What are the factors that influence the scalability of a non-profit, voluntary organization?

– Studying the case of Restaurant Day
Abstract

This research aims to illuminate the reasons behind the scalability of a non-profit, voluntary organization through studying the case of Restaurant Day. The case organization is a completely voluntarily run, project based food carnival that takes place four times a year in every three month, each of which takes one day only. On these days anyone can set up a restaurant anywhere they want. Restaurant Day, since its establishment in 2011 has gained over two million customers and tens of thousands of participants and volunteers worldwide.

Scalability describes the ability of a system to handle growth without substantial effort. The subject has been undergoing an excessive study within the context of online businesses. Professionals have been striving to establish replicable architectures that leads to scaling companies. However, research on scalability within the non-profit, voluntary sector leaves space for further investigation. Therefore, reviewing this can create contribution to the field of scalability.

Three main areas of theories were identified as helpful in setting up the exploratory lenses. Scalability, Organization type and Value Co-creation. These domains, with sub topics within support the understanding of the emerging discoveries. The data set consists of four semi-structured interviews, one with the founder of the Restaurant Day, one with the representative in Denmark and two expert panels. Moreover, observation notes (See Appendix 5) from two participations along with secondary data were collected. Qualitative data analysis methods were used to unfold the underlying causes in order to find the key indicators that drive scalability in RD.

The open, flexible and decentralized organizational structure, the collaborative form of social value co-creation, and the continuous contribution of the many passionate actors were found as the main reasons of scalability in Restaurant Day. As supplementary success factors, a concise value proposition that is easy to comprehend and adopt to distinct environments, the standardization of a guideline that applies internationally and the spreadable effect of the common ownership approach were identified.

The findings accomplish to provide answers for the research questions, thus explain the factors in request. Nonetheless, their generalizability could be extended with a longitudinal time horizon and cross-case comparisons.
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1. Introduction

Scalability is the ability of an organization, network or process to handle growth in an adequate manner. In other words, accommodating an increased volume of growth without impacting the contribution margin (Bondi, 2000).

Scalability has been a hot topic in recent times when the news is swamped by unrivaled success-stories and occasionally miserable failures of the so-called “born-on-the-Internet” Information Technology startup companies. In the hope of exceptional prosperity, growth hackers are employed to establish the ideal circumstances for scaling.

The startup company form refers to a high potential repeatable business model (Blank, 2012). There are examples of startups with extreme growth rates and organizations that invented system designs, which have proved themselves to be surprisingly scalable.

There are numerous different scalable startup approaches. All of them have advantages and drawbacks, and their success depend on multiple factors. However, there is no right or wrong organizational design that functions as a ready-made recipe to scale. The founders need to adjust multiple aspects to their case specific needs and environment (Abbott and Fisher, 2009).

This research inquiries into the factors that determine the scalability of a non-profit, voluntary organization. Furthermore, intends to discover whether it is possible to trigger scale when financial aspect are overruled by social outcomes. Therefore, if the term can be used in a genuinely different context.

1.1 Practical problem and the relevance of the topic

Scalability is most often used for for-profit, online business architectures. This term rarely occurs in other contexts. Therefore, it might seem paradoxical; however the organizational growth that case organization has gone through makes it relevant to observe how a non-profit, voluntary run, project based organization can carry out an organizational design, which is suitable for scaling its operation. There is no comprehensive literature on the partly or wholly offline, non-profit and voluntary organization scalability. For this reason, it is endeavored to carry out a research on this niche field in the hope of making a contribution that will inspire future studies.
To explore this domain, one should look into an existing example of a non-profit, voluntary organization to find out, whether the concept of scalability is explainable in this regard. Restaurant Day (RD) has been chosen as an organization of inquiry.

“Restaurant Day is a food carnival created by thousands of people organizing and visiting one-day restaurants worldwide.” (Restaurantday.org, 2015)

The purpose of these days that are scheduled four times a year in every third month is to share a food-related experiences, enjoy private or public environments together, but first and foremost to have fun (Restaurantday.org, 2015).

Moreover, gastronomy as such has always had continuous demand. However, the ways nutrition is perceived has changed a lot. Top-notch chefs have brought the restaurant experience to levels never been seen before. Some plates have become art pieces and, therefore, what people eat is not the only important factor anymore, but in the Western cultures the surroundings and the experience are also taken into account.

The innovative combination of the pop-up industry, civic engagement, a modern organization form and the passion for food have brought RD into being. Furthermore, despite its voluntary and project-based organizational form, where the motivations differ from a profit seeker perspective and success is not measured based on revenue and earnings, it has scaled impressively.

1.2 Research questions

The described paradox between the non-profit, voluntary organizational design and scalability raise the following research questions.

*What are the factors that drive scalability in a non-profit, voluntary organization? – Studying the case of Restaurant Day*
Sub research question:

1. What are the organizational characteristics that define RD?
2. How can a group or a crowd of people who are not closely related create value for an organization?
3. How do inner drive and volunteer engagement facilitate the scalability of a non-profit, voluntary organization?

1.3 Motivation

This chapter is to express my personal motivation for carrying out a research about Restaurant Day.

The basic idea of this topic of choice was the desire of observing an organization, which is the particular encounter of two domains of my main interest, gastronomy and scalability.

After I have been the author and co-author of other academic papers on similar fields, finished an online course on the New Nordic Diet, was staging in a fine-dining supper club for five consecutive months and completed a course on the creative industries that has been concerned with related matters the research topic came naturally for me.

1.4 Structure of the thesis

The research is divided into eight chapters.

The first chapter introduced the research topic and its relevance. Utilizing the expression scalability in an irregular domain helped the practical problem to take shape, which was followed by the research questions. These questions guided the coming study. This chapter was closed with the personal motivation that supported to narrow down a special, yet wide subject into a refined, researchable topic.

The second chapter describes the case of RD to conceptualize the terrain and give a comprehensive narrative of the case organization through which the research problem is observed. It shows the milestones that RD reached and visualized the trends it has gone through.

Chapter three is devoted to the portrayal of the related literature. It adumbrates three main categories, which were considered the most relevant. Namely, Scalability, Organization type and Value co-creation. Each class includes
further sub-chapters that helped to set up exploratory lenses throughout the investigation. These are handled critically and to various extents refined in the analysis.

The next, fourth chapter is a meticulous display of the methodological decisions all through the fieldwork. The second last paragraph is the description of the coding process, and finally analysis strategy is brought forward.

The fifth following chapter, is a thorough analysis of the findings, based on the methodological decisions. It goes into the details of the four main themes that emerged as a result of coding 50 pages of interview transcripts, observation notes (See Appendix 5), pictures (See Appendix 4), and secondary sources. By taking the most significant samples from the data set, it practices a simultaneous discussion of the findings.

In the sixth chapter the main research question and the three sub-research questions are answered based on the analysis and discussion.

The second last, seventh chapter draws a conclusion from the research results.

Eventually, the last, chapter eight describes the limitations encountered throughout the study. The recommendations for further research were inspired by these limitations.

The Appendix is deliberately divided into two parts, the one included at the end of this volume includes the first four documents. Due to its length, Appendix 5: Interview and observation transcripts is enclosed as a separately bound booklet.

Appendix 1: interview protocol by areas, Appendix 2: First layer coding table, Appendix 3: Second layer coding table, and Appendix 4: Pictures from the two visited event were decided to be featured in this document, by reason of their inseparable quality with the core part of the research.

2. Description of the case

This research bases on a single case organization, Restaurant Day (RD). RD is a non-profit, voluntarily-run, project-based organization. It attracts participants, who are interested in trying out new experiences, mingling with people who they have never met before and are passionate about food. Even though it was brought alive on the 21st of May 2011 in Helsinki, Finland, there was an earlier stage of the phenomena. Two friends who thought that it would be a good idea to sell some cookies and beverages in the parks took their bikes and made it happen. Not long after they learned about all the bureaucratic requirements that they had no chance to meet. However, these
rules did not apply to temporary establishments that operate for one day only, and that is the how idea of Restaurant Day was sparked (Santala, 2015).

In most cases, initiatives like RD have to be implemented within established systems (Davies, 2013). However, RD has found a solution, a legal loophole in line with the regulation of the local authorities to operate legally. Since then Restaurant Day has grown into a social movement, a food carnival with a worldwide scope that takes place four times a year in every third month. The essence of the concept is that on these four days anyone who wants to take part of the event can set up a temporary, so-called pop-up establishment. It can be a restaurant, a bar, a café or anything that falls into one of these categories. These could be set anywhere, indoor, outdoor, public spaces, on streets, in parks, attics, and basements or even in private homes – “only your imagination is the limit” (Restaurantday.org, 2015). The pop-ups are expected to register on the website of Restaurant Day by uploading their menu and opening hours. By providing this information, all the customers that are interested in visiting these pop-up restaurants can navigate there quickly. Either by using the website, or the application that has been voluntarily co-developed for Restaurant Day (Santala, 2015). The restrictions regarding concepts that are not welcomed on RD are limited to units that would seek to promote already existing businesses for commercial purposes C. Frederiksen, cited in (Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014).

At the first ever Restaurant Day event located only in Finland, there were 45 pop-up restaurants of very different sorts, such as beverages, tapas and at last but not least smoothies spread out in 13 different cities. This event, was promoted by a Facebook event and people were passing the information to one another.

Ever since the first event that showed significant interest from the public, Restaurant Day has been attracting a growing number of customers, one day restaurateurs, and volunteers. Even though, there are other pop-up events within the food industry, Restaurant Day is the biggest among all of them, with 22 000 temporary pop-up restaurants that have been operated by over 88 000 staff members and have served upwards of 2.5 million customers in 72 participating countries (Restaurantday.org, 2015).

These countries are spread all over the world from countries like Austria and Czech Republic in Europe, Japan and India in Asia, South Africa and Tanzania in Africa, Peru and Columbia in South America, as well as the USA in North America, and New Zealand in the Australian continent (Restaurantday.org, 2015).
1. Chart, Number of the participating pop-ups between 05/2011 and 08/2015 (Restaurantday.org, 2015)

The top chart depicts the growing number of participating pop-up restaurants registered on the website.

Although it is visible that there are substantial changes regarding of this figure, the chart shows a relatively growing trend. What also stands out that the seasonality effects this participation rate and May, the warmest month out of the four times per year is understandably the most popular among pop-up restaurants, as well as customers.

2. Chart, Number of the participating countries between 05/2011 and 08/2015 (Restaurantday.org, 2015)
This second column chart illustrates a growing trend as well. However, the degree of change regarding the number of countries participating is not comparable to the sum of the pop-up restaurants opened on these dates. Since it has a limited nature. Albeit, there is only a theoretical limit of pop-ups could be set on these days.

Since the first pop-up event, Restaurant Day has received numerous awards. In the years between 2011 and 2014, most of which originate from Finland and have a cultural aspect. Some of the awards are the Finland Prize award, given by Ministry of Education and Culture of Finland in 2011, Best Event from 2012 voted by Helsinki City Tourism and Convention Bureau, and the most recent Consumer Act of the Year, an award given by the Finnish Consumers Union in 2014 (Restaurantday.org, 2015).

These awards along with the continuously growing number of attendants have brought worldwide recognition to Restaurant Day that further helps to spread around the globe.

The headquarter of Restaurant Day is still in Helsinki, operated by only five members. Their different background and set of skills made it possible to create a highly efficient and creative group of experts. Timo Santala, the co-founder, and Chairman of the Board holds substantial experience in event management and communications. Kristi Tuominen’s responsibility is the communication, whereas Antti Tuomala is an expert at restaurant business and Jyrki Vanamo is in charge of coordinating the website and application development related tasks. However, countless other people have been contributing to each field of operation (Restaurantday.org, 2015).

There are other important aspects of Restaurant Day beyond the ones mentioned above, which are raising awareness of cooking and culinary traditions, and some participants can make of the synergies that might derive from the common fields of interest with other attendees. It results in social and economic benefits for the people and the cities where the restaurants pop up. Furthermore, it attracts not only locals but in many cases tourists, who visit a particular city for witnessing Restaurant Day, which boosts the image of these places (Santala, 2015).

2.1 Pop-up

A comprehensive description of the pop-up phenomena is nearly a blank area of the academic domain. Therefore, there is space to be explored for academic researchers.
Pop-ups and even food-related pop-ups are not genuinely new concepts. There are examples of food trucks and temporary eateries in numerous metropoles around the world. Even though, it not possible to say, which of these was the first, there have been so-called supper clubs in Cuba, where people host private restaurants with a limited number of seats, often in their homes for hundreds of years. These promoted many other unconventional restaurant concepts (Fetz and Fieseler, 2014).

The pop-up restaurants are perfect chance for young professionals and beginners to try their skills in real life settings and obtaining valuable feedbacks for their future culinary career (Schindler, 2014).

3. Literature review

The pyramid chart illustrates that theoretical areas that were recognized as the most relevant to the research objective. Scalability, Organizational form and Value Co-Creation are the three main areas described in the Literature Review.
This part of the thesis is to unfold the related concepts that have been observed and studied. In other words, what is already known about this research topic. Due to the particular organizational form of RD, there were contradictions between the contexts that theories regard, and the context of the case organization. Thus, these had to be released and handled critically. The conceptual propositions are within the research field and help to reach the research objectives, as well as support the process of the analysis. However, in some cases, minor or greater adjustments and clarifications were made in the analysis, so they better fit the study goals.

The identification of these theories and the collection of the data started simultaneously, which helped the process of theoretical sampling. The first layer analysis (See Appendix 2) of the data led to the additional necessary information sources, and the emergence of further relevant literature.

The main purpose of this sampling plan is to help developing the lenses through which the data will later speak. Furthermore, to refine the theories that will support to answer to the reason for the scalability and organizational growth of Restaurant Day.

