships) are] often relationship based. Two that come to mind would be, one idea of having, [...] this is related to organizations work together, but you build relationships usually with a person or a couple of people that become that collaboration. P8-S1-O5

Implying that the biggest challenges to collaboration are based on poor relationships is indicative of the salience of the creation of trustful network ties between individuals from different participating stakeholders. This staff member describes the relationship between the two people, and how the relationship “become[s] that collaboration.” The perception that the collaboration is a set of relationships that needs to be actively nurtured emerged frequently. For example, at research site #4 (the social startup incubator), staff members organize a weekly
“Salad Club.” People from different enterprises who share the co-working space each bring one or two ingredients in the style of a pot-luck to create a salad buffet for everyone to benefit from.

*Everyone puts lettuce or tofu and feta cheese and we make the salad bar.*

*It sounds really simple, but what we’re doing is we’re using food as a way to bring people together. What happens then is this amazing thing where we all make salads and we all sit together. The opportunities for me to sit with the Salad Club, might not ever present themselves, right? That’s like such subtle intentional programming as a way to animate a community and get people talking to one another.*  P1-S4-O1

Early on in the formation of the CSSP at research site #4 (the social startup incubator), leaders identified the concern that “co-working” beside different organizations does not necessitate interaction between individuals from the various organizations. So deliberate attempts, such as the “salad club” were used to create individual-level network ties between organizations, to stimulate ideas through the cross-pollination of ideas between organizations. Salad club has a dual meaning in this case, primarily it acts as an excuse to bring people together, but it is also a metaphor for the combination of individual ingredients to create something different and perhaps of value to a broader constituency.

**Creating Relationships with Legitimate First Follower**

The issue of legitimacy has already been discussed in terms of its existence at the organizational level and the political opportunities that it may afford the convening organization in the formation of a CSSP. Among leaders in all research sites with the exception of research site #4 (the social startup incubator), the desire to be perceived as a legitimate convening
organization appeared to manifest itself as a leadership action through the deliberate targeting of legitimate stakeholders for early membership in the CSSP.

In the case of research site #4 (the social startup incubator), interviewee P4-S4-O2 discussed this issue in terms working with their first legitimate first follower. Describing the establishment of a formal relationship with a high profile tenant, the employee said that this new tenant “definitely brought in more tenants,” alluding to the legitimacy afforded to the convening organization necessary to encourage other stakeholders to also join the CSSP.

... it was when our first building was about half empty that we finally convinced [high profile tenant] to occupy most of the fifth floor, we could see our that we were a place to be. [Small startup] and [established organization] leased an office in addition to their main offices so that they could be part of the action. [High profile tenant] got a deal on rent, but definitely brought in more tenants. P4-S4-O1

Another example of the intentional solicitation of a legitimate first follower as an interorganizational mobilizing structure occurred in the very first stages of the formation of research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership). Three locally reputable non-profit organizations from adjacent jurisdictions had been working together for several years aiming to find efficiencies by partnering together to offer organizational development (OD) workshops and consulting services to build organizational capacity within the two local non-profit sectors. I was engaged to help “build a value-proposition” for the CSSP through partnerships and I was explicitly asked to bring on a partner with a “big brand” to co-facilitate some OD workshops. The intention here was clear; I was to bring on a well-known, for-
profit organization as our first partner to build legitimacy among other potential partners and to foster future collective action.

It was my perception at the time that the leaders of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) believed that a well-known, “big-brand” partner, early on in the partnerships was an asset that could benefit the formation of the CSSP. In this case, we were able to bring on a large technology company with a globally recognized brand to use our CSSP as a conduit to offer training to the non-profit sectors in the jurisdictions within which we offered services. The partnership with this technology company was seen by the leaders of the CSSP as exactly what they were looking for and, even before it began, leadership deemed it a success. In retrospect, I have coded the solicitation of a legitimate first follower as the intentional creation of interorganizational mobilizing structures that help to foster further collective action among stakeholders.

A third example of this emerged in conversation with a partnership manager at research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership). This organization acts as a serial convenor of CSSPs and they engage community stakeholders to tackle social or environmental issues separately. Each issue is handled as a separate partnership with separate stakeholders, but are all convened by personnel from research site #2. To foster collective action for each of their initiatives, staff from this research site asks that two high-level decision makers from important stakeholders co-chair each CSSP. In the example of a CSSP that they were convening related to making commercial buildings more sustainable, the interviewee described the following situation.
In each of these groups that we create we have co-chairs. So we take two people from the outside, not part of our organization and we asked them to be the leaders of the group. It's all about, “who are those people and will other people want to be seen to be towing the line from their perspective?” So in the case of the commercial building initiative we asked to tenants to lead this initiative and they happen to be the senior VPs of real estate and corporate procurement in two of the banks. So they are the largest tenants in Canada, so they are very powerful […] they also happen to be in the market [to] either renegotiating leases [or] were thinking about moving to new spaces. So by having the tenants at the table it meant that the landlords must come to the table, either a landlord was their landlord and they wanted to keep them happy or they wanted to try to get an in, and [a] networking opportunity with this very high level decision maker and they wanted to be seen to be coming to the table. So those two tenants those two senior people acted as co-chairs and they were the ones who would convene these meetings with our support in the background. P1-S2-O1

This description reveals the deliberate and systematic creation of interorganizational mobilizing structures that engage legitimate first followers to foster further collective action. The co-chairs, who are hard to say “no” to, convene meetings and ask for participation in the CSSP from other stakeholders, which in the case of research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership) has been part of a tried and true system for successful CSSPs.
Assigning Ownership and Accountability to Stakeholders

In the formation of CSSPs observed in this research inquiry, leaders worked with stakeholders to assign tasks that need to be accomplished for the CSSP to achieve its goals. This substantive code emerged from all of the research sites in different ways, but in all seven cases leaders identified the importance of assigning ownership of tasks and five of the research sites described accountability and ownership as being intertwined concepts. This substantive code was categorized in terms of interorganizational mobilizing structures because the assignment of ownership tasks and the related accountability for their successful completion usually occurred as a formal, mutually agreed upon process between organizations participating in the CSSP. In an interorganizational context, the assignment of ownership can be used as a formal or informal network strategy to encourage collective action (Taylor, 1995; Scholsberg, 2002). In the case of the research sites examined in this inquiry, the deliberate and mutually agreed upon assignment of tasks occurred for two reasons: 1) to successfully complete essential work that needed to be completed during the formation of the CSSP and 2) to ensure that stakeholders felt engaged and had purpose within the CSSP as a strategy to ensure their continued participation.

Research Sites #1, #3 and #7 are CSSPs that aim to engage community stakeholders to help them reduce their atmospheric carbon emissions. All three of them do this by encouraging members to take a baseline measurement of their pre-existing, organization-wide carbon emissions when they initially join as a member of the CSSP, then annually measuring these emissions to track their decline. This is done quite publicly in the form of annual events where all participants in the CSSP and the broader community including local politicians and media are invited to celebrate the achievements of CSSP members related to their carbon footprint reduction. Accountability is an explicit part of this process, where participants are noteworthy by
their absence, either from the CSSP itself or from their lack of carbon emission reduction. At a high profile, public event for research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership), I observed a variety of awards given out to members of the CSSP who achieved their carbon reduction targets. These rewards provided a non-punitive method to ensure accountability for the role that members agreed to take on in the CSSP. This accountability seems to be amplified by in the inclusion of noteworthy community members including the media and local politicians. It was clear that organizations took responsibility for their own greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

Prior to its formation, the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) consisted of three founding member organizations. Through consensus decision making these three founding members created an interorganizational mobilizing structure to assign accountability and ownership of CSSP related tasks by way of formal contract. The three founding members are non-profit organizations from neighbouring jurisdictions with similar organizational capabilities and little power imbalance. The Memorandum of Understanding and Terms of Reference documents that laid out the financial and in-kind resource contributions of each partner, indicated that the assignment of ownership and accountability of CSSP related tasks fell along functional lines. In this CSSP, these functions included: 1) financial administration and registration, including bookkeeping and document retention; 2) marketing and communication, including website maintenance and copy-writing and; 3) curriculum and program development for workshops and consulting services, including follow-up evaluation. Each of the three founding member organizations mutually agreed to take ownership of one of the three broad functional areas and developed “success metrics” which would be reported on at quarterly steering committee meetings. By participating in these
quarterly steering committee meetings, I was afforded the opportunity to see that partners respected the delineation between the three main functions and that each of the member organizations were able to independently make day-to-day decisions and act in a timely manner. As this research site, interorganizational communication was not as efficient as communication within each organization, so the ability to take ownership of a functional area allowed for certain operational efficiencies, in terms of quick project execution. The quarterly steering committee meetings acted as an accountability forcing function, ensuring that each partner was able to think about and articulate progress that was made in the subsequent quarter.

**Process Based Mobilizing Structures**

During the formation of CSSPs, the ways in which stakeholders formally or informally made decisions and built an understanding of each other emerged as a conceptual category at all of the research sites. I have categorized these data incidents as “process based” mobilizing structures because they are aligned with the concept of the same name that is frequently examined in the CSSP literature. Process based mobilizing structures create deliberation opportunities that encourage dialogue and group decision making, including convening processes such as town halls or community meetings, and may lay out the scope of stakeholder participation, the exclusivity of the venue, decision making authority and ensure fit among capabilities, agenda and decision authority (Page, 2010). Sometimes these processes may build cross-cultural understanding (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006), initial agreement, deal with power imbalances and conflict, leverage sector strengths and formalize assessments to track inputs and outcomes (Selsky & Parker, 2005). In the case of this research inquiry, the substantive codes that I organized into this conceptual category include: 1) CSSP funding comes from operations, 2) effective exchange of views, and 3) leveraging sector strengths.
Funding the CSSP from Operations

Social and environmental initiatives are frequently associated with NGOs who gain the bulk of their funding from grants and donations. In fact, many recognizable NGOs earn funds from operations, monetizing products or services, but these monetizable products or services typically are minimal revenue streams. With the exception of research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership), all of the remaining research sites examined in this inquiry reversed the typical funding model; the bulk of their funding comes from the monetization of their core competencies, generating revenue from their main service offering while only a minimal amount of funding comes from grants or donations. I perceive that this is a noteworthy distinction between these CSSPs and other NGOs for a number of reasons. First, because it seems to be aligned with the societal-level political opportunity described in previous section related to the social innovation zeitgeist. Especially in Research Sites #4 and #6, the term “social innovation” seemed to be synonymous with “social enterprises,” where grants and donations were seen only as a means to gain startup funding prior to starting a successful funds-from-operations style of business. This also appeared to be agreeable to funding agencies such as municipal and provincial levels of government, who seemed to want to avoid structural funding for agencies, preferring instead one-time funding for organizations that promised self-sufficiency through generating revenue from operations.

Research Sites #1, #3 and #7 all earn the bulk of their finding from a membership model that asks member organizations to pay an annual fee. Each of these organizations also relies on funding from grants, but usually only for one-time initiatives and these funds are not relied upon for structural funding such as rent and payroll. Research site #4 (the social startup incubator) owns most of the buildings that it rents out in city centres. The rental income earned through
charging member organizations to work in their buildings covers their core operating costs. They were able to purchase the majority of their buildings through “Community Bond” initiatives, where this CSSP entered into a debt agreement with socially minded investors who purchased bonds with a set expiry, coupon rate and a certain amount of priority principle protection in the case of bankruptcy. Research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) provides organizational development consulting services on a fixed-rate, fee-for-service basis. The goal in this case is to cover the operational costs of the CSSP for each consulting engagement, and to provide the consulting services to local non-profit organizations in a way that takes their financial realities into consideration. They partner with local consultants who donate a certain amount of pro-bono time each calendar year to the CSSP. The CSSP then acts as a broker to offer the services of the Consultants to community organizations and charge a small fixed fee to the community organizations to ensure that the costs of the CSSP are covered. Similarly, when organizational development workshops are offered, attendees are expected to pay for their tickets and ticket sales must cover the venue, speaker, administrative and catering costs. While this type of business-minded thinking may seem evident to someone who studies or participates in the for-profit sector, many NGOs think about their mission first, covering costs second and often the thought of monetizing products or services a distant third. With the exception of research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership), all of the convening organizations observed in this inquiry started with a funds-from-operations strategy in their formation stage, an approach which differentiates the CSSPs from many other NGOs.
**Effective Exchange of Views**

Process based mobilizing structures that facilitate the effective exchange of views between stakeholders were observed at all seven of the research sites. These processes were determined to be a substantive code because of their frequency of occurrence and because of their perceived importance to the successful formation of the CSSPs. Effective exchange of views includes both formal and informal processes that allow members of CSSPs to discuss issues. For example, these issues may be a prelude to CSSP decision making and governance, or they may be a part of idea generation for innovative solutions related to the social or environmental initiative that is the focus of the CSSP. Formal processes that enable the effective exchange of views within a CSSP, especially in their formation, were used to make decisions about the structure of the CSSP.

In the formation of the CSSP at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), the convening organization put together an “external working group” that brought together 25 community stakeholders to discuss how multiple sectors could work together to reduce atmospheric carbon emissions in the local community.

*Today of the 25 participants [of the external working group], 22 are part of [the CSSP] members and so that was the story - where the guy says let me connect you with my management team, we actually allowed them to have a decision about how the framework operates and then they want to be more part of it. [...] In fact as we looked to scale the model, we talk about being community led, one of the requirements is that they have to have a process like that. We have to have some kind of the process where we allow the community to make decisions on the model so that by virtue of making*
those decisions those are your first prospect list. And there are actually
elements of that framework that I disagree with. And that is something that I
think is important, again we talk about building a movement that is
communitywide that is not any one person.  P6-S1-O5

In this example, the “external working group” was deliberately put together by the
convening organization to exchange views and ultimately made decisions about how the CSSP
would form and be governed. Note that the founder of the convening organization disagreed with
some of the policy that came democratically out of the external working group, but this leader
recognized the importance of “building a movement that is communitywide - this is not any one
person.” The effective exchange of views in the external working group led to 22 of the 25
members ultimately paying to join the CSSP subsequent to its launch.

The effective exchange of views as a formal process based mobilizing structure is built into
the physical layout of research site #4 (the social startup incubator). During participant
observation sessions at two of their facilities I was able to map the seating arrangements and
office space of the “co-working” member organizations. My observation, which was later
corroborated by a staff member, was that desk and seating arrangements were laid out in such a
way as to maximize serendipitous interactions between people working in the space. These
serendipitous interactions were not only intended for people who work in the same organization,
but were also designed to create interactions between organizations. One interviewee referred to
how the co-working space afforded opportunities for “idea sex,” referring to people with
different viewpoints coming together to formulate new and innovative ideas.
Kitchens and coffee shops play central roles in the various buildings used by the CSSP in research site #4 (the social startup incubator). An example of the use of physical space to effectively exchange views in the kitchen that was described previously is the Salad Club. Another way that this takes place in the kitchen is in the way the oversized counters are laid out; there are multiple sinks where members are encouraged to wash their dishes beside each other, creating more opportunities for serendipitous interactions. Couches are interspersed with desks and there is desk space in the main-floor café in addition to regular café seating. Unlike the external working group used by research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), the exchange of views between members is not formally facilitated by the CSSP in this case, but instead the boundary conditions for these informal exchanges of views were intentionally created by leadership in the formation of the CSSP through thoughtful floorplans and furniture selection. Whether the effective exchange of views between stakeholders is a formal process or an informal process, they are both process based mobilizing structures that are deliberately created by leaders in the formation of the CSSP.

*Leveraging Sector Strengths*

One of the benefits of partnering across sectors is the ability to utilize the organizational skills and abilities developed by the various partners. The core capabilities of a mission focused non-profit organization often differ significantly from the core capabilities of a market driven for-profit organization. Similarly, government and educational institutions have a differentiated set of value-creation mechanisms and viewpoints that may contribute to the successful formation of the CSSP. This section describes the process based mobilizing structures that were intentionally created by leaders in the formation of the CSSPs. Deliberate leveraging of sector
strengths in the formation of the CSSP research sites emerged as an important substantive code in Research Sites #2, #4, #5 and #6.

