Comparative Case Study of Financial Sustainability and Social Impact in Grassroots Organizations

Jinfeng Chen*

Worthlife(Shenzhen) Co., LTD, Shenzhen, China

*jim@worthlife.cn

Abstract

Grassroots organizations (GROs) are vital to address complex social and environmental problems, yet they face a common challenge: how to become financially sustainable while steadfastly adhering to their social mission. The literature has dealt with fundraising strategies or social impact assessment separately and has focused on large nonprofit organizations, devoting less attention to the intrinsic challenges faced by community-based organizations in resource-scarce and unstable environments. This study proposes a comparative multi-case study design to offer a detailed exploration of the different strategies employed by GROs to balance their twin objectives. It will create an integrated "finance-mission" analytical framework based on Hybrid Organizing Theory, Resource Dependence Theory, and Institutional Theory to investigate systematically organizations with divergent revenue structures. Employing qualitative methods of semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis, the study aims to ascertain how different financial strategies influence organizational mission conformity or drift, uncover the key organizational competencies and exogenous conditions for successful straddling of the twin missions, and investigate the process of strategic adaptation amidst internal and external pressures.

Keywords

Grassroots Organizations, Financial Sustainability, Social Impact, Hybrid Organizing, Nonprofit Management.

1. Introduction

Throughout the globe, grassroots organizations (GROs) are being viewed as increasingly pivotal agents for change at the community level and solutions to critical issues confronting society. Based in their communities, they employ local assets and indigenous knowledge to provide sustainable solutions for environmental, economic, and social development [1, 2]. However, their existence and growth are normally constrained by an inherent and persistent structural tension: the desire for economic viability without compromising their social purpose [3]. Traditional funding structures, e.g., government support and philanthropic grants, are characterized by mounting uncertainty and volatility, especially during periods of economic downturn, compelling most GROs to pursue alternative, more resilient financial models [4].

To that, there is an emerging new paradigm on "sustainable finance," involving new instruments like impact investing and social impact bonds [5]. The trend presents opportunities and unprecedented challenges for GROs. On the positive side, it opens up new sources of finance; on the negative, it introduces market-based rationality and measurement metrics that can lead to "mission drift" - when financial objectives become increasingly paramount compared to the initial social mission of an organization [6]. This issue is particularly vital for low-resource GROs operating under uncertain circumstances. Thus, the core challenge they are facing is no longer just fundraising but more specifically forging a rich

and vibrant strategic congruence between their financial strategy and their social mission. This paper will seek to construct and articulate a research framework for systematic investigation of this challenge, exploring the determinants of generating long-term sustainable social value within complex settings through an in-depth exploration of GROs' strategies.

2. Theoretical Foundation and Literature Review

This study is grounded in a multi-dimensional framework that integrates three complementary theories to analyze the strategic actions of GROs from different perspectives.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

To conceptually approach the complex challenges of GROs systematically, this research integrates three key theories. First, Hybrid Organizing Theory provides the core analytical instrument. It posits that when institutions embark on both social and commercial goals at the same time, they embark on rival institutional logics (i.e., social welfare and market logic) which are held inside them, causing perpetual internal tension. This theory will be used to examine contradictions between money and mission objectives inherent in GROs, as well as governance structures and internal practices created to manage such contradictions. Second, Resource Dependence Theory (RDT) is used to explain the strategic seeking of resources. RDT argues that an organization's behavior and survival hinge on whether it can effectively manage its dependencies on resource providers external to the organization. It explains why and how GROs choose some financing strategies, i.e., revenue diversification or strategic partnership, to address funding uncertainty and reduce dependence on a single source of funding. Lastly, Institutional Theory assists in examining how the external environment influences organizational strategy. Institutional Theory posits that an organization's behavior is influenced by its institutional environment to become legitimate. It will be employed to examine how outside forces-policies, industry practices, and expectations of the funders-affect the strategic options and organizational forms of GROs by exerting coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures, particularly in terms of legitimacy construction.

2.2. Literature Gaps

Existing research in this field is scattered. First, nonprofit financial sustainability research typically treats financial well-being as a standalone goal, hardly ever studying its complex interplay with the success of social mission, and lacks qualitative research in the GRO [7]. Second, the current literature on impact investing and sustainable finance largely employs a macro-level capital market perspective and lacks evidence of significant exploration into how resource-constrained community organizations know, adopt, and apply these financial instruments at the micro-level [8]. Third, while the social enterprise literature itself grapples with the dual-mission conundrum, its subjects are typically legally constituted organizations, lacking coverage of the wide range of GROs functioning in informal arrangements. Finally, research in grassroots innovation is focused on the social impact itself, without a systematic analysis of the base financial models and sustainability mechanisms [9,10]. This study is positioned at the intersection of these disciplines with the aim of overcoming this important theoretical gap through the comparative and detailed analysis of GROs' strategic practices.

