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Abstract

The lack of descriptions of 'good for community' collaborations of SMEs and my involvement in various such initiatives has shaped and driven this research. This dissertation aims to explore and describe one such unique case in depth. The collaborative engagement of the SME Boileroom, Guildford is chosen for this purpose. Through the description of this collaboration, this research intends to explore insights regarding the intersection of theories of social capital and collaboration.

The research employs interpretive ethnography, which stems from subjective naturalism. The proposed collaboration was accessed as a volunteer. Participant observations data in the form of meeting notes, reflective descriptions, advertisements, various forms, company documents, email correspondence, photos etc., as well as in-depth semi-structured interviews of three key informants guided this ethnography. Thematic inductive analysis aimed at creating a rich description was utilised to analyse this diverse data.

The narrative that is created from this data sheds light on how such a phenomenon comes to be, the roles undertaken by Boileroom, the way the organisation has engaged with the community and the manner in which it has formed links. Some unique characteristics of this collaboration such as an unstructured approach towards the organising process, a broad overarching goal, down-up distribution of power, high levels of underpinned trust, and an organically developing, informal, and social nature of the initiative were observed. As the current theoretical insights were considered somewhat limited to explicate these characteristics, this research analysed them at length. From this analysis, I propose that the elements of the social capital theory, when linked with the theory of collaborative process, begin to provide us with a suitable foundation for discussing such 'good for community' collaborations. A perspective offered is that many of the unique characteristics observed were the result of a rich, endogenous stock of social capital. A causal conceptualisation of this social capital, which we can observe through a number of network configurations and behavioural features, has been presented.

This research discovered various roles that social capital dimensions facilitated within this collaboration. The structural dimension was observed to have allocated power to participants. The relational dimension allowed for the substitution of social coordination for the formal structure and representation. It also facilitated a level of acceptance in collaboration themes such as the common goals, leadership, and trust. The discovery and description of such roles is the main contribution of this pilot study that has expanded the avenues for PhD research. Exploring further cases of 'good for community' collaborations, to assess the essence of this representation that is offered by the intersection of social capital and collaboration, as well as a detailed investigation of the roles of social capital in such setting has been recommended. The insights from this dissertation can be treated as a first step towards developing a theory of social capital within the collaboration literature.
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1 Aims and objectives
1.1 Background and context:

"Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much" — Helen Keller

Inter-organisational, cross-sector collaborations are increasingly considered significant as a means of tackling major societal issues (Pitz & Intindola, 2015; Bryson et al., 2006; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Huxham, 1996). These complex societal issues such as poverty, environmental sustainability, inequality, social inclusion and others “have ramification for so many aspects of society that they are inherently multi-organisational” (Huxham and Vangen, 2005 pg. 7), and hence, a rationale for collaborating towards the resolution of such issues can be the ‘moral imperative’ (Huxham, 1996). This dissertation intends to explore such specific collaborative efforts, focusing on a very particular phenomenon that is underexplored, and yet, as I intend to argue, has crucial practical and theoretical importance, i.e. inter-organisational collaborations involving small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the UK, formed for the explicit purpose of ‘good for community’ initiatives.

Several authors (Spence and Schmidpeter, 2003; Hallak et al, 2012; Fuller & Tien, 2006; Spence et al, 2003) have identified the potential of SMEs to affect societal issues due to their distinctive positioning within and strong relationships to the local community. Federation of Small Businesses (FSB, 2015) reported that SMEs represent 99.3 per cent of all private sector businesses, accounting for 47.8 per cent of private sector employment and 33.2 per cent of private sector turnover. This speaks not only of their importance as an economic entity but also as an embedded part of social structure with wide reach to the communities. Further, the unique positioning of these businesses (Moyeen & Courvisanos, 2012; Fisher et al, 2009; Bacchus & He, 2014) and their heavy reliance on close reciprocal relationships within the community (Hallak et al, 2012; Westerlund & Svahn, 2008; Fuller & Tien, 2006) tend to suggest a better awareness of and access to the societal issues in the local area. Therefore, it would be pertinent to ask, how are the SMEs getting involved?

There does not seem to be a clear, straightforward answer. One of the reasons is that, typically, the examination of such an involvement, which is under a variety of labels like CSR, Social Responsibility, Responsible entrepreneurship etc., focuses on models previously applied to large firms, and hence, may not always reflect the organisational realities in small organisations (Fraj-Andrés et al, 2012; Fen Tseng et al, 2010). Of the research that does focus specifically on SMEs, one of the key papers is the analysis by Fuller and Tien (2006), who perform content analysis on 144 essay entries of the SMEs to the “best UK small business” competition. They conclude that SME behaviour manifests in various roles all of which are linked social capital dimensions. Another example is Levitt’s (2013), who, through a survey of 1300 SMEs in York and Bradford areas in the UK, suggests that even the smallest of the SMEs in the UK are engaged with their community and respond with the initiatives that support both the business and social communities. Similar to Fuller and Tien (2006), he also identifies a wide number of roles that the SMEs assume and concludes that the involvement is varied. Supporting this, Spence et al (2003) examine key cases of the UK SMEs in three sectors and compare them with SMEs in Germany, and confirm that involvement of SMEs could differ heavily.

Even though the conclusion from the above studies, regarding SME involvement, seems wide-ranging and does not answer the above question directly, two recurring characteristics of relevance can be identified. First, most of these studies focus on the individual efforts of SMEs. While this is an entirely legitimate direction, I suggest that the focus on collaborative effort might be better justified. This is because, as stated in the beginning of this chapter, the societal issues, towards which these
efforts are directed, are complex and inherently multi-organisational. Further, considering the negative implications of small size (Russo & Perrini, 2010; Fisher et al, 2009) and resource poverty of SMEs (Sen and Cowley, 2013), it seems even clearer that the collaborative efforts of SMEs could potentially be more significant than the individual efforts. Consequently, the question previously asked (how are the SMEs getting involved) should be, how are the SMEs getting involved in a collaborative manner? Nevertheless, here, there is a decisive gap in the literature. Levitt (2013; 2015) intends to answer this partially by supporting the idea that the successful examples of responsible activity of small businesses are often linked to active and effective local inter-organisational collaborations in both private and voluntary sector, but suggests that there is a significant lack of research to form a conclusive argument. This dissertation, hence, intends to deal with this particular gap by contributing a rich, in-depth narrative of how a successful example of collaborative effort of a UK SME, aimed at ‘good for community’, takes shape. The purpose of this research is to shed light on this underesearched phenomenon, to describe and to explore. My personal experience of working with small businesses in the past has exposed me to a number of such initiatives and the lack of descriptions of such initiatives in literature is one of the core reasons that have driven this work. Through exploration of one such unique key case, this dissertation will provide in-depth, qualitative insight on the practice, detailing the involvement of SMEs and the process of formation of the collaborative initiative as well as the role(s) that the SME assumes.

To identify such an effort, the definition of collaborations suggested by Himmelman (1996), “exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources and enhancing capacity of another for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose”, because of its explicit description of activities, is considered useful in this study. Although, further contextualisation is necessary to narrow the focus on a specific phenomenon and, to this purpose, this study uses two filtering criteria: 1) only the collaborations involving the SMEs in the UK and 2) common purpose explicitly understood as ‘good for community’. The terminology ‘good for community’ is used to avoid dichotomy between common good and individual good (Stroup et al., 1987; Lewis, 2006; Crosby & Bryson, 2005), as well as to avoid the underlying issues with defining common good (Lewis, 2006; Maclntyre; 1984; Nagel, 2016; Clayton, 2016). Following the recommendation from these authors, in this dissertation a contextual approach is adapted, and hence, the term ‘good for community’ is expressed to mean collective engagement towards a shared societal issue, agreed upon by the participants, which also enhances and forwards the personal interests. Through exploring such a specific collaborative phenomenon, I intend to make the subsequent contributions: The contribution to the practice would be bringing a key example of the efforts of the SME to light, detailing how such initiatives come to be. The theoretical contribution will be highlighting the functions of social capital within this collaborative phenomenon.

This theoretical contribution is linked to the second recurring characteristic identified within the SME related studies mentioned above. While the first recurring characteristic identified within these studies, a focus on the individual organisations, led this research towards a dissimilar and less explored route (focus on collaborative efforts), the second i.e. ‘links to social capital theory’ has paved the way towards a useful framework to study such initiatives. All of the SME related studies referred to above (Fuller and Tien, 2006; Spence and Schmidpeter, 2003; Spence et al, 2003) use the theory of social capital as a construct to build their argument. The justification for this seems to be related to the high levels of embeddedness of SMEs, which refers to the influence of social relationships and norms over the rational economic decision making (Granovetter, 1985). This is
significant in the domain of SMEs, where ‘relationships are everything’ (Fuller and Tien, 2006). When discussed in light of collaborations of these SMEs, which this study intends to do, this is even more relevant.

Simply put, social capital is a positive consequence of sociability (Portes, 1998). A number of authors (Portes, 1998; Macke and Dilly, 2010; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998) identify the two key theoretical models, and by that extension two definitions, which underpin the concept of social capital in the literature. One is led by Bourdieu (1986) who interprets social capital as a potential resource associated within and from networks, focusing on individual acquisition of this resource and impact on power relations, and the other is led by Putnam (1995) who sees it as an attribute of a community that provides impetus to pursue shared objectives. For this dissertation a well-recognised combination of these attributes by Nahapiet & Ghoshal (1998) who arrange these ideas in three dimensions of structural, relational and cognitive (figure 1) is considered suitable. This framework is further elaborated in the review of literature. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998 pg.243) define social capital as “the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationship possessed by an individual or social unit”, which this dissertation has used.

The justification for using the concept of social capital, and further this particular model and definition, as a lens to explore these particular collaborations is threefold. First, one of the reasons for focus on collaborative activities of SMEs is their presumed close relationships and unique positioning to the community. These two factors tie in very strongly with the structural and relational dimensions of social capital theory. Second, the high embeddedness of SMEs discussed above (Fuller and Tien, 2006; Spence and Schmidpeter, 2003; Spence et al, 2003) is equally, if not more, influential in a collaborative effort, and hence, the justification provided by previous studies to use social capital remains a valid ground. Lastly, social capital is considered a useful concept to explain the behavioural aspects of collaborations (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011) and is an under-explored theory in collaboration context (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011; Macke and Dilly, 2010; Sydow, 2005). Thus, using analytical insights from a unique case study narrative, this dissertation intends to theorise about the relationship between social capital and collaboration.