The leveraging of sector strengths at Research Sites #4, #5 and #6 emerged at the beginning of the CSSP. The convening organizations of the three CSSPs structured the partnerships to leverage the core capabilities of the cross-sector partners as an in-kind contribution of resources for the betterment of other partners. Research site #5 (the angel and venture capital funding match-maker) ensures that accredited investors in socially oriented business ventures have adequate business intelligence to make savvy investment decisions:

So we have partnerships with a series of vendors like [business consulting company #1], and [business consulting company #2] and a number of others who provide us with reports which we then offer to our clients at no cost, [ ... ] so that our clients are able to understand basic things like the competitive landscape, the size of the market for the product that I'm in and therefore gauge potential returns, and this is extremely important for potential investors. P5-S5-O5

In this case, the sector strengths of the for-profit sector are leveraged for the benefit of socially minded investors. The business consultants offer their market analysis reports as their in-kind contribution to the CSSP for the betterment of other partners. Similarly, P5-S5-O5 describes why they utilize the core competencies of other services providers, “I think our supplier relationships, many of them have been very successful particularly with law firms because we have client[s] that ha[ve] a real need for expert knowledge, and it's one that we can't deliver ourselves because we are not lawyers.”
Research site #5 (the angel and venture capital funding match-maker) also benefitted from the vast resources of a for-profit founding partner that is a major Canadian stock exchange. Because there was alignment between the social cause of the CSSP and the strategic direction of the stock exchange, the partner was willing to use many of their strengths to ensure that the CSSP was successful.

*We were keen on the idea and believed in the space, and that helped get some financing from the provincial government for the feasibility study. We continued to push it and participate where we could. Show up where we could, and lend expertise where we could.*

*Naturally, many of the exchange-related issues that they were facing were things that we had the ability to answer in-house, whether it was from legal people, or from listings-related people, or from regulatory people. We were able to contribute quite a bit of thinking to some of the work that they were doing. P2-S5-O2*

In addition to the items mentioned above, this partner also contributed $150,000 of their own funds towards the feasibility study that they lobbied the government to also help fund. The motivation and the core-competencies of this particular partner were instrumental in the successful formation of the CSSP in this research site.

Another exemplary example of the leveraging of sector strengths emerged at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) where a for-profit technology company was engaged to offer training services to the non-profit sector related to how their products and services could be used for community benefit at no cost. This technology partner
offers a variety of cloud-based back-office business services including email, calendaring, data warehousing and other essential business functions. These capabilities were in high demand from cash strapped non-profit organizations who were excited about the prospects of retiring their old and fallible computer servers and moving to a cloud-based solution. The strengths of the technology partner that were leveraged in this example included: the cloud-based products and services, product and service knowledge, trainers, and a venue for the workshops. Prior to this workshop series, the most highly attended workshops typically drew no more than 30 or 40 attendees, the workshops offered by the CSSP related to the technology partners’ products and services drew almost 150 people from the local non-profit community. The venues used in the past could not accommodate an audience of that size, so the in-kind contribution of facilities capable of seating that number of attendees was essential for the successful delivery of that workshop series.

**Engaging in Framing Activities**

Framing is the act of persuading others to make meaning through interactions (Dewulf, et al., 2009). It is an iterative process where those involved negotiate a shared understanding of their shared social-construction of reality (Stokes & Hewitt, 1976; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). Cognitive frames, the objects of interest in the act of framing, describe the knowledge structures, mental models or cognitive representations that people hold about the world around them (Dewulf, et al., 2009). Leaders may attempt to persuade others to share a particular cognitive frame about the world around them. It is a process where new information is amalgamated into new and existing frames that work to minimize cognitive dissonance (Bacharach, Bamberger & Sonnenstuhl, 1996). Central to framing activities is conflict resolution in the form of alignment.
interaction between those involved (Dewulf, et al., 2009); this alignment is of key importance to leaders concerned with framing processes.

Cognitive frames may emerge as a social construction within a CSSP without intentional framing activities by leaders. Framing is a top-down process (Benford, 1997) and many of the shared social constructions within CSSPs emerge as a bottom-up process (della Porta & Diani, 2009). In observation of the leadership activities in the formation of the CSSPs at the seven research sites investigated in this inquiry, I was particularly interested in the top-down, intentional leadership activities, which is why I focused on framing, rather than cognitive frames. At an organizational level of analysis, I explored the narratives that convening organizations communicated to stakeholders to foster collective action. These narratives were observed in the form of frequently mentioned talking points, promotional materials and website copy. I perceived that the convening organizations showing organizational-level leadership, engaged in a variety of intentional framing activities that can be organized into three conceptual categories: 1) framing activities that help to highlight the social or environmental problem (diagnostic framing), 2) framing activities that recommend and advocate for a solution (prognostic framing), and 3) framing activities that motivate others to participate in that solution (motivational framing). Figure 6.2, provides a visual overview of the theoretical conceptual categories and substantive codes that will be describe in the following section.
Table 6.3 summarizes the conceptual categories, substantive codes and exemplary data incidents. Appendix D provides a more comprehensive table linking data incidents with the substantive codes related to framing activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Category</th>
<th>Substantive Code</th>
<th>Research Sites</th>
<th>Exemplary Quote/Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Framing</td>
<td>Highlighting the Social/Environmental Issue</td>
<td>Sites #1-7</td>
<td>Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where the air is so clean and healthy you can see for miles on hot summer days, where the lake and rivers are clear and beaches are safe for swimming. Imagine a waste management system that captures and puts to use the materials we currently send to landfills. Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where people travel quickly from [one end to the other] – and everywhere in between - on a comprehensive transit system. This is our vision for a [the CSSP] and it is within reach. (From promotional material distributed by the convening organization for research site #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Framing</td>
<td>Highlighting the Overlap of Stakeholders’ Motivations</td>
<td>Sites #1-7</td>
<td>… the biggest was our ability to understand the co-benefits, [ … ] when we met with the environmental planner we actually read this strategy of that community before we had that conversation and we listened to their feedback and integrated that back into what we did. And we spoke to the business person and we presented the business case for their organization, rather than carbon impact, talking to the mayors it was about the reputation to this community, so that goes back to that empathy point, that we were able to understand the needs of who we’re speaking to and how they can benefit from it and how we can all be benefited from this collaborative movement we are looking to create P6-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Framing</td>
<td>Highlighting Individual Sector Failure</td>
<td>Sites #1-#3, #7</td>
<td>The fact that the federal government isn't keeping Canada involved in the [Kyoto] Protocol I don't think has lessened community interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We still see a need, whether or not our federal government recognizes it. We see a lot of the action happening at the local level anyways. We're still motivated by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and by a number of other factors that are part of moving people to action. P3-S1-O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognostic Framing</td>
<td>Highlighting the Need for Collaboration</td>
<td>Sites #1-7</td>
<td>we recognize the [value] of having a diversity of tactics, that is we are all better off. Greenpeace’s work, is that valuable work? Absolutely. It is valuable in the cross-section of collaborative environmental movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and we have got our role to play in there and they have got theirs, and the movement is stronger as a result, and our efforts in the movement our stronger as a result. [...] So first of all is the need for that diversity of tactics secondly it is recognizing that building the need for diversity in the over arching movement and that we each bring different strengths to that movement and it is seeing the value of what we’re doing is to have that bigger impact  P6-S1-O5

Prognostic Framing  Highlighting the transfer of Associational Value  Sites #1-7  [The CSSP] is only seeking out the most reputable, most widely known organizational development consultants; you will be seen in the community to be a part of this elite group. Most of the consultants participating have over 25 years of experience in their field; this group is a tremendous resource from which you can learn new techniques and best practices. (From the “pitch script,” to solicit participation from Management Consultants. Document from research site #6)

Prognostic Framing  Highlighting the Shared Ownership of the Social/Environmental Issue  Sites #1-7  But anyways, shared leadership, empowerment, and then ownership ultimately, I think, are what lends themselves to the sustainability, I mean sustainability as ongoing, or institutionalization of these things [...] A good example, is sometimes...so the [CSSP led project] here, where we provide a service to members. We can sort of feel which members are taking it as a service and see it as their program versus those...like, we have some that still use language like, "Oh, we're happy to support you." And we smile, "We're supporting you." No, no, no. It's nobody supporting anybody. This is your thing. We want you to feel like it's yours. We can feel that shift when they start to take ownership and embed it in their other work. P8-S1-O5
Diagnostic Framing

The convening organizations within each CSSP research site actively sought to change the cognitive frames of participant stakeholders and other community members. Many of the narratives shared through framing activities involved informing or educating others related to the social or environmental issue that was the focus of the CSSP. The diagnostic framing activities observed among the research sites in this inquiry tended to showcase and educate stakeholders about a problem that existed related to a social or environmental issue. These educational narratives emerged as a conceptual category for three substantive codes related to framing: 1) frames that highlight the social/environmental issue, 2) the overlap of stakeholder motivations, and 3) past failures of attempting to solve the social/environmental issue.

Highlighting the Social/Environmental Issue

This framing task involved ensuring that others understood that the social/environmental issue was a problem worthy of collective action. Education and advocacy about the social/environmental issue emerged as a substantive code in all of the research sites. The education and advocacy techniques used by convening organizations at the research sites varied, but each of the seven research sites publicly articulated and promoted a vision statement. These vision statements were good examples of prognostic framing at the organizational level because their common rhetoric could be read on promotional material and websites or read aloud verbatim in small or large gatherings. These vision statements highlighted an ideal future where the need for each CSSP would no longer exist; the goals of the CSSP would already have been achieved and the collective action would no longer be necessary. As an example of diagnostic framing, written rhetoric such as vision statements highlight for readers that a problem still exists.
The convening organization at research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership) initiated a series of CSSPs, one of which was tasked with bringing together stakeholders to "green" a major metropolitan area. The term "green," used as a verb, seemed to be used intentionally to encompass a broad range of environmental related issues that may resonate with a variety of community stakeholders. To highlight the environmental issues that were faced by residents of this major metropolitan area, the convening organization publicly conveyed the need for action through its organizational level rhetoric. This rhetoric is typified in the vision statement for the CSSP:

Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where the air is so clean and healthy you can see for miles on hot summer days, where the lake and rivers are clear and beaches are safe for swimming. Imagine a waste management system that captures and puts to use the materials we currently send to landfills. Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where people travel quickly from [one end to the other] – and everywhere in between - on a comprehensive transit system. This is our vision for a [the CSSP] and it is within reach. (From promotional material distributed by the convening organization for research site #2)

This vision statement highlights the environmental issues faced by the major metropolitan area through envisioning a future where the issues are not present. Diagnostic framing identifies that a problem exists; by focusing on an ideal future, a vision statement such as this implies that the present is not adequate and requires change. CSSP participants recognize that the air is not healthy and clean on hot summer days and that rivers and lakes are not clear and that a comprehensive transit system does not exist from one end of the city to the other.
Another example of a CSSP vision statement highlighting the social/environmental issue as diagnostic framing comes directly out of the publicly available strategic plan for research site #7 (the small sized local sustainability partnership). This CSSP is tasked with improving environmental outcomes in the region while at the same time balancing the needs of business and the local economy. Their vision statement reads as follows:

[The convening organization of the CSSP] is a new non-profit corporation with a powerful vision for [the city] as the city with the greatest commitment to sustainable development in North America. We envision a world-class city with a vibrant, resilient economy, exceptional quality of life and healthy natural environment.

This vision is shared by sustainability experts and local business and community leaders in [the city] who are supporting and guiding [the CSSP] to make it a reality. (CSSP website from research site #7)

This vision statement offers a more general ideal view of the future. While specific examples of the ideal future are not offered, it is evident that the city may someday be much more than it is today. As an organizational level framing tool, the vision statement provides a reference point for organizations participating in the CSSP to work toward; it is a positive narrative but it problematizes the current state of affairs and clearly implies that there is a need for change.

**Highlighting the Overlap of Stakeholders’ Motivations**

Another substantive theme that emerged related to diagnostic framing in the formation of CSSPs is related to narratives used by convening organizations to highlight the overlap of
stakeholders’ motivations. In five of the research sites there was an emphasis put on articulating that the achievement of the common goal of the CSSP is a win-win situation across sectors. It was recognized that for-profit stakeholders will be motivated by different factors than those in the non-profit or government sectors. However, communication was tailored to each audience to highlight the overlap of motivations between stakeholders in order to foster collective action. For example, at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), the convening organization of the CSSP modified their rhetoric in relation to their audience. When discussing how potential CSSP participants were approached in the formation of the CSSP, the founder described it in terms of identifying and talking about the “co-benefits” of participation in the CSSP:

... the biggest was our ability to understand the co-benefits, [...]

when we met with the environmental planner we actually read this strategy of that community before we had that conversation and we listened to their feedback and integrated that back into what we did. And we spoke to the business person and we presented the business case for their organization, rather than carbon impact, talking to the mayors it was about the reputation to this community, so that goes back to that empathy point, that we were able to understand the needs of who we’re speaking to and how they can benefit from it and how we can all be benefited from this collaborative movement we are looking to create  P6-SI-O5

Another example emerged at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) in terms of how local organizational development consultants were approached for participation in the CSSP. A script was created by staff of the CSSP to provide a
consistent, accurate and persuasive pitch to encourage the consultants to donate pro-bono consulting hours to local non-profit organizations. Some of the wording used in this script uses diagnostic framing to highlight the overlap of motivations of CSSP stakeholders. The following talking points were copied from the “pitch script” used to engage local organizational development consultants and were coded to relate to this substantive code.

A thriving community benefit sector provides more consulting opportunities through increase financial capacity and the improved ability to afford business consultants.

Exposure to pro-bono business consultants breeds more awareness of the value of business consulting in the non-profit sector and may lead to improved business development opportunities.

Pro-bono consulting engagements offer consultants with increased community exposure and may result in improved business development opportunities.

Your ability to create an impact in the community is improved by joining a network of likeminded practitioners who likewise want to create real change in the community benefit sector.

(From the “pitch script” document at research site #6)

In these four talking points used by staff of the convening organization when approaching organizational development consultants, several motivators were highlighted: capacity building in the non-profit sector (referred to in this case as the “community benefit sector), increasing the
chances of creating future consulting business for the consultant, and working with likeminded individuals. These three issues appeared to be motivators for many organizational development consultants and were deliberately used as talking points in introductory conversations to foster collection action.

**Highlighting Individual Sector Failure**

Pointing out the systematic failure of individual sectors to solve the social issue on their own also emerged as a substantive code. By highlighting the failure of individual sectors, leaders were able to better justify the value of a cross-sector initiative such as the CSSPs, as a viable way to solve the social/environmental issues they were attempting to address. In the case of Research Sites #1, #2, #3 and #7, there was explicit mention of the failure of local, provincial, federal or international governments to adequately regulate the emissions of atmospheric carbon. A strategic partner of the CSSP at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership) described the failure of the federal government to adequately fulfill the needs and desires of the region:

*The fact that the federal government isn't keeping Canada involved in the [Kyoto] Protocol I don't think has lessened community interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We still see a need, whether or not our federal government recognizes it. We see a lot of the action happening at the local level anyways. We're still motivated by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and by a number of other factors that are part of moving people to action.* P3-S1-O3
In speaking with those associated with Research Sites #1, #2, #3 and #7, there appeared to be the assumption among interviewees that the government, particularly the Canadian Federal Government, did not have the desire or the ability to affect change related to environmental issues. The failure of the Kyoto protocol was used as a common narrative for framing the failure of the government sector to curb atmospheric carbon emissions. This issue was an important topic for a long-time board member of the convening organization of the CSSP at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership):

Well then, the silence in the 00's [of the Canadian Federal Government], the Liberals [the Liberal Party of Canada] in the first part of the naughties [2000's] tried to belatedly bring in a plan, bring in voluntary action from the top down, and then the conservatives [the Conservative Party of Canada] have shown, as we talked about, relatively little interest in this. There is a vacuum of activity on the file most certainly. By implication that means the leadership vacuum. The way the framing of the issue, the way it's progressed, a recognition that there is a need for this more community-based activity and that it can be beneficial as well for a variety of reasons. […] you do not have to wait for the lowest common denominator in order to proceed. P12-S1-O8

This board member recounts one of the reasons for the CSSP existence as the “leadership vacuum” left behind though government inaction. He then describes how they framed this leadership vacuum as a “need for this more community-based activity.” This type of framing is both diagnostic and prognostic as it does two things, first it highlights the existence of the problem (sector failure through government inaction) which can be thought of as prognostic
framing, but it is also diagnostic in that it suggests a solution to the problem (need for a community-based activity).

