

Learning to do good

Lonsdale, Chris; Le Mesurier, Nick

DOI:

[10.1108/IJPSM-05-2023-0145](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2023-0145)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Lonsdale, C & Le Mesurier, N 2024, 'Learning to do good: developing capabilities to deliver social value from public procurement within English public authorities', *International Journal of Public Sector Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2023-0145>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Learning To Do Good: Developing Capabilities to Deliver Social Value from Public Procurement within English Public Authorities

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Public Sector Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJPSM-05-2023-0145.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Public procurement, Social value, Social procurement, Organisational capabilities

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Learning To Do Good: Developing Capabilities to Deliver Social Value from Public Procurement within English Public Authorities

Abstract

Purpose: To explore how social procurement-related capabilities might be developed within public authorities.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Qualitative research, based upon an inductive research design, leading to a model to inform future research and practice.

Findings: Within the context of a ‘disconnected and nascent institutional field of practice’ (Loosemore et al., 2023), the research generated rich data illustrating how certain English public authorities have developed relatively mature social procurement capabilities and applied them within the procurement process. The former included the appointment of ‘champions’; founding of groups/units; training, using webinars, online resources, and case studies; ‘toolkits’, including policy documents, process guidance and measurement tools; and networking. The latter included consultation with social value recipients and close engagement with both internal stakeholders and suppliers. The research also revealed the internal political skills of ‘champions’, as social procurement challenges incumbent logics regarding procurement objectives and practices.

Originality: The paper contributes to the literature by analysing social procurement from the largely overlooked resource-based perspective, by providing rich data on buy-side practice, usefully adding to the literature’s emerging ‘practice theme’, and by offering guidance to buy-side managers within public authorities.

Introduction

Social procurement (SP) has a long history, especially in some countries, for example, the United States, where it is traced back to the 19th century (McCrudden, 2004). Recent research focuses upon ‘new social procurement’ (Barraket, 2020, p195), seen in, for example, Africa, Australasia, Europe, North America, and South-East Asia (Lou et al., 2023). SP is understood here as procurement activity consciously aimed at delivering additional community well-being beyond what would be delivered via narrow economic regulatory criteria. It has been targeted in recent years at the disparate and critical issues of social exclusion, climate change and regional economic development (Awuzie and McDermott, 2016; Loosemore et al., 2023; Wright, 2015).

Within the UK, the paper’s focus, ‘new social procurement’ pre-dated but was furthered by the 2012 Public Services (Social Value) Act (SVA) (HM Government, 2012), which called upon public authorities to include social value (‘economic, social and environmental well-being’) within the procurement process. The scope of SP is wide in the UK, as outlined in a ‘procurement policy note’, PPN 06/20 (Cabinet Office, 2020), that mapped a series of ‘themes’: community recovery from Covid-19; tackling economic inequality, fighting climate change (also mandated by other policies, of course (Rankl et al., 2023)), equal opportunity, and (health and community) well-being.

‘New social procurement’, including in the UK, has required organisations on both the buy and supply-side to develop SP-specific capabilities, defined within the resource-based perspective (Wernerfelt, 1984) as an organisation’s capacity to deploy tangible, intangible, and human resources for a desired end result (Helfat and Lieberman, 2002). Within an emerging ‘practice theme’ (Loosemore et al., 2023), the literature has indeed identified efforts at developing such capabilities, including, for example, the emergence of SP

1
2
3 'champions' (Loosemore et al., 2022), mentoring skills (Troje and Gluch, 2020) and
4
5 knowledge sharing (Troje and Andersson, 2021).
6
7

8 Such efforts have, however, faced significant headwinds. SP, it is said, challenges 'incumbent
9
10 institutional logics' related to procurement and supply (Troje and Andersson, 2021, p256),
11
12 with acceptance of intangible criteria and 'horizontal' objectives (Arrowsmith, 2010). This
13
14 has frequently generated internal resistance in myriad forms on both the buy and supply-side,
15
16 including a reluctance to provide necessary resources (Loosemore et al., 2022; Troje, 2023).
17
18 The result is that the 'formalization of sustainable practices is weak ... practices have not
19
20 been fully internalized ... [and the] institutionalization of social procurement has been limited
21
22 at best' (Troje and Andersson, 2021, p256). Loosemore et al. (2023, p4205) describe 'an
23
24 experimental, disconnected and nascent institutional field of practice with no clear
25
26 occupational identity, position and organisational knowledge base'.
27
28
29
30
31

32 While such underdevelopment is clearly the predominant state of SP practice, research
33
34 undertaken into buy-side practice within UK (specifically English) central and local
35
36 government reveals certain public authorities where, echoing Troje and Kadefors (2017) and
37
38 Barraket (2020), practice appears more advanced, with authorities having developed
39
40 relatively mature SP-related capabilities. In this paper, data on such authorities is presented to
41
42 explore the following research question: *how might social procurement-related capabilities*
43
44 *be developed within public authorities?* First, the manner in which certain English public
45
46 authorities have developed a degree of capability maturity is documented. Second, the
47
48 deployment of such maturity is examined via a task within the procurement process - the
49
50 selection and shaping of social value 'themes', a key challenge of SP delivery (Burke and
51
52 King, 2015).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The paper makes an important contribution to the SP literature in a number of respects. First,
4
5 the paper analyses buy-side SP capability development from the resource-based perspective,
6
7 a perspective that has thus far been largely, although not entirely overlooked within SP
8
9 research (Ewuga and Adesi, 2023; Lou et al., 2023). The approach taken encompasses both
10
11 ‘classical’ (Whittington, 2001) and critical concepts (Clark, 2000), allowing both capability
12
13 development and constraints to be analysed. Second, it provides rich data on relatively
14
15 mature buy-side practice that usefully adds to the emerging ‘practice theme’ within the
16
17 literature (Loosemore et al., 2023). Third, it provides guidance to buy-side practitioners (at a
18
19 sufficiently generic level) in the hope that the practice identified can be replicated more
20
21 widely.
22
23
24
25

26 **Literature**

27
28 As mentioned, SP is not new (McCrudden, 2004). However, this paper confines itself to ‘new
29
30 social procurement’ (Barraket, 2020, p195). Debate exists over the precise definition of SP
31
32 (Gidigah et al., 2022). Cartigny and Lord (2017, p8) call it: ‘[Procurement including] a
33
34 benefit to a community’s efficacy or an individual’s network of connection and trust in their
35
36 community’, while Young (Cabinet Office, 2015) focus upon the concept of ‘well-being’.
37
38 Murtagh and Brooks (2019, p184-185), meanwhile, argue that SP is a recognition that ‘public
39
40 procurement can achieve more than basic provision of amenities’. Combining these views, SP
41
42 is understood here as procurement activity consciously aimed at delivering additional
43
44 community well-being beyond what would be delivered via narrow economic regulatory
45
46 criteria.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 What falls within the scope of SP differs within different nations (Hamilton, 2020), but
54
55 overall includes the disparate issues of social exclusion, climate change (thus an overlap
56
57 between SP and sustainable procurement in certain countries) and regional economic
58
59
60

development (Awuzie and McDermott, 2016; Troje and Gluch, 2020; Wright, 2015), with buy-side authorities often drawn to ‘intractable social problems in the communities they represent’ (Loosemore et al., 2021, p1908).

Within the UK, the paper’s focus, the scope of SP is quite broad, ‘a big tent approach’ (Hamilton, 2020). To assist practitioners with this breadth, in 2020, building upon the 2012 SVA, a set of ‘themes’ was codified by the UK government within a ‘procurement policy note’, PPN 06/20. These were community recovery from Covid-19 effects; tackling economic inequality, fighting climate change, equal opportunity, and (health and community) well-being. The note also outlined both the ‘policy outcomes’ sought within each theme and ‘what good looks like’ in terms of outcomes (Cabinet Office, 2020). The note was expanded upon in a follow-up document, the Social Value Model (Government Commercial Function, 2020).

