SEN PILOT QUICK VIEW DASHBOARD

Heather: Linking what’s that?

Nell: It means that the SEN gives us access to funders’ investors and policy forums 10 x more effectively than working individually!

Call: Wow, so if there’s a local SEN I can join, I could connect 4 more effectively with the sector than otherwise? That’s fantastic!

James: Bonding is all about getting support from people going through the same thing as you, so you don’t have to reinvent the wheel. It makes it much easier to learn, share ideas and reduce costs!

Fiona: Bridging, connecting beyond your local or thematic SEN, brings new ideas, information, and can lead to new opportunities. Thanks to new technology any social enterprise can benefit by joining a SEN no matter where they are.

Trusting relationships increased by more than 570%

Total No. of ties increased by > 900%

LINKING > 1000%

BRIDGING > 750%

BONDING > 950%

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

The U>P (Unlocking Potential) pilot has sought to provide a broader understanding of the impact being made by 4 Social Enterprise Networks (SENs) on their members and the wider social enterprise sector as well as the benefits the SENs can bring through demonstrating this impact. Over the course of 2017-2018 four SENs – Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee and Health – have participated in this impact evaluation pilot using the Unlocking Potential (U>P) as part of the Social Enterprise Action Plan (2F.5).

The Scottish Government is also committed “to support the extension of Scotland’s Social Enterprise Networks to every part of Scotland that wants one. These should develop as an important collective voice on key issues for the sector, establish an extended range of peer mentoring and peer-to-peer support, and facilitate further collaboration between social enterprises.” (Action 2C.1)

OUTCOMES

CONNECTIVITY & COLLABORATION

The Social Network Analysis results of this pilot clearly demonstrate that SENs provide a valuable support infrastructure for their members. By joining a SEN, Scottish social enterprises are better placed to understand how to plot their course through start up to scale up with access to peer support, expert professional network facilitators and direct, face-to-face connections. Having access to a SEN is a significant benefit for social enterprises – both individually as well as for the sector as a whole.

- The greater the number and density of connections within a SEN, the more resilient the SEN is collectively - decreasing the cost of transactions, i.e. knowledge, information and opportunities
- Joining a SEN, allows social enterprises to access resources contributing to their sustainability
- SEN Coordinators clearly enhance the social capital in each SEN, ensuring interconnectivity with the other SENs and the wider sector – actively supporting their members in accessing knowledge, ideas, resources and opportunities
- SENs are clearly delivering on their targets - with the breadth and scale of activity across the SENs that would prove very difficult to achieve through a centralised point or agency
- SENs are focusing their resources on growing awareness of social enterprise and their members’ services - connecting them locally, regionally and nationally – ensuring a coherent, well connected and well-informed national network of networks contributes to greater resilience and, in turn, allows social enterprises to respond to the challenges and opportunities that may arise

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The 4 participating SENs have a membership or engagement of over 470 social enterprises. This represent circa 36% of membership/engagement over all 22 local and thematic SENs.

The pilot revealed the following statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pilot Figures</th>
<th>Extrapolated to all 22 SENs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Connections</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Out of shared values comes trust, and trust, as we will see, has a large and measurable economic value”

Francis Fukuyama, 1996
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THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

Social Enterprises are recognised as delivering social and/or environmental outcomes for their communities. In Scotland, there are about 5,600 social enterprises across a wide variety of sectors from the arts & creative industries to tourism, sport and heritage as well as housing and health, employing over 80,000 people and contributing an estimated £2.04bn to the Scottish economy every year.1

In 2016 the Scottish Government created the first ten-year Social Enterprise Strategy, followed by the first of three 3-year Action Plans: Building a Sustainable Social Enterprise Sector in Scotland – Action Plan 2017-20.2

SEN IMPACT EVALUATION PILOT

With the action point 2C the Scottish Government has committed “support the extension of Scotland’s Social Enterprise Networks”. Furthermore, point 2F of the Action Plan, specifically focuses on ‘Demonstrating Social Value’ in line with the trend towards increasing demand for third sector organisations to produce evidence of the impact they deliver. The 2018 GIIN Report,3 found that the overwhelming majority of impact investors (84%) are committed to measuring and managing their impact. The 2017 Social Enterprise Census found that the highest level of support needed by of respondents (44%) was on how to measure their social impact. This pilot was delivered by ASC4 under point 2F.5, using the social impact measurement tool Unlocking Potential (U>P) to test new methods of demonstrating value, in partnership with 4 of Scotland’s 22 Social Enterprise Networks5 (SEns) during the first year of the Action Plan.

"Social Enterprises are a vital partner in the economy, Civil Society and in creating a fairer, more inclusive Scotland.”