To summarise, the research gap that this work primarily intends to address is the lack of descriptions of examples of collaborative initiatives of SMEs that are aimed at ‘good for community’. This work aims to use the social capital as a lens to observe and describe this collaborative phenomenon, reflecting on suitability of this concept for this purpose, and ultimately, contributing towards our understanding of social capital within collaborations. This MRes dissertation, in its role as a pilot for informing the direction of PhD research, is expected to provide exploratory insights that could link these concepts.

1.2 Research questions and objectives

Within the context of a key collaborative phenomenon that could be identified as ‘good for community’:

How does the SME involved and other organisations engage with one another and the community? How are the links formed? What specific roles does this SME play in this collaboration? How are the various dimensions of social capital evidenced and linked within this collaborative phenomenon?
Research objectives, based on the above questions, are detailed below:

1. To review the literature relevant to the concepts of social capital and collaboration to contextualise it for the purpose of this investigation and identify the insights that could inform empirical work and analysis.

2. To identify and access a key collaborative phenomenon in the UK that is aimed at 'good for community' and involves SME participation.

3. To explore this collaborative phenomenon through the ethnographic method of participant observation in the event and through in-depth interviews with the key informants.

4. To create a narrative based on the inductive analysis of the above data to discover, describe, and discuss the characteristics of the above collaboration and the role of and the links to the dimensions of social capital.

1.3 Case study

The SME Boileroom, located in Guildford, which operates as a live music venue/bar and employs eight members of staff, is at the central focus of this dissertation. The organisation, when not using their venue for live music events, utilises it to facilitate a number of community events. One such initiative, the Boileroom SOUP event, is considered to have created and furthered an informal and social collaborative network of which they have become a part. This collaboration, which is visible through an assumed group identity and continuous joint efforts aimed at 'good for community', is the unit of analysis within this research. A detailed description of the criteria and the process of selection of this particular collaboration have been provided in the methodology. The findings and discussion chapters present a narrative of this collaborative and analyse it to answer the research questions presented above.

1.4 Structure of dissertation:

This dissertation is divided in six chapters. The first chapter has introduced and contextualised the significance and the purpose of this research. In the following chapter, the literature relevant to the concepts of collaboration and social capital is reviewed, discussing the conceptualisation, key theoretical models, and other important aspects. The third chapter elaborates on the interpretive ethnographic methodology utilised within the research. The implementation of the method is considered in some detail as this MRes dissertation, which as a pilot study, is meant to direct the PhD research further. Presentation of findings in the fourth chapter details the findings from the participant observation, reflections, and the interviews in form of a narrative of the collaboration. In the subsequent chapter, i.e. discussion of findings, which would be of prime interest to the reader, the analysis of these findings and links to the theoretical ideas are conveyed. The last chapter summarises the key findings of this dissertation, discusses implications on future research, concluding with the discussion of avenues for expanding this work.
2 Literature Review
2.1 Introduction

As discussed in the first chapter, this dissertation intends to explore an SME’s collaborative engagement that manifests as a ‘good for community’ initiative. Descriptions of such specific phenomena are not fully explored in the academic literature. However, the theoretical ideas that can be a useful basis to observe and describe such initiatives (social capital and collaboration) have been widely written about in a multidisciplinary context. This presents an extremely challenging task, as even though the literature around these ideas is in abundance, the specific insights that could be a useful basis for comprehending such an initiative are patchy, widespread, and tangential. The purpose of this review, hence, is to sieve through this literature 1) to explore these concepts briefly 2) to contextualise them for the purpose of this investigation and 3) to identify key insights through their intersection that may inform the empirical work and analysis.

This review used primary keywords such as ‘social capital’, ‘collaboration’, and ‘SME’ to identify the literature, which was filtered by analysing the relevance to the above stated purpose. Reference trail was used to identify additionally pertinent work. NVivo was used to index and code the literature in a number of parent and child nodes and to classify them as themes. In accordance with the interpretive ethnographic methodology, and the inductive, exploratory approach of this research, the method of analysis was the interpretations attained by the author by categorising and summarising the literature. The review of literature, as well as its selection, was a continuous process, which in its role to inform the empirical work and vice versa, has been continually reshaped until the very end.

This chapter is divided in three parts. The first part will explore the concept of social capital and discuss the typical operationalisation difficulties associated with the use of it. The second part mainly focuses on discussing collaborations, and themes within the collaborative process that could be particularly relevant to this research. The last part looks at the intersection of the two main ideas and highlights gaps. The concluding section brings the key insight of this review together. These insights have helped to shape the empirical work, to aid discussion, and to identify connections between these theoretical concepts.

2.2 Social capital

2.2.1 Exploring the concept

Social capital is one form of the capital, the other two being economic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986), which indicates resources accrued from involvement and participation in a group. Portes (1998) suggests that this rather staple of the notion of ‘benefits of sociability’ has become popular as it is able to characterise non-monetary forms of power and influence and provides an interesting perspective to look at ‘rationality of economic choices’. Multiplicity of potential applications of this concept has led to multiple definitions. Adler and Kwon (2002) review over twenty-one different definitions of social capital, to identify that the main difference between the definitions is whether the focus is on relationship or structure or both. Among the modern theories of social capital, the definition and conceptualisation proposed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) has been widely reviewed (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011; Macke and Dilly, 2010; Fuller and Tien, 2006; Spence and Schmidpeter, 2003; Spence et al, 2003; Adler and Kwon, 2002) and has been utilised as a
starting point in many SME focused studies (Macke and Dilly, 2010; Westerlund and Svahn, 2007; Fuller and Tien, 2006). They propose three dimensions of social capital (figure 1)

### Structural dimension
- network ties
- network configuration
- patterns of linkages
- connectivity
- hierarchy
- appropriability

### Relational dimension
- trust and trustworthiness
- norms and sanctions
- honesty
- identity and identification
- obligations and expectations

### Cognitive dimension
- shared representations
- systems of agreed meanings among parties
- interpretations

Figure 1: Dimensions of Social Capital (adapted from Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998)

The structural dimension of social capital is the overall pattern of connections (impersonal configurations) between actors/organisations. Within SME context the structural dimension could constitute information benefits as ‘who you know’ could determine ‘what you know’ (Fuller and Tien, 2006). The relational dimension concerns elements like trust, norms, obligations, expectations, respect, identity, trustworthiness, and friendliness. Value acquisition from relationships, a recurring idea in SME literature (Hallak et. al., 2012; Westerlund & Svahn, 2007; Fuller & Tien, 2006), has clear links to this dimension. The third dimension of cognition focuses on a shared understanding of ideas through common language, codes, and narratives. This particular framework provides a systematic and incisive approach to the otherwise messy elements of social capital.

#### 2.2.2 Difficulties in using the concept of social capital

Social capital is considered an elusive concept (Durlauf, 2002) and has a number of definitional issues and concerns (Portes, 1998; Fukuyama, 1999; Durlauf, 2002) that make the empirical assessment difficult, and hence, a cautious, vigilant approach has been recommended when theorising while using this concept. This task becomes even more challenging as the social capital transactions are characterised by uncertainty, less transparency, unspecified obligations, and indefinite timeframes (Loury, 1977; Bourdieu, 1996; Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998; Fuller and Tien, 2006; Macke and Dilly, 2011). Durlauf (2002) points out that the core of the definitional issues associated with social capital lies within the mixing of two disparate ideas, i.e. functional conception (predefined norms within the group facilitate cooperation) and causal conception (cooperative behaviour, in turn, leads to a rational expectation of cooperation).

Another main concern, as Fukuyama (1999) puts it, is the absence of consensus on how to assess social capital. This could be explicates by discussing studies that have attempted such an assessment. Work of Abreu and Camarinha-Matos (2011) is an interesting example as they focus on assessing social capital specifically within the collaborative networks. They apply the graph theory and propose a mathematical model to identify the social capital accumulated within collaborative networks. However, their study admits the lack of experimental validation of the model as one of the limitations. In addition, the definition of social capital adopted by their study is linear as it treats
social capital only as an asset. Further, they do not provide a way to determine the ‘level of health’
of relationships making it nearly impossible to measure any of the five elements within the model. In
comparison, the approach by Macke and Dilly (2010) seems slightly better. They use an in-depth,
qualitative content analysis of the text from the focus groups of employees of their case study
company and, by using the three dimensions of social capital (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998), present
a formal structure of network of trust. However, despite the discussion of other dimensions in the
review, this research treats trust as a sole indicator of social capital and assumes a static position of
these network points, which is in clear contrast with the fluid framework that they adopt.

Fukuyama (1999 pg. 1) suggests, “Producing anything like a believable census of a stock of social
capital is a nearly impossible task, since it involves multiplying numbers that are either subjectively
estimated or simply non-existent”. However, to say that its effect cannot be perceived would be
overstating this difficulty. In such a case, a careful consideration of the definitional ambiguities and a
qualitative in-depth analysis in a case by case manner tends to provide us with better intuitive
means, typically manifesting in form of indicators that may help identify and assess (in qualitative
terms) the social capital and its effects (Portes, 1998, Fuller and Tien, 2006).

This section has explored the concept of social capital and identified operationalisation difficulties as
well as possible means to overcome these. As the phenomenon that will be explored using this
concept is collaboration, some key ideas from the collaboration literature are discussed in the next
part.

2.3 Collaboration

2.3.1 Conceptualising collaboration

Exploring and theorising about the social capital within collaboration is the core purpose of this
research and for this reason, reviewing the way the collaborations are conceptualised is essential. A
number of authors see collaborations as a sequential process. The literature, typically aimed at
facilitating practice through this theoretical notion, expands this idea to identify a continuum of
stages, phases, and/or key factors that make this process successful. A notable example could be
setting, direction setting, and implementation and monitoring. Similarly, Edelenbos (2005) identifies
a three-step process that includes preparation, plan development, and decision making, each step
having a range of sub-stages. Various other authors take this route and suggest their own framework
and key factors/steps/stages for a successful collaboration with various levels of empirical support
provided for these claims (Himmelman, 1996; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Scott and Thurston, 1997;
Mattessich et. al., 2001; Pratt et. al., 1999, Bryson et al 2006). It is to be noted that the idea of
complexity of collaborations is not entirely lost in such linear conceptualisations but usually an effort
is made to represent it through a cyclic or emergent nature of the process.