While certain SP initiatives in the UK pre-date them (for example, Mather, 2009), both the 2012 Act and PPN 06/20 have accelerated SP (Baker, 2023), following a slow start (Cabinet Office, 2015), in part as the latter obligates public authorities to incorporate social value criteria within the procurement process. SP also features within the UK government’s National Procurement Policy Statement (Cabinet Office, 2021) and, while not explicitly mentioned, is accommodated by the ‘Most Advantageous Tender’ policy of the post-Brexit procurement act (O’Brien, 2023). As such, there is an increasingly robust SP policy environment (deemed important by Barraket and Loosemore (2018)), for which there is broad political consensus (Rayner, 2022).

SP can be implemented via procuring from organisations employing ‘disadvantaged’ people; adding ‘secondary’ social value to contracts with ‘conventional’ suppliers; redefining a product/service; and/or ensuring supplier CSR (Furieux and Barraket, 2014). It affects different stages of the procurement process, including the purchase specification, supplier

1
2
3 pre-qualification, award criteria (Cabinet Office, 2020), contracts/voluntary agreements
4
5 (Cartigny and Lord, 2017) and contract management (Wright, 2015).
6
7

8 There is evidence that, on both the buy and supply-side, the challenges of such
9
10 implementation are being addressed, and assisted by intermediaries (Barraket, 2020). An
11
12 emerging ‘practice theme’ (Loosemore et al., 2023) has identified emergent SP capabilities,
13
14 promoted by SP ‘champions’ (Loosemore et al., 2022), including mentoring skills (Troje and
15
16 Gluch (2020); practices and routines (Troje and Andersson, 2021); knowledge sharing (Troje
17
18 and Andersson, 2021) and co-operation between relevant stakeholders (Barraket and
19
20 Loosemore, 2018). A recent review (Lou et al., 2023) has outlined an agenda for further
21
22 progress in developing SP capabilities, including leadership, teamwork, competence
23
24 development and the adaptation of procurement techniques for SP.
25
26
27

28
29 Such efforts have, however, faced significant headwinds (Lou et al., 2023). On the supply-
30
31 side, internal resistance (Loosemore and Reid, 2019; Troje and Andersson, 2021), often
32
33 fuelled by buyer-supplier ‘goal misalignment’ (Caldwell et al., 2017; Troje, 2023), has been
34
35 identified. This has contributed to SP receiving limited resources, for example, SP roles
36
37 performed alongside the ‘day job’, ‘bricolage’ and limited engagement from colleagues
38
39 (Loosemore et al., 2022, Molloy et al., 2020; Troje, 2023), with consequences, exacerbated
40
41 by a lack of relational skills (Loosemore et al., 2021), for SP capability development
42
43 (Loosemore et al., 2023). On the buy-side, the paper’s focus, a similar picture is reported
44
45 (Loosemore, 2016; Lou et al., 2023), with SP capabilities adversely affected with respect to
46
47 specifying social value, market engagement, tendering and supplier relationships (Burke and
48
49 King, 2015; Murtagh and Brooks, 2019; Troje and Andersson, 2021; Wright, 2015). There is,
50
51 therefore, still much to be done to develop relevant capabilities, a prominent literature
52
53 regarding which we now review.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Developing organisational-level capabilities

The research here exploring buy-side SP capability development draws inspiration from the resource-based perspective (Wernerfelt, 1984), a broad tradition which has extensively researched the development of organisation-level capabilities (see review of Kraaijenbrink et al., 2010). Such capabilities are defined as an organisation's 'capacity to deploy resources for a desired end result' (Helfat and Lieberman, 2002, p725), in this case positive SP outcomes. Resources are divided into three categories: tangible (including financial resources, physical assets); intangible (including brand, reputation, intellectual property, explicit knowledge, culture); and human (including skills, tacit knowledge, attitude, values) (Grant, 2012). Such resources are converted into capabilities via routines, understood as patterned and repeated sequences of actions involving several personnel, coordinated by communication and authority (Clark, 2000). Often tacit, other routines are underpinned by explicit rules and guidance (Grant, 2012).

The use of a resource-based lens here can draw upon three relevant literatures. First, given the recent nature of 'new social procurement', research can usefully be guided by the concept of 'absorptive capacity', defined as the ability of an organisation to recognise the value of new external knowledge, assimilate it, and apply it to desired ends (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990) and widely utilised within the resource-based tradition (Zahra and George, 2002). Absorptive capacity requires an organisation to, first, have individuals within it, human resources (Grant, 2012), possessing pre-existing knowledge that permits recognition of relevant and valuable external knowledge (a potential intangible resource (Grant, 2012)). Such individuals, second, 'assimilate' this knowledge, via interpreting it within the context of the organization. Organisations, third, need to create routines (Clark, 2000), permitting the development of new capabilities by applying the knowledge (Sun and Anderson, 2010). The concept has been applied to wider 'responsible management', as, for example,

1
2
3 ‘environmental capability development entails a change in practises, routines and activities’
4
5
6 (Dzhengiz and Niesten, 2020, p889).
7

8
9 Second, more critical research within the resource-based perspective notes that the
10 development of capabilities is also subject to constraints (Child et al., 2010). With respect to
11 this, the organisation is said by Clark (2000) to operate within a ‘zone of manoeuvre’, a
12 sphere of activity within which it can successfully operate, given its existing and feasible
13 future capabilities. One constraint on future capabilities identified by Clark is organisational
14 politics, seen as commonly affecting the cross-functional activity of procurement (Franke and
15 Foerstl, 2020). Different ‘internal stakeholders’ (procurement personnel and local authority
16 service managers here, for example) are said to frequently possess narrow and misaligned
17 functional interests, values and goals, negatively affecting decision-making and, in turn,
18 procurement performance. Applied to SP, senior internal stakeholders may not release
19 necessary resources and internal stakeholders more widely may not engage with SP due to
20 antipathy, lack of interest, time constraints or objectives overload, a concern expressed by
21 Loosemore (2016). In this framing, those seeking to advance SP capabilities within the
22 organisation need to employ ‘political’ skills, themselves a human resource (Kulikowska and
23 Zatoski, 2022), to overcome ‘indifference or resistance to change’ (Loosemore et al., 2022,
24 p392).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Third, when resource-based models were being developed in the 1980s and 1990s, the focus
47 was largely internal (Wernerfelt, 1984). More recently, given extensive outsourcing, it is
48 accepted that the development of organisational capabilities often requires effective supplier
49 engagement (Allred et al., 2011). Developing this further, the inter-organisational relationship
50 (IOR) literature, utilising social exchange theory, identifies linkages between formal/informal
51 communication quality and relationship performance (Shamsollahi et al., 2021), especially in
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

novel situations where knowledge and information is low (Gessel et al., 2022), situations reported as common within SP (Cartigny and Lord, 2017; Murtagh and Brooks, 2019).

These three literatures within the broad resource-based tradition concerning capability development can provide initial guidance to inductive research seeking to explore the research question: *how might social procurement-related capabilities be developed within public authorities?* Exactly how is explained below.

Methods

While appreciating the emerging ‘practice theme’ (Loosemore et al., 2023), given the relatively limited previous research illustrating successful public authority capability development, an inductive research design was adopted in order that important factors were not missed at this stage of literature development. Following the design principles of Strauss and Corbin (1990), and Caldwell et al. (2017) in similar research, the researchers were, as stated, initially guided by three management literatures within a resource-based frame related to capability development.

The literature choices made here sought to provide the research with initial direction and *a priori* codes, without being prescriptive. These codes were supplemented by ‘grounded’ codes/sub-codes iteratively developed from data collection and analysis as the research proceeded. The aim was to build a model to guide future SP research and practice. There were initial descriptive (job title/function; SP projects; SP outcomes) and *a priori* (external documents; processes and practices; internal politics; supplier engagement) codes. Grounded codes/sub-codes developed were: ‘champions’; groups/units; senior support; government policy documents; training (webinars, case studies, online resources); coaching; ‘toolkits’ (policy, processes, templates, measurement tools, audit tools); networking (national bodies, informal networking); consultation (national, local).