The choice of theories were made in line with the elementary empirical sub-research questions. However, the ones described in the introduction are the refined, final versions of these questions.

1. What makes RD scalable?
2. What kind of organization is RD?
3. How can a group or a crowd of people who are not closely related create value for an organization?

These inquiries will lead the study towards the understanding of the research phenomena and an answer to the main Research Question.
3.1 Scalability

For the comprehension of the research topic, the definition of scalability has to be elaborated on. This subchapter is to clarify this concept, its different dimensions, and categories. Furthermore, to look into the practices in scalable environments.

Scalability has become a hot topic lately, and the expression is used within various fields of business consultancy, in information technology; it is used to describe growth and, therefore, success in a particular area (Davies, 2013).

However, most of the extant theories regarding scalability observe it as a feature of IT companies and technological systems. However, in this particular case, it concerns RD, and the growing number of participants, attendees, and volunteers who make this organization reach a critical mass of people and cause the concept spread all over the world.

It requires an operating leverage that is the ability to generate additional revenue with a smaller addition to the operating costs of an organization (Jones, n.d.).

Before technology has become such an essential part of practically any kind of organization regardless of its structure and size, institutional leaders had to restructure systems to make them more suitable for scaling. Without standardizing both organizational work and consumption, it was hardly possible to scale. The predictable consumption and repetitive tasks performed by the organization employees were the factors that brought the organization a step closer to becoming scalable (Hagel III, Davison and Seely Brown, 2009).

However, according to Hagel III, Davison and Seely Brown, (2009) in the era of digital infrastructures, the information imbalance between the service providers and the ones who buy them has reduced dramatically. The communication democratization and the emergence of new media platforms have given freedom to the individuals. Therefore, their influence is much bigger on the organization than it used to be. With this power in the customers’ hand institutions had no other choice than becoming more sensible to client’s needs. As a result, the precondition of growing successfully has shifted from scalable efficiency to scalable learning, about the customers’ needs. The innovation and performance improvements carried out by the employees’ talent within the organization must meet or even go beyond the surrounding ecosystem for the sake of becoming a scalable organization.

There are types of organization models that are particularly suitable for scaling. According to Liu (n.d.) the Social Media, and the Leveraging Scalability models are two of these. The article elaborates on Facebook as the social media platform with practically unlimited growth potential that took only thousands of engineers to engage hundreds of millions of users.
There are numerous examples of confusion of the two words growth and scalability, in fact, they are not at all interchangeable.

Growth means that an organization applies additional resources at the same rate as its revenues increases. It reflects a classical business model, in what a gaining a client means extra revenue, which could result in hiring a new employee and organizational growth. Consequently, the extent to what the organization grows is in tight connection with the additional costs (Admin of Fundable, 2014).

On the contrary, scalability means that performance increases in a higher degree than the growth-facilitating resources that are added to the system (Admin of Fundable, 2014).

A scalable system can be defined in different ways depending on the goals that the organization strives to reach.

Genuinely, as Jamil (2003) describes four types of scalability.

1. Administrative Scalability: The ability to accommodate the rising number of organizations or individuals that are sharing resources by maintaining the same level of performance.
2. Functional Scalability: The ability to improve a system with additional functionality without substantial effort.
3. Geographic Scalability: The ability to geographically expand the activities of the organization without compromising its performance and usability.
4. Load Scalability: The ability to bear with the change regarding load.

In the scalability literature we can find additional types of scalability, although these regard only for-profit architectures, so this study is not concerned with them.

The further refinement of scalability considers horizontal and vertical dimensions as well.

Rouse (2015) defines horizontal scalability as the ability to increase capacity, which is only constrained by the number of individuals that are connected by the system.

On the other hand, vertical scalability describes the additional resources that are added to the system. An alternative way of naming vertical scalability is, scaling up. In most cases vertical scalability requires time. While the
resources that trigger this type of scalability are added, the system cannot function. Moreover, it has limits that are specified by the organization (Rouse, 2015).

If a system uses its ability to scale, it means that it carries out growth of some kind, which can be measured on both the horizontal and vertical dimensions.

Horizontal growth: to broaden up an organization to new locations, increase the network and customer base, taking part of more events and introduce new services or products.

Vertical growth means to focus more on the already existing services, products, and practices by deepening the organizational experience and knowledge on one particular field (Sharma, 2012).

Fast-growing startups sometimes have to deal with an increasing amount of customers starting using their services in a short period. This mounts in the demand should be expected, and the way it is handled can be critical in order keep the users of the particular organization. This challenge can either mean the great success that an organization, which strives for or a failure if the users of the system do not meet their expectations.

For “born-on-the-Internet” organizations slow growth is not a choice. These organizations with a global marketplace approach either scale or fall. The well-defined building blocks of how to bring off an online venture are as follows (Say, 2013).

1. Know your industry

As bedrock of a successful organization, the founders need to oversee clearly the market environment that they operate in. However, the average growth lifecycle of most of the internet startups have been decreasing due to the kaleidoscopically changing ecosystem. Say (2013) describes an M-shaped growth curve within the social media-based, “born-on-the-Internet” organizations, with dramatic highs and lows. The founders have to understand these dynamics in order to build up a defense mechanism for the so-called lows and, therefore, retain their customer base.

2. Speed up the product development

The faster a product is developed, the faster it can be launched. A company or an organization can easily create a competitive advantage by being quicker than their rivals in the product development phase. This period has been
shrinking by time as more decision makers comprehend the importunateness of short product development cycles in a vying marketplace. If the users are satisfied in the early stage, they do not only stay loyal to the organization but are willing give it publicity and practically become its advocates.

3. Build the management team

The founding team of high potential organization with a seemingly scalable model has to anticipate the rapid growth not only in traction but as well as regarding the number of employees. To get the highest possible performance of the organization members, a matching management style has to be utilized. In most cases it is necessary to bring executive professionals on board for integrating the management skills that the CEO or other founders might be lacking.

4. Focus on Financing

The monetary requirements for financing growth are the best when anticipated before at a pinch. The absence of financial liquidity is often the reason of the inability of growing. Every organization that intends to scale its operation need to establish the preconditions that are among other things adequate finances and a stable organization.

5. Don’t prioritize

In the early stage, most of these requirements are equally essential, and putting too much focus on one of these blocks over another can bring undesirable consequences.

**Spreadability**

To scale a business or an organization, a critical crowd of users or customers have to become aware of its existence. Therefore, the idea needs to spread (Burkus, 2014). The paragraph regards this concern.

**How to spread an idea**

A great idea and even making it happen does not mean an axiomatic success. The target audience needs to be able to adopt the concept to their set of previous experiences and values (Burkus, 2014).
Rodgers (cited in Burkus 2014) identified relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability as the five factors, which determine whether to adopt or reject an idea or concept. There is a short description of each of these categories to display their meaning in practice.

1. Relative Advantage is the degree to what the consumers perceive an idea as better to the extant ones. If there is a major improvement, the likeliness of welcoming the concept is greater.

2. Compatibility shows how easily adoptable the approach is to the ones already existing. The resemblance to prior norms raises the chances to accommodate the concept.

3. Complexity represents the difficulty to comprehend the new service or product. How easy it is to understand, to use or to become involved in with it are some of the questions that can be asked to find it out. The easy interpretability can shorten the time substantially, as long as it takes to incorporate the new idea.

4. Trialability measures how easy it is to experiment with the new product. The effortlessness of gaining experience about it makes more likely to get positive feedbacks and engage even more users.

5. Observability means that the more displayed the product or service is the higher the chances are of mass adoption.

**Spreadable media**

Jenkins (2010) states that the spreadable media stands for the difference between distribution and circulation. In this context distribution means a spread of media content, whereas circulation implies the commercial and non-commercial content transaction between participants.

Media is spreadable when it goes through various platforms, of which users share with their social networks and by doing so they increase the visibility and the emotional engagement of the shared contents. The higher the traction is of these subject-matters the more engagements are expected to occur. This form of constant content distribution and circulation results in the terms, participatory culture and transmedia communication.

According to the interview with Jenkins (2010), it also turns out that social media contents, which users can manipulate, share and embed are the ones that spread well. These users either unintentionally or on purpose raise awareness of the particular ideas or become the ambassadors of these concepts. However, most of the conscious
users deliberately share certain contents with people they care about, with the purpose of contributing to their conversations or social media profiles.

Nonetheless sharing certain contents can also happen as a commodity or promotion for economic interests, not only driven by the social value of them. There are different types of contributions within users can engage with, and not all of these require the same set of skills. To perform some of these inputs the given user should have a different set of experience than for other ones, however, everyone can find a way in line with his or her knowledge and intentions.

The last third of the chapter investigates the concepts from Abbott and Fisher’s (2009) book, The Art of Scalability. Even though this volume is one of the most comprehensive studies on scalability, it regards IT companies, therefore its relevance is highly limited.

**People’s role in scaling**

When it comes to scaling a system, people are one of the most important and yet the most neglected assets of the organization. However, different types of systems require distinct conditions to become suitable for scaling. People working in the organizations are the ones who drive or hinder the scalability process. The success regarding to accomplishing scale as an organization mainly depends on an exceptional group of people. The amount and type of work that the members of the organization can perform at a given time is among other factors an important indicator of scalability. The communication schemes between these members of an organization can also influence the productivity and even though the coordination between members raises costs, the overall benefit of their inputs are worth keeping them within the system if their potentials are well occupied (Abbott and Fisher, 2009).

**The role of management in scaling**

According to Abbott and Fisher (2009) the management style within an organization can either foster or hinder scalability, depending on how well prepared and experienced they are at managing people. Managers are usually responsible for pushing activities, whereas the leaders are in charge of pulling them. It means that the leadership sets goals to be reached, and management makes sure that the organization’s assets are ideally employed in order to deliver these goals. The management measures and evaluates the particular goals, and tries to remove obstacles that might be a bar to these achievements. By doing so, management reduces the cost per unit of work. For close evaluation and successful improvement of the organizational effectiveness-measurement is crucial. The members
of the management team are the ones that are responsible for the description of a concise, realistic but ambitious vision along with a particular focus on realizing these objectives, with continuous feedback on the ongoing procedures and processes.

**Processes are critical to scale**

Great employees, supervised by skillful managers are both essential, yet are not enough to success. The processes that the organization follows are the factors that make them complete. According to the “Process” Cambridge Dictionary entry (n.d.) processes are series of actions that one takes to achieve an end. The particular mechanisms allow the team to react rapidly to needs of change, identify the causes of failure, determine the capacity of a system, put the scalability projects into action, ‘et cetera’ (Capability Maturity Model for Development v.1.2, cited in Abbott and Fisher 2009). Since all organization is different in terms of its culture, the experience that the members hold and all possible factors that one can think of that describes a system, there is no, one ideal process of operation. Every single organization needs to find and develop the most suitable chains of processes that are in line with the particularities of the organization and serves in our case the goal of scalability. If these two conditions are not given and processes impair them, these could even become demoralizing for the organization. Standardized actions while performing repeated tasks are for example not the best process for all kind of organization. Additionally, as organizations go through change over time, it is necessary to maintain intermittently these processes, so they are the best match of the current goals (Abbott and Fisher, 2009).

Even though, the theories that have been described in this chapter elaborated on the concept of scalability, it is difficult to define what the prerequisite conditions for a non-profit organization to become scalable are. The later data analysis that is be underpinned by relevant theories will help us to grasp of the attributes made RD one of them.
3.2 Organization type

The second section of the chapter examines the related organizational literature. RD has multiple particular characteristics that might influence the findings. Therefore, the below descriptions will help to contextualize the relevant irregular organizational forms and to lead the focus towards the research objectives. The sub-paragraphs in sequential order are as follows.

1. In search of the Hybrid Ideal
2. The Loosely Organized System (LOS)
3. Non-profit organizational effectiveness
4. Voluntarily run organization
5. Project-Based Organization
6. Projects of passion
6. Organization design

It would be hard to classify RD as one particular type of organization. This paragraph is dedicated unfolding the related literature on the some of the hybrid organizational forms, which will be refined then critically reflected on in the coming analysis and discussion chapters.

Considering that the initial goal of RD is not profit-generation, we cannot talk about business model to describe its structure. Therefore, other organizational models are elaborated in this part of the report that will take us towards the understanding of the relevant contemporary organizational theories.

On the website of RD, they claim that it is a carnival. According to the online form of the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d) carnival is “a special occasion or period of public enjoyment and entertainment involving wearing unusual clothes, dancing, and eating and drinking, usually held in the streets of a city.”

Still in the same entry there is another definition: “A public event, often held outside, where you can take part in competitions and buy small things and food, often organized to collect money for a particular purpose” (Anon, 2015)
In search of the Hybrid Ideal

Battilana et al. (2012) call an organization hybrid when it combines the social aspect and a revenue generation scheme within an organization in an unnatural way. This dichotomy in a system is what makes it hybrid - the simultaneous occurrence of two normally unattached features within a bounded system; the unification of social and commercial ends. There are many examples of this hybrid organizational design from the health care to the banking industry and they often drive innovation thanks to their novel approach. However, they regularly encounter particular challenges, such as legal recognition, financing, customers and beneficiaries, or establishing an organizational culture. The particular challenges are as follows.

Legal Dilemma:

Legal dilemma mainly derives from the revenue generating activities in a non-profit or voluntary organization, since the tax should be paid on revenues. Entrepreneurial exercises are not common in these organization categories, which do not focus on value maximization and can lead to the forfeiture of their tax benefits. This predicament can be unlocked by the entitlement of both the non-profit and the for-profit status in an umbrella organization. The non-profit then obtain equity in the for-profit sub-organization and by doing so, it has the right to control its operation. In fact, in some countries, to make this process less complicated new legal structures have been introduced for instance the L3C or the so-called Low-Profit Limited Liability Company (Battilana et al. 2012).