However, the second approach, which views collaboration as a linked, interdependent mesh of
elements, dimensions, or themes, is able to offer a way to conceptualise the interconnectedness and
complexity in a much clearer way. A notable illustration of this approach is produced by Thomson &
Perry (2007; 2006), who build on their previous research (Thomson and Perry, 1998; 2001) and on a
systematic review of the multidisciplinary research on collaborations to propose five non-sequential
dimensions of the collaboration process. They suggest that these five interlinked dimensions, which consist of collaborative governance, administration, organizational autonomy, mutuality, and norms, have to be balanced constantly, with considerable investment of money, time, and effort to reach an equilibrium that will make the collaboration process possible. Similarly, Huxham and Vangen (2005) through detailed research-oriented action research, which is built through a number of cases over fifteen years (Huxham and Vangen 2000; 2004; 2005; Huxham, 1996; Vangen and Huxham, 2003), present a convincingly intricate picture of entangled ideas as 'Themes in Collaboration Practice'. Some of these recurrent, practitioner-generated themes are common aims, membership structure, trust, power, identity, and leadership. Huxham and Vangen (2005) present contradictions between the common-sense notions and realities of practice and provide a valuable insight into the ingrained tensions and complexity within these themes. This themed conceptualisation, due to its approach towards interconnectedness and complexity, seems promising for providing useful insights when exploring and discussing collaborations. A few of these themes, that may be pertinent to the discussion of social capital, have been considered below.

2.3.2 Themes within collaborations

2.3.2.1 Common aims

Achieving a level of clarity and congruence on the goals of collaboration has been typically presented as an essential for collaborations (Huxham, 1996; Grey, 1991; Thomson, 2001; Agranoff and McGuire 2001; Thomson and Perry, 2006; Ansell and Gash, 2007). However, literature has also pointed out a number of difficulties in reaching any such agreement (Agranoff and McGuire 2001; Bryson et al, 2006; Vangen and Huxham, 2011). The notion of 'collaborative advantage' that sets ambitious targets (Huxham, 1996), and draws on diverse organisational expertise and resource for synergy, implies different partners have varied and distinct goals. Thomson and Perry (2006) suggest that congruence may not mean agreement on the best decision but willingness to comply once the decision has been made. Nevertheless, this very notion of being pulled in different directions by different organisation goals (further, various individual/collaborative goals and the varied perceptions and expectations attached to them) suggests a tension between congruence and diversity (Vangen and Huxham, 2011). Typical strategies suggested to deal with this issue include influence, relationship, and objective mapping (Finn, 1996), facilitation (Schuman, 2007; Marcy et al, 2011) and a number of goals mapping/visualising frameworks (Ackermann & Eden, 2011, Vangen and Huxham, 2011). A valuable conclusion seems to be that the tensions in agreement of goals are endemic and the practicality of reaching such agreement should be carefully assessed before making efforts towards it (Vangen and Huxham, 2011).

2.3.2.2 Authority and Power

Power imbalance between stakeholders and the conflicts arising from it are a common issue in collaborations (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Agranoff, 2006; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Himmelman, 1996; Grey, 1991). Researchers typically focus on identifying the sources of this power and achieving a level of understanding/consideration. Agranoff (2006), for example, identified four relatively static elements of power as the champions, political core, technical core, and support staff. On the other hand, Huxham and Vangen (2005; 2004) discuss various 'points of power', either structural, functional or within various micro indicators, that keep continually shifting. Many others have
associated power with individuals through their leadership (Thomson & Perry, 2006), technical or collaborative skills (Himmelman, 1996; Agranoff, 2006) or the relationship skills (Westerlund and Svahn, 2008), which, similarly, could be identified as these points of power. Himmelman (1996) proposes that the collaborations themselves can have the transformational ability to shift the current power balance through empowerment. While exploring the relationship value perspective of SMEs in collaboration, Westerlund and Svahn (2008) suggest that power balance can be managed by individual-level aspects overcoming the organizational-level issues. Crosby & Bryson's (2005) proposal, according to which, for the collaborations within the realm of social problems, a shared-power perspective, where no one is in charge, seems suitable to the current research.

2.3.2.3 Trust

Considerations towards building trust have been recognised widely as a critical component of a successful collaboration (Huxham, 1996; Lane and Bachman, 1998; Thomson, 2001, Tett et al, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Thomson and Perry, 2006; Ansell and Gash, 2007). Research suggests that most often the problems in trust building are associated with the balance of power, managing expectations of the participants and the risk management; the starting point often being that of suspicion (Huxham and Vangen, 2003; 2004; 2005). Thomson and Perry (2006) support the findings of Huxham & Vangen (2005), who suggest that the process of trust building takes inordinate amount of resources, time, and nurturing. Ring and Van De Ven (1994) suggest that this process of trust building is moving away from contingent reciprocity to long-term commitments based on psychological contracts. While a number of frameworks and tools pertaining to management of trust exist, the issues associated with trust-building are multifaceted and a straightforward prescriptive approach is not considered possible. The use of tools for assessing the existing and the required levels of trust, paying continuous attention towards the changes to the structure, goals, and power and capitalising on small wins (Bryson, 1998; Huxham and Vangen, 2005) can be a suitable holistic approach.

2.3.2.4 Structure and representation

Structure, within this context, is meant to suggest the hierarchical map, membership, allocation of responsibilities, defined roles, and other such organizational essentials within a collaboration. Thomson and Perry (2006) identify two of the five dimensions of collaborative process (governance, administration) as structural components. Traditional mechanisms such as a static hierarchy, routine, and standards are less feasible in collaboration as structuring the process for joint decision-making through social coordination is at the core of collaborations (Grey, 1991; Thomson, 2001; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Thomson and Perry; 2006). Further, issues with the ambiguous degree of representation or membership, complex structure of relationships and the shifting nature of all of these factors add to the complexity (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Crosby and Bryson (2005), while considering the domain of social problems, show the interconnectedness of organisations through a similar messy snapshot (Figure 2). Exploring these structures through mind mapping and other diagramming techniques has been suggested as a measure to deal with this inherent complexity.
2.3.2.5 Leadership aspects

Mainstream classical notions of leaderships, due to the complexity and interconnectedness of the collaboration themes and the lack of hierarchical structure, have less to offer in this particular context (Thomson & Perry, 2006; Crosby and Bryson, 2005; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; 2000). While the leadership remains to be seen as a vital component of the process of bringing participants together and steering them on (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Imperial 2005; Lasker and Weiss 2003; Margerum 2002; Murdock et al, 2005) the emergent, shared-power, relational or facilitative leadership is considered a more suitable approach (Crosby and Bryson, 2005). Huxham and Vangen (2000; 2005) suggest that the leadership could be visible through structures and processes as well as the participants and that it requires a delicate balance between a facilitative and a directive role. Crosby and Bryson (2005) support this perspective when they present an image of a connective, quiet and even an invisible leader who sometimes has to use the power and control to make a decision, because even a decentralised structure sometimes needs someone in the centre (Thomson & Perry, 2006). A number of functions/roles that can be performed by the leader have also been suggested by the above-discussed authors; however, mindful of the leaders’ awkward positioning, a contextual description, at times, is considered more valuable than a prescriptive approach.

The discussion of these individual themes, which has a considerable scope to be expanded, is purposefully brief. This review provides a summarised sense of how the literature has addressed these core ideas about collaboration, which could aid empirical work and establish further links between collaboration and social capital. The last part of this review looks at this intersection.
2.4 Role of social capital within the collaborations

Social capital has been recognised as a relevant element within the collaboration literature (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Thomson & Perry, 2006), but needs further elaboration. Abreu and Camarinha-Matos (2011) suggest, “Reaching a better characterization and understanding of the role of social capital in collaborative processes can be an important element for a better understanding of the behavioural aspects in the collaborative networks”. Despite some of the recognised functions of social capital as a facilitator in forming collaborative networks (Svendsen and Laberge, 2005), as a control measure that reshapes behaviour (Tubagus, 2015; Fuller & Tien, 2006) and as one of the possible outcome (Macke and Dilly, 2010; Fuller & Tien, 2006), the concept is merely treated as a small element within the complex myriad of collaborations. Two (mutuality and norms) of the five key collaborative process dimensions proposed by Thomson & Perry (2006) are social capital dimension. Huxham and Vangen (2005) have identified social capital as one of the entangled themes in the ‘Themes in Collaborative Practice’, further elaboration of which has been recommended (Sydow, 2005). Many of the indicators of the social capital dimensions (shown in Figure 1) are visibly connected to these themes.

Surprisingly, while social capital has been discussed as a relevant idea in the above papers, and its links are evident within this discussion, this review was unable to find any research within the collaboration literature that could clearly articulate the specific roles undertaken by social capital. It follows that the descriptions of any phenomenon, which could clarify such roles, and highlight how these two concepts are interlinked needs further exploring.

2.5 Conclusion

This literature review was valuable in exploring some key concepts and providing context. The three dimensional model proposed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) was discussed as a useful starting point to operationalise social capital. However, literature also pointed out typical definitional issues that are associated with the use of social capital. A careful consideration of these ambiguities and a reflective in-depth analysis of conceptualisation provide means to overcome these limitations. In the second part, the themed conceptualisation of collaborations was discussed in some detail. Core ideas discussed within these themes, such as the common aims (complex tangled web, congruence nearly impossible), authority and power (continually shifting points of power that need consideration), trust building (cyclic, time and effort consuming process, capitalising small wins recommended), structure and representation (inherent complexity, ambiguity and dynamic nature, managed through exploration), and leadership aspects (preference to emergent, connective leadership, balance of directive and facilitative role needed) were reviewed in this part. This cursory synthesis has provided a brief yet suitable theoretical base that would aid observation of a ‘good for community’ SME collaborative. Lastly, this review was helpful in identifying a number of areas to which this research could contribute:

1. Need for further deliberation of social capital as a theme within ‘Themes in Collaboration Practice’ (Sydow, 2005), exploring its specific roles.
2. Necessity for better characterisation and understanding of behavioural aspects of collaboration through an improved understanding of social capital (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011).
3. Lack of research that could support the idea that the responsible activity of small businesses is often linked to effective local inter-organisational collaborations (Levitt, 2013).
3 Methodology
This chapter discusses the research methods implemented within this dissertation and the philosophical paradigms that have informed these methods. Using the framework suggested by Crotty (1998), the key methodological elements of this research, i.e. epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and research methods, can be summarised as below.

Subjectivism
Interpretivism/phenomenology
Ethnography
Participant observations and interviews

Figure 3: Proposed methodological framework (adapted from Crotty, 1998)

The following subsections detail the justification for these particular choices in respect to the research aim. First, the methodological paradigm has been considered, followed by the choice of research method. At this point, the implementation details such as the sample selection and the data collection, as well as the method of analysis are discussed. Towards the end, various ethical considerations and limitations associated with the chosen method are detailed.