The Scottish Government

U>P - UNLOCKING POTENTIAL PLATFORM

U>P is a cloud-based evaluation platform developed by ASC to demonstrate social impact in simple, non-financial, quantifiable ways, making intangible and qualitative outcomes measurable, which can then be measured against targets. U>P is based on the academic framework of social capital, which recognises connection and collaboration as a necessary platform for social and economic interactions to take place effectively.

“networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate cooperation within and amongst groups”

SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital describes the value of relationships between individuals as a kind of ‘glue’ that binds people, making it easier for them to work together. Social Capital defines the social fabric and structures of groups and communities. There are 4 elements of social capital, all of which affect each other so that positive change in one will also benefit the others. They are:

- Shared Understanding – based on shared norms and values impacting on standards of behaviour and expectations within a group or community.
- Reciprocity – occurs when people support each other, confident that someone will return the favour in the future.
- Trust – is the confidence that other members of the community will act in the best interests of the group or initiative.
- Networks – describe the relationship ties by which people are linked together; there are three different types of network ties:
  - a. Bonding – close, strong ties between members of a community
  - b. Bridging – peer-to-peer, horizontal ties with similar groups
  - c. Linking – vertical ties with individuals in a position of authority or influence (financial, political etc.)

Social capital has been found to benefit individuals, groups and communities in a wide variety of ways supporting them to respond positively and effectively through collective action, addressing the challenges they face, improving health and wellbeing, increasing inclusion and equality and lowering levels of crime. Higher levels of social capital can help communities flourish.6

1. Statistics and data used from the most recent Social Enterprise Census (Social Value Lab, 2017) 2. Scottish Government, 2017 3. ANNUAL IMPACT INVESTOR SURVEY 2016 Global Impact Investor Network (GIIN) 4. Assist Social Capital CIC (ASC) is a social enterprise focussing on social capital and sustainable development as approach for organisations and social enterprises, ASC has developed Unlocking Potential as impact evaluation tool.
5. The Scottish SENs are a forum for social enterprises that come together to access peer support, share resources and develop shared solutions: https://senscot.net/ networks/
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Senscot act as a central support for both local and thematic Social Enterprise Networks, bringing together a community of social enterprises based on their shared norms and values. The Social Enterprise Network (SENs) include aspiring, emerging and established social enterprises. There are currently 22 SENs, 6 thematic - Community Food, Cultural & Creative, Employability, Health, Sport and Tourism - and 16 local networks - stretching from the Scottish Borders to Moray, with collectively over 1,300 social enterprise members across the SENs.

The SENs provide their members with a community of people who share their passion and provide the opportunity to learn and improve as they interact regularly through their SEN events.

The connection between the SENs and social capital has been studied in ‘Social enterprise networks and social capital – A case study in Scotland/UK’. The study highlights that the SENs provide access to:

- Specialist Social Enterprise Support
- A Collective Voice
- A Platform for Social Enterprise to Maximise their Value
- Regular Meetings and Events
- Exchange of Learning and Information
- Access to New Opportunities
- Collaboration and Cooperation
- A Community of Practice

“...The practical importance of the concept of social capital is that it provides a structure and vocabulary, which enables us to examine and understand exactly what benefits and disadvantages its different forms brings...social capital and public wellbeing can be fostered by social enterprise, addressing specifically the role of networking.”

Campbell and Sacchetti, 2014

Table 1 below, provides a correlation between the kind of activities being delivered by the SENs and their impact on generating social capital outcomes.

Table 1 SEN Activities and their Social Capital Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL ENTERPRISE NETWORK ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SOCIAL CAPITAL ELEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a ‘Community of Practice’ for social enterprises.</td>
<td>Shared Understanding Common values and norms around social enterprise activities/values &amp; norms Bonding Opportunities for regular encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting established, emerging and aspiring social enterprises</td>
<td>Shared Understanding Underlying values and norms of social enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating role of a social enterprise-led network</td>
<td>Bonding Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing of bulletins, website &amp; newsletters for members</td>
<td>Shared Understanding Information sharing, which also leads to development of bonding, Bridging and Linking ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Networks</td>
<td>Social enterprise within local context Bonding Opportunities for regular encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Networks</td>
<td>Social enterprise operating in specific sector Bonding Opportunities for regular encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Support for social enterprises</td>
<td>Shared Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Meetings and Events for network members</td>
<td>Shared Understanding Bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-to-peer Support (information &amp; learning exchange, best practice sharing, problem-solving etc.)</td>
<td>Bonding Reciprocity Based on mutual support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities &amp; enabling professional development</td>
<td>Bonding Shared Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of contact with external agencies (wider Third Sector, local authorities, and private sector, etc.)</td>
<td>Bridging and Linking Opportunities to connect with other third sector organisations and agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building links with national agencies (government, national intermediaries etc.)</td>
<td>Linking Opportunities to connect with influential agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform to influence policy and strategy by acting as a representative voice</td>
<td>Linking Opportunities to add the voice of the SEN members to influential forums and agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical importance of the concept of social capital is that it provides a structure and vocabulary, which enables us to examine and understand exactly what benefits and disadvantages its different forms brings. Social capital and public wellbeing can be fostered by social enterprise, addressing specifically the role of networking.”