Financial Dilemma:

There are numerous options for for-profit companies to get a hold of the necessary funding for starting up or scaling their activities, however in the non-profit sector, these differ and in most cases narrows down to venture philanthropists, community foundations, donations, PRI (program related investments) and fellowship grants. As mentioned above, if the non-profit sub-organizations merge into a hybrid model, it is more likely to get the funds from the non-profit sources. In this way this way it is cheaper to finance its operation (Battilana et al. 2012).

Customers and Beneficiaries:

In the case of conventional businesses the consumers are called customers, while the consumers of a non-profit organization are rather considered beneficiaries. In hybrid companies where the commercial and social values are overlapping each other these expressions are more blurry, often interchanged and indistinguishable. When the beneficiary and the customer base are one and the same, organizational growth does not compromise their
resources. Often when the social value creation and its conversion into revenue are one single transaction the beneficiaries will not be able to compensate the value that is given to them due to the lack of their financial power. Furthermore, Battilana et al. (2012) also warn of the possible shift from the initial social value creation purpose to profit generation.

**Organizational Culture and Talent Development:**

When the purpose is dual, it is not feasible to maintain an equal attention at all times. Priorities shift from the social mission to the commercial side. The bigger the organization, the harder to favor the primary intentions. Sufficient operation and being loyal to a social mission is sometimes a great trial to the management. The accomplishment of both sustaining the operation and carrying out the social goals require disparate skill sets. It can take some time until the collaboration of people with different backgrounds turns into successful operation without internal conflicts (Battilana et al. 2012).

Battilana et al. (2012) set an example of a real-life case when a microfinancing company hired employees without any prior experience to eliminate the internal conflict of beliefs. However, this approach might hinder the early growth, due to the lack of real time experience.

**The Loosely Organized System (LOS)**

The relevance of this theory is the generally decentralized nature of the civic engagements and community-based platforms. RD as the website argues follows a flexible organization structure (Restaurantday.org, 2015).

In Loosely Organized Systems there are regular boundary shortfalls, these organizational entities do not hang together strongly, and their limitations are often not clearly defined. The components of a LOS are not tightly connected, which represents a poor organizational design. Occasionally the integrity of these systems can be as underdeveloped as it becomes hard to decide whether they even exist or not (Kaplan, 1982).

These organizations are likely to have a less hierarchical and centralized, flexible network structure. The most important features of the interaction within the social network concept are open communication and reliable partners (Boundless, n.d.).
Non-profit organizational effectiveness

There is a broad range of non-profit organizations (NPO), the funding or support from what these organizations can sustain themselves could come from different sources. Some of which are supported by the government, international organizations or local municipalities, as well as donations from the private sector, is an option can be taken an advantage of. However, the case company of this research RD does not possess any of the above-mentioned resources and, therefore, can only leverage the volunteers’ contributions, who do not get any remuneration for their inputs to operate sufficiently, which results in a non-profit, voluntarily-run organization (Herman and Renz, 1999).

The effectiveness of a non-profit organization depends on the observer’s perspective, which is not the well-defined business performance indexes such as revenue, profit or other financial measures. In this particular case as it will be visible in the later analysis that these are the internal processes. The call for the volunteers and all the resources that take the system closer to what it seeks to reach. It indeed makes easier to measure effectiveness when an organization is compared to another one alike, but the scope of this research constraints this consideration.

Depending on their scope, particular indicators can reflect the effectiveness of certain subunits or the whole organization. It is a matter of course that goals of subunits ought to be in line with the organizational goals. There is a correlation between the board and the organizational effectiveness, and thus, it can be controlled of what and how the board members do. The better the practices are that the board uses, the more efficient an NPO can get. The board usually makes strategic decisions according to their strategic plans and, therefore, planning leads to a more effective organization, however sometimes it happens the other way round, and an effective and growing organization starts requiring more emphasis on planning (Herman and Renz, 1999).

Even though different organizational theory models suggest distinct measures to assess the effectiveness, in this case, three of them seem to be to most relevant concepts to use.

Voluntarily run organization

An entry of the Encyclopedia Britannica claims, that voluntarism derives from the Latin word “voluntas” (Anon, 2015) that means will or freedom. A voluntary organization depends on either regular or occasional voluntary inputs of its members for its operation, and it might have paid staff members but not necessarily. The organization has numerous characteristics, such as autonomy from the state, self-governance through a board of unpaid trustees, it offers a service, product or some benefits to non-members and the profit generation is not a focal point. At last but not least the organization provides the chance to join the system (Voluntary Organization, n.d.). The members
intend to accomplish beyond their own or other people’s interest, and organization needs to rely on support from voluntary resources.

Even though there are various definitions of a Voluntary Organizations, one of definitions that captures its essence sufficiently is,

“A Voluntary Organization is an endurable use to the community, which has to serve a strong desire and motivation for community development among its members. In order to become economically feasible it has to have a dedicated and hardworking leadership and means to command of expertise within the areas undertaken.”

Prof. M.R. Inamdar (cited in Shah, n.d. sec. 3)

Along with other considerations that most commonly motivate voluntary actions are religion, business, philanthropy and mutual aid. However, looking for experience, recognition or knowledge, and satisfying passion are also motivational factors that could potentially drive participation in a Voluntary Organization (Shah, n.d.).

According to Shah (n.d) the feeling of community with the fellow members, the homogeneity regarding beliefs, socio-economic status and educational background are further indicators that ease for the members of a Voluntary Organization to relate to the community. Yet these drivers can vary from one individual to another.

Project-Based Organization

Project-based organizations (PBO) gather professionals in temporary teams in order to carry out a task where their specialty is needed. At times, future cooperation or employment in the same team is not to be expected after the successful realization of the unique project goals Bechky (cited in Cattani et al., 2011).

However, it does not seem to be a consensual definition regarding the temporary nature of PBOs. There are examples of organizations founded for one particular task-execution with neither past nor future existence. In fact, organizations with continuous presence with a core group of employees accomplishing projects from time to time are also a type of PBO.
According to Cattani et al. (2011) projects refer to a temporary task-driven undertaking, which regularly has a predefined time frame and expected to be completed within a particular time, cost, quality and further project specific business constraints.

Organizations that operate on a project base occur in many distinct industries such as culinary and gastronomy, music, media, festivals and carnivals (Cattani et al., 2011).

**Projects of passion**

Passion driven projects according to Svejenova (2011) are a constant chase of self-expression. Furthermore, as described earlier this chapter unlike for-profit ventures that are driven by economic motivations, projects of passion are mainly creative endeavors of expressing personal or group identities and the values associated with them. The members are driven by inner motivation and, therefore, the success of their undertaking depends on two social factors – authenticity and impact.

**Organization design**

Apart from the classical organizational types, namely the simple, functional or divisional, there are other emerging contemporary designs such as the matrix, learning and boundaryless. In this subchapter because of its relevance to the case organization, only the latest will be elaborated on.

In a boundaryless organization, the boundaries are less concerned by the vertical, horizontal, geographic and other external structural measures. By reformulating the external, loosening the horizontal, flattening the vertical and crossing the geographic boundaries, these organizations introduce a new level of flexibility. As the rigid bureaucratic practices of the older well-established systems are challenged by the changing market conditions, the flexibility that a boundaryless design proposes have become a new success factor. It revolutionizes the relationship with the employees, customers, as well as with the partners and alliances. These organizations where the chain of commands does not play a crucial role and a shared mindset has been developed, tend to have a low number of employees and reach out to external professionals if a need of solving a unique problems arises (Ashkenas et al., 2002).
3.3 Value Co-creation

Restaurant Day is not operated by an individual or a legal entity, it is run by everyone who takes part in the movement. The last section of the Literature review describes the aspects of the collaborative form of value creation. This can support the understanding of how this approach affects scalability. Therefore, the concepts that this section elaborates on are definitions and context of Collaborative Value Creation, Peer Production, Participation and Engagement, and the so-called Many to Many Marketing. At last, it introduces the Format Project.

Although, not every organization takes an advantage of co-creation, the involvement of internal, or external community in the developmental decisions is a worthwhile method that each system can benefit from. Through co-creation, the stakeholders became more collaborative and empowered by decentralizing the decision-making regarding strategy, development ideas, processes and products or service lines. The chance of making biased decisions decreases whereas the probability of positive reception of the co-created settlement rises. The change implementation is also likely to be more successful, since the stakeholders, who could be employees, members of the organization, customers, partners or suppliers are the ones that need to adopt to the modifications. As soon as co-creation is embedded into an organization the internal knowledge is better stored and shared. Furthermore, the group efforts become more transparent than before, not to mention the increased capacity to innovate (Danelutti, 2012). According to Tapscott and D. Williams (2006), prosumer communities that consist of the customers with a substantial knowledge of the particular service or product are incredible sources of innovation, but if and only if they are given the tools they need to engage in the value creation.

**Collaborative Value Creation**

Austin and Seitanidi (2012) suggest that at the micro (individual), the meso (internal), as well as at the macro (external) level greater value can be created if the sole creation shifts to co-creation. The forms of value comprise economic, social and environmental that can be realized on different levels, such as individual, organizational or even societal.

Austin and Seitanidi’s (2012, p. 945) definition of Value Creation is as follows “*the transitory and enduring benefits relative to the costs that are generated due to the interaction of the collaborators and that accrue to organizations, individuals, and society*”. In accordance with this interpretation, an organization that manages to leverage the potential that lies in its employees, members, customers and other stakeholders will obtain an excellent value.
This resource complementarity can happen through partnership formation, which gains visibility to each party. By using the synergic effects of mutually beneficial partnerships, organizations can capture their full potential. However, in order to meet the preconditions of fruitful collaboration, there is a need for careful choice of partnerships. To unfold the linked interests and avoid partnership incompatibilities thorough examination of the future partners is a necessity (Austin and Seitanidi, 2012).

Co-creation requires project based or long term cooperation and collaboration between the organization and its collaborative partners depending on the organization type. Certain competencies are needed for a prosperous cooperation. These are showcased in Jarche’s (2012) Venn diagram that. It also depicts the Content Creation, which falls into the overlapping terrain. For long-term success and better networks, the coexistence of the below skills is a requirement. The cooperative behavioral forms make the members of an organization more than just business units and perceived as intrinsic benefits. Cooperative Competencies (Jarche, 2012)

Cooperative:

1. Effective communication on the social network platforms and within the work teams
2. Sharing information with colleagues in an opened manner
3. Meeting and talking to new people to exchange obtain new information and extending the existing networks this way
Common field:

- Content creation based on the organization knowledge and its spread among the member

Collaborative:

- Task coordination with the least time and effort
- Conducting and actively participating in meetings to minimize the amount of resources that go to waste
- Quickly finding the people that are the best match to each task

Cooperative Competencies (Jarche, 2012)

Organization in the crowd: peer production in large-scale networked protests

Personal and mass national and international platforms of social networks on what participants share texts, images, videos and websites within and beyond national borders are suitable tools for engaging a larger public. It is not completely explored how these subtle networks become equally efficient to more structured and well-established systems, but there are precedential organizations that proof that it is possible. These crowd-enabled networks without a conventional organizational form are at times held high potentials and turn into coherent systems (Bennett, Seberberg and Walker, 2014).

These networks of networks behave as hybrid organizations Chadwick (cited in Bennett, Seberberg and Walker, 2014).

In Bennett, Seberberg and Walker’s (2014) the forthcoming findings regard protests, however because of its nature, it is just as well related to the case organization of this research. In some instances, large-scale networks have physical realization in the form of occasional meet-ups apart from the online activities. These physical enactments tend to serve as occasions to develop specific norms and vocabularies. The non-bureaucratic systems require continuous peer contribution for sustainment. The large-scale crowds disintegrate if the circulation of information is not well maintained or if the interactions within the communities are not constant. Therefore, they are dependent on the contribution of their participants.
Participation and Engagement

To maximize the input that a voluntary contribution means to an organization, it needs to be used strategically.

The Volunteer Involvement Framework™ (Jane Rehnborg, Ph.D. et al., 2009)

The framework illustrates the subjects of volunteer engagements and it is used mainly for decision-making and prioritization. The management can consider to improve the volunteer engagement practices, which depend on what the goals are that the organization sets (Jane Rehnborg, Ph.D. et al., 2009).

The horizontal columns, which are called the Connection to Service elaborates on focuses, Affiliation and Skills. The single person or group of individuals in the Affiliation cell go in a volunteer quest of opportunities in line with the mission and the purpose of the organization. The Skill orientation cell comprises the volunteers whose expertise are going into service (Jane Rehnborg, Ph.D. et al., 2009).

The vertical Time for Service dimension focuses on the availability of the volunteers. The raw called episodic, stands for a short-term of service, whereas the one under collects the volunteers that carry out long-term engagements (Jane Rehnborg, Ph.D. et al., 2009).
Many to Many Marketing

The usual marketing initiated by a company is value-centric, conversely the Many to Many Marketing is customer-centric, and it focuses more on the benefits that consumers get out of using the particular products or services (Gummesson and Mele, 2010).

This concept incorporates relationships, networks and interactions. The network can be either inside, which means the organization or the outside that stands for the market or the society in general.

Although social media platforms recently take a great advantage of opinion sharing, Customer to Customer (C2C) marketing has still not been recognized as part of the marketing theory, yet this is the concept that Many to Many Marketing is based on. The Word of Mouth (WOM) when customers or the users of a given system share their ideas, insights with one another. The social media platforms are perfectly suitable for these engagements. The incontestable importance of this practice plays a substantial role in decision-making and, therefore, influences the customers’ behavior (Gummesson and Mele, 2010).