3.1 Methodological paradigm

The core purpose of this research is to explore, experience, and narrate a phenomenon (the ‘good for community’ collaboration of an SME) to contribute interesting new perspectives to the existing knowledge. This exploratory aim in itself is shaped by my previous experiences and insights that I have obtained from the literature, and hence, is more suitably accommodated by a perspective laden subjectivist standpoint (Cooper and Schindler, 1998; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Further, the concepts that this research intends to refer to for obtaining descriptions, such as the social capital or the collaboration only exist through the interaction of humans and through the meanings that they attribute to them. In view of that, subjective naturalism, in the sense intended by Matza (1969), who sees it as a fusion of elements of the interpretivist epistemology and the constructivist ontology is the closest match to this research. In accordance with this, in this research, it is understood that the people attribute meaning to their behaviour and are the authors of the social world rather than passive objects. Further, the ‘sense making’ of this interactive reality is only possible through the perception of an individual, and hence, needs to be reflective.

3.2 Choice of research method

As discussed above, this research intends to explore, describe and theorise, and, to that purpose qualitative methods are considered suitable over quantitative. Moreover, within the variety of qualitative techniques available, ethnography stands out as the most suitable and obvious choice for this project. This is because, in the given research setting, the phenomenon is of primary importance. It is not the views of participants per se that are important, but also the interactions within them, the process, the behaviour, the symbolism, the cultural aspects etc. In addition, while
the other qualitative methods available would be able to make sense of participant views, they would not offer a holistic picture. A research strategy that allows the researcher to study people ‘in field’ (here in context of collaboration), one that draws on a range of sources and involves interpretation of the meanings, functions, and consequences of human actions and institutional practices (Hammersley, 2007) could be a suitable approach. Ethnography as described by Holloway et al (2010), “description or interpretation of a culture or social group, whose aim is to understand social reality by focusing on everyday behaviour and to provide in-depth study of that culture”, seems an appropriate method for capturing this holistic snapshot. Jaimangal-Jones (2014) suggests that ethnography is appropriate in the event context as it is able to identify rich and complex meanings (Hammersley, 2005; 2007; Oeye et al, 2007) and is also a useful tool for understanding the motivations that link the phenomenon and the participant together (Pearson, 2009; Li, 2008). Considering the support from the above-mentioned authors and the suitability to the purpose of this dissertation, interpretivist ethnography, leading to participant observation and semi structured in-depth interviews, is chosen as the research method.

3.3 Case and sample selection

In order to facilitate the above method, a unique case study approach coupled with judgemental, subjective sampling has been utilised. Unique case study approach is suitable here because “the case is an object of interest in its own right and researcher aims to provide in-depth elucidation of it” (Bryman and Bell, 2011 pg. 54). In accordance with the inductive approach followed throughout this research, the idea for this project was partially driven from my personal experience of working with several SMEs in the ‘good for community’ context. A preliminary review of literature, however, drew specific attention to the two theoretical concepts (collaboration, social capital) that could be utilised for and then expanded through this work. At this stage, I had to strike a delicate balance between following the somewhat restrictive criteria indicated by the literature for identifying the case study and keeping a broad open-minded perspective as the ethnographic approach suggested. To manage this tension, a number of networking events (either relevant to SME networking or ‘good for community’ context) were attended, widening the research access. To discover such events, personal contacts as well as the secondary sources such as the newspapers, charity company websites, and other advertising media were used. This included collecting large amounts of data in the form of participant observation notes, which, at times, have not been directly relevant but were helpful in shaping the research questions further.

Through this network of contacts a number potential events, which could be observed for the MRes dissertation, were identified. The time restrictions, as well as the fluid, unstructured nature of these collaborations were clear obstacles to this process. After much deliberation ‘Boileroom SOUP’, a social crowdfunding event, organised by the SME Boileroom, Guildford, which has developed itself into an informal, social collaboration aimed at ‘good for community’, was chosen as the unique case study. The criteria for selecting ‘Boileroom SOUP’ were the suitability of this event to contribute to the themes that are relevant to this dissertation (collaboration, social capital), access to the event within the timescale of MRes, uniqueness of this collaborative (in terms of its formation and structure) and the recurring and expanding nature of the event (suitability towards a continuous study). It has been reflected upon that these criteria are of a subjective nature and it is argued that my personal judgement, which has been shaped and developed by being involved in various such phenomena, can be termed a useful means to make this selection (Hammersley, 2007). In such case,
the justification for the choice and the vigour within the process should be analysed by looking at
the ability of such data to produce a rich narrative that will potentially expand knowledge
(Hammersley, 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Similarly, the key informants, based on a lengthy
contact within the event setting and their ability ‘to tell something of importance’ (Hammersley,
2007), were purposefully selected.

Once the ‘Boileroom SOUP’ had been finalised as the event, access was negotiated with organisation
representatives as a volunteer. While the ‘open to public’ nature of the event allowed it to be
accessed as a member of the audience, volunteering was considered a better option as it would yield
data that is otherwise internal. Relationships with the key informants have been developed from this
point onwards and are still being maintained and nurtured. All of the relevant data such as the notes
from the meetings, e-mails, informal conversations etc. were written down/stored. Participant
observations were recorded using the field notes and a detailed reflective description was produced
right afterwards (a rule of thumb followed was to write it within 4 hours while the memory is fresh).
Audio recordings of the interviews have been transcribed and the reflective notes detailing the body
language, settings, tone of discussion etc. were stored as associated memos. Publically available
documents about the company, event advertisements, pamphlets, event photos, and various forms
etc. have also been used to supplement the analysis and to triangulate some of the data. These
details have been summarised in the table 1 and 2 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of data</th>
<th>Description of the category</th>
<th>Data generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>- Notes taken for meetings and through attendance as a volunteer</td>
<td>3 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation</td>
<td>- Detailed reflective description of the event using the notes</td>
<td>7 pages of description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents from the</td>
<td>- Event advertisement on the website</td>
<td>6 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event</td>
<td>- Information pamphlet for the volunteers</td>
<td>12 pages - filled forms, ads and speech notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Filled up proposal forms from companies attending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tom’s written pitch, Guildford People to People for the Soup in April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4Acts4Action promotion advertisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company documents</td>
<td>- Companies House information summary</td>
<td>5 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Certificate of incorporation –Boileroom Collective Limited no. 7728767</td>
<td>32 pages of registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Certificate of incorporation –Boileroom Originate CIC no. 9703169</td>
<td>information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Photographs taken at the Soup event</td>
<td>14 photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email correspondence</td>
<td>- e-mail correspondence with Lydia, Toni, Carolyn and Tom for the purposes of negotiating</td>
<td>7 emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to the event, setting up interviews, acquiring documents and others</td>
<td>correspondences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>- Research diary/reflective log throughout the progress of the research</td>
<td>2 documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Notes from meetings and interviews detailing the settings, body language, tone of</td>
<td>8 pages of reflective notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversation and other details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Different forms of data collected (except interviews)
### Key Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informants</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toni Coe</td>
<td>Community Arts Coordinator at the Boileroom: managed the Soup event in June and worked as a volunteer in the previous one. Also, managed the Rock4Refugees event and looks after the Youth Music Programme</td>
<td>30/06/2016</td>
<td>32m 47s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Feaver</td>
<td>Client Service Manager at Guildford Action: looks after the GAF initiative and has been working with the company for 11 years. She represented the company at the SOUP in June and will go back in September to discuss implementation</td>
<td>30/06/2016</td>
<td>43m 50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Doughty</td>
<td>Member of Guildford People for People: part of the core team of volunteers who pitched and won the funding at the Soup event in April for the Rock4Refugees. He came back and spoke about it in the Soup event in June.</td>
<td>12/07/2016</td>
<td>42m 57s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Details of the interviews

The preference to the anonymity of the participants/organisations was discussed during the interviews. Explicit consent has been taken to use the real names of the people and the companies involved. Ethical implications and the potential risks of not anonymising the data were further deliberated through discussions with the supervisors. However, as the case study is very specific, it is nearly impossible to avoid identification, and the risks associated with identification are considered very low.

#### 3.4 Analysing the data

The iterative, continuous process of making sense of this diverse data, as Hammersley (2007 pg. 93) correctly points out “(analysis) begins at the moment a fieldworker selects a problem to study and ends with the last word in the report”, was probably the most challenging aspect of this ethnographic research. NVivo was used to index, code and classify this data in one place. This was a particularly useful tool to identify patterns in the form of various nodes, which were obtained through reading the data as well as the literature repetitively. These NVivo nodes, which were generated from primary data, such as ‘making connections’ (12 sources 22 references), ‘authority indicator’ (17 sources, 22 references), effects of social capital (10 sources, 14 references), and many other were categorised in a number of themes. These themes were further modified, as necessary, after the review of additional data and the discussions with the supervisors. The purpose of this categorisation was to aid ‘making sense of the story’. Hand drawn mind mapping was regularly used to visualise the links within the collaboration as well as within the various nodes and themes. This process of analysis was reflected upon and was repeated a few times before the ‘crystallisation’ (Hammersley, 2007) effectively happened, when ‘everything started falling into place’. As this research aims at describing and exploring, these nodes and themes, as well as the data in its original form were used as a supporting means to develop the narrative that is presented in the next chapter. After the write up, the data and the literature was reviewed once again to confirm the representation, identify quotes and further support that should be used as it is. The narrative, thus, has been informed by and at the same time triangulated by the data and the process of analysis. The theoretical arguments that generate from the narrative have been subjected to a detailed analysis, discussion, and refinement through this iterative process, but should still be treated as a maturing insight.
3.5 Ethical considerations

Authors discussing a wide variety of ethnographic work agree that it is not without a considerable level of methodological and ethical issues. A detailed ethics proposal that discussed the below issues and implementation was submitted to Open University Ethics Committee (HREC ref. 2198) and has been approved. A few of these ideas are briefly considered here. Most widely discussed issues in ethnography are managing the participant's reactivity (Hammersley, 2005; Pearson, 2009), position of the researcher in the observer/participant spectrum, leading either to bias (Jaimangal-Jones, 2014; McCurdy and Uldam, 2013; Feldman, 2011) or distortion of research field (Pearson, 2009; Oeye et al, 2007; Hammersley, 2005), managing social desirability bias (Pearson, 2009) and the narrow criterion in the existing ethical guidelines (Pearson, 2009; Oeye et al, 2007). This section addresses issues most pertinent to this research, detailing the measures taken towards their resolution.