1
2
3 In line with the inductive research design, qualitative data was collected from semi-structured
4 interviews and, where relevant, corporate documents (policy statements, ‘toolkits’, case
5 studies) provided by interviewees. Between May and August 2019 six preliminary ‘scoping’
6 interviews were undertaken, with 31 further respondents interviewed between September
7 2021 and May 2023 (4 providing follow-up interviews to track progress) (see Table 1). The
8 interviews were an average of 50 minutes, recorded and fully transcribed.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 **Table 1 here**
19

20 Interviews were undertaken at 11 public authorities (2 central government departments, 2
21 central government agencies, 7 local authorities), 4 of which provided access to multiple
22 respondents. To achieve interviewee triangulation, 8 managers from suppliers to the public
23 sector, 7 managers from charities and 6 independent SP experts from advisory organisations
24 were also interviewed. The buy-side interviewees were from English public authorities, with
25 the interviews exploring capability development; barriers and actions within the procurement
26 process; and success (or otherwise) in creating social value. Interviews with English supplier
27 representatives and SP experts had a similar focus, while interviews with English charity
28 representatives mainly focused upon their experiences with SP.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 England/UK was selected as the location for this research as it possesses, as stated above, an
43 increasingly robust policy environment, enjoying ‘increasing institutional interest’ (Barraket,
44 2020, p195). This places it line with Loosemore et al.’s selection criteria of a ‘relatively
45 mature social procurement policy environment’ (2023, p4195). Added to this, England/UK
46 has also been noted as containing promising SP practice (Wright, 2015; Troje and Kadefors,
47 2017) and, after Australia, has been the main focus for SP research (Lou et al., 2023).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The organisations and interviewees were selected via a combination of purposive sampling
57 and (in the case of the buy-side) ‘snowballing’ (Patton, 1990). With public authorities, we
58
59
60

sought managers responsible for or involved with SP. In addition, we sought public authorities that (despite weaknesses and problems – see data section) were amongst the more advanced in SP practice within the English public sector, to explore, in line with the research question, how capabilities might be developed. We were assisted in this selection task by SP experts within the sample (CONSULT 1-3, 5), who had worked or were familiar with the sample authorities (as well as those less advanced).

Such ‘recommendations’ were substantiated during the buy-side interviews by requesting corroborating evidence. This in part related to policy and processes (via documentation). It also related to SP outcomes. LA6, for example, provided a financial amount of social value calculated using an advisory body-provided tool. Others did not reveal numbers but provided examples of SP outcomes. CGOVORG2, LA7 and LA8 also confirmed that supplier SP commitments were monitored, as did CGOVORG3, LA2, LA5 and LA9, although they admitted gaps in practice. Perhaps not surprisingly, most (although not all) of these more advanced public authorities were large and, in the case of local authorities, urban. Many of the local authorities contained areas beset by significant economic and social problems, highlighting the importance of the SP agenda.

The selection criteria for the suppliers and charities were different and designed to recruit organisations that varied in sizes and sectors. Overall, a sample was compiled that provided ‘a broad range of perspectives regarding the topic of interest’ (Hausman, 2005, pp775-776).

Findings

The described research process generated the following findings regarding buy-side capability development and application to the selection and shaping of social value themes.

The development of social procurement capabilities

According to CONSULT2, some English public authorities were involved with SP prior to the SVA, whereas others reacted to it (LAORG1 versus LAORG4, for example). Beyond this variation, the research revealed patterns in capability development.

Social procurement 'champions'

First, adding to previous reports (Loosemore et al., 2022), SP 'champions', in place either before (LA1, for example) or as a result of the SVA (LA 6, for example), were widely identified in the research. In contrast to previous studies (Loosemore et al., 2023), these 'champions' were usually located within procurement functions and were either in SP-specific roles or had workload dedicated to their SP remit – resources had been allocated. They were also noticeably very passionate about SP, for example, LA6: 'I love the role I am doing at the moment – it's turned into my life. I want to make sure it's implemented in [name of council]'.

Such 'champions' were seen to play a pivotal role in converting resources into SP capabilities (Grant, 2012). As CGOV3 explained: 'It is not enough to develop policy and expect project teams to know how to implement it in the procurement process'. LA7 provided the outlines of how he seeks to make this work in his organisation, mainly via explicit routines promoted by a 'toolkit' (see later):

'We have our SV policy, in which we explain what we mean by it. We have a charter document which says what exactly we want in terms of SV. And we provide an action plan with a defined set of measures, what you do step-by-step and also the relative value of those steps, the multiplier, etc. This is standard. What we do additionally at the beginning of each procurement exercise with the commissioners and service leads is complete a template, called the SV Rationale, and that document specifies the

maturity of the market, what social value is relevant to this particular procurement exercise, etc.’

‘Champions’ were also playing a key role in addressing internal resistance to SP, organisational politics that has both echoes with the resource-based and procurement literatures (Child et al., 2010; Franke and Foerstl, 2020) and threatens SP capability development. LA6 explained the resistance, from procurement colleagues as well as internal stakeholders, to be overcome when seeking to advance SP:

‘A lot of these new things are given to procurement to implement, and we’ve got to go out and say, “You’ve got to do this now and think about this”. Procurement teams are seen as people who just give people work all the time, so it’s an extra thing that procurement and commissioners have got to think about, when they’ve already got a lack of capacity’.

The coolness of some internal stakeholders was noticed by suppliers and particularly affected the contract management stage of the procurement process, where social value could ‘leak’ if the procurement ‘champions’ had departed the scene:

‘Understanding can vary between the tender teams and the operational teams. Sometimes social value might come across as very important in the tender stage, but, actually, when we win the contract and get to the delivery stage the client contacts are less interested’ (SUPP5).

In this context, CGOV4 believed a key role was driving ‘changes in attitudes and behaviours’. NAT1 commented similarly:

‘We get a bit of push back from [internal] stakeholders, who say “Why not put 10% more on the cost part of the bid?” So, there is a job there. Many [internal] stakeholders are unfamiliar with social value and need to be persuaded’.

1
2
3 Not surprisingly and adding to extant research (Lou et al., 2023), several ‘champions’ within
4 public authorities mentioned that when addressing internal resistance, top-level support was
5 important (and solicited) – for example, ‘local councillors pushing on this’ (LA7). LA6
6 reported both political and executive support in her authority:
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 ‘The message has come from the leader of the council, [name], and Councillor
14 [Name]. He sponsors social value, that's no secret. And our director of Resource and
15 Housing, he signs the whole thing off. We have quarterly board meetings with him
16 where we are talking about social value outcomes and good practice. We also report
17 to Scrutiny. So having the attention of those at a high-level, and really drilling it down
18 to the operation, it's helping us to filter it and implement it.’
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 What was also emphasised by certain ‘champions’, but also supply-side interviewees, was the
28 significance of PPN 06/20 (Cabinet Office, 2020), a central government policy note, but one
29 that has had a wider signalling effect. The effect of this changed policy context, mentioned by
30 Baker (2023), and previously stated more widely as an important factor underpinning SP
31 (Barraket and Loosemore, 2018), came through in the interviews. For example, SUPP5
32 commented: ‘We are certainly seeing the minimum 10% weighting coming through quite
33 strongly and that's from ... the 06/20 launched last year’. This policy note has been useful to
34 ‘champions’ seeking to overcome internal resistance.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Social procurement groups and formal units*

47
48
49 It should also be noted that within certain of the sample public authorities, significant
50 investments were being made beyond individual ‘champions’, echoing the creation of
51 ‘foundations’ within certain UK suppliers (for example, SUPP4 and SUPP8). LA7, for
52 example, works for a regional procurement hub (LAORG6) bringing together the
53 requirements of five local authorities. LA7 is the social value lead within LAORG6, but,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 within an informal group, there are others with an SP remit and managers with SP remits in
4
5 each local authority. The group is involved in ‘strategic discussions ... to show how
6
7 procurement can be used to deliver the regional ambitions and to showcase the in-house
8
9 expertise’ (LA7). It also participates in ground-level work, for example, within volunteering
10
11 teams in a regeneration initiative attached to a bridge construction project. LA7 reported that
12
13 in 2021 social value had been delivered by the group in the areas of apprenticeships, local job
14
15 opportunities, increased local spend, local regeneration and reduced plastic usage.
16
17