Campbell and Sacchetti, 2014
**SEN IMPACT EVALUATION REPORT**

This report provides a ‘snapshot’ of the SENs at the time of the pilot in 2018, using social capital analysis as a lens to evidence social impact. Four Social Enterprise Networks took part in the one-year pilot (2017-18):

**Three local SENs:**
- **Edinburgh Social Enterprise Network (ESSEN)** population of Edinburgh - 482,005. Edinburgh SEN emerged initially from as small group of social enterprises in 2008 it has more than 130 members.
- **Dundee Social Enterprise Network (DSEN)** population 148,270. The SEN began as a small informal group in 2007. It became a Community Benefit Company in 2010 and currently has almost 50 full and more than 30 aspiring members.

**One thematic SEN:**
- **Health Social Enterprise Network (HSEN).** As a thematic SEN, the HSEN operates across Scotland and has almost 160 social enterprise members.

**METHODOLOGY**

ASC worked with SEN Coordinators and staff to invite social enterprise members to participate in the pilot, filling in the U>P question set to create the Social Network Analysis:

1. **Social Network Analysis (SNA):**
   - SNA maps and quantifies individual and aggregated relationships based on the mix of relationships types, referred to as ties, identifying the quantity and quality of connections.

2. **Social Capital Compass™:**
   - SEN Coordinators also filled in a Social Capital Compass™ as part of the self-evaluation process to provide additional evidence to evaluate and triangulate impact.
   - This records past, present and potential social capital scores on a ‘spider-web’ graph visually and numerically, backed up by evidence supporting each of the scores.

3. **Delivery Against Stated Targets (DAST):**
   - U>P also considers whether the actions being undertaken by an organisation are delivering the results desired. This assists in decision-making for the delivery of future actions and enables the strategic development of social capital outcomes, providing learning for the allocation of resources. U>P refers to this as Delivery Against Stated Targets (DAST). DAST helps to identify the success of the targets delivered as well as their capacity to generate social capital, see sample in Table 2.

**EVALUATION RESULTS**

**SNA Results**

Forty-eight SNAs were completed by 46 people (2 people completed 2 sets of SNAs as they were members of both a thematic and a local SEN), see Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>No. SEN Coordinators &amp; Staff</th>
<th>No. Members</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The majority of interviewees were between 40 and 59 years of age
- Most have completed further education, undergraduate (28%) or postgraduate degree (26%)
- The average length of SEN membership was 3 years

Average years of SEN membership is 3 years

**Table 2** Delivery Against Stated Targets (DAST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Impact (eg % delivered, Numbers attending, etc.)</th>
<th>Social Capital Indicator (Primary Indicator in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website Development</td>
<td>Launched by March 2018</td>
<td>Launched</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Shared Understanding (Bridging)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3** Numbers of Interviewees per SEN

**Chart 1** Breakdown (in years) of membership in SENs
Network Map 1 displays the relationships of the people interviewed (terracotta nodes) in terms of bonding ties (blue nodes), Bridging (green nodes) and Linking (gold nodes).

The Benchmark Social Network Analysis-SNA shows the connections people already had when joining their SEN. The Now-SNA, shows the connections people have established after joining the SEN.

Network Map 2 is the same as Network Map 1 but in this case for members only, the SEN connections of Coordinators and staff have been greyed out.
The results in Network Map 1 show that by becoming a member of a SEN, an individual significantly increases their connectivity within as well as across the SENs. The total increase in connections (from the Benchmark to Now) is more than 900% (Chart 2). Bonding, Bridging and Linking ties have increased as follows:

- **Bonding** (connections within SEN membership) increased by 950%
- **Bridging** (external connections with peers outside of SENs) increased more than 750%
- **Linking** (connections to those in positions of influence) increased by 1000%
- **Trust** (Chart 3) increased by 570% across the SENs (more than 5-fold). Excluding Coordinators (Network Map 2), the increase in trusting relationships is 344%, 4 times as many trusting relationships after joining.