3.5.1 Participant reactivity

The notion of naturalist research, from which ethnography as a concept has emerged raises some issues regarding informed consent (Hammersley, 1995; 2005; 2007), as being aware of the role of the researcher affects participant reactivity, the so-called observer's paradox (Oeye et al, 2007; Jaimangal-Jones, 2014). In this research, the key informants were informed and a personalised consent for interviewing and recording was obtained. It is acknowledged that there is a possibility that this informed consent changed their natural reactions while being observed and somewhat distorted the research field, however, this was deemed ethically essential. Many authors agree that communication, based on the comfort and the trust level of the research subjects, is a key element in managing this ethical dilemma (Jaimangal-Jones, 2014; Holloway et al, 2010; Oliver and Eales, 2008; Li, 2008). Based on that, the research information was conveyed in a conversational manner as the encounters with informants became more engaging, natural, and frequent. Further, reflections of the possible impact to the research field are used as another rich source of data to juxtapose these narratives.

3.5.2 Position on the observation/participation spectrum

The level of immersion of the researcher affects and shapes the research that is being carried out. Whether the researcher behaves as a participant or a researcher, and how this affects the research field is at the centre of this argument (Holloway et al, 2010; Jaimangal-Jones, 2014). McCurdy and Uldam (2013) suggest that the positioning is a fluid process and cannot be controlled, but the dilemma can be solved by clarifying position in each of these situations. Polymorphous engagement suggested by Jaimangal-Jones (2014), which includes socialising with and observing the key informants before and after the events, is a useful tactic that was utilised within this research. In addition, a reflective research log is also recommended to achieve clarity of the researcher's own position (Holloway et al, 2010; Hammersley, 2005; Jaimangal-Jones, 2014). Accordingly, I have kept a reflective journal in form of a research diary and used it to contrast the narratives from various positions.
3.5.3 **Researcher as research instrument**

Various authors, notably advocates of positivism, have expressed perennial anxiety with the use of the researcher as a research instrument, which is commonplace in an ethnographic research (Hammersley, 2005; Holloway et al, 2010; Jaimangal-Jones, 2014). It is also worth considering that features such as gender, age, physical characteristics, ethnicity affect the participant’s reactivity (Li, 2008) and can create tense situations in the research (Oliver and Eales, 2008). This research has been carried out in a diverse community with ethnic variety and the ‘ascribed characteristics’ (Hammersley, 2007) mentioned above, which cannot be managed, have played a role in the nature of the data gathered. My own cultural background, values, and beliefs have shaped this research and, while helpful in some situations where there are similarities, they proved to be a barrier in others. I have followed the guidance from Li (2008) who suggests that a conscious understanding of these issues and a critical and reflective account of these situations make the narrative richer and interesting, rather than considering it limited due to these unmanageable attributes.

3.6 **Validity and reliability**

Typical research design criteria of validity such as the measurement, internal, external, or ecological validity, or the other considerations such as the generalisation and replicability are not appropriate for discussion in a unique case study research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Similar to Fuller and Tien (2006), who through the study of narratives of SMEs claim that they were able to generate concepts and give meaning to the abstract propositions, this study is also seeking theoretical and analytical generalisation rather than statistical. The central issue of concern then becomes the quality of this theoretical reasoning (Hammersley, 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). The following questions (Bryman and Bell, 2011 pg. 56) are considered a key guideline for measuring the validity within this research:

- How well do the data support the theoretical arguments that are generated?
- Is the theoretical analysis incisive?
- Are the connections between the various conceptual ideas clearly demonstrated?

The arguments generated in the findings and the discussion sections were reflectively assessed using these questions to confirm and demonstrate the validity and rigour of this research.

3.7 **Limitations**

As with any research, this research, due to the choices for its design and implementation, is subject to a number of practical and theoretical limitations. The particularly important practical limitations to be mentioned here are the low visibility of such collaborative, ‘good for community’ initiatives that affected the access efforts, the postponement of an event that was initially considered, and hence, accessed as a suitable case study (considerably affecting the originally proposed schedule) and the constraints on the timescale for the MRes project. Some of the theoretical limitations have already been discussed in the ethical considerations and validity. It is useful to reiterate that an exploratory research such as this is more useful for raising questions than answering them. Specifically, the success of this research is to be measured within its limited means as a pilot study that would inform the direction of the PhD research.
4 Presentation of Findings
The findings of this research will be presented in this section. The synthesis of the information gathered from the participant observations, documents, interviews etc. and its analysis has informed the below presented narrative of collaboration. This section merely intends to ‘tell the story’ and these findings will be discussed and analysed in detail in the subsequent chapter. The first subsection describes the event Boileroom SOUP. Afterwards, two specific instances developed from SOUP, in the form of Boileroom’s relationships with ‘Guildford People to People’ and ‘Guildford Action for Families’ have been detailed to give a sense of how this ‘good for community’ initiative has developed. The concluding section of this chapter will bring together the key distinguishing characteristics of this phenomenon.

4.1 Boileroom SOUP

This social initiative, in the form of a crowdfunding event that is organised and run by Boileroom, is based on a concept that was originated in Detroit, USA. For this event, Boileroom works with a number of community organisations, charities and other companies who have ideas for improving the local community. Prior to the event, the individuals representing these organisations submit a small written proposal form (3 pages - easy to answer questions). From these submissions, for each event, 3-4 ideas are chosen to be pitched to the audience. At times, the Boileroom representatives work with these companies for shaping/modifying these ideas further (as was the case for Rock4Refugees event, detailed later). These organisations are given four minutes to pitch the idea and then the audience is given a chance to ask questions. Additionally, within the event, four volunteers, who are in-charge of bringing some homemade soup, are also given a chance to talk to the audience for one minute each. Typically, these volunteers are from within the organisers, friends of friends, or at times, other small companies who may wish to promote their own businesses. Boileroom also works with local, start-up musicians/bands that get to perform at these SOUP events to showcase their work. People attending the event are charged a fee of £5 each and, in return, they get a chance to enjoy two live music performances, get to vote on a community project and get some delicious homemade soup and bread. The bar is also open and people can buy drinks while watching the performances. All of the money that is raised from the event is given to the organisation that gets the highest votes for their community project pitch. The whole event typically lasts for about 3-4 hours and presents all the participants with a lot of networking opportunities.

One of the goals of Boileroom is to get this initiative replicated within the nearby areas. Toni, one of the representatives, who was interviewed, informed that the central idea is called ‘Surrey SOUP’ under which currently two SOUP events are taking place i.e. the Boileroom SOUP and the Bellfield SOUP (this is carried out by an organisation called Joining In, which has had support from Boileroom to set it up). They intend to expand this initiative further in Surrey and then to the other parts of the UK. It has been observed that, through this SOUP event, the relationships that the Boileroom develops with these companies are more complex than just being a sponsor for the funding. In this dissertation, I present the idea that these relationships have taken the form of an informal and organically developing social collaboration that is aimed at the goal of ‘good for community’.

Two specific instances are discussed in the following sections: 1) Rock4Refugees, which was an event organised by ‘Guildford People to People’ that used the funding from SOUP in April 2016, 2) the relationship that has been developed between Boileroom and Guildford Action for Families (GAF), which won the funding for SOUP in June 2016. The description of these instances shall serve to
denote how this informal, social collaboration has been developing, and outline the specific roles that Boileroom plays within this initiative.

4.2 Boileroom and ‘Guildford People to People’: The Rock4Refugees event

Guildford People to People (GP2P) is a non-political, grassroots, community organisation supplying humanitarian aid to refugees in Calais, Dunkirk and across Europe. They are non-registered but simply operate as a spontaneous network of like-minded people that care about a social cause. Christina Manning started this initiative with clothing collections and then set up a Facebook group, which has now developed into a large network of 1500+ people. Since their inception last year, they have done a number of collection days, carried out regular aid distribution trips, donated food and other items and have organised events such as the RefuTea and Rock4Refugees. Through these efforts, GP2P have managed to raise funds of over £7000; yet, the organisation has no formal structure or constitution or plans to form one. Rather GP2P are taking conscious effort to involve more people and advice them that it is a ‘community owned’ initiative. Tom, the representative interviewed, described the reasons for this unstructured approach to be the attitude of Governments towards the refugee problem (which inevitably leads to resistance to the formally recognised organisations) and the flexibility that this lack of structure offers.

"We can move effectively to respond to this flexible issue as and when it happens"

Initially GP2P got in touch with Boileroom for the Rock4Refugees, and then developed the relationship further through the SOUP event in April 2016. ‘Rock4Refugees’ was developed when one of the members of GP2P came up with the idea to hold a one-day event fundraiser that would involve 8-10 performances from local bands complimented by various stalls (food and entertainment). The meeting to discuss how this idea can be realised was held in Boileroom, in which, the Boileroom representative, Lydia, took part to shape the idea further. She suggested that GP2P pitch at the SOUP event for securing the funding to help towards ‘Rock4Refugees’. Boileroom contributed in a number of different ways to develop this collaborative relationship further. Through the SOUP event, they provided the GP2P a platform to talk to a wide audience and gave them the chance to secure further funding. At the SOUP event, GP2P also managed to acquire three volunteers who offered their help at Rock4Refugees. As the members of GP2P did not have the necessary skills to organise an event of this scale, these two organisations worked very closely together to manage the Rock4Refugees. On the day itself, Boileroom provided GP2P with free use of the venue, music equipment, advice on the logistics and the timings, security for the day and gave substantial input throughout that shaped this event. GP2P were able to raise over £3000 through Rock4Refugees alone.

In return, Boileroom also benefitted from this event. Toni, when speaking about the benefits of the SOUP event, points out

"It's only gotten easier as I made contacts and started working with people more, and, through collaborating with people in charity events, often paid work comes through in the end anyways. So it is generating income and good karma."