**Prognostic Framing**

Prognostic framing relates to activities that attempt to create cognitive frames among others related to the solution to a problem. This type of framing is predicated on some agreement that a problem exists and creates a shared understanding between individuals. Among other prognostic framing activities, convening organizations of the CSSPs examined in this inquiry advocated for a cross-sector, collaborative approach to solving their social or environmental issue. More specifically, three substantive codes that emerged related to this conceptual category were: 1) the need for collaboration, 2) transfer of associational value between partners, and 3) framing ownership of the problem.

**Highlighting the Need for Collaboration**

Emphasizing the need for collaboration as a diagnostic framing activity was explicitly discussed by interviewees in four of the research sites. As a mode of interacting, all of the CSSPs at the research sites acted collaboratively, but framing the solution for the social or environmental issue in terms of collaboration was more important at Research Sites #1, #2, #3 and #7. The need for collaboration can be illustrated by thinking in terms of its counter-point approach, the use of combative tactics against government or corporations. The substantive code that is described here as “framing the need for collaboration” speaks to narratives by leaders in CSSPs that emphasize embracing stakeholders who have traditionally been seen as negatively contributing toward the social or environmental issue.
This emerged at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership) where the CSSP positively engages with local governments and corporations, many of whom have a substantial carbon footprint. They engage with them, not to embarrass them, but instead to help and encourage them to move toward reducing their atmospheric carbon emissions. When the founder was asked why they took this collaborative approach rather than being more combative, this was the response:

we recognize the [value] of having a diversity of tactics, that is we are all better off. Greenpeace’s work, is that valuable work? Absolutely. It is valuable in the cross-section of collaborative environmental movement - we have got our role to play in there and they have got theirs, and the movement is stronger as a result, and our efforts in the movement are stronger as a result. [...] So first of all is the need for that diversity of tactics. Secondly it is recognizing that building the need for diversity in the overarching movement and that we each bring different strengths to that movement and it is seeing the value of what we’re doing is to have that bigger impact. P6-S1-O5

Framing the need for collaboration is a central narrative at the annual events at Research Sites #1, #3 and #7 where members of the CSSP who have progressed in reducing their carbon footprint are recognized for their efforts and celebrated by the community. Rather than focusing on the amount of atmospheric carbon still being emitted by their community partners, these events are setup to frame the narrative positively in terms of their achievements. This approach is part of a broader strategy that highlights the importance of collaboration in the successful achievement of the goals of the CSSP, which was pioneered at research site #1 (the large local
sustainability partnership) and subsequently used at Research Sites #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership) and #7 (the small sized local sustainability partnership). The strategy aims to 1) educate partners, 2) celebrate achievements and 3) encourage partners to measure and commit to carbon footprint reductions.

One of the most important partners of the CSSP at research Site #3 is a landfill company whose core operations negatively affect the local environment. During a participant observation session at a public event, this “advanced member” of the CSSP received accolades for their progress in “lighting and appliance retrofits.” In contrast to the 25,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions released annually by this partner, these reductions may seem minimal, but the convening organization of the CSSP and other members carefully framed the narrative to celebrate these achievements. Partners are not shamed in the case of them not reaching reduction targets, but instead they are simply not celebrated at annual event. Even though an adversarial narrative could be used by those interested in affecting changes in business, the convening organization at research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership) ensures that collaborative framing is the dominant narrative among the CSSP members.

Collaboration is a term that was used frequently in interviews and was often integrated into substantive codes. After conducting a word frequency analysis of all data sources and removing common words that are regular parts of speech, the word “collaboration” was the tenth most common word found in all data sources, with 309 occurrences. While word frequency does not necessarily denote meaningfulness of the term, qualitatively this information indicates that the word “collaboration” is part of a common narrative used in speech by those involved in CSSPs.
Highlighting the Transfer of Associational Value

Associational value refers to the tangible or intangible benefits afforded to organizations through the association with other organizations (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012, 2012b). If an organization has a positive image in the community, by having the engagement of that organization in the CSSP, the convening organization and other participant organizations may receive some associational value by also being a part of the CSSP. Two of the research sites explicitly framed the value that partners were afforded by being associated with the CSSP and its partners and the credibility this offered. This particular data incident emerged as a substantive code because it appeared that this framing activity was actually occurring at all of the research sites, even if it was discussed indirectly.

For example at research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership), I have already discussed the credibility that was sought out and transferred the CSSP when the first legitimate first follower, a large educational institution, became a member organization. It was not until the convening organization of the CSSP began communicating with others about this new legitimate first follower that there was a transfer of associational value to the CSSP. In this case, the prognostic framing took the form of website modifications to highlight that the educational institution was now a member and the CSSP and the founder took every opportunity to discuss this new partner while soliciting participation from other stakeholders. The founder of the convening organization for the CSSP said, “We were able to leverage that [new partnership], we went straight to those that we had been talking to before [and highlighted that the new partner was now a member of the CSSP.]” His implication here was that the educational institution transferred associational value onto the CSSP in the form of legitimacy and credibility, but that would only manifest itself when framed appropriately to the right audiences. In this case, the
founder of the convening organization at research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership) was framing the transfer of associational value to new potential members simply by telling them about their legitimate first follower.

The convening organization at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) was observed to have utilized this framing activity in a way more explicit than that previous data incident. One of the mandates of the CSSP at research site #6 was to offer organizational development support to local non-profits through consulting services. These consulting services were offered in part through a network of consultants who offered their services on a pro-bono basis. The “pitch script,” that was described previously, makes explicit the frames that should be articulated to new potential consulting partners to encourage their participation in the CSSP. There were two points on this script that directly relate to framing the transfer of associational value:

[The CSSP] is only seeking out the most reputable, most widely known organizational development consultants; you will be seen in the community to be a part of this elite group.

Most of the consultants participating have over 25 years of experience in their field; this group is a tremendous resource from which you can learn new techniques and best practices.

(From the “pitch script” document at research site #6)

These two frames highlight two different types of associational value; the former highlights the legitimacy and credibility that may be offered to the consultant if they join “this elite group,” and the latter describes that transfer of knowledge that could occur if consultants
choose to join. These framing activities associated with this “pitch script” were largely successful because ultimately all but two of the organizational development consultants who were approached using this pitch script chose to sign up as a member of the CSSP.

**Highlighting the Shared Ownership of the Social/Environmental Issue**

Ownership of the social or environmental problem emerged as a substantive code at each of the CSSP research sites involved in this inquiry. Convening organizations highlighted to potential stakeholder partners the shared ownership of the social or environmental issues. This theme was used to motivate partnership participation and manifested itself in two ways. The first way relates to narratives highlighting the importance of assigning ownership of tasks to CSSP members to ensure their active participation in the CSSP. The second relates to the need for “all of us” to take ownership of the social or environmental issue, rather than “someone else.” As an example of the former, use of “ownership” in framing activities related to assigning ownership to CSSP members, was described by an employee of research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership). While discussing effective ways to ensure participation of CSSP members, this staff member described the following:

*But anyways, shared leadership, empowerment, and then ownership ultimately, I think, are what lends themselves to the sustainability, I mean sustainability as ongoing, or institutionalization of these things [ ... ] A good example, is sometimes...so the [CSSP led project] here, where we provide a service to members. We can sort of feel which members are taking it as a service and see it as their program versus those...like, we have some that still use language like, "Oh, we're happy to support you." And we smile, "We're supporting you."*
No, no, no. It's nobody supporting anybody. This is your thing. We want you to feel like it's yours. We can feel that shift when they start to take ownership and embed it in their other work. P8-S1-O5

In this passage, we can see the interviewee describing how the convening organization of the CSSP frames certain “programs” as being run by members, by using rhetoric such as “This is your thing,” and “we’re happy to support you.” This interviewee frames ownership of CSSP led programs to “embed it in their other work.” In the course of conversation, this appeared to imply that by empowering members to take ownership of CSSP programs, their active participation in the CSSP was maximized.

In the above three sections, data incidents emerged related to three elements of the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs: the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing structures and engaging in framing activities. These activities occurred with the explicit aim of executing on the mission of the seven CSSPs, but given the collaborative nature of all of these convening organizations these may be thought of more specifically as activities that encourage the collective action of stakeholders. The following chapter will explore reasons why these convening organizational activities were undertaken towards the facilitation of stakeholder collective action.
Chapter 7 - Mobilizing leadership in the Formation of CSSPs – Why Convening Organizations Facilitate the Collective Action of Stakeholders

The previous chapter included the discussion and categorization of findings related to the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. Having shown these findings, this chapter will provide a discussion of their theoretical implications for the CSSP literature. The intentional leadership activities described above have associated with a core code, which I call ‘mobilizing leadership’ (see Figure 4.6). This core code may be thought of as the common category under which all substantive codes are associated. Mobilizing leadership may also be thought of in terms of the ontological assumptions related to Relational Leadership Theory, described in Chapter 2. Mobilizing leadership, by virtue of the way it was constructed, is a researcher’s interpretation of a social construction. It is comprised of an aggregation of stakeholder narratives that when related together, create a conceptualization of the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. This conceptualization involves all of the primary data collected throughout the course of this study, but it also includes conceptual insight from the extant literatures.

In Chapter 2, Crosby and Bryson’s (2010) integrative leadership is described as a construct that conceptualizes leadership in the context of cross-sector partnerships that provide public value. As a framework, it offers descriptive guidance to scholars related to leadership in all chronological stages of CSSPs and attempts to theoretically encapsulate CSSPs, both with and without, convening organizations. Because it is so broad, and the focus of this research is so specific, the framework provided by integrative leadership is not able to provide valuable theoretical and explicative guidance for the substantive codes that were described in the previous chapter. Crosby and Bryson (2010) define ‘integrative leadership’ using a process view of
leadership that includes two important concepts: 1) bringing groups together across sector boundaries; and 2) solving complex social issues for the betterment of society. These two concepts were drawn into the definition of mobilizing leadership presented below. This represents a more fully developed concept of intentional leadership activities at the formation stages of CSSPs.

As described in Chapter 5, the political process model from social movement theory was used in the data analysis process to help explain what was being seen at the research sites (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996). This framework, like much scholarly work in social movement theory, focuses on the bringing together of a group of stakeholders to form a social movement. By mobilizing stakeholders to work together towards a common goal, Social Movement Theory Scholars describe a process of creating collective action. Collective action is a precursor state of a social movement prior to the achievement of their collective goal (McAdam, 1982; Tarrow, 1983). This is theoretically useful when attempting to conceptualize the core code observed in this study, because of the intentional leadership activities of the convening organizations focused on mobilizing stakeholder participation – or collective action of stakeholders – in the CSSP. It is for this reason that the definition of mobilizing leadership described below includes reference to “fostering collective action,” as it is understood in the social movement theory literature.

Based on this extant literature as well as the categorization of the substantive codes uncovered in this study, ‘mobilizing leadership’ may be defined as intentional activities undertaken by individuals or organizations that foster collective action, spanning sector boundaries, to solve complex social issues. This definition includes some of the underlying motivations of organizational actors for their activities described throughout this chapter.
Fostering collective action, spanning sector boundaries and solving complex social issues are associated with the formation stage of CSSPs, but there are other outcomes associated with these intentional leadership activities which will be described below.

This chapter includes a discussion that explores the theoretical implications of mobilizing leadership and how it is associated with the mobilization of resources without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. Using Figure 1.1 as a visual guide, this chapter will focus on the circular component of that diagram, exploring the association between mobilizing leadership, collective action and Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity. The discussion below will also suggest why convening organizations preferentially engaged with some stakeholders over others, followed by an exploration of why convening organizations focused on the encouragement of collective action of these stakeholders over other priorities.

To explain why collective action was a priority for convening organizations, it is important to first consider the enterprising nature of the organizations that took part in this research inquiry. These organizations differ from non-enterprising non-profit organizations because they fund the bulk of their operations using revenue generated from the monetization of their own products or services, rather than depending solely on grants and donations. This observation sets convening organizations apart from the traditional non-profit sector in that they must operate with a business acumen that allows them to mobilize the necessary resources to successfully execute the mission of the CSSP, while at the same time attempting to generate sufficient revenue to pay the bills. While grants, donations and sponsorships comprised a portion of their funding strategy, they operated as enterprising organizations that derive, or attempt to derive, the bulk of their funds by offering fee-based services. Social entrepreneurship has been defined by Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern (2006), as an “innovative, social value creating activity that
can occur within or across the non-profit, business or government sectors” (p. 2). This conceptualization of social entrepreneurship will be used in this research as it foregrounds multi-sector focused organizations that create social value as well as monetary value. Social entrepreneurship blends together these two value creation approaches, where the non-mutually exclusive priorities of profit and mission coexist. Social enterprises negotiate these dual priorities and each organization is unique in their negotiation of situations where profit occurs at the expense of mission and where a mission focus will occur at the expense of profit.

Given the mission-focused social orientation of the convening organizations observed in this research, combined with their enterprising approach to generating funds, these convening organizations may be classified as social entrepreneurial ventures, or social enterprises using Austin, et al.’s (2006) definition. It is therefore appropriate to examine these organizations in the context of this literature and describe the formation of these CSSPs in terms of social entrepreneurial opportunity (Lehner & Kaniskas, 2012).

Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity for Convenors of CSSPs

The context in which convening organizations are successful, measured both in terms of their continued survival as a formal organization but also in their ability to create value for the CSSP and its goals, is a topic that has been examined theoretically and empirically (King, 2008; Sharma, Vrendenburg & Westley, 1994; Dorado & Vaz, 2003; Hundal, 2013). The success of new ventures has been considered in terms of entrepreneurial opportunity, which is the potential to create a venture that provides a product or service to a non-saturated market that is novel or improves or imitates existing products or services (Singh, 2001). This entrepreneurial opportunity refers to situations where demand is not matched with a commensurate supply of
products or services and is at the heart of much entrepreneurial scholarship (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

Typically entrepreneurial opportunity is associated with commercially oriented enterprises, but opportunity is sometimes different in the context of social enterprises; this social entrepreneurial opportunity is something that is not well understood and requires further scholarly investigation (Haugh, 2005). Literature related to social entrepreneurial opportunity approaches the construct from a variety of perspectives including opportunities arising from social needs, innovation, social value creation, social networks as well as other sources (Lehner & Kaniskas, 2012). Current conceptualizations of social entrepreneurial opportunity share a conceptual focus on the relevance of stakeholders for the creation of opportunity. For example, Hockerts (2006) describes three dimensions that lead to social entrepreneurial opportunities: 1) activism by those who hold social concern, 2) help from beneficiaries of the social enterprise and 3) philanthropic donations by those who support the mission of the social venture. Each of those three dimensions depend on the active participation of resource holding stakeholders. In some cases, grass-roots ‘leaderless’ initiatives facilitate the mobilization of resources, such as in the case of social movements (McAdam & Scott, 2005; Davis, McAdam, Scott & Zald, 2005; King & Soule, 2007), but in other cases activists, beneficiaries and philanthropists may not mobilize their resources without the active facilitation of a convenor. That is not to say that grass-roots mobilization is not important for convening organizations of CSSPs, but instead that it is the role of a convenor to facilitate the mobilization of resource holding stakeholders who are not sufficiently motivated, and thus are not part of the grass roots movement, to actively participate in the CSSP.
In the case of the seven research sites examined in this study, entrepreneurial opportunity was recognized and created by convening organizations. For the convening organizations of CSSPs, and other mission-focused entrepreneurial ventures, opportunity does not manifest itself in terms of profit-seeking from market inefficiencies as it does in more commercially oriented ventures (Singh, 2001), but rather as the opportunity for collaboration between stakeholders and the mobilizing of their resources towards the shared goal of solving a social or environmental issue. CSSPs, like many mission-focused social ventures, are successful if they are able to encourage the necessary stakeholders to collaborate towards fulfilling their collective mandate.

**Recognizing Political Opportunity as Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity**

In Chapter 6, themes related to the identification of political opportunity, the creation of mobilizing structures and engaging in framing activities were discussed in a descriptive sense to identify what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. This section addresses this issue in an explanatory manner, suggesting that why they engage in these activities relates, at least in part, to social entrepreneurial opportunity. Social entrepreneurial opportunity is comprised of two components, recognition and creation. The first component of social entrepreneurial opportunity involves recognizing that opportunities exist and that they may positively impact the formation of an entrepreneurial venture.