More than 900% increase in total connections from joining ‘benchmark’ until now

570% increase in trusting connections

Chart 2: Increase in relationships from Benchmark until Now

Chart 3: Increase in trusting relationships from Benchmark until Now

On average a member gains an extra 42 new connections by joining a SEN. Additionally, the quality of relationships improves with 15 of these being identified as relationships of Trust.

The scores for trusting relationships (Chart 4) show an individual on average gains 15 trusting ties. The members only scores show they still gain on average 8 trusting relationships.

Chart 4: Average increase in Trusting relationships per Person

The breakdown of new connections resulting from joining a SEN (Chart 5), shows that the highest increase tends to be with other members of the same SEN (Bonding), with an increase of 23 new connections after joining.

Chart 5: Average of new connections per person for all SENS (aggregate)

Comparing Bonding, Bridging and Linking Ties

The different types of relationship ties – Bonding (between members of a SEN), Bridging (peer-to-peer ties with non-members) and Linking (relationships with an influencer, non-member), each have specific quality and impact within a network.

Depending on the individual context and focus of a project or network, the composition of these three relationship types will vary, see Chart 6. It is up to the individual SEN, to strategically consider if the blend they are creating will help them achieve their desired outcomes.

Chart 6: Breakdown of Now relationships for Bonding, Bridging and Linking
Network Maps 3 and 4 highlight the differences in the blend of relationship types between the 4 SENs.
The boundaries of the SENs are defined by the Bonding relationships formed between the members. This is emphasised when the SEN Coordinators and staff are included (Network Map 3). In all cases there is a clear increase in connectivity from the Benchmark (left column) to the Now (right column). Members of these 4 SENs are increasing all 3 types of relationships. This is important as it demonstrates that the SENs are providing members with access to a range of resources, not merely creating social enterprise cliques. The number and density of interconnections is highest for Bonding followed by Bridging and then Linking ties, with the latter being the least dense. This finding is consistent with the fact that internal Bonding is the easiest to create based on the highest level of shared understanding, followed by Bridging connections, external peer-to-peer type relationships with similar organisations outside of the SEN membership. Bridging facilitates opportunities to connect with similar kinds of third sector organisations. Linking ties are formed with individuals from organisations such as funders or local and regional governments, where the aims and objectives can be very different and so the level of shared understanding is reduced, acting as a barrier to connection.

Both sets of Benchmark results with and without Coordinators (Network Maps 3 & 4) look very similar. However, when comparing the Now social network maps, there is clear evidence that the Coordinators act as focal points for the individual SENs, whilst also creating interconnectedness between the SENs.

This is also supported by the Coordinators Network Map (Network Map 5), where the SEN Coordinators and staff make up only a very small number of connections in the Benchmark but are then highly connected in the Now map.

Chart 7 and 8 confirm the impact of the Coordinators showing significantly greater levels of connectivity when the Coordinators are included in the results.
BREAKDOWN OF SOCIAL CAPITAL TIES BY SEN

The totals for the 4 SENs (Chart 7) are 55% Bonding ties with members of their respective networks. The remaining 45% are with non-members of which 29% are Bridging, connections with members outside of their SENs, and 16% Linking, connections with stakeholders in positions of authority.

- **Glasgow SEN** has the highest level of connectivity
  - Bonding makes up a considerable amount of relationships (about 66%); followed by almost equal amounts for Bridging and Linking ties, 19 and 18% respectively
  - the ratio changes when looking at the members only result where Bonding makes up a slightly smaller amount with 59% but Linking noticeably increasing to 24% which suggests that GSEN’s members are not only well connected with each other but also with influencers (Chart 8)

- **For the Edinburgh SEN**, the breakdown is similar to the breakdown of the total aggregate (see Chart 8 for comparison)
  - Bonding again is the highest with 51% of all ESEN relationships ties which still accounts for a high level of inter-member relationships, followed by 37% Bridging and again slightly less Linking ties with 12% (Chart 7)
  - this is similar to the members only scores, though the Bonding increases to 65% of all ties, followed by 24% and 11% for Bridging and Linking (Chart 8)

- **In Dundee SEN** there is a slightly different pattern observed
  - Bridging 41% is the slightly more dominant type of relationships in comparison to Bonding 43%; Linking relationships, though, remain at a similar level as for ESEN and GSEN making up 16% (Chart 7)
  - this trend is mirrored in the members only scores with Bridging making up 41% followed by Bonding 42% and Linking 17% (Chart 8)
  - this may be down to the smaller size of Dundee in comparison to Glasgow and Edinburgh. Dundee is often described as “a village, where everyone knows everyone” – this local context may explain why the Bridging connections are comparatively higher here than in the two larger cities

- **Finally, in the case of the Health SEN**
  - the total scores look similar again to the aggregate with Bonding having the highest proportion at 52%, then Bridging 32% and Linking 16% (Chart 7)
  - when comparing that to the members only score, however, this ratio changes significantly with Bridging now making up 46%, followed by Bonding with only 33% and Linking with 21% (Chart 8)
  - the stark difference between the Heath SEN’s total and members only score may be explained by the fact that this is a nation-wide SEN, making it more challenging for members to interact in person on a regular basis due to the geographical distances between them. This emphasises the role of the Coordinator when it comes to bringing a thematic SEN together.