Despite providing the venue and some of the other aspects free, Rock4Refugees was a commercial event for Boileroom, and was able to generate income for the paid staff. Besides, it was an event
that attracted nearly 280 people (venue capacity is 300), made a lot of good noise about the company and created goodwill. Many other local organisations, some for similar reasons, also contributed to the event. Tom took initiative in forwarding a detailed list of the companies (see Table 3) that have helped GP2P for these events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Contribution towards Rock4Refugees and GP2P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendalls Hire</td>
<td>Provided discounted van hire to carry the donations to Calais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaneFM</td>
<td>Local community non-profit radio station - provided lots of publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Radio</td>
<td>Commercial radio station - provided publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopmove</td>
<td>Removal firm which has given loads of boxes for collecting donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Borough Council</td>
<td>Allowed use of their building for clothing collections days and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Toy Box, Godalming</td>
<td>Offered a giant train set for children to play on at the Rock4Refugees and another (slightly smaller) one as a raffle prize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glitter Aid</td>
<td>Set up a face painting stall, proceeds donated to charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Sports Centre</td>
<td>Agreed to auction 3 swimming lessons and an ice skating session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anvertons</td>
<td>Local music shop that provided sound equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Live</td>
<td>Live venue in Guildford which provided 2 event tickets as a raffle prize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Scooters</td>
<td>Donated 250 rucksacks; each of these was filled with a complete outfit plus toiletries by pupils at a local school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: List of companies that have helped Guildford People to People

He goes on to say “There are, of course, many other organisations who have helped us - too many to mention ...” One of the most interesting aspects of this is that these relationships, which primarily developed through these events, such as the SOUP and the Rock4Refugees, are not sporadic but are still being built further. GP2P went back to the SOUP event in June 2016 to speak to the audience regarding how the funds from the last event were utilised. They held another event to thank these organisations (many of whom are SMEs) and the volunteers and managed to raise another £500 from that event. Tom took part in the "What's your activism", which is a discussion series run by Boileroom to raise awareness of the social issues. Further, GP2P, in collaboration with Boileroom and The Gallery Cafe, have organised a film screening in September that consists of a photo exhibition and display of the written journal of a photographer describing his life in the refugee camp. This event also coincides with Boileroom's birthday and the funds are being raised for three different campaign organisations. In addition, GP2P have already booked Boileroom as the venue for another Rock4Refugees event in April 2017. A number of companies mentioned above will be coming back to set up the stalls or contribute in the manner that they previously did.

It is also interesting to note that some of the companies that have been mentioned in the above table also come up in the discussion with Boileroom. Toni spoke about the companies that Boileroom works with on a day-to-day basis and that included G-Live, Guildford Borough Council, Eagle Radio and a few more. They typically collaborate with these companies to keep up with the industry and for facilitating the Youth Music Programme. Therefore, these events (SOUP and Rock4refugees) were not only able to strengthen the bond between the key participants but were also able to create many connections that are being used in a wider context.
4.3 Boileroom and Guildford Action for families (GAF)

Guildford Action for Families, located right across the road from Boileroom, is a registered family support group that has been working for the past 20 years in Surrey. They primarily work to reduce isolation, improve mental health, and allow children and parents to form friendships away from the playground. A lot of this support work is made possible through collaborating with a wide network of service providers. Carolyn, the client service manager at GAF, spoke about working with the organisations, such as Citizens Advice Bureau, Christians against Poverty and a number of other companies that provide help and advice on housing, finance, or mental health. GAF does a lot of ‘signposting’, i.e. they connect the disadvantaged people with the potential service providers. However, their primary role is providing many of these services themselves and creating a ‘safe space’ for people and families to meet each other, make friends, converse and be healthy. While their relationship with Boileroom goes back a few years, Carolyn only started collaborating with Boileroom a year ago. This involved getting to know Dom and Toni from Boileroom on a personal level, organising small events (vintage fairs, bazaars) with them and keeping them informed of GAFs’ initiatives. As this multifaceted working relationship slowly developed, other entities that these two organisations work with, such as the service providers mentioned above, musicians/bands, event organisers, small businesses, and other charities have become entangled in these initiatives. Through promoting such endeavours further, Boileroom and GAF have taken an active role in supporting one another.

One key aspect of the relationship to consider is the resources in the form of funding that are made available to GAF through Boileroom. On a number of occasions, when an event organiser wants to undertake a performance that will also raise some money for a good cause, Boileroom has recommended GAF as their charity of choice (E.g., 4acts4action raised £600). At times, depending on the scale of the event, this kind of help is provided without GAF even being actively aware. In August, Boileroom held a ‘Comedy Club’ and raised £70 for GAF, who were not even aware that this was taking place. Similar to the case of GP2P, the idea to pitch for funds at the SOUP event was suggested by a Boileroom representative. This event raised another £200 that was used to take the disadvantaged families for a small summer outing at the Birdworld.

However, besides the funding, there is a lot of information, activity, and skills sharing that have made work easier for both the companies. Vintage fairs and other festivals that are organised by Boileroom, always have a contribution from GAF. They set up stalls to auction miscellaneous stuff (which they typically acquire through donation from other companies) or hold some performance that would entertain kids. These events facilitate contacts. Through the SOUP, Carolyn was able to make contact with a recruiter from the Department of Work and Pensions and secured a job for one of her clients. She also talked about a family, which has a son who was rather skilled at lighting arrangements etc., but has some mental health and sociability issues. Toni from Boileroom was able to get him to work for an event. This provided some free skilled labour to Boileroom, gave the kid a lot of confidence, and, in the end, helped GAF.

An unwritten social contract between these companies that is based on reciprocity and aimed at the idea of ‘good for community’ is visible through these examples. When a legal high shop was operational nearby, some of the clients who come to GAF premises, specifically the ones with drug abuse issues were creating nuisance to nearby residents. GAF worked with the Waitrose staff (also
located in the same vicinity) to monitor and control this situation, which helped Boileroom. Boileroom has offered the clients of GAF to use their premises and garden for free, and at times, Boileroom does end up getting some business from them. Carolyn has actively offered to help people who pitch at SOUP events for a cause. What was observed during participation, and triangulated in the discussions and the interviews, is that these organisations consider themselves to be part of a group, and have almost created a group identity. This group, while unnamed and informal, works together towards a number of social issues, typically the ones that are relevant for their local community. Moreover, while there is no formal structure to this work, Boileroom, through their active interest in organising events that facilitate this work, act like the core. Carolyn, when speaking about the perception in the community regarding Boileroom said

“\textit{The Boileroom are a lot like the heart of the community in a way, and people know that, so people that are wanting to raise funds or do something good go to them [...] So it’s quite good building those connections as well. It’s just that little fling through the Bolleroom. So as I said it’s like they are the heart with so many strands of connections...}”

4.4 Characteristics of this collaborative

Some distinguishing characteristics of this ‘good for community’ collaboration can be identified from this narrative. An important recurring theme is the informal, unstructured approach towards the organisation of this collaborative. This is evidenced by the fluid, flexible nature of the events that are organised together, conscious choices regarding non-registration of GP2P, non-standardised membership within the collaboration and the open nature of the collaboration as well as the voluntary participation. Even the goals of the initiative keep constantly changing to adapt to unforeseen circumstances.

“When we had the Rock for refugees, we held back on stating the cause that we were appealing for the money for the first month, because everything changes.”

“We are reviewing the initiative every 6 weeks, adapting and making changes as needed.”

However, it is important to note that what keeps these organisations together and binds them within the group identity is the broad, vague ideal of ‘good for community’. The widespread acceptance and the low effort in the negotiation of this goal seem to be related to its ambiguous nature. This vague nature is, perhaps, more acceptable to the participants. Another unique characteristic is the unusual down-up distribution of power and authority. As stated by Tom, these initiatives are meant to be ‘community led’ and ‘owned by people’. People who came up with a certain idea were put in-charge of seeing it come to fruition. Further, participation is voluntary and roles are arbitrary and unassigned.

“(Within the event) nobody actually instructed us to do anything. So we tried to take initiative and get food area as organised as possible.”

“And really, what we were saying was that we are a community organisation, we want to pass ownership over to everyone.”

However, detailed scrutiny shows that the power could be demonstrated to be associated with some people more than others. This is either by the virtue of their wide network of social
connections, their specific skills or through their self-assumed responsibility within the setting. Within this collaboration, these were identified as people who were passionate about a cause (and this passion was quite contagious), who took conscious efforts to build a rich stock of social capital (either in form of a wide network or through the relational dimension) and, once the process of working together had began, mindfully took a passive role, so that the others can become more engaged. These hidden champions showed considerable emergent leadership in running the show.

"...because you need someone who really understands the structure of the evening, you know, so that it has at least some structure" 

Some of the power influence came from the external environment. For example, it was the Mayor of Guildford’s recommendation that acted as a catalyst to an already brewing idea within Boileroom to start the SOUP event. Tom spoke about how his mother, who was a former MP, advised and helped GP2P deal with political obstacles or opportunities ‘delicately’. In addition, the resistance of the Greek and the French Government to allow official charities to work with refugees was what led to a grassroots organisational structure of GP2P. The immigration backlash after the Brexit was also mentioned as one of the challenges for their activities. Another characteristic, which is closely related to the idea of this power distribution, is the relaxed, natural ‘feel’ of the events. When speaking about the SOUP event, Carolyn said

"What I loved about it is that they don’t encourage you to take PowerPoint or that sort of thing. It’s simple, friendly. Coz I do get struck on nerves a bit when I do the talks and such and I just felt in my comfort zone really, and I think everybody did. And that’s just what’s nice about it."

Similar to the discussion of the veiled power within leadership above, where these champions assume a mindful passive role, this natural feel is also a conscious choice rather than something that just happened, as Toni explains.

"No, I think it is deliberately done informal really. It has to be something that’s very comfortable for everyone to become a part of and you know not strict you know, not strict with the timings, just purposefully relaxed..."

Besides these unique characteristics, the benefits from this collaborative are important to describe, as they are closely linked to the ideas of ‘social capital’ and ‘good for community’. If we take the example of the Rock4 Refugees event, besides the benefits to refugees, the event was also able to encourage local artists and bands, provide paid work and publicity for Boileroom, train the members of GP2P to organise a large scale event, able to create the opportunity for small organisations to showcase their work, and fill a small void in the calendar for a community event in Guildford. Moreover, as Tom puts it, the end user (attendees and participants) satisfaction of such events as well as the resources raised from them is much higher than the other endeavours (e.g. clothing collections). He proposes that this is ultimately the result of collaborating.

However, this collaboration, because of its informal, unstructured approach is perhaps only useful in tackling these social issues on a superficial, reactionary level. While the findings showed that many of the issues were influenced by the external or political environment, participants of the collaborative (and the organisations) took conscious effort to distance themselves from the
government, implying that they were non-political. This is not to say that their efforts are any less
important than the other means to address such issues, but that due to this seemingly distant
engagement the usefulness of the initiative is limited at a certain level.

Although, in terms of positive impact, a recurring idea that is visible throughout, and which can be
termed a core benefit of these initiatives is ‘making connections’. Toni spoke about how she spent
the first six months of her job to systematically create and grow a network of contacts by
volunteering and attending the community events. Tom has been able to create a social network of
300+ people through these endeavours. He also made many close friends from diverse backgrounds
with whom he socialises on a daily basis.

“The people that we have organised the Rock 4 Refugees with, you know, that group of 6
people, we have become firm friends. We’ve had a few nights in the pub; we just had a big barbecue
couple of weeks back. And then one of us had his birthday last month and then we all went out for
that. We are all quite close now.”