Opportunity recognition has been well theorized in the entrepreneurship literature, and are often referred to as discovery theories of entrepreneurial opportunity (Shane, 2000). While there is less scholarly work looking specifically at social entrepreneurship, Lehner and Kaniskas (2012) have categorized the extant social entrepreneurial opportunity recognition literature into three categories: those that approach recognition with an allocative view, a discovery view or a creative view as described by Sarasvathy, Dew, Velamuri and Venkataraman, (2003). The
substantive codes categorized as “the identification of political opportunity” that were identified in the data analysis may be categorized as a discovery view of opportunity recognition. The discovery view of social entrepreneurial opportunity relates to situations where opportunities are searched for and found using active strategies that keep an end-goal in mind (Sarasvathy, Dew, Velamuri & Venkataraman, 2003). This instrumental perspective associates “discovering” opportunity with both the identification (allocative view) and the creation (creative view) of opportunity, which may be thought of as part of the broader concept of social entrepreneurial opportunity.

The substantive codes categorized as “the identification of political opportunity” in the previous chapter related to situations where people involved with the formation of the CSSP held an ad-hoc recognition that opportunity existed, rather than situations where the opportunity existing by happenstance and/or the opportunity was identified post-hoc through a selective memory bias. This ad hoc recognition of opportunity is conceptually congruent with the concept of entrepreneurial opportunity recognition (Shane, 2003). As was discussed in the previous chapter, interview participants related many of their actions that were categorized in terms of “identification of political opportunity” as opportunity related to the encouragement of active stakeholder participation in the CSSP. It is evident that active stakeholder participation was a core concept that underlay why convening organizations undertook many of the actions that they did during the formation of the CSSPs. But why did the convening organizations take this collaborative approach and focus so clearly on facilitating collective action? Why is social entrepreneurial opportunity related to the collective action of stakeholders?

Austin (2006) describes the benefits of collaborative, “social purpose alliances” from a resource mobilization perspective, “When institutions come together and jointly deploy their
resources, they are frequently able to create an innovative configuration that has the capability to generate greater social value than either organization by itself” (p. 30). Social entrepreneurial opportunity recognition identifies situations when the facilitation of stakeholder collection action is likely. Convening organizations of CSSPs focus on collective action because active stakeholder participation increases the amount of resource mobilization available to the CSSP to successfully accomplish their mission. Recognizing opportunity is only one component of social entrepreneurial opportunity, the second component relates to opportunity creation.

**Opportunity Creation by Convenors of CSSPs**

Social entrepreneurial opportunity involves the recognition of contextual factors that may positively affect the formation of an entrepreneurial venture, but it also includes individual and organizational-level agency that creates opportunity (Alvarez & Barney, 2005; Baker & Nelson, 2005). Theories of the creation of entrepreneurial opportunity conceptualize opportunity in terms of their creation, rather than their discovery; implying that an opportunity does not exist until it is created (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). In this chapter, opportunity creation is used as a complementary term that works in conjunction with opportunity recognition to begin to fully conceptualize the social entrepreneurial opportunity associated with stakeholder collective action in CSSPs. Opportunity recognition leads to activities by entrepreneurs that create further opportunity. The pragmatic assumption in this line of reasoning is that both the recognition and creation of opportunity are essential components of maximizing social entrepreneurial opportunity. On their own, either may lead to the success of a social entrepreneurial venture, but combined they increase the likelihood of active stakeholder participation and the resources afforded to the venture based on that participation.
In Chapter 6, substantive codes related to the “creation of mobilizing structures” and “engaging in framing activities” were noted. The activities associated with these substantive codes related to individual and organizational level actions that encouraged stakeholder collective action. The mobilizing structures created in the seven research sites appeared to be created strategically to maintain long-term collective action. It is not enough to simply get stakeholders “to the table,” there was also a concerted effort to ensure that stakeholders remained engaged over the long-term. This active and intentional process created social entrepreneurial opportunity related to the mobilization of resources necessary for the successful execution of the mission of the CSSP.

**Resource Mobilization without Monetary Reciprocity**

In the previous two sections, social entrepreneurial opportunity has been described in terms of two components: opportunity recognition and opportunity creation. This section will elaborate on why social entrepreneurial opportunity is related to the collective action of stakeholders and the mobilization of their resources. Scholars have examined the issue of mobilizing resources from a variety of perspectives, including how entrepreneurs work with friends or family members to gain resources in the pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunity (Kotha & George, 2012) and the relationships and contracts between entrepreneurs and those who finance them (Zheng, Lui & George, 2010; Kaplan & Stromberg, 2003). Many of these theories and research studies involve the acquisition of monetary resources, although non-monetary resources, have also been examined including: materials, labour and skills (Shane, 2003).

Organizations may seek to mobilize resources through activities such as raising capital from venture capitalists (Shane & Cable, 2002), raising funds from friends or family members (Kotha & George, 2012), or through bricolage, using whatever resources are currently on-hand.
(Baker & Nelson, 2005; Desa, 2012). The ways in which resources are mobilized will depend on a number of factors, including the ability of an organization to generate profit in the near and long term. The founders of these organizations often raise funds to grow their business by selling equity in their venture to investors based on the promise of future value-creation and free cash-flow. Raising capital by selling equity in a business in return for future profit is only available to for-profit social enterprise organizations that can reasonably justify future profitability. Due to legal limitations related to their organizational form, all of the non-profit organizations examined in this research, regardless of how “enterprising” they may be, cannot mobilize resource through the selling of equity. Similarly, when examining the needs of employees, socially-oriented organizations, especially non-profit organizations, are not usually able to offer competitive compensation when compared with the for-profit sector (Oster, 1995; Cole, 1982). Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006) describe three challenges that social entrepreneurs face while mobilizing resources; the first factor relates to the difficulties faced while attempting to attract and retain talent, for the financial reasons mentioned above. Second, there are fewer financial institutions willing to work with organizations without a clear profit motive. Third, access to startup capital is not as readily available for mission focused social enterprises when compared with commercially oriented ventures. These factors incent social entrepreneurs to be innovative in their approach to mobilizing resources.

Resource mobilization challenges exist for social enterprises (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2012; Desa, 2012), but unique resource mobilization opportunities also exist. Resources offered without the expectation of monetary payment seems to be preferentially available to socially-oriented organizations partially due to a desire to “do good,” or because of an ethic of care sensibility among stakeholders (Tronto, 1991, 1993; Sevenhuijsen, 2003; Simola, 2007).
Tronto (1991) describes an ethic of care as “a species level activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our ‘world’ so that we can live in it as well as possible” (p. 103). Relevant to cross-sector partnerships, an ethic of care (EOC) perspective has been used to identify innovative, win-win solutions to complex, multi-stakeholder problems that require the consideration of the subjective perspectives of a variety of groups (Gilligan, 1982). These win-win solutions involve a sense of equity between groups even when resources are offered without monetary payment. An EOC perspective provides an alternative view on the traditional monetary-based conceptualizations of value-exchange for the transfer of resources. Based on Tronto’s (1991) description of an EOC perspective, there is “a species level” propensity toward valuing the care of others and the world around us to the point that resource holding stakeholders are willing to offer their resources, not for monetary reciprocity, but instead because of a desire to further the social/environmental mission at the heart of the social entrepreneurial venture.

Perhaps resource holding stakeholders offer their resources to social enterprises for normative reasons that resonate with individual and organizational-level stakeholder values, or for more instrumental reasons that stem from an enlightened self-interest (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Regardless of the reasons, access to these resources may offer a competitive advantage to socially-oriented organizations or at the very least, a low cost alternative to bricolage and a means of gaining the materials, labour and skills necessary for social enterprises to execute on their mission.

In the research sites examined in this study, active participation by resource holding stakeholders was a precursor to the mobilizing of resources. The act of participating in the CSSP in and of itself involved the donation of resources in terms of personnel time to attend CSSP related meetings and events. Once the active participation of stakeholders was in place, resources
were offered to the CSSP and barriers to requesting resources decreased through the creation of legitimized and trustful personal connections. In nearly all cases, resources that were offered to the CSSPs at the seven research sites, without the expectation of monetary reciprocity, were provided by stakeholders who were formal members of the CSSP. It appeared as though the active participation of resource holding stakeholders in the CSSP related to their offering of tangible and intangible resources without the promise of monetary reciprocity.

**Tangible and Intangible Resources Mobilized without Monetary Reciprocity**

The resources mobilized from actively participating, resource holding stakeholders included tangible and intangible resources. Table 7.1 provides a list of tangible and intangible resources provided to CSSP from resource holding stakeholders. The tangible resources included the more traditional types of resources discussed in the entrepreneurship literature, such as materials, labour and skills (Shane, 2003). For example, Research Sites # 1, 3, 6 and 7 made extensive use of *volunteer labour*, for the completion of many organizational functions. At research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), on a typical week, more hours of work were completed by volunteer labour than by paid staff. The *pro-bono donation of professional services* from accountants, lawyers and technical professionals emerged as a substantive code at Research Sites #4, 5 and 6. Extensive regulatory hurdles with the Ontario Securities Commission, the provincial financial securities regulator, required many hours of legal and accounting attention prior to the launch of the social impact investing service at research site #5 (the angel and venture capital funding match-maker). All of the accounting and legal professional services were provided to the social enterprise on a pro-bono basis. The convening organization at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) resold the pro-bono professional services of management consultants to third party organizations.
The convening organization acted as a broker between the management consultants and the third party organizations, receiving a fee for facilitating these connections.

*Government and foundation grants* were part of the mix of startup funding for nearly all of the research sites. Of these grants, some were issued by socially oriented funds such as the Ontario Trillium Fund (OTF), a government agency tasked with offering grants for the creation of social value. Grants such as those from OTF would not be available to more commercially oriented entrepreneurial ventures. research site #4 (the social startup incubator) offered *community bonds* to community investors, the proceeds of which were used to finance the purchase of real-estate for the purpose of creating office space for socially-oriented startup organizations. Bond holders were paid a nominal yield that offered a rate of return lower than what the organization’s risk profile might demand on traditional bond-markets. Charging *membership fees* to stakeholders participating in the CSSP occurred at Research Sites #1, 3 and 7. These fees consisted of monthly or annual payments to the convenor of the CSSP and varied in cost depending on the type of membership and the services offered by the convenor. Also, the donation of *in-kind resource by partners’ staff members* was another form of resources mobilized from partners. The stakeholders participating in the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) contractually offered their own staff time for activities such as marketing/communication, back-office functions such as payroll, accounts payable and receivable as well as training/consulting services for community organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Tangible/ Intangible</th>
<th>Research Sites</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSSP Participation</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#1-#7</td>
<td>Stakeholder participation in the CSSPs included a variety of activities, including attending governance meetings, awareness workshops, evenings of recognition, paying membership fees, signing up for CSSP communication initiatives including emails lists, providing opinions through questionnaires and surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Labour</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#1, #3, #6, #7</td>
<td>Volunteers performed a variety of tasks related to the operations of the convening organizations of the CSSPs. These volunteers worked along-side paid staff and often performed similar functions. These roles included outreach positions, event planning/organizing, and business development among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-bono Professional Services</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#4, #5, #6</td>
<td>Professional services such as accountants, management consultants and lawyers provided their services to the convening organizations of the CSSPs without payment. These professional services were used in “back-office” capacities for the convening organization and as re-sellable services available to third parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Foundational Grants</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#1, #3, #4, #6</td>
<td>The alignment between the mission of the CSSPs and the social aims of some government and foundational grants provides financial opportunity for mission focused social enterprises. These funding sources are jurisdiction dependent and are typically one-time funding related to a particular capital expenditure, project or event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bonds</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>The convening organization issued bonds to community members for the purchase of two buildings that would be converted into office space for social enterprises. Bond holders were paid a nominal coupon payment and principal was repaid at a set expiration date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#1, #3, #7</td>
<td>Members of the CSSP were charged an annual fee to be listed as a member of the partnership. The amount paid by members depending on the level of their participation in the CSSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind Resources by Partners’ Staff</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>A formal contract was drawn up between stakeholders participating in the CSSP, promising to take on particular roles necessary for the successful execution of the mission of the CSSP. Activities such as marketing/communication, back-office functions such as payroll, accounts payable and receivable as well as training/consulting services for community organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Value</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>#1-#7</td>
<td>Value provided to the CSSP and to other actively participating stakeholder, in terms of the legitimacy afforded to these organizations because of their association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with a well-renowned partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intangible Resource</th>
<th>Intangible</th>
<th>#1-#7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-Mouth Referrals</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>#1-#7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By being associated with a CSSP, active stakeholder participants discuss their involvement with other organizational actors and suggest that they should also be involved. This acts as a growth mechanism for collective action in the CSSP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Building of the Social/Environmental Issue</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>#1, #2, #3, #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many stakeholder participants find value in highlighting their participation in the CSSP through awareness building initiatives related to the social or environmental issue. These communication initiatives effectively provide “free marketing” for the CSSP, which not only increase awareness of the social or environmental issue, but also increases awareness and legitimacy of the CSSP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSP Governance</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>#1, #2, #4, #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By including stakeholders in the governance of the CSSP, convening organizations may be able to leverage the particular strengths of organizations related to effective strategic decision making. Some organizations have access to business intelligence or data analysis techniques that improve strategic decisions and organizational governance otherwise unavailable to the convening organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actively participating stakeholders also offered intangible resources to the convenors of the CSSPs (see Table 7.2). These included a variety of value-creating activities that were not directly associated with the materials, labour and skills immediately required by the social enterprises, but still contributed toward the execution of their mission. Many of the themes related to intangible resources that emerged from the study involved the building of legitimacy of the convening organization and the CSSP itself. The *associational value* afforded to the CSSP by the participation of well-renowned, legitimate stakeholders may be thought of as an intangible resource. For example, the opportunity creation activity of finding and leveraging a legitimate first follower, described in the previous chapter, may be thought of as contributing to the mobilization of this intangible resource. Associational value is afforded to social enterprises simply by the public participation of legitimate stakeholders in the CSSP. Similarly, participating stakeholders lent legitimacy and business development opportunities to the social entrepreneurial
venture through word-of-mouth referrals. This substantive code emerged from all of the research sites, with an example occurring at research site #2 (the established environmental issue partnership). Large financial companies who leased office space in the downtown core of a major Canadian city encouraged their commercial landlords to actively participate in the CSSP. The power, legitimacy and urgency of the large financial companies made their word-of-mouth referral a salient message, which was quickly acted upon by their commercial landlords through their subsequent participation in the CSSP (Mitchell, Agle & Woods, 1997). These word-of-mouth referrals are part of a broader theme related to awareness building.

Stakeholders who participate actively in the CSSPs are formally and informally engaged in awareness building narratives through their communication activities with other stakeholders. These communication activities may also be thought of as “free marketing,” where awareness of the CSSP and the social or environmental issue is articulated from a credible source. Some stakeholders engaged in awareness building by including the logo of the convening organization of the CSSP on their own website. One corporate stakeholder at research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership) highlighted their participation in the CSSP through issuing of joint press releases in conjunction with the convening organization.

The final intangible resource that emerged as a substantive code related to stakeholder participation in the governance of the CSSP. Stakeholder participation in governance processes provide value to CSSPs by leveraging each sectors’ characteristic strengths (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). One example of the leveraging of a particular sectors’ strengths occurred at research site #5 (the angel and venture capital funding match-maker), a CSSP tasked with creating a financial exchange where socially minded, high net-worth individuals could be matched with social enterprises to provide early-stage funding. One of the stakeholders involved
in the formation of the convening organization of the CSSP was an organization that operated a large, traditional stock exchange. The representative from that organization sat on the executive advisory committee and offered strategic advice related to the formation of the CSSP and was perceived to be a particularly useful resource related to governance and strategic decision making.

In this chapter, there has been a discussion of why collective action is of such value to convening organizations of CSSPs. Collective action was associated with the mobilization of resources from actively participating stakeholders without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. Examples were drawn from the data collected from the CSSPs at the seven research sites. The resource mobilization examples were then categorized in terms of their ability to directly (tangible resources) or indirectly (intangible resources) lead to the mobilization of materials, labour and skills. The next chapter will provide a discussion of the limitations of the current research and provide avenues for future research.
Chapter 8 - Discussion and Conclusion

Theoretical and Empirical Implications of this Research

In this section, a summary is provided that describes the key theoretical and empirical implications that have been described throughout the various chapters of this manuscript. These empirically based, theoretical implications are novel to the CSSP literature, each of which create opportunities for future research.