18
19
20 CGOVORG2 had gone even further than an informal group and created a formal unit, a
21
22 ‘centre of expertise’. This reflected both the perceived importance of SP and also the spend
23
24 size, many billions. CGOV2 reported how the unit was seeking to establish routines in
25
26 CGOVORG2: ‘It has been put in place to make sure we have a standard, coherent and
27
28 consistent application across all areas’, reflecting concern that procurement colleagues and
29
30 internal stakeholders act in line with the SP policy and processes. While operated within
31
32 procurement, CGOV2 added: ‘We have brought in HR specialists and a sustainability
33
34 engineer as well’. The unit, it was claimed, was ‘on a journey to mature social value’.
35
36
37

38
39 Between the employment of ‘champions’ and the creation of groups and units, there was
40
41 evidence in these public authorities that significant financial resources were being invested in
42
43 SP capability development, a key concern in the literature (Loosemore et al., 2023; Troje,
44
45 2023). In the sections above, there were also initial indications about how these ‘champions’,
46
47 groups and units were seeking to develop SP capabilities. We look further at the specifics of
48
49 this below.
50
51

52 53 *Training and coaching*

54
55
56 First, in an attempt to develop human resources (Grant, 2012), numerous public authorities
57
58 ran training programmes, and informal coaching (CGOV4), for procurement colleagues and
59
60

1
2
3 especially internal stakeholders, usually managers in service/project delivery teams. LA1 had
4 put 90 staff through a ‘two-hour social value webinar’, created as a follow-up ‘four e-learning
5 modules, about, for example, contract managing social value’ and developed an extensive set
6 of online resources. In a sign of increasing stakeholder engagement, the webinar was initially
7 requested by a delivery team and since become a standard part of professional development,
8 although it was reported parts of the council had not yet engaged. This model of entry-level
9 training, follow-ups and online resources was quite common within the sample, for example,
10 the model was also seen within LAORG5 and CGOVORG2. While follow-ups could relate to
11 special topics, for example, procurement regulations (CGOV5), in LAORG4 it was more in
12 response to sub-optimal delivery team performance, although here the issue was as much
13 attitude as competence:
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 ‘What hasn’t worked well is contract management ... Some managers are very
30 diligent, but some are not. We are running regular training and putting managers
31 under pressure to improve’ (LA5).
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Case studies*

38
39 What was deemed important as part of training and coaching efforts was the use of
40 organisation-specific case studies. Such case studies had different purposes. For LA1, it was
41 about helping internal stakeholders communicate with suppliers, deemed important within the
42 IOR literature (Shamsollahi et al., 2021) and critical in allowing suppliers to contribute to
43 buy-side capability development (Allred et al., 2011): ‘They wanted to know what social
44 value looks like. Not knowing makes it hard to have conversations with suppliers. We needed
45 case studies to help them’.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Cases were also said to assist, however, with the ‘political’ effort to engage internal
57 stakeholders and overcome potential resistance or indifference (Franke and Foerstl, 2020):
58
59
60

1
2
3 'We have to show them that picture ... it's important to keep people on board and show them
4
5 what their hard work is doing' (LA6).
6
7

8 *'Toolkits'* 9

10
11 Training and coaching were often based around an SP 'toolkit' that provides both a process to
12
13 be followed and guidance on best practices along that process. 'Toolkits' were used,
14
15 therefore, both to help establish the routines needed to convert resources into organisational
16
17 capabilities (Clark, 2000) and develop human resources (Grant, 2012). Aspects of such a
18
19 'toolkit' and its use were described above by LA7, with LAORG1 providing another
20
21 example. LAORG1's 'toolkit' was used to guide internal stakeholders through defining social
22
23 value; develop measures for it; and implement it through the procurement process (LA1).
24
25 'Toolkits' went beyond local authorities. CGOV2 reported one, with NAT1 adding that her
26
27 procurement 'hub' had 'rolled it out nationally'.
28
29
30
31

32
33 At the national level, CGOV3 reported his organisation including within its 'toolkit' an audit
34
35 tool, tracking progress towards good practice across eight aspects of SP. For each aspect, the
36
37 tool describes five different states of capability development on a scale that managers can
38
39 match current capabilities against. This audit tool reflects other reports of attempts to embed
40
41 a culture of continuous improvement. For example, LA8 talked of tracking 'learning by
42
43 doing', while CGOV5 reported her organisation starting to 'capture data through the e-
44
45 procurement system' to identify opportunities to assess current practice. These efforts at
46
47 reflecting upon current practice helps to provide a feedback loop that can assist in the
48
49 development of SP capabilities (Davies and Brady, 2000).
50
51
52
53

54
55 Many of these 'toolkits' were bespoke, although informed by external resources and
56
57 knowledge such as the 2012 legislation and policy documents from the Cabinet Office and
58
59 advisory bodies. Not all were, however. LA1 reported that her organisation's 'toolkit' is a
60

1
2
3 slightly adapted version of one developed by a UK-wide partnership of advisory and peak
4
5 bodies. LA8, meanwhile, was one of numerous authorities utilising an external advisory
6
7 body's measurement tool within their 'toolkits', which assists with developing specific
8
9 supplier performance metrics, an aspect of SP that LA6, and suppliers, for example, SUPP7,
10
11 admitted is challenging and potentially distorting if it focuses solely upon raw numbers (of
12
13 disadvantaged people, for example) rather than the more intangible lasting impact made on
14
15 supplier conduct (CONSULT3, CGOV2).
16
17
18
19

20 The use of both bespoke 'toolkits' incorporating external knowledge and more 'off the shelf'
21
22 versions have echoes, of course, of absorptive capacity models (Sun and Anderson, 2010).
23
24 LA1, for example, referred to how 'we embed the tools into the tenders', a practice replicated
25
26 in LAORG6 in relation to its measurement tool, which 'enables public procurers to include
27
28 social value in decision-making' (LA8). We see here external knowledge being recognised,
29
30 assimilated, and applied to achieve the desired end of social value creation (Cohen and
31
32 Levinthal, 1990).
33
34
35

36 *Networking*

37
38
39 Further external knowledge contributing to SP capability development in the manner of
40
41 absorptive capacity models came from networking. LA8 reported participating in a national
42
43 'taskforce' that meets quarterly: 'It's all about knowledge and sharing best practice;
44
45 developing measurement systems and tools and techniques to deliver social value outcomes'.
46
47 External knowledge also came from informal networking. LA6 reported 'collaborating across
48
49 other authorities, working with experts come and say, "This is how you can make it work"'.
50
51
52
53

54 ***Applying social procurement capabilities: selection and shaping of social value themes***

55
56
57 Having discussed various mechanisms by which public authorities are developing a degree of
58
59 capability maturity, we now explore how such capabilities are being applied. A key task early
60

1
2
3 in the procurement process to which SP capabilities need to be applied is selecting and
4
5 shaping the social value ‘themes’ (Cabinet Office, 2020) to be taken forward by the public
6
7 authority, both as organisation-level priorities and in individual procurements. If this task is
8
9 not undertaken effectively then the social value may not match social need or be ineffectively
10
11 delivered, as noted in the SP literature (Burke and King, 2015; Cartigny and Lord, 2017).
12
13

14 15 *Consultation to select themes*

16
17
18 The starting point within the local authorities was community consultation to obtain valuable
19
20 knowledge – usually engagement with community organisations where there were existing
21
22 relationships. This was, first, to select organisation-level SP priority themes. LA7
23
24 commented:
25
26

27
28 ‘To understand what the priorities are across the region, we did a consultation
29
30 exercise: “We’ve got the SV offer, what are your biggest priorities and barriers over
31
32 the next 12 months?” So, it was local economic recovery and tackling environmental
33
34 challenges’.
35
36

37
38 This type of engagement was replicated elsewhere, as described by CONSULT2,
39
40 commenting about the many local authorities she has advised:
41
42

43
44 ‘When we work with an organization, our starting point is, “What are the priorities of
45
46 that particular organization?... And are they based on the needs of that particular
47
48 community? If not, identify its outcomes and priorities’.
49
50

51
52 Second, there was also community engagement to select SP themes for individual
53
54 procurements. LA6 describes this, highlighting again the importance of ‘champions’ in
55
56 coordinating SP activity as they are the link between internal and external stakeholders:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ‘We have partnerships with our “anchor groups” in the city ... For example, in [place
4 name], which is quite a socially deprived area, if we’ve got some construction there,
5
6 we will speak to the community and say, “What do you need for your community ...
7
8 for example, what health and mental health support do they need”. We listen and go
9
10 to our procurement officers and say, “In [place name] we need 20 apprenticeships”, or
11
12 we need to ensure we employ say ten people with disabilities, BAME, or women. So,
13
14 we can specify what communities need’.