It is observed that this networking as well as socialising makes the furthering of this initiative easier
and it is undertaken as conscious, methodical effort. During the interviews, the key informants
agreed on this. These hidden champions showed particular interest, and systematic effort,
sometimes at the cost of work-life balance, to develop their social network.

“Even when I’m tired and want to go home and I don’t want to talk to anyone anymore, I still
meet a new person and would end exchanging numbers or have another cup of coffee. But it’s great.
It’s just that I think to do this kind of work you have to be on form all the time.”

To conclude, this ‘good for community’ SME collaboration, developed through the SOUP or the
Rock4Refugees, can be said to show some unique characteristics. These include informal,
unstructured approach to organising, preference towards working together for a vague, broad goal,
a relaxed, natural feel of the whole initiative, a down-up distribution of the authority and power on
surface that is supplemented underneath by hidden champions who show connective emergent
leadership skills and possess a rich stock of social capital. The benefits created by this collaboration
are multi-layered but it is important to note that they show definite indication of increasing the
current stock of social capital and seem to be able to aid the development and function of these
initiatives in a number of ways. To end with, the whole essence of such initiatives can be captured in
the below words by Toni,

“And it’s just great to work in partnerships. I mean, there is literally no downside to
collaborating with people. We make more friends; we socialise and we do something productive. As I
said, there’s absolutely no downside.”
5 Analysis and Discussion
This chapter, which presents the core arguments within this dissertation, builds on the findings and analyses them to obtain further insights. This discussion, while only pertinent to the specific phenomenon observed, is able to raise some ideas that may be useful to expand the current knowledge on social capital and collaboration and, in the least, offers some interesting directions for potential future research in this area.

5.1 Understanding uniqueness of ‘good for community’ collaborations

The first three research questions raised within this research, which were mainly driven by the lack of description of ‘good for community’ collaborations of SMEs, could only be answered descriptively. To this purpose, the narrative presented in the previous chapter has shed light on the way Boileroom has engaged with the community, the roles undertaken by it and the manner in which the organisation has formed links. This chapter is particularly concerned with the answer to the last research question ‘how are the various dimensions of social capital evidenced and linked within this collaborative phenomenon?’ However, as it became evident during the progress of this emergent research process, before tackling this question or attempting to identify links between social capital and collaboration, another key question needed to be addressed, ‘How clearly can the current theories on collaboration accommodate the characteristics of this particular ‘good for community’ collaboration?’ This clarification was necessary because this particular collaboration is more distinct than the cases previously discussed in the literature. This distinctiveness is considered below.

For the sake of an argument, a critical stance against conceptualising the above-narrated initiative as a collaboration could be assumed. While the events, the specific points of interest, are named, the collaborative phenomenon, which seems to extend beyond the events and is mainly indicative through the group identity, relationships, and interaction, does not have a formal name. There is no written contract or a formal documentation for this collaboration. The roles, regulations or the objectives have not been detailed. One of the organisations, GP2P, does not even have a constitution. Further, there is no defined timescale for working together. In most instances, participation is voluntary and the goal for collaborating is a broad, vague idea. Therefore, it would be prudent to ask, is this a collaboration at all?

Yes, it is. As discussed in the first chapter, to identify collaborations within this research, the definition by Himmelman (1996), “exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources, and enhancing capacity of another for mutual benefit to achieve a common purpose”, has been used for its explicit description of activities. The example of Rock4Refugees can be analysed to verify if it fits these criteria. For Rock4Refugees, Boileroom and GP2P scheduled discussions, shared information and resources (premises, time, and the labour), and organised activities together. Moreover, through the task of organising a large-scale event, the participating organisations exchanged valuable skills and increased each other’s capacity. Both the organisations were able to benefit individually and, at the same time, the mutual purpose of ‘good for community’ was achieved. In addition, and most importantly, this interaction is repetitive and developing. These organisations, having developed a sense of working together and having achieved a small win, are coming back

---

1 How does the SME involved and other organisations engage with one another and the community? How are the links formed? What specific roles does this SME play in this collaboration?
together continually to collaborate in different manners. They are involving other organisations and intend to undertake more of such initiatives, which makes this phenomenon truly collaborative.

Yet, as mentioned above, this narrative does tell an uncommon story. The collaborative example of 'The Alliance for Social Inclusion', considered by Huxham and Vangen (2005 pg. 13), can be contrasted against this to explore this uniqueness. This particular example tells the story of a collaboration with a formal membership structure, which has survived for over 12 years, where the core organisation, working relatively independently, operates for the members as well as with them. While they speak of a number of changes to the membership, structure, goals, and the role of the organisation, a long-term collaboration, such as this one, typically leads to a contractual phase where some structuring, goal negotiation, agreement (to an extent), and a level of formalisation can take place. On the other hand, initiatives like Boileroom SOUP or Rock4Refugee are social and informal collaborations that are spontaneous, organically developing, flexible, and relatively short-lived. A broad overarching goal that is combined with an unstructured, continually shifting approach fits the purpose of these ventures better. If we were to consider a spectrum of 'the fluidity of the structure' of collaborations, these two examples, by the virtue of their very different characteristic, would likely be on the opposite ends.

It could be argued that, while both of these are termed collaborations, as this research uses an explicit description of activities (Himmelman, 1996) as a base for defining collaborations, the comparison is not like for like. The theory of collaborative advantage (Huxham and Vangen, 2005), from where a lot of theoretical insights for observing collaborations have been obtained, was developed through collaborations like 'The Alliance for Social Inclusion' rather than the social informal ones that are characterised by voluntary participation and an unstructured, informal approach. In this research, the comparison between the two is performed with a conscious awareness of this difference, and is specifically helpful in identifying the characteristics that are inconsistent with the typical theoretical descriptions of collaboration. A detailed analysis of the characteristics of this 'good for community' collaboration against the insights previously gathered from the literature has been presented in Table 4. It would be useful for the reader to refer to this table at this point as this analysis forms the basis of the rest of the discussion.

5.2 Social capital as a means to explore 'good for community' collaborations

Considering the lack of description and analysis in the literature of such particular initiatives, as the one discussed in this research, the notion that the theoretical insights from literature do not fit neatly to a 'good for community' collaboration is not entirely surprising. For the kind of collaboration that this research is shedding light on, perhaps, a new perspective is required to explain in fullness what it stands for. Social capital theory, when combined with the collaboration literature, seems to be a promising idea that can be employed to discuss these initiatives. The perspective offered within this research is that many of these unique characteristics of this collaboration (last column in Table 4) are the effects of a rich endogenous stock of social capital observed within this collaboration.

Before continuing with the elaboration of this intersection of social capital and collaboration, it is essential to clarify any potential operationalisation ambiguities of social capital in this specific research, as indicated necessary by authors (Portes, 1998; Durlauf, 2002). Within this research, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration Themes</th>
<th>Insights from literature</th>
<th>Case study findings that support theoretical insight</th>
<th>Unique characteristics that contrast with theoretical description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Goals</td>
<td>- Diverse goals within different dimensions as 'tangled web'; tension between congruence and diversity (Vangen and Huxham, 2011)</td>
<td>- Consistent with the theoretical representation, the goals were evident to be diverse and interlinked within the various dimensions.</td>
<td>- A broad, overarching goal of 'good for community' was present and accepted&lt;br&gt;- Less tension between congruence and diversity than described within literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>- Trust building takes inordinate amount of resources, time, and nurturing (Thomson and Perry, 2006; Huxham and Vangen, 2004; 2005)&lt;br&gt;- Starting point is often of suspicion and mistrust (Huxham and Vangen, 2004; 2005)&lt;br&gt;- Place attachment attributes trustworthiness (Hallak et al, 2012)</td>
<td>- Trust building process was indeed observed to take investment of time, effort, and resources and was considered a critical component of working together.&lt;br&gt;- Shared attributes like the place attachment (we are all local here) or the setting of the collaboration (community event) attributed it a high level of trustworthiness</td>
<td>- Unlike typical descriptions, collaboration was underpinned by a high level of trust and trustworthiness&lt;br&gt;- The process of trust building was simpler than conveyed by the literature&lt;br&gt;- Trust simplified the implementation process: lack of contracts and the informal control mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority and Power</td>
<td>- Structural, functional or other continually shifting 'points of power' (Huxham and Vangen, 2005; 2004)&lt;br&gt;- Transformational ability of collaborations to shift power balance (Himmelman, 1996)</td>
<td>- Various points of power mainly associated with people rather than process or structure&lt;br&gt;- Power identified in wide network of social connections, specific skills or through their self-asserted responsibility within the setting&lt;br&gt;- External environment influence was evident</td>
<td>- Conscious effort towards down-up distribution of the power was visible&lt;br&gt;- Purposeful 'natural feel' of the events was observed and managed by champions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and representation</td>
<td>- Messy snapshot of interconnectedness of organisations (Crosby and Bryson, 2005)&lt;br&gt;- Ambiguous degree of representation or membership, complex structure of relationships and the shifting nature of these factors add to complexity (Huxham &amp; Vangen, 2005).</td>
<td>- Ambiguity and complexity, as described in the membership structure and representation was easily identifiable&lt;br&gt;- Interconnected of various organisations is similar to that presented in Figure 2. The links were unclear and messy</td>
<td>- Voluntary, 'open to all', participation&lt;br&gt;- Roles are arbitrary and unassigned, participants took initiative to assume roles&lt;br&gt;- Links between the organisation were less formal and more dependent on links between the people representing them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>- Emergent, shared-power or facilitative leadership is a suitable approach (Crosby and Bryson, 2005)&lt;br&gt;- Balance between a facilitative and a directive role required (Huxham and Vangen, 2000; 2005)</td>
<td>- Champions took conscious effort to distribute the power. 'No one in charge' was a fitting dynamic.&lt;br&gt;- Leaders assumed responsibility, directing as required but typically played a silent part, influencing people through actions.</td>
<td>- The intrinsic rewards of the process and lack of standardised performance measures seemed to make the sense of achievement easier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Analysis of the case study characteristics against the literature insights
conceptualisation of social capital that I propose is solely causal² (Durlauf, 2002). This is to say that social capital within this setting is created through the conscious choices of participants and is endogenous to the process, and hence, this causal conceptualisation does not lead to definitional issues/ambiguity. Through the analysis of experiences from ‘in field’ ethnography and the triangulated information from the data, I suggest that within this phenomenon, the champions or the organisations that were seeking collaborative engagement have taken mindful efforts, through the investment of their time and resources, to generate and accumulate social capital. This accumulated social capital, within this research setting, has been observed through a number of indicators. As the literature review suggested that the framework by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) is able to provide a systematic and incisive approach towards such identification, I have employed it within this setting. Some example indicators of the structural dimension of social capital (evidenced by the network configurations) and the relational dimension (evidenced by the behavioural characteristics) are detailed below in table 5. The cognitive dimension, characterised by the shared values, meaning and perspectives, could only be assessed intuitively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural dimension indicators (observed as network configurations)</th>
<th>Relational dimension indicators (observed as behavioural characteristics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Purposefully and systematically created personal database of contacts through attending community events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facebook group connections (created by joining particular cause relevant groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contacts added as friends on social networking tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mailing list (created specifically for people not on the social networks and maintained by the champions of collaboration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People made effort to get to know each other by names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meetings for decision making purposes were conducted in pubs or at homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informal invitations for informing the members about the meetings (through personal text messages, phone, Facebook updates) were preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Way of exchanging contacts/information with new members was casual (using phones to give each other missed calls – no business cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informal socialising outside the collaborative (drinks, barbecue) was typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Indicators of Social Capital within the observed collaborative phenomenon

Portes (1998) suggests separating the apparent effects of the social capital from its definition to clearly evidence rigour and validity of the identification of roles of social capital. The definition used within this study, “the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationship possessed by an individual or social unit” (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998 pg.243), clearly points to the indicators in table 5, whereas the effects of these indicators, which come into play much later, have been discussed afterwards in table 6.