In this thesis, I have developed an understanding of intentional leadership activities at the formation stage of CSSPs, which I describe as mobilizing leadership. Based on data and extant literature, mobilizing leadership is defined here as intentional activities undertaken by individuals or organizations to foster collective action, spanning sector boundaries, to solve complex social issues. The primary contribution of this dissertation research is relating intentional leadership activities in the formation of CSSPs with the collective action of stakeholders that leads to social entrepreneurial opportunity. This contribution of the social movement theory literature to the CSSP literature, relates the intentional leadership activities described in Chapter 6, with the tangible and intangible resources afforded to social enterprises described in Chapter 7, thus a link between leadership and outcomes is suggested. This contribution is built on a series of theoretical implications that have been identified throughout the thesis. The following section summarizes some of the key theoretical implications described in the previous chapters.
Empirical Contribution Related to the Role of Leadership in the Formation of CSSPs.

This section describes the first contribution offered in this research study. In Chapter 2, a gap in the Leadership and the CSSP literatures was identified related to the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs. This gap led to the primary research question (RQ #1): what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs? In Chapter 5, a gap in the CSSP literature was identified related to the role of political opportunity recognition by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. This gap led to a secondary research question, (RQ #2): what is the role of political opportunity recognition by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs? Also, a gap in the CSSP literature was identified related to the role of framing activities by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs. This gap led to a secondary research question (RQ #3): what are the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations related to framing activities, in the formation of CSSPs?

These three research questions establish that there is a need for further scholarly work related to our knowledge of the intentional leadership activities in the formation of CSSPs. As was described in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs was described as the fostering of social movements, based on a series of empirical interpretations of findings. Specifically, leadership activities described as mobilizing leadership are associated with the fostering of the collective action of stakeholders in CSSPs. The fostering of a stakeholder collective action involves three organization level leadership activities: 1) identifying political opportunity for collective action; 2) creating mobilizing structures to encourage collective action, and; 3) engaging in framing activities that encourage collective action.
The role of political opportunity recognition by convening organizations during the formation of CSSPs included the identification of organizational and societal-level political opportunities. These two conceptual categories were linked with five distinct intentional leadership activities that included the following: i) identifying the perception of external legitimacy of the convening organization and; ii) identifying the existence of internal champions within partner organizations. At the societal level, intentional leadership activities included: i) identifying alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP; and ii) identifying a perceived risk of regulators intervening in the status quo within stakeholder organizations.

The role of framing activities by convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs included diagnostic and prognostic framing activities. Specifically, these intentional leadership activities included the following diagnostic framing substantive codes: i) highlighting the social/environmental issue to potential CSSP partners; ii) highlighting the overlap of stakeholders’ motivations and; iii) highlighting past individual sector failure. Prognostic framing activities included: i) highlighting the need for collaboration between sectors; ii) highlighting the transfer of associational value between high legitimacy partners within the CSSPs and; iii) highlighting the shared ownership of the social or environmental issue between sectors. These empirical findings, positioned into the literature using constructs from both the CSSP and SMT literatures constitute a contribution to the CSSP literature.

Findings also indicated that the intentional leadership activities of convening organizations in the formation of CSSPs included the creation of interorganizational and process-based mobilizing structures. The substantive codes related to this conceptual category are not particularly novel in the CSSP literature, but as part of the overall model described in Figure 1.1,
these become part of a useful framework for conceptualizing Mobilizing Leadership; specifically, the intentional leadership activities related to the creation of mobilizing structures, which include the creation of interorganizational and process based mobilizing structures. Activities related to interorganizational mobilizing structures, included: i) the creation of structures that increase direct network ties and trust between stakeholder organizations; ii) the creation of structures that facilitate a relationship with legitimate first followers and; iii) the creation of structures that assign ownership and accountability to stakeholder organizations. Process based mobilizing structures included activities related to: i) developing a strategy that uses funds-from-operations as the primary source of operating revenue for the convening organization; ii) developing structures that provide opportunity to effectively exchange views between partnering organizations and; iii) developing structures that leverage the strengths of individual sectors to further the goals of the broader CSSP. These substantive codes, conceptualized as activities associated with Mobilizing Leadership constitute a contribution to the CSSP literature.

**Theoretical Contribution Related to Why Convening Organizations Engage in Mobilizing Leadership.**

In Chapter 7, extant scholarly work from the Social Enterprise and CSSP literatures, combined with findings from this research study suggest that *enterprising convening organizations of CSSPs may be conceptualized as social enterprise ventures*. Extant scholarly work from the Social Entrepreneurship literature, combined with findings from this research study suggests that *social entrepreneurial opportunity includes opportunity recognition and opportunity creation*. This describes the upper half of the model shown in Figure 1.1. and re-conceptualizes the findings described above in social entrepreneurial terms. Opportunity
recognition categorizes the two types of political opportunity identified in the previous section. Opportunity creation categorizes the constructs described as ‘the creation of mobilizing structures’ and ‘engaging in framing activities’. These two broad categories, described using language from the social entrepreneurship literature, relate to a single desired outcome, which involves encouraging participation of stakeholder organizations. Specifically, as is depicted in the middle of the top half of Figure 1.1, social entrepreneurial opportunity for convening organizations of CSSPs involves the collective action of stakeholders. This reconceptualization itself does not offer theoretical explanation related to why convening organizations engage in Mobilizing Leadership; why these activities are undertaken may be understood in terms of social entrepreneurial opportunity.

In Chapter 7, the social enterprise literature was enfolded to the interpretation of the data in order to suggest that the collective action of stakeholders is related to the mobilization of resources for CSSPs without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. Gaining access to these resources without financial cost constitutes opportunity that is uniquely afforded to socially oriented organizations. The resources mobilized without the expectation of monetary reciprocity included both tangible and intangible resources. Some examples of the tangible resources that were afforded to convening organizations include: i) CSSP stakeholder participation; ii) volunteer labour; iii) pro-bono professional services; iv) government and foundational grants; v) community bonds; vi) membership fees; vii) and in-kind resources provided by partners' staff. Intangible resources were also afforded to convening organizations without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. These intangible resources include: i) the associational value of being associated with a credible partner; ii) word-of-mouth referrals; iii) awareness building of the social or environmental issue; iv) and, CSSP governance. The theoretical implications that
emerge from this contribution to the entrepreneurship literature relate to social entrepreneurial opportunity and address why convening organizations engage in Mobilizing Leadership. Social entrepreneurial opportunity is an underdeveloped construct that is only partially understood by focusing on the mobilization of resources without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. This construct requires further examination through future scholarly work.

**Future Research**

Examining the phenomena of organizational leadership of convening organizations in CSSPs necessitates a research perspective that solicits narratives from a variety of stakeholders. The research methodologies used in this research study were selected in an attempt to align the phenomena with epistemological assumptions and methodological best practices. These epistemological assumptions included a social constructionist perspective which foregrounds the importance of aggregating narratives from a variety of participants, organizations and research sites. The themes that emerged from this aggregation of narratives provide an interpretation of the shared perception of the phenomena being examined. However, these themes are only as valuable as the quality and the quantity of the narratives themselves. In the course of this research study, these narratives were drawn from individuals through semi-structured interviews, participant observation and document analysis. Using these methods, my interpretation of the phenomena often represent an observer rather than a participant’s understanding of what is going on within organizations, relying on the perceptions of organizational actors. At research site number 6, I had the opportunity to participate in the daily operations of the formation of that CSSP. This unique access afforded me a privileged understanding of that research site that I did not have at the other six research sites. Future research opportunities exist for scholars to deepen our understanding of these organizations and their actions through embedded ethnographic
methodologies. For example, embedding a researcher in active roles within CSSPs using methods described as Participatory Action Research may offer a valuable avenue to provide first-hand, scholarly interpretations of a research site (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2008; Rapaport, 1970).

In Chapter 7, a significant amount of discussion was provided around the construct “social entrepreneurial opportunity” and how it is related to the mobilization of resources through the collective action of stakeholders in the CSSP. However, the reasons why resource-holding stakeholders offer resources without monetary reciprocity is not clear. A rationale was offered related to the presence of an ethic of care ethos within resource-holding organizations, but this does not provide a full explanation of why resources are provided to CSSPs without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. We understand that money is universally valued, but the type of non-monetary reciprocity that is offered to resource-holding stakeholders who participate in CSSPs is often subjectively valued. For example, a socially-minded angel investor who has a lived experience of dealing with drug addiction, may be more apt to fund social startups that engage in activities related addictions and mental health. Whereas a law firm may be more apt to donate in-kind professional services to social startups that target local communities within which their employees live. In the former case, the non-monetary reciprocity offered by the social startup to the investor may include hope that the pain and suffering experienced by the investor will not be experienced by others. In the latter case, the non-monetary reciprocity involved, may include an enlightened self-interest that the law firm’s pro-bono work contributes positively to their local community, thereby benefitting their employees and clients. Further scholarly work is needed to offer a general explanation of what resource holding stakeholders expect as non-monetary reciprocity for their resources.
Other future research is needed to explore the theoretical implications listed in the sections above in this chapter. This empirical work could examine a broader spectrum of types of CSSPs and/or other social enterprises to provide a comparison of cases, perhaps using a cross-case analysis (Yin, 2012). This approach could contrast various types of social enterprise initiatives, especially comparing collaborative ventures with those that are less collaborative. Research comparing organizations such as these may offer theoretical guidance related to whether collective action is the bridge between social entrepreneurial opportunity and resource mobilization in a broader spectrum of social enterprises. Comparative analysis between different types of organizations and partnerships could examine variables such as organizational form, profit orientation and type of social issues, to name a few. Similarly, research opportunities exist to contrast the resource mobilization techniques of profit-oriented social enterprises with those of more mission-focused social enterprises.

Another interesting avenue for future research could be to compare the coupon-rate of community bonds issued by social enterprises, such as those at research site #4 (the social startup incubator), with the coupon rate of commercial entrepreneurial ventures of a similar risk profile. If the rate of return demanded by investors for the social entrepreneurial venture is lower than that of commercial entrepreneurial ventures, then the difference between the rates may offer a way to quantify social entrepreneurial opportunity and the mobilization of resources, as it pertains to access to capital. Finally, this research is focused on the intentional leadership activities that occurred in the formation of CSSPs. Future research could contrast the intentional leadership activities that occur in the formation of CSSPs with other chronological periods of the CSSP lifecycle.
In general, there is ample opportunity for future research related to the leadership of collective action in organizational theory. The concept of mobilizing leadership, as it pertains to leading collective action, is applicable not only to CSSPs, but also to Social Entrepreneurship, Public Administration, Strategic Alliances, Organizational Governance and Non-Profits, among other disciplines within organizational theory. Similarly, the concept of resource mobilization is a topic that is of interest to scholars and practitioners across management disciplines. The theoretical implications of this research study could provide a significant amount of opportunity for a robust research program.

Limitations of this Research

While much of the data collected for this research were obtained during the formation of the CSSPs, some data incidents involve interviewees’ post-hoc accounts of the formation of the convening organizations and the CSSPs. The accounts of past events were never more than twelve months old and were drawn from interviewees using non-leading, open-ended questions. Even so some of the interviewee accounts of what occurred during the formation of the CSSPs may be subject to a retrospective and hindsight biases (Roese & Vohs, 2012). Also, the research sites for this study were purposively selected to fulfill criteria related to some CSSP sensitizing concepts (Bowen, 2006; Charmaz, 2014). This purposive sampling limited the scope of this research to only include data from collaborative, formal organizations tasked with convening CSSPs. This sample of convening organizations could be seen as non-representative of other forms of CSSPs or social enterprises. Attempts were made to reach a broad spectrum of participants from various stakeholders of the CSSPs at the seven research sites, but narratives were not solicited from stakeholders who chose not to participate in the CSSPs. This research may have benefited from these perspectives. As with all research projects, the scope of the
researchers’ ability to collect data was limited due to budgetary and scheduling constraints. While it was evident that theoretical saturation occurred related to the theoretical codes observed in this research, given more funds and more time a larger geographic area, included more research sites, interviews and participant observation sessions may have led to a broader theoretical understanding of the research questions.

**Conclusion**

In this study examining the role of leadership in the formation of CSSPs, a conceptual framework was presented based on extant theory and empirical findings (see Figure 1.1). This framework links concepts related to intentional leadership activities in CSSPs with the fostering of social movements. Fostering social movements in collaborative partnerships, described in this thesis as mobilizing leadership, is primarily associated with creating the conditions that facilitate the collective action of stakeholders in CSSPs. This description of what organizational leadership activities were observed at the seven research sites demonstrates what activities are associated with mobilizing leadership, specifically: 1) the identification of organization-level and societal-level political opportunity; 2) the creation of interorganizational and process-based mobilizing structures; and 3) engagement in diagnostic and prognostic framing activities.

The primary contribution of this dissertation research is relating the intentional leadership activities in the formation of CSSPs with the collective action of stakeholders that leads to social entrepreneurial opportunity. This relationship foregrounds why mobilizing leadership occurs. This instrumental argument relates to the recognition and creation of Social Entrepreneurial Opportunity. Entrepreneurial opportunity involves a good idea that when successfully implemented, provides a product or a services that fulfills an unmet market demand; but this also involves a pragmatic understanding of operational realities. Opportunity only exists if thought is
put into how the organization will successfully gain the resources necessary to execute on their mission. In the case of collaborative social enterprises, such as the convening organizations of the CSSPs observed in this research, the collective action of stakeholders appears to be linked to the mobilization of these resources. Active stakeholder participants were observed to provide resources to the convening organizations without the expectation of monetary reciprocity. Mobilizing resources through collective action provides social entrepreneurial opportunity to new social ventures.

This study provides a robust research agenda to further our scholarly knowledge of the leadership of CSSPs. These types of partnerships are being considered more frequently as viable and desirable options for addressing complex social and environmental issues. By contributing to the scholarly discourse related to these important phenomena, I intend that this early groundwork will provide helpful direction for future research that academics may undertake in this domain. Equally, these findings hold relevance for practitioners who are interested in forming and leading partnerships that improve social and environmental outcomes. Bringing people together by fostering collective action provides opportunities that do not exist when we work in isolation, as Zinn (2010) captures here:

There is a power that can be created out of pent-up indignation, courage, and the inspiration of a common cause, and that if enough people put their minds and bodies into that cause, they can win. It is a phenomenon recorded again and against in the history of popular movements against injustice all over the world (p. 83).
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Appendices

Appendix A - Initial Substantive and In-vivo Codes, Prior to Theoretical Coding

Building legitimacy to motivate stakeholders to participate

Data Incident 1:

Legitimacy is critical to us, I mean who would come out to [CSSP event] if we didn’t have that legitimacy? The value of the reporting to the community is only as much as they trust the validity of the body who is reporting. P6-S1-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Legitimacy is critical
- Credibility with the community
- Building legitimacy
- Value of the collaboration is only as much as they trust the convener participation
- Carbon reporting validity

Data Incident 2:

I think the legitimacy is a big piece, we also have a building that you can look at. Which doesn't sound that great but when you think most people operate out of their basement, when they have meetings they come in there is this thing that clicks and they are like 'oh wow this is real' P6-S5-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Physical structure as legitimacy among collaborators
- Legitimacy equated to something real

Data Incident 3:

[organizational actor] would personally call someone and say I'm doing this and I really want you to be part of it and lots of people said “you can never say no to [organizational actor], ” with stars in their eyes. Definitely that was a factor. P1-S2-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

- Getting participation in the collaboration
- Individual-level influence
- Individuals you can’t say no to.
• High profile participants asking for participation.