15
16
17
18
19
20 National-level public authorities, by contrast, reported a more ‘top-down’ approach to
21
22 selecting priority themes. Managers made judgements, although in some cases after
23
24 consultation with national-level stakeholders. NAT1 commented as such: ‘We ask, what is
25
26 relevant and what is a priority for the different areas?’, as did CGOV2: ‘In the guidance
27
28 we’ve issued to our procurement colleagues, we’ve said “These are the main areas we want
29
30 you to focus on in all your acquisitions”’. A more top-down approach was, perhaps, likely
31
32 with national-level organisations. First, there is greater ‘distance’ between such organisations
33
34 and community-level organisations. Second, these organisations, unlike local authorities,
35
36 have a specific policy remit and reported being keen to link that remit to SP activity.

37
38
39
40
41 As an aside, what was also picked up during the research was that some social value themes
42
43 outlined by PPN 06/20, for example, disability employment, were seemingly ‘slipping
44
45 through the cracks’, not picked up either during the community consultation by local
46
47 authorities or by the policy focus of the central government organisations (numerous,
48
49 especially CH1 and CH3). This should be of concern to UK policymakers.

50 51 52 53 *Making selected themes specific*

54
55
56 For individual procurements, the next step was to make requirements within the selected
57
58 themes specific for suppliers and thus deliverable. To this end, according to CONSULT1,
59
60

1
2
3 many local authorities map chosen themes against the external measurement tools within
4
5 their ‘toolkits’, although certain suppliers noted that such mapping was ‘very restrictive and
6
7 often difficult to report on’ (SUPP4). Nevertheless, LA6, for example, reported her tailored
8
9 use of one such tool:

10
11
12
13 ‘We’ve looked at the national framework and we’ve bespoke it to match our
14
15 priorities. Any measure that is used should help us to get to our priorities. So, it’s
16
17 about looking at what that community needs and looking at our ... framework’.

18
19
20 Making requirements specific also requires ‘champions’ to work closely with internal
21
22 stakeholders, while simultaneously seeking to make them more independent in the future.
23
24 CGOV5 commented: ‘In my role as social value lead, I am instructing project teams about
25
26 pre-market engagement. The teams need to think about what social value is proportionate
27
28 and, crucially, able to be delivered by the supplier’. Engaging with internal stakeholders to
29
30 develop specific requirements was a reason for the unit established by CGOVORG2:

31
32
33
34
35 ‘[The unit] looks at making sure we can provide advice and guidance around what
36
37 project teams put in their ITTs, their valuation of those, and how they'd translate those
38
39 into good quality measurable outcomes’ (CGOV2).

40 41 42 *Supplier engagement*

43
44
45 It is also critical here that public authorities engage effectively with suppliers (Allred et al.,
46
47 2011), where ‘early engagement with the market is important’ (CGOV3). Developed buyer
48
49 capabilities (or otherwise) are evident to (especially competent) suppliers here. SUPP7
50
51 referred to having ‘real partnership conversations’ and a ‘collaborative approach to
52
53 developing the social value plan’ with competent public authorities, while ‘having to take the
54
55 lead’ on other occasions where authorities ‘just don’t get it’ (SUPP4).

1
2
3 The objectives of supplier engagement are said to vary. First, in some cases it is simply to
4 assist suppliers understand social value – as with the buy-side, not all suppliers to the public
5 sector are at the same stage. LA7 commented: ‘We use the case studies we develop to show
6 suppliers what social value is - to try and demystify’. LA6 commented similarly:
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 ‘We’ve been talking to some suppliers when they're going through the bidding stage
14 and they're saying to us, “How do we do it, we don’t know what it is, we don’t know
15 what to do. So, we say, look at this or that, and after having those discussions with
16 them a light bulb comes on, and it’s almost, yeah, we can do this’.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Second, engagement can ascertain that SP priority themes can be met by suppliers. Public
24 authorities need to have priorities, given the breadth of social value, but there is also danger
25 in being inflexible or unreasonable, as this could affect core delivery and/or increase costs.
26 Flexibility in terms of which prioritised themes are pursued is suggested and can be worked
27 through in close supplier dialogue that ideally results in enhanced ‘goal alignment’ (beyond
28 that already generated by the SVA-sanctioned award criteria) (Caldwell et al., 2017; Troje,
29 2023). CONSULT2 reflected on experiences with public authorities, with constrained choice
30 suggested:
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 ‘We're always saying [to public authorities], it's a supplier that has to own this, so
43 they should have the option to choose. As an organization, everything you've got on
44 this list [of priority themes] is important ... [so it] doesn't matter what the suppliers
45 select, your residents and communities are going to benefit ... If suppliers select
46 things that as a business are important to them, they will have a vested interest in
47 delivering it well, because it's not just about giving a [disabled] person a job, for
48 example, it's about ensuring ...that person is supported’ (CONSULT2).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 At times, it is said to be necessary to even explore, again through dialogue, options off the
4 priority list, if the supply base cannot deliver: ‘We took that [procurement] exercise to local
5 suppliers, to say, “These are the priorities we are getting from the region, are you as suppliers
6 geared up to help us? Or is there something else you would like us to focus on?”’ (LA7).
7
8 CGOV5 has had similar experiences: ‘Ask the suppliers, “These are themes and outcomes we
9 might adopt. Are these OK, or might you struggle? Can you suggest others?” Go through the
10 process’. More advanced suppliers, perhaps possessing a ‘foundation’, will have often
11 already worked on this. For example, SUPP8: ‘My role is engaging with local communities
12 where we build. All our jobs have a social agenda, so before we start a job ... we look at our
13 customer’s requirements and try to put a social value agenda together which matches that’.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Third, engagement can concern ascertaining supplier plans for delivering social value.
28
29 CGOV6 explained his organisation’s actions here:

30
31
32 ‘We are looking to get a comprehensive answer from the supplier on how they are to
33 provide social value. It is very easy to get a very generic response from suppliers - the
34 CSR policy and so on. We are now more focused on how social value can be captured
35 during the contract’.

36
37
38
39
40
41
42 LA5 provided a specific example of this: ‘We know there is a lot of rough sleeping around
43 the council housing. We asked under ‘partnership with communities’, “Please specify how
44 you are going to address rough sleeping in the city centre”’. Indeed, suppliers in the sample
45 reported increasingly being asked to provide detailed plans. SUPP5 was one: ‘We had a
46 tender recently where they wanted us to map out [a delivery plan] on a monthly and quarterly
47 basis ... Who we would liaise with, what we were planning to deliver and when ... all
48 mapped to the national [measures]’.

1
2
3 Fourth, the dialogue with suppliers can involve the public authority seeking to learn from
4 suppliers. For example, the large firm ‘foundations’ (SUPP4 and SUPP8) possess
5 considerable knowledge and expertise, as do smaller, local suppliers that can contribute to an
6 understanding of local needs and how to deliver upon them. LA6 believed that SMEs were
7 particularly likely to be able to contribute in this way: ‘We need to engage with them because
8 they are the people on the ground. They have so much knowledge that can help. We don’t
9 want to forget about them’. This aspect of supplier engagement in particular highlights
10 vividly why resource-based models adapted to include supplier interactions (Allred et al.,
11 2011).