Wikonomics

In peer production communities, community members contribute with their knowledge, time and whatever resources they have at disposal for nonmonetary reasons on a voluntary basis. They contribute because they want to and they can. People not getting paid to participate in these activities does not mean that they do not benefit from their engagements in other ways, such as gaining experience or belonging to a community (Tapscott and D. Williams, 2006).

There are billions of people recently, who are connected via the Internet so they can cooperate and make practically anything happen with their computers and internet connection that requires creativity. The need for relying on capital-intensive firms to carry out these initials is not that obvious anymore; through cooperation and utilization of the mentioned resources they can accomplish virtually anything (Tapscott and D. Williams, 2006).
According to Tapscott and D. Williams (2006) the motivation why people decide to participate in peer-production communities that co-create value varies, in fact, it works the best when the following three preconditions coincide.

1. The outcome of the contribution is either culture or information and for this end, the cost of participation is kept low.

2. Certain tasks that require less or more time and expertise so everyone can find something that suits them the best. In this way, the time and energy that contributors need to invest is lower in relation to the benefits that they get out of it in return.

3. The integrational cost of those contributed pieces into the finished service or product, which includes the quality-control and leadership processes must be kept low as well (Tapscott and D. Williams, 2006).

When the participants can harvest some value from their contributions and feel enabled in different meaningful ways, the organization has the potential to scale its activities and become truly global. Nevertheless, at times the openness of these systems come with the fact that there is no guarantee of each contribution reaching the same level of quality and professionalism (Tapscott and D. Williams, 2006).

**The Format Project**

In recent times, new ways of collaborative social practices have been quickly spreading around the world and Restaurant Day is one of these collective actions. However, RD is not a lone actor of the cultural co-production industry; it is the most widespread international gastronomy and food-related voluntary run organization. Thanks to the connectedness that the digital world offers the collaborative peer production model that RD has makes use of social media platforms and contribution of passionate volunteers. By doing so, the likeliness of global spread has fiercely increased. The rather social than commercial nature and the inclusiveness of RD has a high level of transparency in terms of the processes it follows and the goals it seeks to achieve. Moreover, it makes RD a replicable format of cooperation in newly joined countries (Bujdoso, et.al. n.d.).
Bujdoso, et.al. (n.d.) argue the practices of mass collaboration and socially co-created systems of which values are grouped around specific goals and beliefs are replicable formats of cooperation; and have three prevailing characteristics:

1. Involve a high number of participants
2. Have a particular form and design
3. Transplantable to other contexts and domains

The capability of keeping the participants’ motivation up throughout the whole process and not just a single instance is the guarantee of continuous engagement. This way the organization can sustain its existence and processes on local, as well as on a global network level.

Replicability carries the ability of scaling organizations. In particular, these formats are capable of creating and raising awareness of values that attract people who are willing to cooperate in the name of these goals and beliefs. The definition that Bujdoso, et.al. (n.d.) suggest is

“At large, such social formats are constitutive instruments of the soft and hard infrastructure of cooperation and social coexistence.” (Bujdoso, et.al., n.d. p. 37)

Furthermore, Bujdoso, et.al. (n.d.) compare this to the concept of Social Software that runs on a mass of people instead of a hardware - and requires the contribution of the many. These contributions can embody in both tangible and intangible forms such as time, experience, wisdom, creativity, knowledge, communicational power and even money and physical goods.

The three areas of theory supported the understanding of the conceptual terrains that are the most related to the research objectives.
4. Methodology

In a qualitative research that aims to create knowledge, a set of methodological decisions have to be made throughout the process.

After the identification of the research topic and the multiple qualitative empirical, as well as secondary data sources further research steps had to be clarified. This chapter elaborates on eight necessary choices that a researcher needs to consider in the process of designing a qualitative research. It follows the steps that Yin (2011) demonstrates in his book – *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*.

However, before jumping to the first of the eight choices, the Research Onion (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009) is presented below. It helps to visualize the methodological decisions, which are described in details in this chapter. Each layer represents different areas that determine the characteristics of the given research.

4.1 Research Onion:

**Pragmatism:**

Guba and Lincoln cited in (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009) claims that taking only one epistemological and ontological position is fairly unrealistic and in this case the rather flexible pragmatism is the best philosophical path to take. In this particular case the nature of the knowledge was the determinant of the adopted epistemology and ontology. This research philosophy led to complement the collected data with subjective meaning by handling both of them as an acceptable knowledge, which gives access to reality. In axiological terms, the researcher’s values and beliefs are also sources of data interpretation (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). Researchers that follow pragmatism in a social context are focused on the practical implications of the research (Creswell, 2007). The adoption of multiple data collection techniques, such as interviews and observation that were used are a peculiarity of pragmatic research too.

**Inductive:**

There are no or very few research domains with no prior theorizable knowledge on it. It is very rare that a researcher finds an entirely blank spot in the literature (Yin, 2011). According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) some criticize deduction, since it tends to create a theoretical framework, which then tested on the data. However, a novel perspective of an already researched terrain can still be a valuable contribution to the field (Yin 2011). The exceedingly structured approach of deduction might limit the extent to what the researcher let the data reveal unexpected findings. In deduction, theory follows the data, however in this more flexible inductive case it happens the other way, and the data itself has a bigger role regarding refining the theoretical propositions. In fact, it incorporates the most related concepts and theories into the study. The purpose of the literature review is to set up an exploratory lens, through which the data is observed. However, these concepts and theories are not to generate hypothesizes. In deduction a hypothesis is to be tested on the findings (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). Nevertheless, this way of predicting the future is more suitable for quantitative researches in the area of hard sciences (Bendassolli, 2013).

In inductive research, the results emerge from the empirical findings in preference to the initial conceptual categories. Therefore, induction is more suitable for letting authentic, case-specific findings to emerge (Yin, 2011).

This inductive research intends to refine the theories rather than test them. Consequently, the main interest is to gain an understanding of the scalability of RD, substitute for describing of its scalable nature (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009).
As Yin (2011) argues, researchers have to hold some knowledge and preconceptions of the studied field to capture the meanings of a certain social phenomena, and assemble the meanings revealed in qualitative studies. Therefore the initial theoretical propositions described in the Literature reviews are fundamental.

However, induction is not equal with grounded theory that restricts the researcher to utilize extant theories. In induction, most cases the analytic procedure incorporates inductive, as well as deductive approaches (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). Therefore, some findings in the analysis are interpreted in the light of the related theoretical concepts described in the literature review.

Case study:

Robson cited in Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009) describes case study as an empirical investigation of a given organization within its real-life context. Case studies are backed up by numerous data sources, such as interview, participant observation and secondary data. Triangulation stands for using multiple data collection techniques. It is a tool that lets the researcher ensure that findings from the data are what they seem to be (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). As Morris and Wood also cited in Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009) argues that case study is the appropriate choice of research design when the observer intends to obtain a deep understating of a particular context and the processes within it. In this research, there is one unique phenomenon, scalability in the focus, studied through one case organization. Therefore, it falls into the category of single instrumental case study Stake cited in Creswell (2007). However, it is an embedded case study according to Yin’s (2014) definition because more than one organizational sub-units are observed to find an answer to the research question. Moreover, case study research is markedly suitable for challenging the preconceived theories described in the literature review (Yin, 2014).

Multi method:

Research can be either quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative research uses techniques, which generate numeric data, such as questionnaire. In qualitative studies the observer collects non-numeric data, these techniques among others are interviews and observations. A single data collection technique is called the mono method, whereas more than one is referred as multiple methods. The latter is more suitable for case study researches as this study is, and business researchers in general because its findings are more valid and suitable for triangulation. Multi method qualitative research is a subcategory of multi method research choices, but not the same as mixed-methods. In mixed-methods research both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques contribute to the final data
set. This is a multi-method qualitative research and do not intend to generate numeric data (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009).

Qualitative data, however, can be analyzed in two ways. Qualitise means the conversion of the data into a narrative, and this is that the researcher works with or quantitise when the codes are analyzed statistically (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). The presentation of codes that are chosen based on their frequencies is quantitising, whereas the discussion of the findings is qualitising. It is described in details later this chapter, how both qualitising and quantitising are used in the analysis of this research.

**Cross-sectional:**

The course of data collection was not extended for long periods. Cross-sectional observations provide a picture of the research topic at a particular time. In fact, the four interviews and the two actual participant observations were conducted over the period of six months. Furthermore, the secondary data set concerning RDs from previous years were included as well to reduce biased findings, however, it still does not make the research longitudinal.

**Research Design**

The research design is a layout of logical steps that promote the coherence of the investigation by creating links between the research components. (Yin, 2011) In rare cases, qualitative studies can start without a research design. However, it emerges later in the process, the research design has a reflective role over how the study was conducted. Thus either the design determines the direction of the research, or the introductory field experience has an impact on the study direction. Every single research study has an explicit or implicit design that is to strengthen the validity of the findings. Furthermore, it supports the researcher to make the most pertinent data collection decisions to the topic, which helps to answer the research question (Yin, 2011). Therefore, it was decided to employ a research design to explore the scalability of a voluntary run organization through the case of RD, an exploratory single case study design has been chosen.

According to Yin (2011) even though in qualitative research there are design options to choose from, the researcher has the freedom of customizing the ready-made blueprints to some extent, so it suits the particular research the most. In agreement with this instruction, the design protocol was not followed strictly step by step. Yet, the coming considerations were taken into account.
4.2 Validity, Reliability, Credibility

Despite the commonplace assumption, a qualitative research without any extant theorizable concept is just a diary-like portrayal of reality, and it is not suitable for a valid, reliable academic research (Yin, 2011). The primary concern of validity is the integrity of the research as a whole and the conclusion that is developed based on the findings (Bryman and Bell, 2011). It poses the question, whether the evidence reflects the reality that is being investigated (R Gibbs, 2012). The strategy for building up validity in the research had numerous bricks, such as the triangulation of multiple data sources and data collection methods that helped to check the accuracy of the findings. The detailed description of the findings, the careful choices of interviewees were additional ways of strengthening validity. Moreover, particular attention was paid on the conflicting findings that gainsaid the emerging themes (Creswell, 2009). This general skepticism towards the individual discoveries raised the confidence that the findings are as reliable as they were thought to be (Yin, 2011).

There are different types of validity. Internal validity examines the connection of two different variables. External validity is concerned by the generalizability of findings. There are also further refinements of validity categorization, such as ecological validity, nevertheless in this specific case it would not be relevant to go more into details with these. However, generalizability gets special focus later in this chapter.

**External validity – Generalizability:**

According to Yin’s (2011) generalizability is sometimes called external validity, and it represents the degree to what the study findings are pertinent and applicable to other contexts and settings. It notably applies to case study researches, especially if they are as it is a single case study (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). The case organization has a peculiar, however emerging organization design, which to some extent might make some of the study findings applicable to organizations operating in similar social contexts. This could be tested by the so-called analytic generalization that consists of two steps, a theoretical claim that the findings would address other hypothesized circumstances and eventually test the theory built in other situations alike (Yin’s, 2011). The intention of this research is not to produce a theory that would hold water in different contexts, however. In fact, the application of the refined theories that this research intends to produce are not to be used in various contexts without additional research. These conditional assumptions do not enable the researcher to claim that its findings are generalizable theories and applicable beyond the bounded system of RD. This is rather a pivotal feature that the researcher who is conducting a qualitative study needs to be concerned with than a choice to make.
Reliability and Credibility:

Research reliability depends on the skills of the researcher conducting the study.

Reliability stands for making sure that if the study would have been conducted by other researchers with the same methods it would have brought the same results. There are three cases that compromise reality. The subject error means that data collected at a point can be different from if it had been collected on another day, depending on the research subject. Subject bias happens when the researcher is tried to be impressed by giving the answers that he or she wants to hear. The observer error and biases are influenced by the observer’s state of mind which can also be different from time to time. A reliable research must be consistent from time to time (R Gibbs, 2012).

According to R Gibbs (2012), the sufficient level of elaboration throughout the process of the research and the researcher’s background reflects its credibility.

4.3 Clarification of the data collection units’ complexity

According to Yin (2011), the number of the data collection units within a research represents the level that a researcher attends the given matter. For this particular study, four semi-structured interviews have been collected. The four interviewees were chosen with special care, considering the most authentic sources of information. However, there was other levels data collection that involved more types of data such as participant observation notes and secondary sources. The complexity represents the number of units and their relationship. The broader levels are organizational entities, and the narrower are practices or actions. In this particular case the organization of RD was the broader level, and its processes, practices and stakeholders were the narrower levels. These more levels together frame the organization of RD that can be addressed at a broader level. However, it is inseparable from the tighter organizational unit levels, which two together result in the case of the main topic.

Sampling:

As a part of the research design, Yin (2011) suggests to make the decision about the data collection units in line with research goals. Both the nature and the number of units have explained in research. The deliberate selection of data collection units, which is followed in this study is called purposive sampling. These sources gave access to the most relevant and richest data for the research goals. Even though, there is no ideal figure of these units, the higher number and or the authenticity of the units lead to greater confidence in the findings (Yin, 2011).

The selection of inter, as well as extra-organizational units, provide a broad understanding of the reasons of scalability within RD. The scope of the external, so-called professional panels’ insights on the reasons of scalability
went beyond the organizational boundaries due to the lack of their personal involvement. These findings were amended by the founder of RD and the Danish ambassador. The last component was the participant observation. With the purpose to shed light on new perspectives and understand the organizational practicalities, multiple pop-up establishments were attended on two consecutive RDs. This combination of techniques along with an adequate number of units resulted in a comprehensive picture of the underlying reasons of scalability in RD.

The snowball sampling effect, which means that the one data collection unit led to another also played a role in the process (Yin, 2011). As soon as the first interviewee, Timo Santala was briefed of the research topic, not for turning away from his interview, but rather as an additional recommendation, he suggested to get in contact with of the expert panels, Attila Bujdosó.