3. Research Design and Methodology

To achieve its objectives, this study will employ a qualitative, comparative multi-case study methodology. This approach is particularly suitable for in-depth exploration of the "how" and "why" questions behind complex social phenomena, allowing for a holistic capture of organizational strategic decision-making processes within their real-life, dynamic contexts [11].

3.1. Case Selection

This research plans to select four to six GROs as cases, using purposeful sampling based on the logic of "theoretical sampling." To allow for theoretical replication and extension, case selection will ensure diversity across several key dimensions. First, cases will be chosen based on their Dominant Financial Strategy to compare how different funding logics (e.g., donations, commercial revenue, government contracts) shape the unique pressures and opportunities they face. For instance, the study might compare an environmental NGO reliant on foundation grants with a women's cooperative generating revenue from craft sales. Second, diversity in the Organizational Sector will be sought to explore how the nature of the social mission influences the choice and effect of financial strategies, such as by comparing an urban recycling project with an after-school tutoring center for migrant children [12]. Finally, cases will be selected from different Geographic & Institutional Contexts to test how external environmental pressures shape organizational strategy and legitimacy. This could involve contrasting a community garden in a major metropolis with an eco-tourism project in a remote village.

3.2. Data Collection and Analysis

To ensure the reliability and validity of the research, this study will use multiple data collection methods to achieve triangulation:

1) Semi-Structured Interviews: In-depth interviews with key stakeholders in each case organization (founders, managers, core staff, board members, etc.).

2) Documentary Analysis: Collection and analysis of internal and external documents, such as strategic plans, financial statements, annual reports, project proposals, and promotional materials.

3) Non-participant Observation: Observation of key organizational events, such as board meetings, staff meetings, and community activities [13].

Data analysis will follow a theory-driven, systematic coding process. The analysis will be guided by a conceptual model where Organizational Viability (OV) is conceptualized as a dual-construct comprising Financial Sustainability (FS) and Social Impact (SI). Its realization can be expressed as the following functional relationship:

$$OV\{FS, SI\} = f(Strategy(S) \otimes Capabilities(Cap) \mid Context(C)) \tag{1}$$

Where S represents the portfolio of financial and operational strategies, Cap represents internal organizational capabilities, and C represents the external institutional and resource environment. To further deconstruct this model, the core components can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} FS &= g(RD, FE) \\ SI &= h(MA, SS) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, Financial Sustainability (FS) is considered a function of Revenue Diversification (RD) and Financial Efficiency (FE). Social Impact (SI) is a function of Mission Alignment (MA) and Stakeholder Satisfaction (SS). These relationships will be explored qualitatively. Furthermore, to assess the core tension, a conceptual "Hybridity Tension Score" (HTS) can be formulated as an analytical tool:

$$HTS \approx w_f \cdot FS_{\text{focus}} - w_s \cdot SI_{\text{focus}} \tag{3}$$

This score helps conceptualize the degree of divergence between financial logics (FS_{focus}) and missiondriven logics (SI_{focus}), weighted by their respective importance (w_f, w_s).

To operationalize this framework, the analysis will be structured around four key dimensions. The Financial Strategy (S) dimension will involve coding themes like revenue source composition and financial planning from interviews and reports to compare the degree of revenue diversification across cases. The Social Impact (SI) dimension will focus on themes such as mission adherence and impact assessment methods from reports and interviews to assess mission clarity and potential drift. Organizational Capabilities (Cap) will be evaluated by coding themes related to leadership, governance, and staff skills to compare financial management and marketing capacities [14,15]. Finally, the External Context (C) will be analyzed through themes of policy environment and funder relations to understand varying resource dependencies and legitimacy pressures. This systematic approach will ensure a rigorous and comparative analysis both within and across the selected cases.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents a hypothetical data table to illustrate the potential findings that could emerge from applying the proposed research framework. It is followed by a discussion of the expected contributions of this study.

4.1. Illustrative Cross-Case Findings

The analysis is expected to reveal distinct patterns in how different types of GROs manage the finance-mission tension. Table 1 provides a hypothetical comparison of two archetypal organizations to demonstrate how the analytical framework would be used to distill and compare findings.

Table 1. Illustrative Comparison of Strategic Balancing in Two Hypothetical GROs

Dimension	Case A: "Eco-Guardian" (Donation-Reliant NGO)	Case B: "Artisan Alliance" (Commercial Cooperative)
Dominant Financial Strategy	High reliance on grants from environmental foundations (85%); some public donations (15%).	Primarily self-funded through the sale of artisan crafts (90%); occasional small grants (10%).
Social Mission	To protect local biodiversity through advocacy, research, and community education.	To empower women in rural areas by providing fair-wage employment and preserving traditional crafts.
Key Organizational Capabilities	Strong grant-writing and donor relationship management skills; expertise in ecological research.	Strong product design, quality control, and direct-to-consumer marketing skills.
Observed Outcome	High mission alignment but faces chronic financial instability; vulnerable to shifts in funder priorities.	Achieves strong financial sustainability but experiences pressure to lower production costs, posing a risk to wage levels and material quality.
Primary Tension Point	Balancing long-term research projects with the short-term, project-based funding cycles of donors.	Balancing the market demand for low-cost goods with the mission to provide fair wages and use sustainable materials.