22 Discussion

23
24
25 This research explored the question: *how might social procurement-related capabilities be*
26 *developed within public authorities?* Using three literatures within the broad resource-based
27 tradition to initially guide the research, the findings here both confirm and build upon
28 existing research into capability development within the ‘practice theme’ of the SP literature
29 (Barraket, 2020; Loosemore et al., 2021; Loosemore et al., 2022; Loosemore et al., 2023;
30 Troje and Andersson, 2021).

31 Figure 1 here

32
33
34 As can be seen in Figure 1, the research very much confirmed the central importance of SP
35 ‘champions’ to buy-side capability development (Loosemore et al., 2022). First, in line with
36 absorptive capacity models (Sun and Anderson, 2010), such ‘champions’ were seen (Box 1)
37 to be identifying (in the form of, for example, government policy documents and external
38 ‘toolkits’/measurement tools) and assimilating (in the form of, for example, creating policies
39 and bespoke ‘toolkits’) external knowledge, facilitating the ultimate application of such
40

1
2
3 knowledge (for example, via the embedding of tools in tender documentation) as they pursue,
4
5 with some success, positive SP outcomes.
6
7

8 This assimilation of external knowledge led to the public authorities possessing an SP
9
10 'infrastructure' (Box A) to assist the development of SP capabilities, elements of which have
11
12 previously featured within SP research, but often as an aspiration (Lou et al., 2023). First, the
13
14 establishment of SP policy, signalling the importance of SP to the organisation. Second, a
15
16 formal education programme involving webinars, online learning materials and case studies
17
18 to develop human resources (Grant, 2012). Third, 'toolkits' to guide actions and establish
19
20 routines (Clark, 2000). The research identified both externally obtained 'off-the-shelf' and
21
22 externally informed bespoke 'toolkits' that guided procurement managers and internal
23
24 stakeholders along the procurement process.
25
26
27
28

29
30 At present, despite the progress achieved, the 'toolkits' were seen to be mainly contributing
31
32 to explicitly stated routines (Grant, 2012), with much 'handholding' of internal stakeholders
33
34 by 'champions' and filling out of templates. It will be interesting to see whether such explicit
35
36 routines are simply appropriate to SP (given, for example, the variable engagement of
37
38 internal stakeholders) or whether tacit routines develop as the public authorities mature
39
40 further. The findings also identified a risk of the measurement tools within 'toolkits' being
41
42 too reductionist, i.e. focusing upon numbers (of, for example, disadvantaged people
43
44 employed under a contract) rather than more difficult, less tangible, but arguably more lasting
45
46 cultural change within suppliers. This was a live debate within several of the public
47
48 authorities here, with such measurement risks much discussed within wider public sector
49
50 management (Mannion and Braitwaite, 2012).
51
52
53

54
55
56 Second, the 'champions' were also seen to play an internal 'political' role within the public
57
58 authorities (Box 2), possessing as they did an awareness that an SP 'infrastructure' was of
59
60

1
2
3 little use if key internal stakeholders were not using it. In line with ‘political models’ within
4
5 the resource-based tradition (Clark, 2000) and research within the procurement field (Franke
6
7 and Foerstl, 2020), the ‘champions’ here were, on the one hand, involved in profile-raising, to
8
9 ensure SP got heard above the organisational ‘noise’ – internal stakeholders, for example,
10
11 have myriad agendas, priorities, and targets. ‘Champions’ were also pursuing actions to
12
13 address internal, often service delivery team resistance (Watson et al., 2013). In terms of
14
15 addressing such resistance, while they were helped by the obligatory policy environment
16
17 created by the SVA and PPN 06/20 (Box B), they were also proactive in both seeking to
18
19 utilise ‘relational authority’ (Huising, 2015) in the form of persuasion (Box C) and by acting
20
21 to maintain top-level support (Box D) (Lampaki and Papadakis, 2018).
22
23
24
25

26
27 Finally, the ‘champions’ were also seen to be playing a coordination role (Box 3) at the
28
29 centre of a network that consisted of internal stakeholders, suppliers, and social value
30
31 recipients (for example, local community groups). Such a role is, of course, essential given
32
33 that procurement, including SP, is a ‘boundary-spanning’ activity and involved both bringing
34
35 these key players together and transmitting knowledge and information between them.
36
37 Specifically, the ‘champions’ were, first, informing procurement colleagues and wider
38
39 internal stakeholders about the expressed social value needs of social value recipients.
40
41 Second, in line with resource-based (Allred et al, 2011) and inter-organisational relationship
42
43 literatures (Shamsollahi et al., 2021), they were also engaging and communicating with
44
45 suppliers, as well as linking them with their procurement colleagues and wider stakeholders.
46
47 The nature of this communication varied depending on how developed the suppliers were in
48
49 terms of SP. With suppliers new to SP, knowledge and information flowed outwards,
50
51 particularly where suppliers needed assistance with understanding the concept of SP (Gessel
52
53 et al., 2022). Where suppliers were more advanced, some even possessing SP ‘foundations’,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the knowledge and information flow was two-way, with both discussions to ensure alignment
4
5 on SP themes and mutual learning on 'best practice' (Cheung et al., 2011).
6
7

8 What was observed, therefore, were three complementary roles on the part of the
9
10 'champions' (anticipated by the three resource-based literatures) that had furthered SP
11
12 capabilities within their organisations. External knowledge was utilised to develop an SP
13
14 'infrastructure' that was then operated with both internal (the sometimes-reluctant
15
16 procurement colleagues and service delivery teams) and external stakeholders (social value
17
18 recipients and suppliers).
19
20
21

22
23 It is interesting to note, however, that, while the research here confirmed the central
24
25 importance of SP 'champions' to capability development (Loosemore et al., 2022), it also
26
27 contrasted in certain respects with past research (Loosemore et al., 2023). First, the findings
28
29 revealed that in these public authorities, at least, such buy-side 'champions' were
30
31 predominantly procurement professionals. No significant differences were found in the
32
33 challenges, roles, successes and failures of 'champions' located within procurement or within
34
35 other functions, perhaps because of their common middle management status. Second, the
36
37 level of investment in 'champions' here was often quite significant – the research identified
38
39 specialist SP roles, SP as part of workload and in some cases SP groups or units with multiple
40
41 'champions'. This investment appeared to be taking SP practice in these authorities beyond
42
43 the 'experimental, disconnected and nascent' (Loosemore et al., 2023, p4205).
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Conclusion**

50
51 This paper has explored, via inductive research, the development of buy-side SP capabilities
52
53 within a sample of English public authorities. While underdevelopment is clearly the
54
55 predominant state of SP capabilities around the world, within these public authorities, at least,
56
57 developing maturity was discernible. The research here exploring this maturity generated a
58
59
60

1
2
3 model (Figure 1) providing an agenda for buy-side SP capability development that can play a
4
5 role in the emerging ‘practice theme’ within the literature (Loosemore et al., 2023). A few
6
7 priorities stand out.
8
9