The table shows the certain informants (units), their role in RD and the type of data that were collected from them. It also includes information about the documentation method and the length or scope in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Length / Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timo Santala</td>
<td>Founder, Chairman of the Board</td>
<td>Semi structured qualitative interview</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Nymand-Grarup</td>
<td>Ambassador of RD Denmark</td>
<td>Semi structured qualitative interview</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila Bujdosó</td>
<td>Expert Panel author of The Format Project</td>
<td>Semi structured qualitative interview</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalma Berkovits</td>
<td>Expert Panel</td>
<td>Semi structured qualitative interview</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergő Láng</td>
<td>Researcher, study conductor</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Observation notes</td>
<td>Two RDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Table Sampling, own arrangement, Based on Riccardo Romano’s (2015)
4.4 Early stage participant feedback

Yin (2011) describes the option of getting an early stage feedback from the certain study participants based on the data that was collected throughout the collection period. For this study four interviews were conducted, which were then transcribed, all the transcription mistakes were corrected as part of the data cleaning (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009) and sent back to the interviewees for approval. As it is quite usual to get some assessment later in the process, this practice is not always necessary, however, could prevent undesirable situations in what the ethical issues might occur. With seizing the opportunity to obtain these consents from each respondent, served as an extra guarantee of having the valid answers. Sharing substantial parts of research notes and plans at this stage would have been unnecessary and could have resulted in design issues, such as too much external influence in the research process (Yin, 2011).

4.5 Research protocol

The last choice that Yin (2011) suggests to make is whether to employ a research protocol or not. This procedural framework holds a threat of undermining the study findings and, therefore, it is a common practice to avoid using them as a ground rule in qualitative research. The incompatibility of the protocol with the open-mindedness depends on the researcher, however. As the research archetype was described in the earlier chapter, even in an empirical approach there are some conceptual categories identified partly prior somewhat simultaneously of the data collection. These theories along with the research question enable the investigator to set up certain subjects that are ought to be covered throughout the data collection. Even though these cannot influence or anticipate the discoveries. If the research circumstances permit the co-existence of the researcher’s impartiality and broad-mindedness with such “mental framework” (Yin, 2011, p. 103) they could even help to organize the data gathering process without harmfully compromising the validity and reliability of the results. The level of structuredness can range from not having a protocol at all to strictly follow one, although the latter would still not be equivalent with a research instrument. These could be surveys, questionnaires, but these are more likely to be used in quantitative inquiries (Yin, 2011).

In this case, a moderately organized research protocol was employed in the interviews that helped comparisons within the data set, thus made it more suitable for triangulation in the analysis. Even though some interviews were conducted in person, others as video interviews, in none of the cases was the protocol shared with the interviewees. Minor supersedes and revisions had to be made, and extra topics were necessary to elaborate on to flexibly adapt to the emerging themes by avoiding biases rather than strictly stick to the premediated plan. (See appendix 1)
4. 6 Fieldwork

Fieldwork stands for engaging in real-world situations in a structured and formal way, and for the interaction with people in them (Yin, 2011) Fieldwork covers all parts of the research that seek to collect information from real life settings. The researcher needs to build up and maintain a positive relationship with people within these settings for a successful cooperation throughout the process. Fieldwork is a process, since it consists of a sequence of multiple events.

During the first attempts of entering the field, the investigator has to be flexible and prepared for unexpected things to happen. If so, going with the flow is the best practice to follow. These situations can result in valuable pieces of information, or source of information, such as the earlier-mentioned snowball effect. In this research the secondary data sources were studied prior entering the fieldwork, which helped to alleviate potential obstacles deriving from the lack of background knowledge. It consisted of the website of RD, previous research paper on the organization, Facebook groups, articles, videos, interviews, pictures, 'et cetera' (Yin, 2011).

**Entering the field:**

The different ways of entering the field include site visits and participant observation, and further following other data collection techniques. As mentioned earlier, observation and interviews were used for this research. The findings and discoveries collected throughout the observation shed light on matters under investigation. However, the primary sources of information obtained in the field happened through four interviews.

As partly noted in the interview protocol (See Appendix 1) all these endeavors started with disclosing the researcher’s identity and the purpose of the study. Transparency and clear communication at these early stages were essential to represent the professional nature of the research over personal curiosity. Due to the research etiquette, maintaining a qualified, respectful, and friendly but not smarmy behavior was followed. This behavioral pattern was essential in getting the most unbiased information to the best of research participants’ knowledge (Yin, 2011).

As part of the fieldwork, first the founder of the organization, Timo Santala was approached via an email, which was then followed by a pilot interview and eventually a semi-structured interview was conducted. In the same manner, another semi-structured interview was scheduled with the current Danish ambassador of RD. Additionally, two expert panel interviews reinforced the findings collected throughout these interactions. Two
Restaurant Day visits were viable during the course of study; on these days apart from collecting observation notes (See Appendix 5), personal interactions were initiated with the pop-up restaurateurs. All these were portrayals of the underlying reasons of the organizational scalability.

4.7 Data collection

This paragraph details the field-based data collections methods that were chosen to assemble a comprehensive data set that served as a foundation for this qualitative study.

According to Yin (2011), data are the compilation of organized information. In qualitative research context, mainly consisting of images, sound recordings, texts, observation notes, 'et cetera.'

There general characteristics of a proper data collection process are as follows. Being a good listener, being inquisitive, being able to manage time efficiently, having the ability to distinguish between first and secondhand information, and at last but not least triangulating evidence. These are ways of strengthening the trustworthiness of the findings (Yin, 2011), were the guiding principles of the data collection procedure.

4.7.1 Interviewing

Unlike rigorously scripted, structured interviews that have more closed-ended questions as a way of reaching accuracy, qualitative interviews are less meticulous and give more space to flexibility, these are referred as semi-structured interviews. Therefore, the semi-structured interview technique is suitable for exploratory studies as this one is.

In this research, the four qualitative interviews had a rather conversational approach. No a questionnaire with a complete set of questions was followed. Apart from prior familiarization of the organization, solely open-ended questions and areas were prepared. This technique offered the chance for a two-directional communication, in what sometime the research participant could ask questions as well. Asking questions that are likely to be answered with a predefined way can lead to troublesome situations that do not trigger further redundancy in the answers given by the participants. This undesirable practice can be prevented by letting the participants express their thoughts by using their own terms, which result in rich data as well. Therefore, directive and predisposed behavior was avoided (Yin, 2011).
Flexibility throughout the dialogues was essential as well. Some of the answers given in the qualitative interviews had the potential of raising topics that were not expected or predefined. When these were related to the research topic, as Yin (2011) suggests they were proceeded with.

As Bryman and Bell (2011) define the semi-structured interviews as they are likely to follow an interview guide and cover the same topics throughout the certain interviews. It was decided to make a use of such a guideline. The interview protocol table (See Appendix 1) shows the themes. However, the sequence of the questions was not the same in each of the four cases.

4.7.2 Observing

The next type of primary data collection method that increased the richness of the data for this research was observation. According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) observation involves systematic observation, data recording, analysis and interpretation of the documented behavior.

There are two types of observation, structured and participant observation, the former is more concerned with quantitate contexts and gives less space to flexibility. Therefore, the participant observation approach was followed. Participant observation derives from the discipline of social anthropology, and it is a more appropriate choice for qualitative studies (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). During the observation, the researcher engaged in the activity of the subject matter, which was suitable to detect the smallest nuances that helped to answer the research question. Delbridge and Kirkpatrick cited in Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009).

There are different levels of participation from being a complete participant to participant as an observer. It was decided to get involved in symbolic interactions, which means the communication with people in field settings. In these encounters, the behavior had to be adjusted to the given social contexts. However, the researcher’s identity was openly disclosed before the data recording, which falls into the participant observer category. It is a particularly advisable choice when trust needs to be built (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009). However, can have a disadvantage that calls reflexivity, which means the unpredictable influence that an observer’s presence has on the participants. This did not cause a problem when the observed topic were merely the physical settings, but had to be addressed when inter organizational and human activities were involved (Yin, 2011). By the informal tone of communication used through the observation for this study, this source of data bias was reduced to the minimum.
One of the attended events, was in Copenhagen, Denmark and the other one in Budapest, Hungary. The limited number of cites might influence the generalizability of results regarding of all the other participating locations worldwide.

Furthermore, as (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009) describes, how spoken language differs from written manuscripts, the interview transcripts were therefore completed with observation notes (See Appendix 5), which include the researcher’s remarks on the interviewee’s behavior and general approach.

4.7.3 Collecting Secondary Data

Secondary data were valuable asset in the data set while looking for an answer to the research question, and through the validation process in the triangulation. Extant, already collected data is called secondary. Yet, it can be further refined to raw, unprocessed data and published materials, such as emails, pictures, reports, 'et cetera.' Most of the secondary data for this research was collected through the website of the case organization and other related social media platforms or other mass media outputs. For instance online newspapers and magazines. Even though, these were a beneficial addition to the primary data set, by themselves would not have been appropriate to address the research goals thoroughly (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009).

Furthermore, this research benefited from non-written documentary secondary data, namely photos, videos, however articles, an interview subscription and survey-based secondary data are part of the secondary data set too. Therefore, the secondary data set is considered multiple-source. The interview used as secondary data, C. Frederiksen, cited in (Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014) was collected by a research group that included the author of this thesis. Therefore it was easy to locate. This familiarity with the data source reduced one of the biggest disadvantages, the lack of control over its quality. The rest was freely accessible on the internet. An overwhelming amount of secondary data was collected in the early stage of the research process, however after careful evaluation with the so-called critical hermeneutical approach, Phillips and Brown and Forster cited in (Bryman and Bell, 2011) not everything that first seemed relevant turned out to be usable for answering the research question. On most occasions due the lack of validity and research suitability (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009).

The table below illustrates the data collection methods used for the research. Furthermore it shows the data type, suitability and gives a specific example from the research for each category.
### Data collection methods, suitability, examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Specific example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>• Language, • verbal communication</td>
<td>• Deep understanding of the phenomena • first-hand information • unreplaceable insights</td>
<td>• explanations of the certain phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>• Social context interactions • participant’s gestures • physical setting • sounds • conversations • overall environment</td>
<td>• Field-setting • live real life representation of the case organization’s events</td>
<td>• Relations between participants coordination • event arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data collection</td>
<td>• Mass media outputs organization website photos</td>
<td>• Findings validation through triangulation • new perspectives</td>
<td>• Interview transcript column chart • event photo archives • promotion video</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Table, Data collection methods, Own arrangement, based on Yin (2011) p.131

### 4.8 Data Recording

Recording data is a part of data collection that also consist of smaller and bigger sub-tasks. Different data are recorded in different ways, but what is common in them that they all need to be revised and clarified before used in the analysis. Gaps or logical discrepancies can at times be fixed after the initial data recording. It is the researcher’s judgment call to decide what is relevant to record and what is not, the best strategy for this is always to keep the research question in mind and document accordingly (Yin, 2011).

#### 4.8.1 Interviews

Each of the four interviews after the prior approval of the interviewees was recorded audibly with a portable sound recorder. This allowed focusing on the semi-structured conversations fully. After the interviews, the audio files were transcribed in written form, then filed for the analysis. For the transcription, the Express Scribe Transcription software was used that substantially shortened time of orienting in the recordings by a controller pedal. Pausing and play and going back and forth can be performed by taps on the separate pedals, after a short process of
mastering the software and device it was for the researcher’s convenience. The written transcriptions as the last step before using them as analysis material were sent to the information sources for final verification (Yin, 2011).

4.8.2 Observation

Taking field notes happened in the most discrete way possible so that neither the social interactions were not compromised, nor the researcher’s attention was distracted from possibly important details while writing hints into the notebook. Taking too many notes was not possible accordingly, but a middle course had to be found for sufficient data. The main remarks, keywords were noted straight away, but no well-rounded thoughts could be put down at this point. These fragmentary field notes had then to be organized in line with the analytical needs. The relevant details had to be recorded shortly after the observation took place to remember the smallest details, and to comprehend the meaning of the compressed thoughts as well. The written notes brought exciting new ideas during the initial note-enhancement period. At this point initial codes could be anticipated from the final notes.

When the interview transcripts were approved, and the observation notes (See Appendix 5) were wrapped up, the comparison of the anticipatory codes and the main findings were compared. These cross-checkings were the best way of a final empirical data verification before these were used in the analysis (Yin, 2011).

4.8.3 Secondary data

With the same thoroughness as was described for the observation notes (See Appendix 5), the secondary data sources were narrowed down to the most relevant pieces, then stored in the data base until the later analysis.

All the data were collected in the form that was ready for analysis; they were organized in a structured database for easier orientation and transparency (Yin, 2011).
4.9 Coding

As Miles and Huberman argue cited in (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009), lengthy documents of data are problematic to analyze due to the lack of careful organization. Therefore, for an accurate reduction of the data, the coding process was carried out first.

The data coding has been performed without a Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS). Even though such a tool could be a useful assistance through the analysis process, due to the time constraint it was decided not to be used. Furthermore, the terminology changes from one software to another. Because its limitations a manual coding process has been performed on the interview transcripts and observation notes (See Appendix 5).

According to Yin (2011) qualitative data coding supports preventing biased and nonsystematic judgments, yet could make the analysis too mechanic. The open-mindedness that is a necessity during the process.

The direct quotes and frequent revisions served the avoidance of this pitfall (Romano, 2015).

There are various approaches to coding and analyzing qualitative data. Even though, this research gives credits to numerous ways, it did not follow any of them strictly. Instead, a system was developed that seemed the most logical. The best answer to purpose of coding the notes and transcripts, and present the findings in a sufficient manner. It partly followed the logic that Löfgren Ph.D. (2013) and Creswell, J. (2009) describe in their methodological propositions.