The hypothetical data in Table 1 illustrates that the source of funding is deeply interconnected with the nature of the strategic challenges faced by a GRO. "Eco-Guardian" excels in its social mission but its dependency on external funders creates financial precarity. Conversely, "Artisan Alliance" achieves financial independence through commercial activities, but this very success introduces market pressures that could potentially compromise its social mission. These

illustrative findings highlight the critical role of organizational capabilities in mediating these tensions.

4.2. Expected Contributions and Practical Implications

This research is expected to make significant contributions to both theory and practice. For theory, this study will provide a novel empirical application of an integrated theoretical framework to the under-researched context of GROs, offering new empirical evidence for nonprofit management theory. Through an in-depth exploration of the management mechanisms of hybrid organizations in resource-scarce environments, this research will enrich and extend the applicability of hybrid organizing theory. Finally, the research will produce an empirically grounded typology of "finance-mission" balancing strategies, laying a foundation for future quantitative research.

For practice and policy, the findings will offer GRO managers an analytical framework and a set of actionable strategies for navigating the finance-mission tension. For funders and investors, this research will shed light on how different funding models impact organizations on the ground, thereby helping them design more effective and supportive relationships. For policymakers, this study will provide evidence to inform policies aimed at fostering a more enabling ecosystem for grassroots social innovation, for instance, by identifying which types of capacity-building support (such as financial literacy training) are most critical and urgent.

5. Conclusion

Grassroots organizations face a fundamental and highly complex challenge in balancing financial sustainability with their social mission. Traditional methods of analysis are insufficient as they fail to capture the holistic and contextual nature of this strategic problem. This paper proposes a robust research design, utilizing a multi-theoretical perspective and a comparative case study methodology, to systematically investigate this core issue. By examining the lived realities and strategic choices of diverse GROs, this study will not only bridge a critical academic lacuna but will also generate insights of high practical relevance. The expected outcomes will equip GRO leaders, funders, and policymakers with the knowledge needed to effectively manage the inherent tensions of hybridity, ultimately fostering the development of more resilient and impactful organizations capable of creating lasting social value.

References

[1] Gupta, S. (2020). Understanding the feasibility and value of grassroots innovation. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(5), 941-965.

[2] Pansera, M., & Sarkar, S. (2016). Crafting Sustainable Development Solutions: Frugal Innovations of Grassroots Entrepreneurs. Sustainability, 8(1), 51.

[3] Powell, M., Gillett, A. G., & Doherty, B. (2019). Sustainability in social enterprise: hybrid organizing in public services. Public Management Review, 21(11), 1575-1597.

[4] Lin, W., & Wang, Q. (2016). What Helped Nonprofits Weather the Great Recession. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 26(3), 301-319.

[5] Cunha, F. A., Meira, E., & Orsato, R. J. (2021). Sustainable finance and investment: Review and research agenda. Business Strategy and The Environment, 30(8), 3749-3765.

[6] Giones, F., Ungerer, C., & Baltes, G. H. (2020). Balancing financial, social and environmental values: can new ventures make an impact without sacrificing profits. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing, 12(1), 1-21.

[7] Bowman, W. (2011). Financial capacity and sustainability of ordinary nonprofits. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 22(1), 37-51.

[8] Phillips, S., & Johnson, B. (2021). Inching to Impact: The Demand Side of Social Impact Investing. Journal of Business Ethics, 171(3), 465-481.

[9] Zapata Campos, M. J., Barinaga, E., Kiaka, R. D., & Ocampo, J. (2023). Nothing to lose: the rationales of grassroots financial innovations in contexts of extreme scarcity. Social Enterprise Journal, 19(2), 209-227.

[10] Alnajem, A. A. Q. I. (2024). The role of Grassroots Movements in achieve Community Sustainability. MEDAAD.

[11] Golka, P. (2024). Epistemic gerrymandering: ESG, impact investing, and the financial governance of sustainability. Review of International Political Economy, 1-25.

[12] Grabs, J., Langen, N., Maschkowski, G., & Schäpke, N. (2016). Understanding role models for change: a multilevel analysis of success factors of grassroots initiatives for sustainable consumption. Journal of Cleaner Production, 134, 98-111.

[13] Tao, J., Shan, P., Liang, J., & Zhang, L. (2024). Influence Mechanism between Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Sustainability: Empirical Evidence from China. Sustainability, 16(6), 2406.

[14] Ye, S., & Gong, X. (2021). Funding the present and the future: Drivers of NPO 's financial sustainability. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 32(1), 101-121.

[15] Zioło, M., Bąk, I., & Cheba, K. (2021). THE ROLE OF SUSTAINABLE FINANCE IN ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS: DOES IT WORK? Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 27(1), 45-70.