**Data Incident 4:**

Sometimes you need a key-lead stakeholder, a supportive one, who's involved. Or, periphery ones, so, identifying those. But, you need, at some point, the organizations that have the authority to implement something, or to approve it, or to pull the lever, whatever it is. If you don’t have that amongst you, then, you can’t get them to the table, it doesn’t happen. P1-S1-O1

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Key lead stakeholder
• Credible early stakeholder lends legitimacy to the partnership
• Agency related to action

**Champions driving collaboration**

**Data Incident 1:**

It's such a minor thing, but those champions or those relationships define the entire collaboration between two organizations. You're not working with all 200 of their employees. You're usually working with one or two. The flavor of it can go in one direction or another based on that person, in both the role or job that they play and also the personality or passion that they bring to it. P8-S1-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Champions define the entire collaboration
• Relationships define the entire collaboration
• Flavor of partnership is based on personal relationships
• Champions bring personality and passion to the partnership

**Data Incident 2:**

We often look at [their] sustainability person, so who is the community director who, in that company, has the same values as we do? Who has the same vision? Who is the intrapreneur in that company that wants to make the change? Can we work with them to help provide a convincing argument to management. P6-S5-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Look for people with the same values
• Seek out sustainability personnel at stakeholders
• Look for people with the same vision
• Look for intrapreneurs who want to make change
• Work with champions to make convincing arguments to management

Data Incident 3:

I really believe in the mandate of their program. I think what they're doing is absolutely tremendous. The level of interest, and practical engagement that they're doing, I'm fully supportive of it, because there's no way I could achieve that myself. They're at a far better position to do that kind of engagement. P1-S1-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

• Belief and support in the partnership
• Champion showing support for partnership
• Stakeholder looking for a convener to engage with other stakeholders

Perception of goal alignment between social cause and business

Data Incident 1:

In our sector, talent is key to our success and we see consistently from employees a keen interest in having some alignment between their personal values and interests and those of an organization that they choose to work for. Over the years, we've definitely seen an increase in the questions that interview candidates ask about what the company's doing under that broad umbrella of sustainability. We see a high degree of engagement from existing employees and so it contributes to the engagement our existing employees, retention of existing employees, and attraction of new employees. P4-S1-O4

In-Vivo Codes:

• Alignment between personal values and their workplace (sustainability)
• Increase in employees asking about sustainability
• High engagement of employees in sustainability
• Retention of employees associated with sustainability activities
• Attraction of new employees associated with sustainability initiatives.
Data Incident 2:

... why does a business care about reducing their carbon impact? They want to mitigate risk that is either policy or supply chain risk, they want to improve their brand in light of other green wash and rise above that, they want to attract Gen Ys that have an interest in organizations having a true environmental strategy. P6-S1-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Business care about reducing carbon impact
- Understanding of policy or supply chain risk related to carbon emissions
- Generation Ys have an interest in organizations having a true environmental strategy

Data Incident 3:

Through document analysis, we can see that the term “social innovation” is used prolifically and prominently throughout public documents, including websites and promotional materials at research site #4 (the social startup incubator). The name of nearly all projects include the term “innovation” or “innovative” and, as at least one employee of a partnering organization of the site #4 CSSP acknowledges, “right now social innovation is a buzz word and hopefully it's around to stay.”

In-Vivo Codes:

- The term “social innovation” is a zeitgeist.
- Conveners specifically incorporate the term “Social Innovation” to align with positive associations among funders and the public

Data Incident 4:

Through my own participant observation with grant writing initiatives related to organizational capacity building at research site #6 (non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), I know that grant application submissions were specifically timed to coincide with this particular “social innovation” zeitgeist within two key funding bodies. The identification of the existence of this societal alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP offer an example of what Waddock (2009: 283) describes as “politically savvy” difference makers, intentionally being “in the right place at the right time with the right idea.”

In-Vivo Codes:

- The term “social innovation” is a zeitgeist.
• Opportunistic use of the term “social innovation” for gain legitimacy
• Politically savvy use of language.

**Government regulation as a motivator for participation**

**Data Incident 1:**

*Under the Green Energy Act... We thought that that was our chance to jump on them again, and we put on a little workshop in the spring to try to tell them about it what was required of them [under the law]. P1-S3-O1*

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Upcoming government regulation was a chance to jump on stakeholders
• Education related to upcoming government regulations
• Education of organizational requirements of government regulation
• Mandatory carbon emission reporting as a precursor to participation

**Data Incident 2:**

At the time of data collection, the Ontario Provincial Government passed an amendment to the Green Energy Act, known as regulation 397/11, which required that at a future date, public agencies, including municipalities, universities, hospitals and schools, must publicly disclose sustainability initiatives, forecasted reduction of energy consumption, actual results achieved and future sustainability initiatives and targets. In the case of research site #4 (the social startup incubator), this legislation motivated the participation of one of their first key partners.

“[Important public agency] signed on almost immediately, I'd say within six weeks of us reaching out to them, they saw an opportunity, they also knew that mandatory reporting was coming. I'm not sure if you're familiar with 397...” P1-S3-O1

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Government regulation directly associated with participation
• Reaching out to stakeholders using government regulations as business development talking points
Data Incident 3:

It [the CSSP] began as a simple paper that designed a concept for a social stock market that was a part of the Government of Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Submission. We wrote that paper, added it to our Poverty Reduction Submission. Then, that was ultimately adopted, by the Province of Ontario, as one of their strategies that they wanted to support. They became a partner in the initiative, at first, as someone that endorsed the concept because it aligned with their mission of reducing poverty in Ontario, and driving social innovation, and now ultimately driving social enterprise and impact investing as of 2013. P7-S5-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Government strategies leading to partnership formation of the partnership
- Support from government in the formation of the partnership
- Government endorsement in the formation of the partnership

Data Incident 4:

Through participant observation I perceived that the creation of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) stemmed from a significant reduction in funding from government agencies. This CSSP manifested itself as an adaption to the new financial realities imposed upon the non-profit sector. At the time of the formation of this CSSP, it was understood that government led funding initiatives favored projects that emphasized a sustainable business plan that included “funds from operations” as the primary source of ongoing funding after initial startup financing was allocated. Recognizing that this shift in funding was coming, three leaders from similarly-goaled non-profit organizations agreed to partner together to offer organizational development workshops and consulting services to the local non-profit sector. These workshops and consulting services were previously offered separately through each of the three agencies, funded largely by government grants. The three founding partners of the CSSP recognized that Ontario Government funding agencies were favouring initiatives that approached social value creation in new and potentially disruptive ways. Leaders of the nascent, unfunded CSSP prepared a grant application that proposed a “funds from operations” based CSSP to a funding body controlled by the Government of Ontario. The grant application was fully funded from the government agency, and in this case I perceived that it was the explicit recognition by leadership within the CSSP, of the changes occurring in the status quo at the Ontario Government, and the subsequent actions that led to the successful formation of the CSSP at research site #6 (non-profit organizational capacity building partnership).
In-Vivo Codes:

- Funds-from-operations valued by government
- Governments defunding of non-profit organizations
- Enterprising non-profits valued by governments
- Government policy favouring innovative and sustainable business plans
- Partnering as a means to access government funding

Good relationships exist between stakeholders

Data Incident 1:

... you actually put people together and have them working together and that in unto itself, they become people as opposed to symbols, and they're working towards a common goal and they are breaking through, and not every single project comes to a successful resolution, sometimes there is still competing opinions, that can just never be completely aligned, but for the most part we do get there. P1-S2-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

- Personalize organizations by having people work together
- People rather than symbols
- Personal fit between collaborators
- Working towards a common goal
- Working through competing opinions

Data Incident 2:

I think they're often relationship based. Two that come to mind would be, one idea of having, this is related to organizations work together, but you build relationships usually with a person or a couple of people that become that collaboration. P8-S1-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Effective partnerships are relationship based
- Existing relationship between collaborators
- Establishing trust between collaborators
- Working together involves good relationships
- Relationships between a couple of people become the collaboration
- Personal fit between collaborators

**Data Incident 3:**

The person who had originally launched the [...] program, there was a high degree of trust there [with other stakeholder], as well. In terms of the relationship, he had been on one of the working groups during the launch [...] so there’s a background relationship there, a high degree of trust established” P5-S1-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Existing trust between collaborators
- Existing relationships between collaborators

**Data Incident 4:**

Everyone puts lettuce or tofu and feta cheese and we make the salad bar. It sounds really simple, but what we’re doing is we’re using food as a way to bring people together. What happens then is this amazing thing where we all make salads and we all sit together. The opportunities for me to sit with the Salad Club, might not ever present themselves, right? That’s like such subtle intentional programming as a way to animate a community and get people talking to one another. P1-S4-O1

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Intentionally bringing people together to create opportunity
- Animate a community by getting people talking to one another
- Personal connection between collaborators

**Data Incident 5:**

*I think the word is trust right? A trusting relationship will actually allow us to get in, to talk to them, once were in then we can sort of sell it, P6-S1-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Establishing trust between collaborators
- Managing relationships between collaborators

Work with a notable partner to build credibility early-on.
Data Incident 1:

We were able to leverage that [new partnership], we went straight to those that we had been talking to before that and it didn't take long before, actually it was a matter of weeks, before [key stakeholder] had written us a cheque, and [another key stakeholder] had verbally committed too. P1-S3-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

- Leverage credible partnership
- Educate new partners about existing notable partners
- Partners commit to participate because of association with credible partners

Data Incident 2:

Through participant observation during the formation of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), three locally reputable non-profit organizations from adjacent jurisdictions had been working together for several years aiming to find efficiencies by partnering together to offer organizational development (OD) workshops and consulting services to build organizational capacity within the two local non-profit sectors. I was engaged to help “build a value-proposition” for the CSSP through partnerships and I was explicitly asked to bring on a partner with a “big brand” to co-facilitate some OD workshops. The intention here was clear, I was to bring on a well-known, for-profit organization as our first partner to build legitimacy among other potential partners and to foster future collective action.

In-Vivo Codes:

- Leverage credible partners
- Bring in “big-brands”
- Build legitimacy through association with notable partners

Data Incident 3:

In each of these groups that we create we have co-chairs. So we take two people from the outside, not part of our organization and we asked them to be the leaders of the group. It's all about, “who are those people and will other people want to be seen to be towing the line from their perspective?” So in the case of the commercial building initiative we asked to tenants to lead this initiative and they happen to be the senior VPs of real estate and corporate procurement in two of the banks. So they are the largest tenants in Canada, so they are very powerful [...] they also happen to be in the market [to] either renegotiating leases [or] were thinking about moving to
new spaces. So by having the tenants at the table it meant that the landlords must come to the table, either a landlord was their landlord and they wanted to keep them happy or they wanted to try to get an in, and networking opportunity with this very high level decision maker and they wanted to be seen to be coming to the table. So those two tenants those two senior people acted as cochairs and they were the ones who would convene these meetings with our support in the background. P1-S2-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

- Leaders from stakeholders
- Powerful stakeholders convene meetings
- Stakeholders encourage participation of other stakeholders

Assigning Ownership and Accountability to Stakeholders

Data Incident 1:

Participant observation at research sites #1 and #3 indicated to me that stakeholder ownership and accountability was an unambiguous priority for the CSSP members. Annual evenings of recognitions were observed where all participants in the CSSP and the broader community including local politicians and media are invited to celebrate the achievements CSSP members related to their carbon footprint reduction. Accountability is an explicit part of this process, where participants are noteworthy by their absence, either from the CSSP itself or from their lack of carbon emission reduction.

In-Vivo Codes:

- Formal processes that recognize accomplishments of stakeholders
- Assigning ownership to stakeholders
- Assigning accountability to stakeholders
- Publicly celebrating accomplishments of the CSSP and members

Data Incident 2:

Through participant observation I was part of the creation of the CSSP at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership). The three founding members are non-profit organizations from neighbouring jurisdictions with similar organizational capabilities and little power imbalance. Document review the Memorandum of Understanding and Terms of Reference documents that laid out the financial and in-kind resource contributions of each partner, indicated that the assignment of ownership and accountability of CSSP related tasks fell
along functional lines. In this CSSP, these functions included: 1) financial administration and registration, including bookkeeping and document retention, 2) marketing and communication, including website maintenance and copy-writing, 3) curriculum and program development for workshops and consulting services, including follow-up evaluation. Each of the three founding member organizations mutually agreed to take ownership of one of the three broad functional areas and developed “success metrics” which would be reported on at quarterly steering committee meetings. By participating in these quarterly steering committee meetings, I was afforded the opportunity to see that partners respected the delineation between the three main functions and each of the member organizations were able to independently make day-to-day decisions and action in a timely manner.

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Formal legal document assigning responsibilities of stakeholders
- Leverage organizational capabilities of partners
- Clarity of success metrics for each stakeholder
- Accountability monitored through regular reporting
- Creation of steering committee to oversee partnership

**Funds-from-operations**

**Data Incidents:**

Through document analysis and participant observation, the following can be said about how revenue is generated from the seven research sites:

Research Sites #1, #2, #3, #7 generate revenue from membership fees and fee-for-service initiatives

Research Site #4 generates revenue from rent charged to tenants, issues community bonds

Research Site #5 charges transaction fees

Research Site #6 charges for consulting and training services

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Revenue generated by monetizing products or services
- Enterprising non-profits
- Social entrepreneurship
- Social innovation

**Effective communication mechanisms**
Data Incident 1:

Today of the 25 participants [of the external working group], 22 are part of [the CSSP] members and so that was the story - where the guy says let me connect you with my management team, we actually allowed them to have a decision about how the framework operates and then they want to be more part of it. P6-S1-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- Soliciting participation through shared governance
- Stakeholder input into how the partnership works
- Allow stakeholders to make governance decisions

Data Incident 2:

During participant observation of one of the shared office spaces at research site #4 (the social startup incubator), I was able to map the seating arrangements and office space of the “co-working” member organizations. My observation was that desk and seating arrangements were laid out in such a way as to maximize serendipitous interactions between people working in the space. These serendipitous interactions were not only intended for people who work in the same organization, but also to create interactions between organizations. One interviewee referred to how the co-working space afforded opportunities for “idea sex,” referring to people with different viewpoints coming together to formulate new and innovative ideas.

Kitchens and coffee shops play central roles in the various buildings used by the CSSP in research site #4 (the social startup incubator). An example us the use of physical space to effectively exchange views in the kitchen was described previously is the Salad Club. Another way that this is done in the kitchen is the way the oversized counters are laid out; there are multiple sinks where members are encouraged to wash their dishes beside each other, creating more opportunities for serendipitous interactions. Couches are interspersed with desks and there is desk space in the main-floor café in addition to regular café seating. Unlike the external working group used by research site #1 (the large local sustainability partnership), the exchange of views between members is not formally facilitated by the CSSP in this case, but instead the boundary conditions for these informal exchanges of views were intentionally created by leadership in the formation of the CSSP through thoughtful floorplans and furniture selection.

In-Vivo Codes:
• Seating arrangements to create interactions between stakeholders
• Physical layout as an intentional communication mechanism
• Intentional serendipitous interactions between stakeholders
• Bring together people who wouldn’t otherwise interact

Using partners’ core capabilities for the benefit of the CSSP

Data Incident 1:

So we have partnerships with a series of vendors like [business consulting company #1], and [business consulting company #2] and a number of others who provide us with reports which we then offer to our clients at no cost, […] so that our clients are able to understand basic things like the competitive landscape, the size of the market for the product that I’m in and therefore gauge potential returns, and this is extremely important for potential investors. P5-S5-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

• Use partners’ business consulting capabilities for other stakeholders
• Free professional services
• Professional services extremely important to other stakeholders
• Business capabilities for the benefit of other sectors

Data Incident 2:

We were keen on the idea and believed in the space, and that helped get some financing from the provincial government for the feasibility study. We continued to push it and participate where we could. Show up where we could, and lend expertise where we could. Naturally, many of the exchange-related issues that they were facing were things that we had the ability to answer in-house, whether it was from legal people, or from listings-related people, or from regulatory people. We were able to contribute quite a bit of thinking to some of the work that they were doing. P2-S5-O2

In-Vivo Codes:

• Industry knowledge from business sector offered to the CSSP
• Legitimate business partner advocated for funding for the CSSP
• Governance advice from knowledgeable stakeholder
**Data Incident 3:**

During participant observation at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership), a for-profit technology company was engaged to offer training services to the non-profit sector related to how their products and services could be used for community benefit, at no cost. This technology partner offers a variety of cloud-based back-office business services including email, calendaring, data warehousing and other essential business functions. These capabilities were in high demand from cash strapped non-profit organizations who were excited about the prospects of retiring their old and fallible computer servers and move to a cloud-based solution. The strengths of the technology partner that were leveraged in this example included: the cloud-based products and services, product and service knowledge, trainers, and a venue for the workshops. Prior to this workshop series, the most highly attended workshops typically drew no more than 30 or 40 attendees, the workshops offered by the CSSP related to the technology partners’ products and services drew almost 150 people from the local non-profit community. The venues used in the past could not accommodate an audience of that size, so the in-kind contribution of facilities capable of seating that number of attendees was essential for the successful delivery of that workshop series.