The coding was done as follows:

1. When all the interview transcripts and observations notes (See Appendix 5) were gathered, a careful and thorough reading was performed first. The spontaneous ideas were noted down immediately.

2. Once this first phase was over, started the coding, by labeling shorter and longer chunks of text. At this stage, 159 code categories were identified, however, some of these were overlapping, and others were not relevant or related to the research objectives. These categories and codes were recorded in an Excel document for enhanced manageability. Both of which were then narrowed down to either reoccurring, relevant, surprising pieces. Furthermore, these were analogous to or conflicting with the described concepts, or with emphasized importance by the interviewees.
3. In the next categorization phase the codes were gathered in refined groups driven by the intention of conceptualizing the findings. In this step, certain codes were dropped, merged with other codes or kept as they were. All of these categories were described briefly, and further refined sub-codes with sub-categories were attached to them. These findings are visualized in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3). These major categories and the correspondence between them are the main results of the study.

4. The categories, which for some of the above-mentioned reasons, such as relevancy to the research objectives, similarity or contradictory to the described concepts and frequency in the transcripts and notes were assigned to the final themes that are elaborated on in the analysis chapter in detail. However, these steps might seem straightforward, the coding was a dynamic process with numerous revisions and refinements until saturation, when no more relevant codes and themes emerged.

5. As last the findings and their relation to the conceptual propositions are presented in the Analysis and Discussion of the findings chapter.

The codes, sub-codes, and the pertaining short narratives are all presented in multiple tables in the analysis. These tables support both data view and the perspicacious visualization of the findings. Accompanied by the explanations, they will provide answers to the main and sub-research questions.

4.10 Analysis strategy

In the theory building process, Eisenhardt (1989) suggests to shape hypothesizes based on the qualitative data analysis. Nonetheless, this practice due to the limited degree of generalizability of the results will deliberately not be employed in its entirety.

However, the findings of the analysis will be continuously reflected on in a narrative manner. The reason for choosing this simultaneous way of analyzing and discussing the data is binary. First of all to assure the reflection on all the emerging discoveries that were charted into the four main themes, second of all it facilitates an iterative comparison with the consonant and confliction literature.

The separate discussion would have conveyed the findings more holistically, and even though a more general Enfolding Literature might emerge this way, it would distract the researcher’s attention from the most important nuances. Therefore, it led to the decision of going against the grain with Eisenhardt’s suggestions.
At the end of this chapter, the answers are provided for the research questions. These function as the crystallized results in themselves.

5. Analysis and Presentation of the empirical findings

During the process of identifying the emerging themes, the determinants, mentioned in the coding paragraph of methodology were taken into consideration. The sum of code frequencies within the fourteen main categories was one of the most important determinants, however not the only one.

The enclosed tables that visualize the codes, support the understanding of the connections and dependencies between the findings APPENDIX.

As the last step of the coding process that was described earlier, the four main themes emerged and the relevant codes were attached to them. These codes are listed according to their frequencies from the largest to the smallest in the concerning tables. For the enhanced transparency, related sub-codes, if any are not featured in these refined tables. However, some of the related sub-codes were the part of analysis. These sub-codes can be found in the Second layer coding table (See Appendix 3). Certain codes were deliberately included in more than one main themes, which also proofs their inseparable nature and causality.

Beyond these depictions, there are comparison with the conceptual propositions where it was relevant. The discoveries will bring us to the understanding of the factors that mainly influence the scalability of Restaurant Day, therefore provide answers for the research questions. Nonetheless, the comprehensive testing and application of theories, and displayed models from the literature review are not part of this research.

The four emerging themes are:

Based on second layer coding (See Appendix 3), and the above-mentioned considerations, the following four themes emerged.

1. Scalability within Restaurant Day
2. Organizational Characteristics
3. Social value creation as a community
4. Participation and Motivation
The major discussing statements, are in most cases followed by actual quotes from the empirical data set. These findings concern the given codes from the refined tables in the beginning of the four paragraphs.

The presentation of the many data pieces might fragment the descriptive parts. However, it was found a particularly qualified method for enhancing the findings, and providing immediate reflections. Therefore, this practice was employed as the main analysis strategy.

5.1 Scalability within Restaurant Day

This is the widest among the main themes and even though all the other four themes could be handled as part of it, it is worth to look at it separately through the interpretation of the most related codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name and Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Success Factors</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Idea spread</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Organizational growth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Leverage existing platforms and technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the codes appearing in the table include numerous sub-codes. There are 24 sub-categories within the Success factors, 5 within the Actors, 3 in the Idea spread and 1 in the remaining two code categories. Due to the scope limitation of the thesis not all the sub-categories will be itemized in this paragraph. However, these can be further observed in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3).

The most notable frequency that strikes out first by looking at the table is the one that belongs to the success factors. The 24 subcategories within this code, were identified based on the data collected through the fieldwork with frequencies ranging from sixteen to one. These can be observed in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3) in details. These factors represent the features of RD that guarantee its popularity and worldwide success.
Success factors and Idea spread:

Spreadability effect is the success factor with the highest frequency, which is also charted as a separate code, 2.4. This stands for the concept of RD getting around the whole world. It is closely related to other factors, but mainly to the adoptability and comprehendability of the idea.

“So I do think that the scalability of RD is dependent on many people understanding the concept and being able to pull it into their environment.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 27)

As Attila Bujdoso, the expert panel interviewee explains, the success of the organization derives from two root causes, the perception of the crowds of people and the ability to adopt the concept into their local environments.

The main official platform of RD, their website gives a concise, yet comprehensive explanation to people who intend to familiarize themselves with the idea for the first time.

“Restaurant Day is a food carnival created by thousands of people organizing and visiting one-day restaurants worldwide. The idea of the day is to have fun, share new food experiences and enjoy our common living environments together. The event is facilitated by a team of volunteers who also maintain this website. All restaurateurs are personally responsible for all actions related to running their restaurants.” (Restaurantday.org, 2015)

This mission statement provides just enough information to get a general understanding of the concept, however, does not provide a guideline of how to get involved and open a pop-up restaurant on RD. For this purpose, a simple four-step guideline that functions as a basic level of standardization is described on the same page of how to take part as a restauranteur. (Restaurantday.org, 2015) The fourth step encourages all the participants to spread the word and introduce the idea to as many people as possible. By doing so, they become the part of the collective action as well.

1. Start with the planning
2. Research your customers
3. Be prepared for action
4. Share your experience

(Restaurantday.org, 2015)
However, the simple framework that makes “everybody knows what to do” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.4) does not bind the participant’s hands but instead it gives them enough flexibility and freedom to try out their restaurant plans.

“The freedom, the lack of rules in regards to what you are able to provide as a restaurant.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 24)

“So yes it is the freedom and the accessibility of it that people like the most.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 24)

Based on these remarks the simplicity and the trialability are as well crucial to the success and the organizational scalability. The requirement for the participants are therefore permissive, and this lack of exclusivity makes RD accessible for anyone either as an ambassador, participant, volunteer or customer.

However, people need to be willing to embrace a concept to engage in it. As described in the literature review, there are certain factors, which facilitate this process - and they approve the empirical findings.

Compatibility Rodgers (cited in Burkus 2014) discusses the adoptability of the idea - and since the values and norms that the organization represents are very human; therefore, people are willing to join the movement.

“There is nothing new about food festivals right, and there is nothing new about people hosting other people and serve them food” (Bujdosö, 2015, Appendix 5 p.31)

Which shortens the time of accommodating the concept.

The organizational form has a major importance in this process. Therefore, it is described in the next paragraph. RD is not owned by anyone, and based on data it turns out that this plays a particular role in the popularity of the concept. It motivates people to promote it even more.

“They are talking about something that belongs to them. That they are themselves. And that makes a big difference. Because I have always said that RD is not a product or a company or anything like this.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.4)
This common ownership of the concept and the community that people regardless of their cultural background can easily relate to helps to encase critical masses of people, who want to participate.

The different approaches of the participants help them to make a use of each other’s facilities, knowledge, and insights. It does not only mean leveraging the synergies, but might be the foundation of friendships and future participation. They reported it as a positive experience.

“On previous occasions they got in contact with other pop-up restaurants that were registered close their intended location, in order to build a good personal relationship upfront, and make use of any possible synergies that might derive from their different approaches.” (Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 45)

The regular way that business ideas spread is through multichannel marketing such as direct mails, television, social media and other paid advertising platforms. In the case of RD, the “idea spread” is completely carried out on a voluntary basis, by the actors of the organization.

“We have 10s of thousands of people talking for us and about us.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 4)

**Actors:**

The actors of RD can be divided into five groups

- Core team
- Ambassadors
- Restauranteurs
- Volunteers
- Customers

The core team represents the members of the headquarter. The ambassadors are representatives, who contribute to the standardization of the processes in every country and city. “all around the world they want to make sure that
the same thing happens as it is happening in Finland” (Satntala, 2015, p.7). The restaurateurs are the active participants who set up pop-up restaurants. The volunteers, are the people who without any financial compensation willing to contribute in any way they can, by gaining social value for themselves at the same time “these people benefit from their participation” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36). Finally, the customers are the ones who show up at the pop-ups and become the guests of the establishments.

“Both the existence and the successful growth of RD are dependent on all of these actors.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 29)

It is in line with Abbott and Fisher’s (2009) statement, according to what the scalability of an organization is dependent on this exceptional group of people. According to the Admin of Fundable (2014), scalability is the higher degree of performance than the resources, added to the system. All the knowledge, time and inspiration that actors add to RD voluntarily, of their own free will without substantial effort are the system resources that make the organization Functionally Scalable (Jamil, 2003). According to Jamil’s (2003) definition, RD also meets the requirements of Administrative Scalability, since it openly accommodates every actors, who wishes to be the part of the organization.

Leveraging existing technologies:

Apart from its website, RD uses Facebook as the main communication platform, which is exceptionally suitable to reach the critical mass that is potentially interested in the concept. Without the existence of a social media platform that can be used freely by so many users, RD would not have been able to attract people who were and are the actual or potential user base of its concept.

As described in the literature review certain organizations are more suitable for scaling than others. Since RD has not invested into information technology development, it uses social media platforms as valuable sources of scalability.

“Just to have bare essence and anything else just happens on people’s own channels, they write about it on their Facebook or on their blogs, or you go with hashtag RD, then you get thousands of results.”
We just create an Instagram account and then we give the password publicly to everyone, and anyone can post RD related photos there." (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 13)

In this way without employing any extra resources, the concept spreads through various platforms that are exceptionally suitable for scaling. The various ways of engaging with the shared content, it gains a tremendous user base for the organization without additional investment. Based on Jenkins’ (2010) expert opinion, the ability of social media platforms users to manipulate to content they share, supports the spreadability. RD users share pictures, thoughts, comments, ‘et cetera.’ Therefore, it falls into the so-called Leveraging Scalability organizational model category Liu (n.d.).

“Technology is getting cheaper and more accessible for people. Their knowledge is obvious and international travels are getting cheaper as well.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 32)

Bujdoso’s (2015) explanation, the democratization means the accessibility of information through more affordable technology and traveling. Technology indicates access to the internet and that equals access to information. These two things together, have the capacity of widening the people’s perspective and, therefore, it became easier to come across concepts that they have the tendency to embrace. Moreover, Hagel III, Davison and Seely Brown, (2009) describes the diminishing information imbalance between the service providers and the end users. In a for-profit environment it helps the company to learn about their customers’ needs. However, in RD it offers a platform for beneficiaries to express their ideas and contribute to the community.

**Organizational growth:**

Organizational growth is not be confused with scalability, since the ability to scale a system is to extend it, without employing extra efforts. From the core team’s perspective, RD is a highly scalable organization. It has been growing without them working on it, or investing in the concept any further once the basic idea and guidelines were established. The organization has grown horizontally that according to (Sharma, 2012) means broadening up to new locations with an increased user base and that is exactly what RD has accomplished.

“I think that there are ways that you can support and help growth but RD and others bottom-up initiatives alike and this is a pull mechanism or pull strategy” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p 27)
Due to the pull mechanism, the system hooks new and motivated members, who with their contributions and sharing activities grow the community further and further.

As described in the literature review, at times fast-growing startups need to cope with an unexpected amount of customers, which in the context of RD means all the actors. For RD, it has a crucial importance that actors have access to the necessary information at the time they need it. The success of the specific Restaurant Days, and on long term, the success of the organization depend on it.

“It was 2012 when in May on the first anniversary our website crashed because there was just too many people trying to access the map. 15 minutes after I got a phone call from the biggest newspaper in Finland, which has about 1M readers, and they were like, I heard that your website had crashed, how can we help you?” (Santala 2015, Appendix 5 p. 9)

This anecdote sheds light on the resources that organization can rely on, at least in Finland. However, it blurs the boundaries of what resources can be considered internal and external, since the editorial staff of the newspaper, deliberately not called by its name, felt that RD was theirs as well, and like all the other volunteers they helped how they could.

In light of these findings, it was decided to be beneficial to reflect on the four types of scalability that were described earlier according to Jamil’s (2003) categorization. Based on the analysis of the findings, RD archives three of the four types of scalability.

1. It carries out Administrative Scalability since it accommodates a rising number of actors, who share the values of the organizations, and follow its guideline by maintaining the same level of input on the core team’s side.
2. It performs Geographic Scalability since it has been expanding its activities to more and more countries and cities within them without additional effort of the core team.
3. The Load Scalability, which describes the ability of RD to cope with the ever-changing number of customers, participants, and volunteers from time to time.
4. However, it has not executed Functional Scalability, which would mean to add different functions to the organization, although it has never intended to do so.
Furthermore, Rouse’s (2015) definition of horizontal and vertical scalability mainly applies to computer and information technology (IT) fields; some contradictions stand out that are needed to be handled critically. According to the definition of vertical scalability, adding more participants or volunteers to RD who can be considered as additional “resources” there is no necessity of downtime as it is when adding certain computer resources to a hardware, for example an extra a motherboard. Moreover, as (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 12) states, “We are not scaling up, we are scaling wide” that is a straightforward statement about RD scaling more horizontally than vertically, as scaling up is an alternative way of calling scaling vertically.