“"The area most widely requested [for support needs] relates to help with measuring social impact”
Scottish Social Enterprise Census, 2017

VALUE OF SEN COORDINATORS

As outlined above, a significant finding of this report is the importance of the contribution of the SEN Coordinators and staff to the network of relationships.

The role of the SEN Coordinators and their staff members is closely related to the success of a SEN. Chart 9 shows the clear impact of the Coordinators on the relationships in the SENs. We can see that the Coordinators/staff began with a total of 30 connections when they started work at their respective SENs (Benchmark), increasing to 1349 after joining the network, which represents over 60% of all connections.

This provides clear evidence that the Coordinator’s role is that of a network weaver, facilitating the relationships within and across the social enterprise sector. This is confirmed throughout the report when comparing the scores where the Coordinators are included compared with member-only scores.

This same feature for each of the 4 SENS is also evident from Chart 10.
Chart 11 shows that the trusting relationships score for the 4 SENs increases by 570%. Here again, we can see that the Coordinators play an important role. This shows that both the building of relationships as well as the level of trust in the SEN is impacted significantly by the role of the SENs Coordinators and staff.

Net increase (in %) in Trusting connections

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coordinators Only</th>
<th>Members Only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>344%</td>
<td>570%</td>
<td>1976%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Chart 11  Percentage increase in trust across the SENs

As in Maps 1 and 2, Network Map 5 displays the change of relationships from when a member joined (Benchmark) to Now focusing on the SEN Coordinators and staff only.

The terracotta nodes describe the people interviewed and together with the blue nodes they describe all the Bonding relationships of the SENs; the green nodes describe Bridging whilst the gold nodes describe the Linking connections.

Another factor which supports the critical role of the Coordinators is their impact on the density of relationships, Chart 12.10

We can see that the SEN Coordinators influence the density of relationships in their SEN when comparing the Benchmark and Now, increasing the total density score from 12% to 19%. As a consequence, SEN members have greater access to other SEN members they don’t know in person via the Coordinators who do have higher levels of direct connections with SEN members.

Chart 12  SEN Coordinators Impact on the Network Density

The Coordinators Now network connections increase relationship density by 26% for GSEN and 15% for HSEN. For DSEN the score also increases significantly, from 12% to 24%. In the case of ESEN, the impact of the Coordinators is still positive in the number of relationships they bring to the SEN, but there is no increase in the density of the relationship network. This might be connected to ESEN’s targets, which have the highest focus on creating Linking ties (Table 6 below) of the 4 SENs.

10. The ‘network density’ describes the degree of connectedness within the network
COMMON CONNECTIONS

The Network Maps already identified a number of shared connections between the different SENs. These common connections include SEN members and other stakeholders across the sector. In terms of social capital, these external connections are advantageous as they provide cross-fertilisation between different groups. Within a closed network there is a limited supply of ideas and knowledge. Connecting to other groups allows access to different ‘pools’ of information and ideas.11 Establishing ‘external’ connections which in this case can be shared connections between two or more SENs brings access to additional resources and also access to new opportunities.

Chart 13 shows the average level of inter-connectivity between 2 different SENs is 33 connections. Only 9 people were named by interviewees in all 4 SENs.

Zooming in to Network Map 6, this becomes more visible where each person interviewed (previously the terracotta interviewee nodes) has been assigned a different colour to distinguish which of the 4 SENs they belong to.

11. Granovetter’s ‘Strength of weak Ties’ (1973) as well as Burt’s structural holes (1992) theory both describe this phenomenon of social capital and the benefit of access to other groups and networks.
SOCIAL CAPITAL COMPASS™ RESULTS

The second part of the pilot is covered by the Social Capital Compass™ which was completed by the Coordinators and staff only.

The Compass offered the Coordinators an opportunity to take a closer look at what was happening in their SEN.