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Technological know-how shared with the non-profit sector
- Well-known brand association with the partnership to increase awareness
- Technology solutions offered for free to partners

**Awareness building and advocacy.**

**Data Incident 1:**

Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where the air is so clean and healthy you can see for miles on hot summer days, where the lake and rivers are clear and beaches are safe for swimming. Imagine a waste management system that captures and puts to use the materials we currently send to landfills. Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where people travel quickly from [one end to the other] – and everywhere in between - on a comprehensive transit system. This is our vision for a [the CSSP] and it is within reach. (From promotional material distributed by the convening organization for research site #2)

**In-Vivo Codes:**
• Offering imagery of an ideal future state
• Creating a vision

**Data Incident 2:**

From document analysis of content prominently displayed on the convening organization’s website:

*[The convening organization of the CSSP]* is a new non-profit corporation with a powerful vision for *the city* as the city with the greatest commitment to sustainable development in North America. We envision a world-class city with a vibrant, resilient economy, exceptional quality of life and healthy natural environment.

*This vision is shared by sustainability experts and local business and community leaders in [the city] who are supporting and guiding [the CSSP] to make it a reality.* (CSSP website from research site #7)

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Offering imagery of an ideal future state
• Creating a vision

**Clarify mutual benefit of stakeholders working together.**

**Data Incident 1:**

...the biggest was our ability to understand the co-benefits, [ ... ] when we met with the environmental planner we actually read this strategy of that community before we had that conversation and we listened to their feedback and integrated that back into what we did. And we spoke to the business person and we presented the business case for their organization, rather than carbon impact, talking to the mayors it was about the reputation to this community, so that goes back to that empathy point, that we were able to understand the needs of who we’re speaking to and how they can benefit from it and how we can all be benefited from this collaborative movement we are looking to create. P6-S1-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

• Co-benefits
• Listening to stakeholder needs
• Understanding how we can all benefit

**Data Incident 2:**
From document analysis at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership):

A script was created by staff of the CSSP to provide a consistent, accurate and persuasive pitch to encourage the consultants to donate pro-bono consulting hours to local non-profit organizations. Some of the wording used in this script uses diagnostic framing to highlight the overlap of motivations of CSSP stakeholders. The following talking points were copied from the “pitch script” used to engage local organizational development consultants and were coded to relate to this substantive code.

- A thriving community benefit sector provides more consulting opportunities through increase financial capacity and the improved ability to afford business consultants.

- Exposure to pro-bono business consultants breeds more awareness of the value of business consulting in the non-profit sector and may lead to improved business development opportunities.

- Pro-bono consulting engagements offer consultants with increased community exposure and may result in improved business development opportunities.

- Your ability to create an impact in the community is improved by joining a network of likeminded practitioners who likewise want to create real change in the community benefit sector. (From the “pitch script” document at research site #6)

In-Vivo Codes:

- Process for motivating stakeholder participation
- Co-benefits
- Improving the community for improved revenue opportunity
- Build stakeholder notoriety in the community

Government cannot solve the issue on their own.

Data Incident 1:

The fact that the federal government isn't keeping Canada involved in the Kyoto Protocol I don't think has lessened community interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We still see a need, whether or not our federal government recognizes it. We see a lot of the action happening at the local level anyways. We're still motivated by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and by a number of other factors that are part of moving people to action. P3-S1-O3
In-Vivo Codes:

- Failure of government policy
- Local level action
- Reason for participation in the partnership

Data Incident 2:

Well then, the silence in the 00’s [of the Canadian Federal Government], the Liberals [the Liberal Party of Canada] in the first part of the naughties tried to belatedly bring in a plan, bring in voluntary action from the top down, and then the conservatives [the Conservative Party of Canada] have shown, as we talked about, relatively little interest in this. There is a vacuum of activity on the file most certainly. By implication that means the leadership vacuum. The way the framing of the issue, the way it's progressed, a recognition that there is a need for this more community-based activity and that it can be beneficial as well for a variety of reasons. [...] you do not have to wait for the lowest common denominator in order to proceed. P12-S1-O8

In-Vivo Codes:

- Government inaction related to the social issue
- Vacuum of activity at the government level
- Local level recognition for community based activity

Taking a collaborative approach rather than a combative approach

Data Incident 1:

we recognize the [value] of having a diversity of tactics, that is we are all better off. Greenpeace’s work, is that valuable work? Absolutely. It is valuable in the cross-section of collaborative environmental movement and we have got our role to play in there and they have got theirs, and the movement is stronger as a result, and our efforts in the movement our stronger as a result. [...] So first of all is the need for that diversity of tactics secondly it is recognizing that building the need for diversity in the over arching movement and that we each bring different strengths to that movement and it is seeing the value of what we’re doing is to have that bigger impact. P6-S1-O5

In-Vivo Codes:

- There is value in a diversity of tactics to make social change
- There is need for a diversity of tactics, including a collaborative approach.
- Bring different strengths to create impact
**Data Incident 2:**

Through participant observation at a public event at research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership):

An important industrial partner in the CSSP at research Site #3 is a landfill company whose core operations negatively affect the local environment. During a participant observation session at a public event, this “advanced member” of the CSSP received accolades for their progress in “lighting and appliance retrofits.” In contrast to the 25,000 tones of green house gas emissions released annually by this partner, these reductions may seem minimal, but the convening organization of the CSSP and other members carefully framed the narrative to celebrate these achievements. Partners are not shamed in the case of them not reaching reduction targets, but instead they are simply not celebrated. Even though an adversarial narrative could be used by those interested in affecting changes in business, the convening organization at research site #3 (the medium sized local sustainability partnership) ensures that collaborative framing is the dominant narrative among the CSSP members.

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Comfort with collaborating with a polluter
- Celebrate the incremental achievements of partners
- Making change from within
- Keeping polluters engaged
- Celebrating rather than shaming

**Data Incident 3:**

Through document analysis of interview transcripts:

Collaboration was a term that was used frequently in interviews and was often integrated into substantive codes. After conducting a word frequency analysis of all data sources and removing common words that are regular parts of speech, the word “collaboration” was the tenth most common word found in all data sources, with 309 occurrences. While word frequency does not necessarily denote meaningfulness of the term, it at least indicates that it is a common narrative used in speech for those involved in CSSPs.

**Stakeholders participate to be associated with other high-profile stakeholders.**

**Data Incident 1:**
... it was when our first building was about half empty that we finally convinced [high profile tenant] to occupy most of the fifth floor, we could see our that we were a place to be. [Small startup] and [established organization] leased an office in addition to their main offices so that they could be part of the action. [High profile tenant] got a deal on rent, but definitely brought in more tenants. P4-S4-O1

In-Vivo Codes:

- Leverage new partnership with high profile partner
- High profile partner leads to other stakeholders participating in the partnership

Data Incident 2:

From document analysis of the “pitch script” used to solicit new Consulting Associate partners at research site #6 (the non-profit organizational capacity building partnership) the following points are relevant:

- [The CSSP] is only seeking out the most reputable, most widely known organizational development consultants; you will be seen in the community to be a part of this elite group.

- Most of the consultants participating have over 25 years of experience in their field; this group is a tremendous resource from which you can learn new techniques and best practices.

(From the “pitch script,” to solicit participation from Management Consultants. Document from research site #6)

In-Vivo Codes:

- Ways to encourage participation in the partnership
- Explicitly articulate that only the most reputable stakeholders are solicited to participate
- Highlight the experience of other stakeholders

Stakeholders have a shared ownership of the social or environmental issue.

Data Incident:

But anyways, shared leadership, empowerment, and then ownership ultimately, I think, are what lends themselves to the sustainability, I mean sustainability as ongoing, or institutionalization of these things [...] A good example, is sometimes...so the [CSSP led project] here, where we provide a service to members. We can sort of feel which members are
taking it as a service and see it as their program versus those...like, we have some that still use language like, "Oh, we're happy to support you." And we smile, "We're supporting you." No, no, no. It's nobody supporting anybody. This is your thing. We want you to feel like it's yours. We can feel that shift when they start to take ownership and embed it in their other work. P8-S1-O5

**In-Vivo Codes:**

- Shared leadership and empowerment leading to ownership
- Telling stakeholders that the partnership is “theirs”
- Ownership to embed sustainable practices in stakeholders’ work
Appendix B – Political Opportunity Conceptual Categories, Substantive Codes, Data Sources

Identifying Organizational-Level Political Opportunity

External legitimacy of the convener

Data Incident from Research Site #1

Legitimacy is critical to us, I mean who would come out to [CSSP event] if we didn’t have that legitimacy? The value of the reporting to the community is only as much as they trust the validity of the body who is reporting. P6-S1-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #4

I think the legitimacy is a big piece, we also have a building that you can look at. Which doesn’t sound that great but when you think most people operate out of their basement, when they have meetings they come in there is this thing that clicks and they are like 'oh wow this is real' P6-S5-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #2

[organizational actor] would personally call someone and say I'm doing this and I really want you to be part of it and lots of people said “you can never say no to [organizational actor],” with stars in their eyes. Definitely that was a factor. P1-S2-O1

Existence of internal champions

Data Incident from Research Site #1

It's such a minor thing, but those champions or those relationships define the entire collaboration between two organizations. You're not working with all 200 of their employees. You're usually working with one or two. The flavor of it can go in one direction or another based on that person, in both the role or job that they play and also the personality or passion that they bring to it. P8-S1-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #5

We often look at [their] sustainability person, so who is the community director who, in that company, has the same values as we do? Who has the same vision? Who is the intrapreneur in that company that wants to make the change? Can we work with them to help provide a convincing argument to management? P6-S5-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #5
I really believe in the mandate of their program. I think what they're doing is absolutely tremendous. The level of interest, and practical engagement that they're doing, I'm fully supportive of it, because there's no way I could achieve that myself. They're at a far better position to do that kind of engagement. P1-S1-O1

Identifying Societal-Level Political Opportunity

Alignment between Popular Normative Views and the Goals of the CSSP

Data Incident from Research Site #1

In our sector, talent is key to our success and we see consistently from employees a keen interest in having some alignment between their personal values and interests and those of an organization that they choose to work for. Over the years, we've definitely seen an increase in the questions that interview candidates ask about what the company's doing under that broad umbrella of sustainability. We see a high degree of engagement from existing employees and so it contributes to the engagement our existing employees, retention of existing employees, and attraction of new employees. P4-S1-O4

Data Incident from Research Site #1

... why does a business care about reducing their carbon impact? They want to mitigate risk that is either policy or supply chain risk, they want to improve their brand in light of other green wash and rise above that, they want to attract Gen Ys that have an interest in organizations having a true environmental strategy. P6-S1-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #4

Through document analysis, we can see that the term “social innovation” is used prolifically and prominently throughout public documents, including websites and promotional materials at research site #4. The name of nearly all projects include the term “innovation” or “innovative” and, as at least one employee of a partnering organization of the site #4 CSSP acknowledges, “right now social innovation is a buzz word and hopefully it's around to stay.”

Data Incident from Research Site #6

Through my own participant observation with grant writing initiatives related to organizational capacity building at research site #6, I know that grant application submissions were specifically timed to coincide with this particular “social innovation” zeitgeist within two key funding bodies. The identification of the existence of this societal alignment between popular normative views and the goals of the CSSP offer an example of what
Waddock (2009: 283) describes as “politically savvy” difference makers, intentionally being “in the right place at the right time with the right idea.”

**Perceived Risk of Regulators Intervening in the Status Quo**

**Data Incident from Research Site #4**

*Under the Green Energy Act... We thought that that was our chance to jump on them again, and we put on a little workshop in the spring to try to tell them about it what was required of them [under the law]. P1-S3-O1*

**Data Incident from Research Site #4**

At the time of data collection, the Ontario Provincial Government passed an amendment to the Green Energy Act, known as regulation 397/11, which required that at a future date, public agencies, including municipalities, universities, hospitals and schools, must publicly disclose sustainability initiatives, forecasted reduction of energy consumption, actual results achieved and future sustainability initiatives and targets. In the case of research site #4, this legislation motivated the participation of one of their first key partners.

“[Important public agency] signed on almost immediately, I'd say within six weeks of us reaching out to them, they saw an opportunity, they also knew that mandatory reporting was coming. I'm not sure if you're familiar with 397...” P1-S3-O1

**Data Incident from Research Site #3**

*It [the CSSP] began as a simple paper that designed a concept for a social stock market that was a part of the Government of Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Submission. We wrote that paper, added it to our Poverty Reduction Submission. Then, that was ultimately adopted, by the Province of Ontario, as one of their strategies that they wanted to support. They became a partner in the initiative, at first, as someone that endorsed the concept because it aligned with their mission of reducing poverty in Ontario, and driving social innovation, and now ultimately driving social enterprise and impact investing as of 2013. P7-S5-O5*

**Data Incident from Research Site #6**

Through participant observation I perceived that the creation of the CSSP at research site #6 stemmed from a significant reduction in funding from government agencies. This CSSP manifested itself as an adaption to the new financial realities imposed upon the non-profit sector. At the time of the formation of this CSSP, it was understood that government led funding initiatives favored projects that emphasized a sustainable business plan that included “funds from operations” as the primary source of ongoing
funding after initial startup financing was allocated. Recognizing that this shift in funding was coming, three leaders from similarly-goaled non-profit organizations agreed to partner together to offer organizational development workshops and consulting services to the local non-profit sector. These workshops and consulting services were previously offered separately through each of the three agencies, funded largely by government grants. The three founding partners of the CSSP recognized that Ontario Government funding agencies were favouring initiatives that approached social value creation in new and potentially disruptive ways. Leaders of the nascent, unfunded CSSP prepared a grant application that proposed a “funds from operations” based CSSP to a funding body controlled by the Government of Ontario. The grant application was fully funded from the government agency, and in this case I perceived that it was the explicit recognition by leadership within the CSSP, of the changes occurring in the status quo at the Ontario Government, and the subsequent actions that led to the successful formation of the CSSP at research site #6.
Appendix C – Mobilizing Structures Conceptual Categories, Substantive Codes, Data Sources

Creation of Interorganizational Mobilizing Structures

Creation of network ties between stakeholders

Data Incident from Research Site #2

... you actually put people together and have them working together and that in unto itself, they become people as opposed to symbols, and they're working towards a common goal and they are breaking through, and not every single project comes to a successful resolution, sometimes there is still competing opinions, that can just never be completely aligned, but for the most part we do get there. P1-S2-O1

Data Incident from Research Site #1

I think they're often relationship based. Two that come to mind would be, one idea of having, this is related to organizations work together, but you build relationships usually with a person or a couple of people that become that collaboration. P8-S1-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #4

The person who had originally launched the [...] program, there was a high degree of trust there [with other stakeholder], as well. In terms of the relationship, he had been on one of the working groups during the launch [...], so there's a background relationship there, a high degree of trust established." P5-S1-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #4

Everyone puts lettuce or tofu and feta cheese and we make the salad bar. It sounds really simple, but what we’re doing is we’re using food as a way to bring people together. What happens then is this amazing thing where we all make salads and we all sit together. The opportunities for me to sit with the Salad Club, might not ever present themselves, right? That’s like such subtle intentional programming as a way to animate a community and get people talking to one another. P1-S4-O1

Data Incident from Research Site #1

I think the word is trust right? A trusting relationship will actually allow us to get in, to talk to them, once were in then we can sort of sell it. P13-S1-O9

Creating Relationships with Legitimate First Follower
Data Incident from Research Site #4

... it was when our first building was about half empty that we finally convinced [high profile tenant] to occupy most of the fifth floor, we could see our that we were a place to be. [Small startup] and [established organization] leased an office in addition to their main offices so that they could be part of the action. [High profile tenant] got a deal on rent, but definitely brought in more tenants. P4-S4-O1

Data Incident from Research Site #1

Sometimes you need a key-lead stakeholder, a supportive one, who's involved. Or, periphery ones, so, identifying those. But, you need, at some point, the organizations that have the authority to implement something, or to approve it, or to pull the lever, whatever it is. If you don't have that amongst you, then, you can't get them to the table, it doesn't happen. P1-S1-O1

Data Incident from Research Site #6

Through participant observation during the formation of the CSSP at research site #6, three locally reputable non-profit organizations from adjacent jurisdictions had been working together for several years aiming to find efficiencies by partnering together to offer organizational development (OD) workshops and consulting services to build organizational capacity within the two local non-profit sectors. I was engaged to help “build a value-proposition” for the CSSP through partnerships and I was explicitly asked to bring on a partner with a “big brand” to co-facilitate some OD workshops. The intention here was clear, I was to bring on a well-known, for-profit organization as our first partner to build legitimacy among other potential partners and to foster future collective action.