This accumulated social capital, afterwards, has led to a number of economic benefits (paid work through the contacts made from the charity events) or a number of structural/procedural benefits (simplification of process through the lack of contracts, informal methods of control, and non-standardised norms of operations due to trust) that has made the process of collaboration easier.

The research question ‘how are the various dimensions of social capital evidenced and linked within

---
² cooperative behaviour, in turn, leads to a rational expectation of cooperation
this collaborative phenomenon? can now be answered. The social capital dimensions are evidenced through the indicators in Table 5. Each of this social capital dimensions facilitated a number of functions within the different themes of collaborative process. I propose that within the discussion of these roles and the benefits created through them, a clear intersection of social capital dimensions and themes of collaborative process is evident. A discussion of these roles, which could be considered the main contribution of this research, is provided in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of social capital (Nahapet and Ghoshal, 1998)</th>
<th>Themes of Collaborative Process</th>
<th>Role facilitated within the theme by the social capital dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Structural dimension (network of contacts and configurations) | Power                          | - Network of contacts allocated actual and perceived power to the individuals/organisation (the more resourceful the organisation/individual the more important they are considered)  
- Connecting the people to others was often performed as a means to exchange or accumulate favours at a later stage |
| Relational dimension (Honesty, trust, trustworthiness and reciprocity) | Structure and representation | - Social coordination is used as a substitute for the lack of contracts, constitution and rules  
- Trust and trustworthiness allowed for non-standardised norms of operation  
- Informal method of control and monitoring was accepted and promoted (sending messages or photos on WhatsApp was considered enough to let the company know how the funds were used) |
| | Common goals | - Goals that other participants are passionate about were more easily accepted due to previously built confidence and trust (we know that they would do the right thing)  
- Relational social capital created an illusionary sense of ‘shared vision’ indicative through acceptance of a broad ‘good for community’ goal |
| | Leadership | - Infectious passionate leader is more easily acceptable because of inherent trust previously built (transparency of the motives of leader does not have to be proven) |
| | Trust | - Trust built within process of developing social capital was transferable for the purpose of collaborating, which functioned as a substitute for contracts, rules etc., as discussed above |
| Cognitive dimension (shared meanings) | Common goals | - Allowed for acceptance of a broad aim and less negotiation  
- Modifying the current shared understanding around the needs of community or functions of collaborations was made easier |

Table 6: Roles of social capital within the collaboration case study

Some useful points regarding the description of these roles are noted here. First, these roles conformed to the characteristics of the social capital transactions, i.e. the transactions within them were uncertain, less transparent, created unspecified obligations, and had indefinite timeframes (Loury, 1977; Bourdieu, 1996; Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998; Fuller and Tien, 2006; Macke and Dilly, 2011). Nevertheless, within this case study, the informants suggest that the benefits obtained from social capital were worth the investment of time and resources. Second, the ownership of this social
capital within this particular setting needs further exploration. The structural dimension (contact list, group of networks), at least partially, can be considered to be shared between the individuals and the organisations that they represent. However, the relational dimension, which had the highest impact on the collaboration process (as shown in Table 6, relational dimension affected most of the themes), is created and owned by the individuals. This begins to unravel some potential insights that may be cautiously applied to collaboration theory in general. For example, while discussing the representation within collaborations, Huxham and Vangen (2005) suggest that sometimes the involvement of individuals is more important, other times it is the organisation or, at times, both. The roles undertaken by the relational dimension of social capital may provide us with an answer as to why this is the case. Within this example, where the formal process and structure was severely limited through the relational dimension of social capital, individuals who own this relational social capital are necessarily the key to collaborations. Such elucidations within a few more themes are apparent. However, as this discussion is only focused on a single case study, it would be premature to focus on them at this exploratory stage. However, the ability of this case study to generate such insights should be considered a useful indication.

To conclude, the ‘good for community’ collaboration, which was explored within this dissertation, has a number of distinct characteristics. The insights from theoretical literature were not able to accommodate these characteristics entirely. I suggest that the elements of the social capital theory, when linked with the theory of collaborative process, begin to provide us with a suitable foundation for discussing and exploring these specific initiatives. Moreover, the combination of these two concepts was useful in characterising the behaviour of participants in collaboration and shows potential for unravelling some unanswered questions in field of theory on collaboration. The results presented in table 6 provide an answer to a core research question of how the social capital is evidenced and linked within this collaborative phenomenon, and, while they are strictly limited to this case study, they should be considered a helpful but maturing insight that needs to be expanded and developed.
6 Conclusion and Implications
6.1 Conclusions

This dissertation, which is primarily driven by my personal involvement in various 'good for community' collaborations of SMEs, and shaped further by a lack of descriptions in the literature of such endeavours, aims at exploring, describing and discussing one such case study in depth. The collaborative engagement of SME Boileroom, Guildford that is made possible through the initiative Boileroom SOUP was chosen for this purpose. Through this description, this dissertation intends to provide new insights regarding the intersection of social capital and collaboration. Interpretive ethnography, stemming from subjective naturalism, was employed within this work. The Boileroom SOUP event was accessed as a volunteer. Various forms of participant observations data combined with interviews of the key informants were used and a narrative was created using the thematic inductive analysis of these data.

This narrative, which sheds light on how such a phenomenon comes to be, is one of the core contributions of this research. The narrative described in depth the roles undertaken by Boileroom, the way it engaged with the community and the manner in which it formed links. Some unique characteristics of this collaboration were observed. They were an unstructured approach towards the organising process, a broad overarching goal, down-up distribution of power, high levels of underpinned trust, and organically developing, informal, and social nature of the initiative. Hidden champions, who assumed responsibility for the distribution of power, showed an emergent, connective leadership. The potential shortcomings of such an initiative due to a relatively distant engagement, and reactive approach to social problems were also briefly considered.

To discuss this phenomenon, the unique characteristics mentioned above were analysed against the insights obtained from the collaboration literature. Unsurprisingly, considering the lack of descriptions and analysis of such a phenomenon, the theoretical insights developed within the current literature do not wholly cover the characteristics of a ‘good for community’ collaboration. I propose that the elements of the social capital theory, when linked with the theory of the collaborative process, begin to provide us with a suitable foundation for discussing and exploring these specific initiatives. A perspective offered is that many of the unique characteristics observed within the ‘good for community’ collaboration are the result of a rich, endogenous stock of social capital. This social capital is created through a conscious effort of the participants. A causal conceptualisation of this social capital, which has been observed through a number of network configurations and behavioural characteristics, combined with intuitive assessment of cognitive dimension, has been presented. The most important contribution of this study is the description of the roles undertaken by the social capital within the various themes of this collaboration.

These roles are as follows: the structural dimension has been suggested to allocate the perceived and actual power to the individuals and organisations using networks of contacts as an asset. The relational dimension, which has had the highest impact, affected the structure and representation, trust, common goals and leadership. The main role performed by the relational dimension was the simplification of the formation and implementation process through the substitution of social coordination for written contracts, rules, and standard methods of control. Another key role was evidenced through acceptance of other people's passion and goals and a level of comfort with the lack of clarity on outcomes. The cognitive dimension also contributed to this wider acceptance, creating a shared understanding of the community issues and an illusionary sense of 'common
vision', which if scrutinised is likely to lead to different ideas. Within the discussion of these roles and the benefits created through them, a clear intersection of how the social capital dimensions link within 'good for community' collaborations is evident. Moreover, the combination of these two concepts was useful in characterising the behaviour of the participants in collaboration and shows potential for unravelling some unanswered questions in theory of collaboration.

The literature review had identified a few gaps, particularly suggesting the need to develop the discussion of social capital as a theme within collaboration to better characterise and understand the behavioural aspects of the participants (Abreu and Camarinha-Matos, 2011; Sydow, 2005). In addition, Levitt (2013) had underlined the need for studies that could link the responsible activity of small businesses to effective local inter-organisational collaborations. This dissertation, in its limited capacity as an exploratory pilot study, has begun to address these gaps and has identified directions for future research to further this purpose.

6.2 Implications for future research

Within this dissertation, an intersection of the dimensions of social capital and themes of collaborative process was proposed to be able to offer a more befitting theoretical base to describe and discuss a particular 'good for community' collaboration. It would be useful to explore whether this essence of representation offered by the theoretical insights from this intersection is consistent and applicable for other such initiatives. If other 'good for community' collaborations were observed, would the combination of social capital theory and collaboration literature still be able to offer an incisive, holistic ground for discussion of characteristics and benefits of such collaborations? Using the same methodological perspective, future research could look into this by expanding the current scope of enquiry. The insights obtained from exploring a number of different 'good for community' collaboration case studies and the experience of discussing them through the ethnographic method of enquiry might be a useful direction for developing this research further. In this manner, the findings of this work can be treated as a first step towards developing a theory of social capital within the collaboration literature for a specific type of collaborations. Moreover, this research focuses on the question of 'how does this phenomenon take place?' This question is fitting to the purpose of an exploratory research that aims to discover, describe, and discuss. However, from a policymaker's or a practitioner's perspective, a more beneficial outlook could be 'how can we make this happen' or 'how can this be managed'. A multiple case study research that looks at a number these kinds of successful initiatives might also be able to provide further insights regarding the commonalities and process within such initiatives that would be useful for practitioners or policymakers for managing such collaborations or simply to make them happen.
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