Each Coordinator scored their SEN on a scale from 1 to 10 (‘1’ being lowest and ‘10’ being highest score) for each of the 6 social capital elements:

- **Benchmark** - how they perceived the network scores when they joined
- **Now** - where they perceive the scores now; and
- **Planning** - where they would like to see their network

Chart 14 displays the aggregated Social Capital Compasses for all 4 SENs. It demonstrates that the social capital scores for all the social capital elements have increased from the Benchmark to Now. However, the Planning Compass indicates that there are still opportunities for further developing the SENs across all areas.

To support their Compass scores, the Coordinators added evidence against one of the social capital elements (Table 4). Evidence can be considered any form of documentation such as reports, newsletters, briefing notes, pictures, videos, emails, social media posts etc. which support any of the social capital elements. The act of gathering evidence of impact provides a clear learning opportunity to indicate what is working and why and acts as a form of triangulation with respect to the SNA results.

### Table 4 SENs Social Capital Compass™ & Evidence Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1 - 10 Scale)</th>
<th>Bonding</th>
<th>Bridging</th>
<th>Linking</th>
<th>Shared Understanding</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Reciprocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples for evidence by the 4 SENs include:

- **Network Meetings** – introduction of six network meeting per year to increase relationships between GSEN members
- **New Connections made** – new relationships build between two existing members
- **SEN Collaboration Document** – discussion and agreement with Senscot/SEN Coordinators and Board on the creation of a SEN collaboration briefing
- **Event** – GDPR with Senscot Legal – hosted a session facilitated by Senscot Legal on GDPR for members
- **Employability Consortium** – an employability consortium was created in partnership with Senscot and SFS
- **SE Innovation Masterclasses** – Promotion of Scottish Enterprise Innovation Masterclasses (…)
- **BR The Ripple Intro Meeting** – Visit out to The Ripple following their attendance at recent CFSH CF SEN event. They are joining both the Health & Community Food SENs (…)
- **Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal** – A City’s Region Deal is a mechanism for accelerating growth by pulling in significant government investment. (…) ESE currently represents Social Enterprise and the wider third sector.

Each of the pieces of evidence listed above can be attributed to one or more of the social capital elements as evidence. In total, over 400 pieces of evidence were added (Table 4). Chart 15 displays the distribution for each of the elements.

64% of the evidence pieces are related to the structural elements: Bonding, Bridging and Linking. The remaining 36% are related to the cognitive elements of Shared Understanding, Reciprocity and Trust.
How each SEN’s activities impact on the creation of social capital, depends on their specific context as well as aims of each individual SEN and its members. Table 5 correlates the actions the SENs intended to deliver over the timeframe of the pilot against their tendency to generate social capital. U>P refers to this as Delivery Against Stated Targets (DAST).

Table 5: Example DAST12 from the Individual SENs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Social Capital Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a digital toolkit for members (GSEN)</td>
<td>Toolkit produced by March 2018</td>
<td>Toolkit launched</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Shared Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Developing vibrant and regularly updated GSEN website including Case Studies, Resources for signposting, National and Local News and Events (GSEN) | 2500 hits quarterly  
Average quarterly hits 3716 | Approx 150%                           |          | Shared Understanding/opportunities for Bridging |
| Developing relationships with Schools and universities in Glasgow to raise profile of social enterprise (GSEN) | 2 engagements per year  
3 significant engagements | Increase on target  
Bridging / Shared Understanding |          | \[462x764]\| Benchmarked    Now   Planning |
| Provide-one to-one support to new and established social enterprises and social entrepreneurs (ESEN) | 25 Organisations / individuals worked with  
25 | 100%                                      |          | Bonding, Shared Understanding |
| Refer social enterprises to each other and promote networking, inter-trading, collaboration and sharing of referrals between social enterprises and other enterprise third sector organisations | n/a | 20+                                      |          | Reciprocity, Bonding, Bridging |
| Work with City of Edinburgh Council to open up commercial, sub-contracting and skill transfer opportunities for social enterprises through community benefit clauses and corporate social responsibility (ESEN) | 2 businesses worked with  
ESE CEO appointed as vice chair of ESECBO | Linking, Shared Understanding |          | Bonding, Shared Understanding |
| Deliver 3 social enterprise promotional events to wider sector (DSEN)   | 3  
3 | 100%                                      |          | Shared Understanding /Bridging / potentially Linking |
| Increase number of new start network members (DSEN)                   | 8  
11 | 137%                                      |          | Bonding |
| Increase number of full trading network members (DSEN)                | 5  
3 | 60%                                       |          | Shared Understanding |
| Deliver 3 social enterprise promotional events to wider sector (DSEN) | 3  
3 | 100%                                      |          | Shared Understanding /Bridging / potentially Linking |
| Briefing Papers (HSEN)                                               | 3  
3 | 100%                                      |          | Shared Understanding |
| Community Learning Exchanges (HSEN)                                   | 3  
4 | 75%                                       |          | Reciprocity / Bonding & Bridging |
| Joint thematic SEN Meetings (HSEN)                                    | 4  
5 | 125%                                      |          | Bridging |

12. The individual SEN DAST are available as an Appendix on request.

Out of 58 actions identified the vast majority were delivered or overdelivered, demonstrating a high level of success of the SENs in delivering their stated targets.