10
11 First, further research is needed on the role of SP ‘champions’ in capability development
12
13 (Loosemore et al., 2022). The value of dedicated workload was, not surprisingly, shown here,
14
15 but there is still more to be learned regarding location, seniority, knowledge and skills, and
16
17 differences between buy and supply-side ‘champions’. Second, future research can also
18
19 develop our understanding of necessary buy-side SP ‘infrastructure’. There are findings here
20
21 regarding policy, the acquisition and utilisation of external knowledge, training, ‘toolkits’,
22
23 including measurement tools, that build upon existing research within the ‘practice theme’
24
25 (Loosemore et al., 2021; Lou et al., 2023; Troje and Andersson, 2021). More detailed
26
27 research is needed on these different ‘infrastructure’ elements, which, if undertaken through a
28
29 resource-based lens, can utilise models of absorptive capacity (Sun and Anderson, 2010),
30
31 resource development (Grant, 2012), tacit and explicit routines (Grant, 2012) and supplier
32
33 engagement (Allred et al., 2011), as well as critical models highlighting organisational power
34
35 and politics (Clark, 2000).
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 The findings here also have implications for buy-side practitioners. First, the paper provides a
43
44 potential roadmap for organisational capability development. Second, the research makes
45
46 clear that public authorities should not seek to reinvent the capability wheel. Engagement
47
48 with peers, advisory bodies, established ‘toolkits’, etc. is imperative, with much expertise
49
50 publicly available. Third, it also suggests that smaller public authorities might seek to act as
51
52 part of a consortium rather than go it alone, given the investment required for effective SP.
53
54 We saw an example in the findings. Fourth, the research showed that practitioners need to
55
56 understand SP as not simply a development challenge but also a political one. Experienced
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioners will be accustomed to this and can use existing political nous - the politics of SP
4
5 are not idiosyncratic but part of everyday organisational life.
6
7

8 Finally, the authors accept certain research limitations. First, the paper only addresses
9
10 capability development on the buy-side, which also affects interview data usage. Second, the
11
12 research has a limited sample size and range. A larger sample and the perspectives of small,
13
14 rural and under-developed public authorities might usefully be obtained in future research.
15
16 Third, the model is based upon data from English public authorities only. With respect to this,
17
18 absorptive capacity, organisational processes, training and development, organisational
19
20 politics and buyer-supplier engagement (the key features of the model) are understood to be
21
22 both universal organisational practices and context-specific in their application (for example,
23
24 Flatten et al, 2015; Wong et al., 2017). Therefore, while the model developed here can be
25
26 applied in different contexts with a degree of confidence, implementation on the ground
27
28 would need to honour national cultural and institutional differences (Hartog and Hoogh,
29
30 2024). Fourth, the paper was primarily concerned with 'corporate' procurement capabilities,
31
32 as against looking in detail at implementing any particular social value theme. Such detail
33
34 will be part of training provision, of course, within many public authorities, but was beyond
35
36 the scope of this paper. Finally, detailed case studies to gain greater insight into the
37
38 mechanisms reported here will be useful in future research.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **References**

- 47
48
49 Allred, C., Fawcett, S., Wallin, C. and Magnan, G. (2011), "A dynamic collaboration
50
51 capability as a source of competitive advantage", *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 129-
52
53 161.
54
55
56 Arrowsmith, S. (2010), "Horizontal policies in public procurement: a taxonomy", *Journal of*
57
58 *Public Procurement*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 149-186.
59
60

1
2
3 Awuzie, B. and McDermott, P. (2016), “The role of contracting strategies in social value
4 implementation”, *Proceeding of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Management,*
5
6 *Procurement and Law*, Vol. 169 No. 3, pp. 106-114.
7
8
9

10 Baker, M. (2023), “Delivering social value: How PPN 06/20 is – and isn’t – changing our
11 sector”, *Construction News*, May 25, www.constructionnews.co.uk (retrieved December 8th
12 2023).
13
14
15
16

17 Barraket, J. (2020), “The role of intermediaries in social innovation: The case of social
18 procurement in Australia”, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp194-214.
19
20
21
22

23 Barraket, J. and Loosemore, M. (2018), “Co-creating social value through cross-sector
24 collaboration between social enterprises and the construction industry”, *Construction*
25 *Management and Economics*, Vol. 36 No. 7, pp. 394–408.
26
27
28
29

30 Burke, C. and King, A. (2015), “Generating social value through public sector construction
31 procurement”, *Proceedings of the 31st ARCOM Conference*, Lincoln: UK, pp. 387-396.
32
33
34
35

36 Cabinet Office (2015), *Social Value Act Review*, Cabinet Office, London.
37
38

39 Cabinet Office (2020), *Procurement Policy Note 06/20: Taking Account of Social Value in*
40 *the Award of Central Government Contracts*, Cabinet Office, London.
41
42
43

44 Cabinet Office (2021), *Procurement Policy Note 05/21: National Procurement Policy*
45 *Statement*, Cabinet Office, London.
46
47
48

49 Caldwell, N., Roehrich, J. and George, G. (2017), “Social value creation and relational
50 coordination in public-private collaborations”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 54 No.
51 6, pp. 906 – 928.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Cartigny, T. and Lord, W. (2017) "Defining social value in the UK construction industry",
4
5 *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Management, Procurement and Law*, Vol.
6
7 172 No. 1, pp. 8-16.

8
9
10 Cheung, M-S., Myers, M. and Mentzer, J. (2011), "The value of relational learning in global
11
12 buyer-supplier exchanges: a dyadic perspective and test of the pie-sharing premise", *Strategic*
13
14 *Management Journal*, Vol. 32, pp. 1061-1082.

15
16
17 Child, J., Elbanna, S. and Rodrigues, S. (2010), 'The political aspects of strategic decision-
18
19 making', in Nutt, P. and Wilson, D. (eds.) *The Handbook of Decision-Making*, Wiley,
20
21 Chichester, pp105-138.

22
23
24 Clark, P. (2000), *Organisations in Action: Competition Between Contexts*, Routledge,
25
26 London.

27
28
29 Cohen, W. and Levinthal, D. (1990), "Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning
30
31 and innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 128-152.

32
33
34 Davies, A. and Brady, T. (2000), "Organisational capabilities and learning in complex
35
36 product systems: Towards repeatable solutions", *Research Policy*, Vol. 29 No. 7/8, pp. 931-
37
38 953.

39
40
41 Dzhengiz, T. and Niesten, E. (2020), "Competences for environmental sustainability: A
42
43 systematic review on the impact of absorptive capacity and capabilities", *Journal of Business*
44
45 *Ethics*, Vol. 162, pp. 881-906.

46
47
48 Ewuga, D. and Awesi, M. (2023), "Integrating sustainability practices into the Irish
49
50 construction supply chain: Main contractors' perspective", *Built Environment Project and*
51
52 *Asset Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 105-122.

1
2
3 Flatten, T., Adams, D. and Brettel, M. (2015), "Fostering absorptive capacity through
4 leadership: a cross-cultural analysis", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 519-534.
5
6

7
8 Franke, H. and Foerstl, K. (2020), "Understanding politics in PSM teams: A cross-
9 disciplinary review and future research agenda", *Journal of Purchasing and Supply*
10 *Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, 100608.
11
12

13
14
15
16 Furneaux, C. and Barraket, J. (2014), "Purchasing social good(s): A definition and typology
17 of social procurement", *Public Money & Management*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 265-272.
18
19

20
21 Gesell, C., Glas, A., H. and Essig, M. (2022), "The impact of buyer-supplier communication
22 on production ramp-up performance", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 37
23 No. 5, pp. 945-960.
24
25

26
27
28 Gidigah, K., Agyekum, K. and Baiden, B. (2022), "Defining social value in the public
29 procurement process for works", *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*
30 Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 2245-2267.
31
32
33

34
35
36 Government Commercial Function (2020), *The Social Value Model*, Government
37 Commercial Function, London.
38
39

40
41 Grant, R. (2012), *Contemporary Strategy Analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
42
43

44
45 Hamilton, S. (2020), "Rise to the top: Socially responsible public procurement",
46 *Policy@Manchester Articles: Energy and Environment*, October 19.
47
48

49
50 Hartog, D. and Hoogh, A. (2024), "Cross-cultural leadership: what we know, what we need
51 to know and where we need to go", *Annual Reviews in Organizational Psychology and*
52 *Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 11, pp. 535-556.
53
54
55

56
57 Hausman, A. (2005), "Innovativeness among small businesses: Theory and propositions for
58 future research", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 773-782.
59
60

1
2
3 Helfat, C. and Lieberman, M. (2002), "The birth of capabilities: market entry and the
4 importance of pre-history", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp725-760.
5
6

7
8 HM Government (2012), *Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012*.
9

10
11 Huising, R. (2015), "To hive or to hold? producing professional authority through scut
12 work", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 263-299.
13
14