5.2 Organizational Characteristics

The organizational characteristics determine the way RD operates. Therefore, the unique combination of the organizational peculiarities play a crucial role in scalability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name and Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Opened</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Project based</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Boundaryless</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Similarity to public holidays</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Loosely organized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Table, Theme codes, Organizational Characteristics, Own arrangement

**Legislation:**

Depending on the structure of business, such as Limited Liability Company, Corporation, Partnerships 'et cetera.' Different rules apply to them. The local regulations in the participating countries also differ to various extents.
However, since RD is not an officially registered organization, it would be legally paradoxical to bring it to account as a legal entity for what and how it does.

When the founders in Helsinki, without even thinking about the idea of initiating a global platform, they spun off their early stage concept and started biking around local parks serving drinks.

“Biking from park to park and ask the people what they want to drink, but with the legislations it was impossible to have it all done legally. But we realized that it was something fun happening” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.2)

However, it drove them to focus rather on the potential of the idea than establishing the legal basis for their operation.

“We did not have to deal with legislation or bureaucracy, simply because we have not asked for any permissions or any licenses for anything. Not in the beginning and all these years done, we still have not asked for permission to do what we do. So we are just ignoring it completely and since it is something that should be able to happen, I do not think that people need to ask for permission on this one.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.8)

So with this idealistic mindset, the founders decided to ignore completely the legal considerations, and swung into action instead. So far, due to the project-based, yet permanent nature of RD, they have not encountered any legal disturbance.

“I have not heard of any trouble or any obstacles on the legislation side” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.8)

**Non-profit:**

RD has a particular organization structure, and since its primary objective is not generating profit, it can be handled as a non-profit organization.

“It is non-profit, because apart from the pop-up restaurants revenues, which are mainly to cover their own expenses, generating profit is not in the focus.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 34)
“I think it is the combination of many organizational forms. So it is hard define or classify. RD is basically many people, who gather around a specific idea or concept of RD.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 26)

On the strength of the previous two statements, it is beneficial to reflect on Battilana’s et al. (2012) Hybrid Ideal concept, since the pop-up restaurants do generate revenues, regardless of its function that as it has being said, covering their expenses. The Legal and Financial Dilemmas, which could derive from the financial earnings of the participants within the non-profit organization, have not caused any confrontations with the authorities. According to Santala (2015), the lack of the legal obstacles is the result of the temporary nature of the pop-ups, and the marginal income of these micro one-day businesses.

Even though, scalability is mostly used for for-profit, “born-on-the-Internet” companies, RD has a genuinely scalable organizational form.

“The non-profit nature does not make it less suitable to scale, however.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 34)

The impermanent establishments that are part of the non-profit umbrella organization, form RD into a scalable system together.

**Opened:**

The organization openness in the context of RD means the lack of restrictions in regards to who can take part in the events and how. Everybody is welcomed in the community as long as they follow the concessive guideline presented earlier.

“So of course, these kind of things would not be possible if RD was not a completely opened non-profit organization.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 6)

“What makes RD is exactly the possibility of everyone participating and be completely opened, and that is something I really want cherish because otherwise we would loose some the whole idea that is the essence of RD.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 6)
As Timo Santala (2015), depicts in the quotation above, RD being such opened and welcoming is the bottom line of the organizational success.

**Project-based:**

RD is a project-based organization that internationally assembles actors with a different set of professional and soft skills to carry out four one-day long projects per year with particular project objectives.

“We can separate it from your basic needs, your job in order to sustain yourself and earn money and do it as a side project.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 27)

The organizational qualities of RD are analogous to Cattani et al.’s (2011) statement, according to which these task-driven undertakings have predetermined time frames.

“It is not a huge time investment, whereas in other communities it happens that members become overwhelmed, and they either have to ask salary for the work that they are doing, or they have to look for other opportunities to cover their expenses.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

The people, who participate on RDs either as volunteers or participants, and even the members of the core team handle it as a side project. Therefore, it does not interfere with their full-time employment and other regular duties. It is an alternative way of spending their disposable time that does not require long-term investments in terms of time, money, and other long haul preparations.

“Start working in the organization full time would raise the problem of how to cover their daily expenses and then it would just remain as a hobby project.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 37)

If RD required its actors to spend a certain amount of time on each of the events, it would exclude the ones that look at it as a hobby project. The freedom of dedicating as much time to it as one has at a certain occasion is what attracts participants and volunteers and contribute to their continuous contributions.

“People that have been working on the project long term keep up their motivation” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 39)
The lack of obligations will not prevent the participants to meet their priorities and, therefore, they can sustain themselves and be part of the social movement at the same time.

**Platform:**

“The organization functions as a platform, which consists of different elements.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 38)

“Without this platform organization type, it wouldn’t be functioning this well.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 38)

“It is a Distributed community platform.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

According to Berkovics (2016), RD is a platform itself that has a framework that does not set constraints. It makes people easy to connect and contribute to. Furthermore, as one of the participants describes, they use this platform to address certain social issues, which further enhances the finding of how it can be utilized for multiple purposes. The people who use it can form it into something they want it to be.

“They feel responsible to spread the word to as many people as they can about Restaurant Day, and use the platform to address a social problem, dog welfare” (Observation note, collected by the researcher, 2015, Appendix 5, p. 42)

**Decentralized and Boundaryless:**

By the reason of the two factors being closely related, it was decided to present these two theme-relevant codes together.

The expression of a boundaryless organization, that based on Ashkenas’ et al. (2002) definition means the lack of horizontal, vertical and geographic boundaries has not been explicitly stated in any of the interview transcripts. However, the pieces of data presented below completely confirm the conceptual proposition. Thus, it is worth to mention.
"It combines the flexibility and freedom with some structure that helps everyone to organize." (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 34)

It describes the importance of flexibility, and informal relationship between the different actors of the organization, where nobody is anybody’s superior and the chain of command does not prevail.

“So the lack of hierarchy also makes the organization flexible.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 25)

The ambassador of RD Denmark certifies the expert panel’s commentary on the decentralized organizational structure, and how the dispersed approach of the many actors can promote a versatile system.

**Similarity to public holidays:**

When the core team brought RD into being, they had to work a lot on building up the partnerships, establishing the standards, spreading the concept by themselves. However, as the concept emerged, and more countries started participating, their function started becoming less crucial for growth and success.

“For communication and marketing perspective that is also pretty revolutionary! Because of course RD happens whether if we do communication and marketing but in Finland, for example we would not need to do it anymore it is already so established that all we need to do is to set out the dates, and it will happen. And that is when it is already transformed into tradition, into a holiday kind of thing, a celebration.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.10)

“It resembles much more a national holiday, like Christmas or Eastern or something like this.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.4)

Even though the idea comes from Helsinki, and it might have reached the stage when no further promotional activities are necessary to gain more traction, it is still a must in countries that embraced the tradition, the holiday or the concept later Santala (2015).
Loosely organized:

These findings confirm the boundaryless nature of the case organization, since the loose way of formulating a system assumes the flexible quality of RD, which is a peculiarity of a loosely organized system. (Boundless, n.d.)

“So I would say that it is a loosely organized network of people, who use this format of RD to bring some value into their life and into the cities where it takes place.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 26)

As Bujdoso’s (2015) statement yields, the loosely organized system of RD is suitable for creating social values.

“They rather found a phenomenon for what there is a huge demand and can swing huge crowds into action. This is executed through a sleekly, but at the same time loosely organized framework of the organization.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 35)

Furthermore, this a way of alignment of the organizational activates and operation, can bring success and foster scalability when they are used adequately.

“This loosely organized organization form has a critical role in this because you cannot say that they are not organized at all. They are loosely grouped around this concept, this format.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 33)

Bujdoso et.al. (n.d.) the expert panel, as well as the author of the described Format Project theory, metaphorically compares this format to the Social Software that runs on all the actors.
5.3 Social value creation as a community

RD consist of actors. Millions of people, who create local communities, and by following the same principles and pursuing the same activities worldwide on the same four days every year, they generate value for a global community, for the organization of RD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name and Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Social effects</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Mass collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Social value vs. profit generalization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Personal and social responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Table, Theme codes, Social value creation as a community, Own arrangement

**The social effects:**

In the third main theme, the social effects occurred in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3) with the highest frequency. Correspondingly, as first, this paragraph looks into what the most relevant subcategories are within this group and tries to unfold the ways that these contribute to the process of co-creation.

**Inspirational:**

A quote from the Mayor of Helsinki, Jussi Pajunen captures the inspirational force of RD, which might be a feasible framework for future projects.

“Restaurant Day is exactly the sort of project that will define our future. Restaurant Day has inspired the city’s population to question how things are run and to experiment and put forward new ideas of how daily life might be improved in the future.” Jussi Pajunen, Mayor of Helsinki, Monocle’s city survey on Helsinki in the May 2012, quoted on (Restaurantday.org, 2015)
The advent of RD at new locations induces local participants to follow the pioneers’ practice and come up with their idea of how to become the part of the movement.

“Motivating the local communities” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

Based on the people’s sympathy witnessed through the fieldwork, RD is an engaging movement that everyone, who has the tendency of becoming the part of the collaborative format of community creation becomes inspired to create something unique and on another occasion just something comforting. Either way, they feel entitled, or they love food.

“They love food, preparing and sharing it, real enthusiasts” (Observation note, collected by the researcher, 2015, Appendix 5, p. 48)

“You empower and motivate them in a really human way” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 37)

Furthermore, the previously discussed freedom regarding the form of contribution seems essential in retaining participants’ enthusiasm.

“If they were given more than just a framework their freedom of choice would be constrained, and they would have the feeling of working for someone. It would not be as motivating and inspiring for them anymore.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 37)

Activist approach:

The common interest among the participants was touched upon before, however according to Berkovics (2016) expert opinion their willingness to contribute voluntarily could even turn into an activist approach. Her sentiment is in line with Shah’s (n.d.) statement, according to what mutual aid motivates voluntary actions.

“There is a common interest among them, particularly I love to cook I love to cook for others, I love to eat with other people, I would like to get know people with similar interest, and I’m willing to do things to make this happen even with an activist approach.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)
Cultural diversity:

“I think that there are some cultural differences that influence how they approach it.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 18)

The cultural diversity stands for the broad range of cultural approaches and backgrounds within RD participants around the world. Whichever group of actors we are looking at, RD facilities the exhibitions of creative ideas and real talents on these four days a year.

The participants’ engagements and efforts for a common purpose, yet different perspectives through a global collaboration are a facilitator of the culturally vibrant community. Moreover, in agreement with Bujdoso’s (2015) statement, it also supports the fast scalability.

“RD as a cultural organization that can spread really fast.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 32)

Contribution:

Actor’s voluntary contribution is the most fundamental factor in keeping RD alive, spread it further, and make it flourish in the future as well. It is everyone’s responsibility to co-operate and contribute to the community in their personal way.

“RD it relies on the contribution of many independent actors” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 26)

The simple guideline with the assistance of the ambassadors’ gives a framework for organizing the practicalities. Nevertheless, it is not meant to be a limit for anyone who wishes to contribute in other possible ways, and volunteers do.

“Organizing the practical things, using RD’s toolkit and framework are feasible, beyond that every contribution is appreciated” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)
Community building:

Even though Community building as it is visible in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3) is a subcategory of the social effects, due to its markedly high frequency it was decided to be discussed separately.

As the last instruction of four step guideline stresses, spreading the word of RD is part of building the principles.

“Through the ambassador system the global system of RD can make a use of local branches”
(Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 38)

However, there is a group of people within the system whose responsibility is to raise the awareness of the organization and voluntarily make the actual days running smoothly in their local environment. The below Facebook post exemplifies the Danish ambassador’s action of building the RD Denmark community.

“Restaurant Day DK is looking for new volunteers to help communicate the cheer and idea of Restaurant Day on to people curious to start their own pop-ups. It's fun and full of creativity to be part of the ambassador group and you get to meet new, food crazy types 😊 If you'd like to know more, we'll be holding a meeting in Copenhagen at Café Retro in Jægersborggade, Nørrebro on the 17th March at 17.30. Hope to see you there!” (Mullins RD ambassador, 2016, Restaurant Day Denmark Facebook Group)

All the actors are an equal part of the community, possessing the same rights and freedom. However, their motivation of taking part might differ.

“So they all belong to a community but at the same time, they have the freedom of doing basically whatever they like to in a presentable and visible way.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

“And for somebody, it might be the food for somebody it might be the community for somebody it might be coming together with other people.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.10)
Mass collaboration:
As Bujdoso, et.al. (n.d.) describes in the Format Project theory, mass collaboration is a socially co-created system.

1. RD involves a high number of participants, volunteers, ambassadors, customers and the four permanent members of the core team,
2. Have a particular organizational design, which is brought forward in the previous chapter,
3. And as a last requirement of the Format Project, it is transplantable to various locations.

As the founder of RD evaluates, the participants’ engagements have a dual functionality. Beyond their personal convenience and desires, they support the community of RD as well. As a result, becomes easier to get hooked on the concept and becoming part of the global collaboration (Santala, 2015).

“It is much easier for people to get excited about it when they see that they are doing something for themselves and for the community.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.5)

Another research that was conducted on RD in 2013 expresses the feeling that describes the team spirit among participants while they collaboratively generate social value.