Table 6 shows the numerical representation of how the 58 actions aligned with the social capital indicators.

Table 6: DAST Against 1st & 2nd Social Capital Indicators of the Individual SENs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 SENs</th>
<th>GSEN</th>
<th>ESEN</th>
<th>DSEN</th>
<th>HSEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Understanding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAST - Aggregate of Social Capital Indicators

Chart 16: DAST per Social Capital Indicator for the 4 SENs (collated from DAST of individual SENs)
Given the commonality of aims and objectives of the SENs, it is not surprising to find that a high proportion of actions undertaken by all the SENs is aimed at delivering Shared Understanding (Chart 16). Bonding and Bridging also feature highly, supporting the network building between SEN members (Bonding), as well as with relevant organisations in the wider sector (Bridging). Linking is unsurprisingly lower since it is more difficult to achieve than Bonding and Bridging and requires more resources, but still the success of the SENs as a collective in increasing the proportion of Linking ties by 1,000% demonstrates that the platform of shared objectives being created by the SEN membership has successfully attracted the attention of influential stakeholders. The actions which generate Reciprocity and Trust are the lowest. Trust is not something that can be compelled, however evidence suggests there is a strong correlation between reciprocity and trust, so increasing actions targeting Reciprocity between members, and also between members and the SEN, could prove to be highly beneficial for future development of Trust.

**FINDINGS & CONCLUSION**

**CONNECTIVITY & COLLABORATION**

The Social Network Analysis results of this pilot clearly demonstrate that the SENs provide a valuable support infrastructure for their members. By joining a SEN, social enterprises become part of an extensive peer-to-peer network, an effective means for combating isolation and enabling learning to take place much more quickly than would otherwise be possible. In addition to a 900% increase in connectivity across the board, the quality of connections is enriched with a 570% increase in trust.

The spread and increase in the different social capital elements, Bonding (950%), Bridging (750%) and Linking (100%), demonstrates the SENs’ effectiveness in joining up the social enterprise ecosystem. Without the SENs, Scotland’s social enterprise sector would be far more fragmented.

While there is a common Blueprint of the aims and objectives of a SEN, the context of each SEN varies in terms of their local populations and policy environments. In Network Maps 3 (members and Coordinators), the 4 SENs become evident as 4 clusters of Bonding ties with interconnections existing between the 4 SENs. The clusters as well as the interconnections do not remain as well defined when looking at the Bonding map for the members only (Network Maps 4).

This demonstrates that whilst there is interconnectedness between the members, the SEN Coordinators clearly enhance the social capital in each SEN, ensuring interconnectivity with the other SENs and the wider sector actively facilitating this process, catalysing their members’ access to knowledge, ideas, resources and opportunities. The Network Maps also show that whilst interconnected, they remain 4 separate SENs with their own characteristics and contexts. In addition to this aggregate report for the 4 SENs, U>P also provides results for each of the SENs individually. These individualised reports can be used to inform future actions specific to each SEN’s members, stakeholders and funders and focus resources on the most effective actions within their own contexts to benefit their members and at the same time enhance the capacity of the SENs more broadly.

**RESILIENCE**

The diagram below is a famous demonstration of network resilience, which outlines the fact that the greater the number and density of connections within a network, the greater the resilience and the lower the cost of transactions, i.e. knowledge, information and opportunities. So, the greater the number of connections each member has the more resilient the network is collectively. We also know that trust is a critical element in the effective functioning of any system. Trust facilitates collaboration and is highly dependent on previous experience and takes time and repeated interaction to cultivate. Additionally, trust tends to develop more quickly and to deeper levels in ‘flatter’ environments where direct peer to peer connections are prevalent over hierarchy and centralisation.

The composition of connections in and between the 4 SENs, that is their Bonding, Bridging and Linking, resembles a blend of the second and third networks in the diagram above. The mix of different types of relationships is in itself a strength of the SENs, providing support from start up to maturity. The strategic alliance of social enterprises through a system of connection and collaboration provides leverage, where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. This reflects positively for a specialised professional network or Community of Practice, delivering accessible, personalised and collective support, access to knowledge and expertise, as well as providing external connections and opportunities. An example of the collective power provided by SEN membership is the 1000% increase in Linking. Linking ties are the most difficult to establish yet from the results identified here it is clear that by becoming a member of a SEN, social enterprises are much better placed to obtain the resources they need to build their businesses.