Data Incident from Research Site #2

In each of these groups that we create we have co-chairs. So we take two people from the outside, not part of our organization and we asked them to be the leaders of the group. It's all about, “who are those people and will other people want to be seen to be towing the line from their perspective?” So in the case of the commercial building initiative we asked to tenants to lead this initiative and they happen to be the senior VPs of real estate and corporate procurement in two of the banks. So they are the largest tenants in Canada, so they are very powerful […] they also happen to be in the market [to] either renegotiating leases [or] were thinking about moving to new spaces. So by having the tenants at the table it meant that the landlords must come to the table, either a landlord was their landlord and they wanted to keep them happy or they wanted to try to get an in, and
networking opportunity with this very high level decision maker and they wanted to be seen to be coming to the table. So those two tenants those two senior people acted as cochairs and they were the ones who would convene these meetings with our support in the background. P1-S2-O1

**Data Incident from Research Sites #1, 3 and 7**

Participant observation at research sites #1 and #3 indicated to me that stakeholder ownership and accountability was an unambiguous priority for the CSSP members. Annual evenings of recognitions were observed where all participants in the CSSP and the broader community including local politicians and media are invited to celebrate the achievements CSSP members related to their carbon footprint reduction. Accountability is an explicit part of this process, where participants are noteworthy by their absence, either from the CSSP itself or from their lack of carbon emission reduction.

**Assigning Ownership and Accountability to Stakeholders**

**Data Incident from Research Site #6**

Through participant observation I was part of the creation of the CSSP at research site #6. The three founding members are non-profit organizations from neighbouring jurisdictions with similar organizational capabilities and little power imbalance. Document review the Memorandum of Understanding and Terms of Reference documents that laid out the financial and in-kind resource contributions of each partner, indicated that the assignment of ownership and accountability of CSSP related tasks fell along functional lines. In this CSSP, these functions included: 1) financial administration and registration, including bookkeeping and document retention, 2) marketing and communication, including website maintenance and copy-writing, 3) curriculum and program development for workshops and consulting services, including follow-up evaluation. Each of the three founding member organizations mutually agreed to take ownership of one of the three broad functional areas and developed “success metrics” which would be reported on at quarterly steering committee meetings. By participating in these quarterly steering committee meetings, I was afforded the opportunity to see that partners respected the delineation between the three main functions and each of the member organizations were able to independently make day-to-day decisions and action in a timely manner.

**Creation of Process-Based Mobilizing Structures**

**Funds-from-operations**

**Data Incident from Research Sites #1-7**
Through document analysis and participant observation, the following can be said about how revenue is generated from the seven research sites:

Research Sites #1, #2, #3, #7 generate revenue from membership fees and fee-for-service initiatives

Research Site #4 generates revenue from rent charged to tenants, issues community bonds

Research Site #5 charges transaction fees

Research Site #6 charges for consulting and training services

**Effective exchange of views**

**Data Incident from Research Site #1**

*Today of the 25 participants [of the external working group], 22 are part of [the CSSP] members and so that was the story - where the guy says let me connect you with my management team, we actually allowed them to have a decision about how the framework operates and then they want to be more part of it. P6-S1-O5*

**Data Incident from Research Site #4**

During participant observation of one of the shared office spaces at research site #4, I was able to map the seating arrangements and office space of the “co-working” member organizations. My observation was that desk and seating arrangements were laid out in such a way as to maximize serendipitous interactions between people working in the space. These serendipitous interactions were not only intended for people who work in the same organization, but also to create interactions between organizations. One interviewee referred to how the co-working space afforded opportunities for “idea sex,” referring to people with different viewpoints coming together to formulate new and innovative ideas.

Kitchens and coffee shops play central roles in the various buildings used by the CSSP in Research Site #4. An example us the use of physical space to effectively exchange views in the kitchen was described previously is the Salad Club. Another way that this is done in the kitchen is the way the oversized counters are laid out; there are multiple sinks where members are encouraged to wash their dishes beside each other, creating more opportunities for serendipitous interactions. Couches are interspersed with desks and there is desk space in the main-floor café in addition to regular café seating. Unlike the external working group used by Research Site #1, the exchange of views between members is not formally facilitated by the CSSP in this case, but instead the boundary conditions for these informal exchanges of views were intentionally created by leadership in the
formation of the CSSP through thoughtful floorplans and furniture selection.

Leverage Sector Strengths

Data Incident from Research Site #5

So we have partnerships with a series of vendors like [business consulting company #1], and [business consulting company #2] and a number of others who provide us with reports which we then offer to our clients at no cost, [ ... ] so that our clients are able to understand basic things like the competitive landscape, the size of the market for the product that I'm in and therefore gauge potential returns, and this is extremely important for potential investors. P5-S5-O5

Data Incident from Research Site #5

We were keen on the idea and believed in the space, and that helped get some financing from the provincial government for the feasibility study. We continued to push it and participate where we could. Show up where we could, and lend expertise where we could.

Naturally, many of the exchange-related issues that they were facing were things that we had the ability to answer in-house, whether it was from legal people, or from listings-related people, or from regulatory people. We were able to contribute quite a bit of thinking to some of the work that they were doing. P2-S5-O2

Data Incident from Research Site #6

During participant observation at research site #6, a for-profit technology company was engaged to offer training services to the non-profit sector related to how their products and services could be used for community benefit, at no cost. This technology partner offers a variety of cloud-based back-office business services including email, calendaring, data warehousing and other essential business functions. These capabilities were in high demand from cash strapped non-profit organizations who were excited about the prospects of retiring their old and fallible computer servers and move to a cloud-based solution. The strengths of the technology partner that were leveraged in this example included: the cloud-based products and services, product and service knowledge, trainers, and a venue for the workshops. Prior to this workshop series, the most highly attended workshops typically drew no more than 30 or 40 attendees, the workshops offered by the CSSP related to the technology partners’ products and services drew almost 150 people from the local non-profit community. The venues used in the past could not accommodate an audience of that size, so the in-kind contribution of
facilities capable of seating that number of attendees was essential for the successful delivery of that workshop series.
Diagnostic Framing Activities

Highlighted the Social/Environmental Issue

Data Incident from Research Site #2

Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where the air is so clean and healthy you can see for miles on hot summer days, where the lake and rivers are clear and beaches are safe for swimming. Imagine a waste management system that captures and puts to use the materials we currently send to landfills. Imagine a [major metropolitan area] where people travel quickly from [one end to the other] – and everywhere in between - on a comprehensive transit system. This is our vision for a [the CSSP] and it is within reach. (From promotional material distributed by the convening organization for Research Site #2)

Data Incident from Research Site #7

From document analysis of content prominently displayed on the convening organization’s website:

[The convening organization of the CSSP] is a new non-profit corporation with a powerful vision for [the city] as the city with the greatest commitment to sustainable development in North America. We envision a world-class city with a vibrant, resilient economy, exceptional quality of life and healthy natural environment.

This vision is shared by sustainability experts and local business and community leaders in [the city] who are supporting and guiding [the CSSP] to make it a reality. (CSSP website from Research Site #7)

Highlighted the Overlap of Stakeholders’ Motivations

Data Incident from Research Site #1

the biggest was our ability to understand the co-benefits, [ ... ] when we met with the environmental planner we actually read this strategy of that community before we had that conversation and we listened to their feedback and integrated that back into what we did. And we spoke to the business person and we presented the business case for their organization, rather than carbon impact, talking to the mayors it was about the reputation to this community, so that goes back to that empathy point, that we were able to understand the needs of who we’re speaking to and how they can benefit from it and how we can all be benefited from this collaborative movement we are looking to create. P6-S1-O5
Data Incident from Research Site #6

From document analysis at research site #6:

A script was created by staff of the CSSP to provide a consistent, accurate and persuasive pitch to encourage the consultants to donate pro-bono consulting hours to local non-profit organizations. Some of the wording used in this script uses diagnostic framing to highlight the overlap of motivations of CSSP stakeholders. The following talking points were copied from the “pitch script” used to engage local organizational development consultants and were coded to relate to this substantive code.

- A thriving community benefit sector provides more consulting opportunities through increased financial capacity and the improved ability to afford business consultants.

- Exposure to pro-bono business consultants breeds more awareness of the value of business consulting in the non-profit sector and may lead to improved business development opportunities.

- Pro-bono consulting engagements offer consultants with increased community exposure and may result in improved business development opportunities.

- Your ability to create an impact in the community is improved by joining a network of likeminded practitioners who likewise want to create real change in the community benefit sector.

(From the “pitch script” document at Research Site #6)

Highlighting Individual Sector Failure

Data Incident from Research Site #1

The fact that the federal government isn't keeping Canada involved in the Kyoto Protocol I don't think has lessened community interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We still see a need, whether or not our federal government recognizes it. We see a lot of the action happening at the local level anyways. We're still motivated by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and by a number of other factors that are part of moving people to action.

P3-S1-O3

Data Incident from Research Site #1

Well then, the silence in the 00's [of the Canadian Federal Government], the Liberals [the Liberal Party of Canada] in the first part of the naughties [2000's] tried to belatedly bring in a plan, bring in voluntary action from the top down, and then the conservatives [the Conservative
Party of Canada] have shown, as we talked about, relatively little interest in this. There is a vacuum of activity on the file most certainly. By implication that means the leadership vacuum. The way the framing of the issue, the way it’s progressed, a recognition that there is a need for this more community-based activity and that it can be beneficial as well for a variety of reasons. [...] you do not have to wait for the lowest common denominator in order to proceed. P12-S1-O8

Prognostic Framing Activities

**Highlighting the Need for Collaboration**

**Data Incident from Research Site #1**

we recognize the [value] of having a diversity of tactics, that is we are all better off. Greenpeace’s work, is that valuable work? Absolutely. It is valuable in the cross-section of collaborative environmental movement and we have got our role to play in there and they have got theirs, and the movement is stronger as a result, and our efforts in the movement our stronger as a result. [...] So first of all is the need for that diversity of tactics secondly it is recognizing that building the need for diversity in the over arching movement and that we each bring different strengths to that movement and it is seeing the value of what we’re doing is to have that bigger impact. P6-S1-O5

**Data Incident from Research Site #3**

Through participant observation at a public event at research site #3:

An important industrial partner in the CSSP at research Site #3 is a landfill company whose core operations negatively affect the local environment. During a participant observation session at a public event, this “advanced member” of the CSSP received accolades for their progress in “lighting and appliance retrofits.” In contrast to the 25,000 tones of greenhouse gas emissions released annually by this partner, these reductions may seem minimal, but the convening organization of the CSSP and other members carefully framed the narrative to celebrate these achievements. Partners are not shamed in the case of them not reaching reduction targets, but instead they are simply not celebrated. Even though an adversarial narrative could be used by those interested in affecting changes in business, the convening organization at Research Site #3 ensures that collaborative framing is the dominant narrative among the CSSP members.

**Data Incident from Research Sites #1-7**

Through document analysis of interview transcripts:
Collaboration was a term that was used frequently in interviews and was often integrated into substantive codes. After conducting a word frequency analysis of all data sources and removing common words that are regular parts of speech, the word “collaboration” was the tenth most common word found in all data sources, with 309 occurrences. While word frequency does not necessarily denote meaningfulness of the term, it at least indicates that it is a common narrative used in speech for those involved in CSSPs.

**Highlighting the transfer of Associational Value**

**Data Incident from Research Site #3**

*We were able to leverage that [new partnership], we went straight to those that we had been talking to before that and it didn't take long before, actually it was a matter of weeks, before [key stakeholder] had written us a cheque, and [another key stakeholder] had verbally committed too.* P1-S3-O1

**Data Incident from Research Site #6**

From document analysis of the “pitch script” used to solicit new Consulting Associate partners at research site #6 the following points are relevant:

- [The CSSP] is only seeking out the most reputable, most widely known organizational development consultants; you will be seen in the community to be a part of this elite group.

- Most of the consultants participating have over 25 years of experience in their field; this group is a tremendous resource from which you can learn new techniques and best practices.

(From the “pitch script,” to solicit participation from Management Consultants. Document from Research Site #6)

**Highlighting the Shared Ownership of the Social/Environmental Issue**

**Data Incident from Research Site #1**

*But anyways, shared leadership, empowerment, and then ownership ultimately, I think, are what lends themselves to the sustainability, I mean sustainability as ongoing, or institutionalization of these things [ ... ] A good example, is sometimes...so the [CSSP led project] here, where we provide a service to members. We can sort of feel which members are taking it as a service and see it as their program versus those...like, we have some that still use language like, "Oh, we're happy to support you." And we smile, "We're supporting you." No, no, no. It's nobody supporting*
anybody. This is your thing. We want you to feel like it's yours. We can feel that shift when they start to take ownership and embed it in their other work. P8-S1-O5
Appendix E – Interview Protocols

Initial Interview Protocol

Working as a research assistant in a SSHRC funded study related to the investigation of institutional entrepreneurship in collaborative, civil-society organizations and their stakeholders, I was able to collect data from Research Sites #1, 2, 3 and 7 that directly related to my research question. The protocol for these interviews included questions related to four broad categories that are indicated below. Not all questions were used in all cases, but all four of the broad topics were always discussed in each interview. Most of these questions were written by Dr Barry Colbert and Dr. Elizabeth Kurucz, leadership related questions were added by me.

Questions related to the Conditions for Collaboration

- What is the organization’s general approach to collaboration with other organizations or across sectors (govt, ngo, academia, business?)
- How is collaboration usually initiated
- What motivates collaboration?
- How do you sense out alignment between your organization and potential collaborators?
- How is the potential for shared goals identified?
- What characteristics do you look for in a potential collaborative partner?
- What role do organizational leaders play in the creating the conditions for collaboration?
Questions Related to the Process for Collaboration

- When collaborating with other sectors how is the problem defined?
- Draw on examples to illustrate
- How are goals developed and refined?
- How do your goals for collaborative efforts connect to your general business goals?
- How are resources (time, money) allocated to collaborative efforts?
- How is it justified?
- What knowledge bases might you draw upon to define the problem and goals?
- Draw on examples (e.g. with SW) to illustrate
- How is the collaborative relationship usually governed or managed?
- What in your mind are some factors that contribute to positive collaboration?
- Are there times when collaboration does not or would not work?
- What kinds of things get in the way?
- Do organizational leaders significantly influence this process? If so, in what way?

Assessment of Outcomes

- How would you determine whether a collaborative effort was successful?
- What are the criteria for success?
- Examples of positive outcomes?
- Have new ways of operating emerged?
Learning for Sustainability

- What have you learned from your experiences in cross-sector collaboration?
- Generally and in specific terms?
- Have you been able to connect your learning back into your core operations?
- Would your learning prompt you to enter into other collaborative ventures?

Finalized Interview Protocol

These three broad questions/discussion points acted as the basis for a 30 to 80 minute interview. They led conversation in the general direction conceptual categories that clearly began to emerge from the data. Note that interviews using this protocol also include a variety of ad-hoc prompting questions that utilized contextual cues to align discussion with these three broad categories of inquiry.

1) Think back to the formation of [the research site CSSP], at that time what do you think was going on in the community that helped it get off the ground?

2) Think back to the formation of [the research site CSSP], at that time what were the key processes, rules, ways of interacting or making decisions that helped stakeholders work together effectively?

3) Think back to the formation of [the research site CSSP], at that time what were the key ways of motivating stakeholders to partner together and how was that done?
## Appendix F – Interview Participant to Research Site Mapping Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Participant</th>
<th>Research Site</th>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Interview Participant Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S1-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P2-S1-O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P3-S1-O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P4-S1-O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P5-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P6-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P7-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P9-S1-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P10-S1-O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P11-S1-O7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P12-S1-O8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>P13-S1-O9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S2-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S3-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P2-S3-O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P3-S3-O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P4-S3-O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P5-S3-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S4-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P3-S4-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P2-S4-O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P4-S4-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P5-S4-O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P6-S4-O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P7-S4-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P8-S4-O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S5-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P2-S5-O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P3-S5-O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P5-S5-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P6-S5-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P7-S5-O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P1-S7-O1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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