15
16 Kraaijenbrink, J., Spender, J-C. and Groen, A. (2010), "The resource-based view: A review
17 and assessment of its critiques", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 349-372.
18
19

20
21 Kulikowska, M. and Zatonski, M. (2022), "The relationship between organizational politics,
22 strategic political management, and competitive advantage", *International Journal of*
23 *Contemporary Management*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 15-27.
24
25
26

27
28 Lampaki, A. and Papadakis, V. (2018), "The impact of organisational politics and trust in the
29 top management team on strategic decision implementation success: a middle manager's
30 perspective", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 627-637.
31
32
33

34
35 Loosemore, M. (2016), "Social procurement in UK construction projects", *International*
36 *Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 133-144.
37
38

39
40 Loosemore, M., Denny-Smith, G., Barraket, J., Keast, R., Chamberlain, D., Muir, K., Powell,
41 A., Higgon, D. and Osborne, J. (2021), "Optimising social procurement policy outcomes
42 through cross-sector collaboration in the Australian construction industry", *Engineering,*
43 *Construction and Architectural Management*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 1908-1928.
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Loosemore, M., Keast, R. and Barraket, J. (2022), "A typology of social procurement
51 champions in the construction and engineering industry", *Construction Management and*
52 *Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 391-405.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Loosemore, M., Keast, R and Barraket, J. (2023), “How are social procurement actors shaping a new field of practice in the Australian construction industry?”, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, Vol. 30 No. 9, pp. 4192-4209.

Loosemore, M. and Reid, S. (2019), “The social procurement practices of tier-one construction contractors in Australia”, *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 183-200.

Lou, C., Natoli, R., Goodwin, D., Bok, B., Zhao, F. and Zhang, P. (2023), “A systematic literature review of research on social procurement in the construction and infrastructure sector: Barriers, enablers and strategies”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 15, 12964.

Mannion, R. and Braithwaite, J. (2012), “Unintended consequences of performance measurement in healthcare: 20 salutary lessons from the English National Health Service”, *Internal Medicine Journal*, Vol. 42, pp. 569-574.

Mather, J. (2009), *Leadership for Sustainable Procurement*, Carbon Free Group, Maidstone.

McCrudden, C. (2004), “Using public procurement to achieve social outcomes”, *National Resources Forum*, Vol. 28, pp. 257-267.

Molloy, C., Bankins, S., Kriz, A. and Barnes, L. (2020), “Making Sense of an Interconnected World: How Innovation Champions Drive Social Innovation in the Not-for-Profit Context”, *Journal of Production Innovation Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp274-296.

Murtagh, S. and Brooks T. (2019), “Critical success factors for social value in construction procurement in Northern Ireland”, *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Management, Procurement and Law*, Vol. 172 No. 5, pp. 183–196.

O’Brien, A. (2023), The procurement bill and the future of social value”, www.socialenterpriseuk.org.uk (retrieved December 9th 2023).

1
2
3 Patton, M. (1990), *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, Sage, Beverley Hills: CA.

4
5
6 Petersen, D. and Kadefors, A. (2016), “Social procurement and employment requirements in
7
8 construction”, *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ARCOM Conference*, Manchester: UK, pp.
9
10 1045-1054.

11
12
13 Rankl, F., Collins, A., Tyers, R. and Carver, D. (2023) *The Role of Local Government in*
14
15 *Delivering New Zero*, House of Commons Library, London.

16
17
18 Raynor, A. (2022), *Speech to the Labour Party Conference*, September 25.

19
20
21 Shamsollahi, A., Chmielewski-Raimondo, D.A., Bell, S.A., Kachouie, R., (2021), “Buyer–
22
23 supplier relationship dynamics: a systematic review”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*
24
25 *Science*, Vol, 49, pp. 418–436.

26
27
28 Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory*
29
30 *Procedures and Techniques*, Sage, Newbury Park: CA.

31
32
33 Sun, P. and Anderson, M. (2010), “An examination of the relationship between absorptive
34
35 capacity and organizational learning, and a proposed integration”, *International Journal of*
36
37 *Management Reviews*, Vol. 12 No 2, pp. 130-150.

38
39
40 Troje, D. (2023), “Social sustainability in projects: Using social procurement to create
41
42 employment in the Swedish construction sector”, *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 54 No.
43
44 1, pp. 52-69.

45
46
47 Troje, D. and Andersson, T. (2021), “As above, not so below: Developing social procurement
48
49 practices on strategic and operative levels”, *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An*
50
51 *International Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 242-258.

52
53
54 Troje, D. and Gluch, P. (2020), “Beyond policies and social washing: How social
55
56 procurement unfolds in practice”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 12, 4956.

1
2
3 Troje, D. and Kadefors, A. (2017), "Employment requirements in Swedish construction
4 procurement: institutional perspectives", *Journal of Facilities Management*, Vol. 16 No. 3,
5 pp. 284-298.
6
7

8
9
10 Watson, G., Chicksand, D. and Lonsdale, C. (2013), "The micro-politics of operational
11 adjustment: veto players and the consolidation of demand in the NHS", *Production Planning
12 and Control*, Vol. 24 No. 10/11, pp. 948-961.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Wernerfelt, B. (1984), "A resource-based view of the firm", *Strategic Management Journal*,
19 Vol. 5 No. 2, pp.171-180.
20
21
22

23
24 Whittington, R. (2001), *What is Strategy and Does it Matter?*, Thompson Learning, Toronto.
25

26
27 Wong, C., Sancha, C. and Thomsen, C. (2017), "A national cultural perspective in the
28 efficacy of supply chain integration perspectives", *International Journal of Production
29 Economics*, Vol. 193, pp. 554-556.
30
31
32

33
34 Wright, T. (2015), "New development: Can 'social value' requirements on
35 public authorities be used in procurement to increase women's participation in the UK
36 construction industry?", *Public Money & Management*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 135-140.
37
38
39

40
41 Zahra, S. and George, G. (2002), "Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and
42 extension", *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 185-203.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: List of Interviews

Interviewee	Organisation	Job Role
LA1	LAORG1	Procurement Business Partner
LA2	LAORG2	Social Value Lead
LA3	LAORG3	Social Value Lead
LA4	LAORG4	Councillor
LA5	LAORG4	Policy and Governance Manager
LA6	LAORG5	Social Value Lead
LA7	LAORG6	Economic Development and Policy Manager
LA8	LAORG6	Head of Procurement
LA9	LAORG7	Senior Category Manager
CGOV1	CGOVORG1	Commodity Lead
CGOV2	CGOVORG2	Procurement Director
CGOV3	CGOVORG2	Leader of Expert Unit
CGOV4	CGOVORG2	Project Management Lead – Social Value
CGOV5	CGOVORG3	Social Value Lead
CGOV6	CGOVORG3	Commercial Director
NAT1	NAT ORG1	Commercial Manager
CONSULT1	CONSULTORG1	Social Value Consultant
CONSULT2	CONSULTORG1	Social Value Consultant
CONSULT3	CONSULTORG2	Solicitor
CONSULT4	CONSULTORG3	Procurement Consultant
CONSULT5	CONSULTORG4	Procurement Advisor
CONSULT6	CONSULTORG5	Procurement Consultant
SUPP1	SUPPORG1	Managing Director
SUPP2	SUPPORG2	Business Development Manager
SUPP3	SUPPORG3	Community Engagement Lead
SUPP4	SUPPORG4	Social Sustainability Manager
SUPP5	SUPPORG5	Head of Social Value
SUPP6	SUPPORG6	Director
SUPP7	SUPPORG7	Social Value Lead
SUPP8	SUPPORG8	Community Engagement Manager
CH1	CHORG1	Policy Manager
CH2	CHORG2	Employment Support Officer
CH3	CHORG3	Head of Policy
CH4	CHORG4	Employment Manager
CH5	CHORG5	Outreach and Development Lead
CH6	CHORG6	Policy Manager
CH7	CHORG7	Director of Campaigns

Figure 1. Development of Social Procurement Capabilities within English Public Authorities