---

13. The value of trust in project business Hedley Smyth, Magnus Gustafsson, Elena Ganska
14. See Senscot Blueprint document
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Prior to the emergence of the SENs in 2004, social enterprises regularly found themselves isolated and bounced from pillar to post in search of support for their emerging businesses. There were few third sector agencies with a specialist interest in social enterprise. In 2018, the landscape looks very different, with many commentators suggesting that there are actually too many options available and it’s difficult to navigate the “cluttered landscape” of support available. The existence of the SENs acts as a counter balance to this, providing social enterprises with a mechanism for reducing isolation, increasing understanding of where to access information and plotting a route to the most effective means to build the businesses.

By mapping the 58 actions against social capital indicators in the DAST, we can see the SENs are focusing their resources on growing awareness of social enterprise and their members as well as connecting social enterprises locally and more widely ensuring that new, emerging and established social enterprises can take part in a coherent, well connected and well-informed whole.

The second part of the evaluation process involved the Social Capital Compass™, completed by the SEN Coordinators and staff that provides triangulation, viewing the results from a different perspective. The Social Capital Compass™, a self-scoring tool is backed up by evidence of the delivery of the actions carried out by the SENs in the form of reports, videos, photos, anecdotes etc. The scores and the evidence gathered confirms that the potential for interconnectivity seen within and across the SENs is a direct result of the SENs and the Coordinators and their staff.

This pilot report provides a limited data sample of the impact that is being delivered by Scotland’s Social Enterprise Networks, and yet it points to some extraordinary outcomes being generated by the 4 SENs for their members. The social impact in terms of the quantity and quality of relationships is impressive, yet absolutely in line with social capital theory which argues that by joining together with their peers, social enterprises will be able to tap into the power of the collective, making them more resilient and so more able to meet the challenges facing them. The results come at a time when there is a growing interest within the wider business sector for companies to understand the importance of connectivity and their place within a hyper-connected digital world. There is also an increasing recognition that citizenship and wellbeing are a positive response to the growing complexity and challenges of society that requires a collaborative approach to problem solving.  

At a time when social and environmental challenges are more prevalent every day, the impact of 4 of Scotland’s 22 SENs demonstrates they are delivering significant social impact, providing a dedicated space for innovation and growth to take place and for social enterprises to thrive and deliver social and environmental objectives, which confirms the importance of the SENs in working to achieve these wider ambitions for Scotland’s economy in creating a fairer, more inclusive Scotland.

The social capital results alone demonstrate that significant impact is being delivered in terms of connectivity, when combined with the actions taken to achieve these outcomes, the key role played by the SENs in supporting the development of the social enterprise sector in Scotland becomes even more apparent. The Coordinators identified 58 high level actions they had delivered during the period of the pilot. These included actions such as maintenance and development of bespoke websites, one-to-one support sessions for social entrepreneurs, connections with schools, universities, Local Authorities and funders, promotion of inter-trading between social enterprises and other enterprise third sector organisations, local social enterprise strategies delivered in partnership with Local Authorities, membership of strategic forums, promotional events to the wider sector, briefing papers, learning exchanges, joint thematic SEN meetings, digital toolkits and social enterprise directories. In the vast majority of cases the SENs are not only delivering their targets but going above and beyond. The breadth and scale of these interventions paints a picture of the vibrancy of activity across the SENs that would be hard if not impossible to achieve from a centralised point, making the distributed nature of the SENs an added strength.

The meta-data gathered through such a process would provide an opportunity to delve deeper into the data and explore the emerging patterns in relation to the size, age, sector and even location of social enterprises, how they interact with agencies, funders and are impacted by policy. Scaled up the results could act as a benchmark to the health and wellbeing of the social enterprise sector as a whole in terms of its socio-economic impact. This would also help advise on the progress of point 2C of the Social Enterprise Strategy and ensure that all parts of Scotland have the opportunity to benefit from access to a Social Enterprise Network and form part of the collective voice of their sector.

“...We will support the extension of Scotland’s Social Enterprise Networks to every part of Scotland that wants one. These should develop as an important collective voice on key issues for the sector, establish an extended range of peer mentoring and peer-to-peer support, and facilitate further collaboration between social enterprises.”

Were this evaluation process to be extrapolated to all 22 SENs the aggregate scores would be something along the following lines; Total connections - 12,400; Bonding - 6,800; Bridging - 3,600; Linking - 2,000; Trusting connections - 4,700

16. Advancing the Science of Collaborative Problem Solving, Sage Journals, November 29, 2018