“Thousands of fun loving people organize, monitor and visit one-day restaurants. The idea of co-creation brings amazing feeling and atmosphere of “to do it together”, which make Restaurant Day unforgettable.” (Shaparova, 2013, p. 24)

Based on another related part of the data set that compares RD to a classical for-profit, online-based business model, Berkovics (2016) hypothesizes the collaborative power of the community as an indicator of scalability within the case organization.

“And there is one more considerable feature that is need to be mentioned namely that RD has something that most of the scalable online for-profit startups do not possess and this is the power of the community”. (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 35)
Social value vs profit generalization:

This category overlaps with many of the previous ones. Therefore, some of the findings are conspicuous with ones described earlier.

However, since the main principles of the organization is openness and freedom, any other profit-oriented activity apart from the marginal revenue, which derives from the pop-up customers’ purchases would exclude participants (Bujdosó, 2015). This effect would not be in line with the objectives of RD that is to set up a community that represents social values and functions as a collaborative community.

The two pieces of the transcript presented below analyze the social value and profit relationship.

“So if the goal of the organization would be to create a venue and generate profit it would deter even more people.” (Bujdosó, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 26)

“It belongs to them, and it is not really about the profit of anyone but for the community” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.9)

Be that as it may, Berkovics (2015) emphasizes that RD must not be confused with a social enterprise that strives to provide a solution for a civil issue.

“So according to the classical definition of a social enterprise, it does not try to solve a social issue (for example poverty alleviation), which does not mean that it doesn’t have positive social effects because it does. But as I see its first goal is not to reflect on a major social problem with some sort of business solution that invests the profit back to the enterprise. So all in all my point is that RD compared to a social enterprise that is dealing with bigger social trouble is rather just something nice to have.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 35)

Personal and social responsibility:

RD provides a platform for the enthusiasts that share the beliefs they have settled, however never claimed that it takes responsibility for the behavior of its participants. Like the organization itself, the responsibility belongs to everyone as well. In a personal or case specific issue, the given participant has to act in their sober senses.
“In the case of a food poisoning they cannot shift the responsibility to someone else.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 47)

On the other hand, not just the principles of the concept that were founded by the members of the core team, but also the participants have take social responsibility. When these exemplary behavior patterns are linked to this community, it enhances its legitimacy, and holds the potential of earning global approval.

“They financially support animal shelters as far as it lies within their power (with hand-made dog snacks)” (Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 43)

“Last year they donated their revenue for charity to a children foundation.” (Observation notes, collected by Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014 p. 47)

**Workshops:**

Timo Santala (2015) gave a representative example of collaboratively created, especially tangible product, the RD mobile application.

“For the mobile application was done in a workshop where about 30 people got together for a weekend and just made it happen.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p.5)

**5.4 Participation and Motivation**

The reason of featuring these sub-themes as one, is that based on the empirical findings they are inseparable due to their consequential relation. The second layer coding table (See Appendix 3) could have handled them as one as well, however for the thoroughness of the analysis, this separation in coding was made. Secondly, the categories follow one another regarding their frequencies. As it can be seen in the first layer coding table (See Appendix 2), participation has 52 and motivation has 45 densities.
The essence of RD’s existence is the continuous participation of the many people who attend these events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name and Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Everybody freely</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Benefit from the participation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Inner drive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Chance of testing ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Table, Theme codes, Participation and Motivation, Own arrangement

The codes, personal motivation (4.2) and inner drive (6.1) were deliberately differentiated in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3), since they were relevant to both Participation and Motivation. However, they regard the same findings, which is also proved by their equal frequencies. Therefore, this paragraph of the analysis handles them as one sub-topic. These codes are furthermore pieced together, with Benefit from the participation (10.2), Purpose (6.3) and Chance of testing ideas (6.9). This parallel elaboration is due to their logical cause and effect relation.

Some of the quotations are wholly or partly alike with the ones formerly presented in the analysis chapter. The function of these purposeful repetitions is to throw new light upon the particular findings, by looking at them from a different perspective.

**Passion:**

RD among other characteristics is a passion driven organization. Based on the findings this innate is crucial to success at scalability.

“*It definitely has something to do with passion.*”(Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 24)
When Anne Nymand-Grarup (2015) the ambassador of RD was asked about the reasons laying behind the organizational growth and scalability of RD, she argued that passion plays a major role in the process. Additionally, turned out that her passion and professional involvement in gastronomy did not make her an exemption either.

“I just really much liked the concept, and since I am personally passionate about food and professionally as well, then it was very natural for me to become an ambassador.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 17)

Beyond this interpretation, the below remark from the observation notes (See Appendix 5) backs up her statement.

“First and foremost the passionate approach, the crushing excitement to the whole concept of RD was the first similarity to Timo’s style that marked out from her first tokens.” (Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 40)

To triangulate the finding, Timo Santala’s (2016) the founder and Chairman of the Board of RD attitude and approach were observed as well, and it enhanced the discovery.

“His extremely passionate approach, unfaded excitement and professional and persuasive negotiation skills must have been essential when emerging the concept of RD into new countries, briefing the local stakeholders.” (Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 40)

The way Santala (2016) mentioned, passion as a common personal feature among the actors on a par with the loosely structured organizational design further supports its extraordinary relevance.

“Lack of planning, or the lack a really structured organizational design or is it purpose of getting passionate people together and try to share this experience with everyone.” (Researcher’s words, observation note from the interview, 2015, Appendix 5, p. 24)

**Engagement:**

The second layer table (See Appendix 3) presents to Engagement (code 4.5) numerous sub-codes were assigned to. Namely Commitment, Involvement, Attention, Facultative and Change. As the coming pieces of the empirical
qualitative data will show these codes regularly occurred together. To get a full picture of these codes and their relation, at least, one piece of data is presented in each category.

“And another thing that affects the scalability is similar to any other non-profit organization, which is basically the commitment of the founders, of the core team.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 31)

According to one of the expert panel interviewees, the scalability of RD is influenced by the ongoing commitments of the founders (Bujdoso, 2015). It is true based on the previous findings that without the core team the idea would not have been initiated, at least in the way it was. However, based on founder’s statement, who thinks that RD would happen even without them (Santala, 2015)

“RD could and would happen even without the committee members in the headquarter.”
(Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 40)

Following the definition of scalability, if the founders’ commitment is not, or not exceedingly needed as the organization grows, then RD is a scalable organization.

The decision of how much time a volunteer, ambassador, or pop-up restaurateur devotes to his or her commitment does not depend on anyone else but them. However, as presented before due to its project-based nature and the sustaining activities in these people’s lives is not a full-time engagement.

“If they want to they can do it not as a full-time commitment, but they can do it in their free-time.”
(Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 28)

As the other expert panel interviewee, Berkovics (2016) argues, RD does not require to spend more time on the participation as one can afford free of trouble.

“On the other hand, the commitment that these people are required to do is not big.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

Furthermore, the group spirit triggers further participation and makes the assimilation easier for the newcomers.

“And it is so much easier when all the people are involved already”. (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 12)
The quote points back to Svejenova’s (2011) theory, according to what passion-driven projects are the base of expressing personal and group identities.

The volunteers are the people whose contribution and commitments serve the smooth operation. Thanks to them, the application has been developed, professional photos are taken, the external communicational standard has been established, 'et cetera.'

“Of course there were many professionals involved, like in the field of marketing and communication and some other people from different fields.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 3)

According to the frequently encountered fourth point of the guideline of RD, spreading the idea is highly appreciated. This can be done in different ways, and raising the awareness on the actual days is an effective practice.

The attention of the people visiting the event was attracted by the home-made decorations (See Appendix 5)

“Premade decorations that attract people’s attention.” (Observation notes, collected by Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014 p. 47)

Throughout the observation and all the interviews, it was emphasized that on RD there are no musts, no complicated list of rules to obey to. That would constrain the participants’ imagination of what is possible. (Santala, 2015) The widely promoted freedom has become a keyword for RD, and it attracts people.

“Not something that they have to obey or listen to.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5, p. 16)

“You do not have to celebrate it in one specific way but everybody gets to be the part of it if they want to.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 23)

Apart from the chart in the description, the below quote exemplifies the high growth rate that the organization of RD has experienced.

“Within a couple years, more than 30 countries are taking part, which is a really rapid change.”(Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 32)
Fun:

The very moment, when the idea of RD was born, was a failed mini project. Timo Santala, the founder of RD along with one his friends tried the concept on an incomparably small scale compared to the recent organization. (Santala, 2015) They experienced troubles with the local authorities, but more importantly recognized that they made people happy apart from just themselves.

"But we realized that it was something fun happening" (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5, p.2)

If someone wants to familiarize him or herself with the idea of RD, turns out that the enjoyable and pleasant experience that is shared with others is an essential part of the organizational principles.

"The idea of the day is to have fun, share new food experiences and enjoy our common living environments together." (Restaurantday.org, 2015)

The observation note (2014) that was collected by three researchers reveals that searching for fun can be the drive for participation.

"Two friends who were doing it for fun, passion about food and social interactions, and social responsibility." (Observation notes, collected by Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014 p. 47)

As the last quote in this paragraph shows, that the representative of the Danish branch, the local ambassador forgathers with fellow passionate people, fun is the buzzword of assuring novices about the organizational norms.

“It's fun and full of creativity to be part of the ambassador group and you get to meet new, food crazy types 😊 If you'd like to know more, we'll be holding a meeting in Copenhagen at Café Retro in Jægersborggade, Nørrebro on the 17th March at 17.30. Hope to see you there!” (Mullins RD ambassador, 2016, Restaurant Day Denmark Facebook Group)
Everybody freely:

The openness of the system that enables everyone’s participation has already been discussed, therefore the below two quotes serve as a proof of validation.

“And when the focus is not on profit but it is on having fun, and it has been inclusive it opens up for more people to join, children and elderly as well. I think it should be broader, and I think that is what RD can do.” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 22)

“It is quite literally opened and people can freely participate” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 32)

This conflicts with Shah’s (n.d) remark that the member’s socio-economic status resembles to other members’ of the community, RD in these respects is a heterogeneous organization.

Benefit from Participation, Purpose, Personal motivation, Inner drive, Chance of testing ideas:

The non-financial aspects of the organization and the social values connection to profit generation were analyzed earlier, the below piece approves that participants do get benefits out of their participation.

“So even though it is not financial compensation, these people benefit from their participation.” (Berkovics, 2016, Appendix 5 p. 36)

“Many independent actors, who are not participating and contributing to RD because of monetary or financial and commercial reasons, but because of personal motivation.” (Bujdoso, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 26)

“In my opinion, Restaurant Day brings huge benefits. One of them is “yes we can” feeling, which is essential for urban community and culture.” (Shaparova, 2013, p. 24)

Restauranteurs are not the only one who benefit from the participation, but volunteers do as well. The quotation below is to prove that beyond the social value and indirect financial interests, such as the wide
range of reading, or increased click through ratio in the future can also be motivators for presence and cooperation.

“The newspaper of course they get a benefit, because they get a lot of visitors on their website, because everybody wants to access the information.” (Santala, 2015, Appendix 5, p.10)

Furthermore, tentative purposes could be driving forces of participation too. The enhancement of practical experience before actual employment, for people from the hospitality industry, has identified another cause.

“RD is an option to gain practical experience and test how well they can get along as a one day entrepreneur.” (Observation note collected by the researcher, 2016, Appendix 5, p. 44)

“Their motivation of taking part is that they wanted to try themselves in real life and test whether their ideas and conceptions work as well in real settings as in their home or test kitchen. (Observation note collected by the researcher,” 2016, Appendix 5, p. 44)

Among the very few, yet capital prohibitory rule on RD, which based on previous findings regarding the financial matters is a reason of scalability within the case organization.

“You cannot promote a commercial purpose.” (Bujdosó, 2015, Appendix 5 p. 33)

As last not but not least, the positive and delighted approach that every person had in the sample, is crucial for scalability in RD. According the Danish ambassador, this approach is the reason of the continuous attendance among the actors (Nymand-Graup, 2015). Furthermore, the retention of the loyal participants RD will gain active agents for the organization (Bujdosó, 2015).

“Feeling of making other people happy through the food gives you a motivation to keep on doing it” (Nymand-Grarup, 2015, Appendix 5 Appendix 5 p. 20).

Based on the above findings, coupled with Svejenova’s (2011) arguments, the authenticity and the impact that being a motivated participant of RD means, drives engagements and contribution.
6. Answering the research questions

The sub-research questions support the main research question; therefore, these are going to be answered first. However, the research question has been the guiding principle throughout the whole research. It did not enable the manipulation of the findings, but directed the research and appointed the domain of the investigation.

1. What are the organizational characteristics that define RD?
RD is a non-profit organization, which is operated and co-created by the entirely voluntary engagements of the four-membered core team in Helsinki, the ambassadors in every participating country, the supportive volunteers, the pop-up restaurateurs and the millions of customers. It is not registered in any legal form and sets hardly any limitation regarding whom can take part in the events. RD has a project-based structure and relies on the continuous contribution of a crowd of people that alters from one event to another. The decisional authorities are decentralized, the geographical boundaries do not exist and in some countries, the axiomatic schedules make RD resemble a public holiday.

2. How can a group or a crowd of people who are not closely related create value for an organization?
The platform nature of RD that offers an easy to follow and very permissive guideline, which gathers millions of people from over 70 countries. These people based on their common beliefs and passion create social value together. They are active users of numerous digital communication platforms, such as the website of RD and social media communities. The contents they share and the concept they spread voluntarily, mean inspiration to many and facilitate future attendance of all different types of actors. These contributions are neither obligatory nor time-consuming, in fact, strengthen the organization of RD. However, they do not solely create value for the organization, but they do for themselves and everyone within the RD community.

3. How do inner drive and volunteer engagement facilitate the scalability of a non-profit, voluntary organization?
The commitment of the founders was essential in scaling RD for the first two times. However, the fieldwork reviled a notable similarity in all the actor groups, which is their passionate approach. After the early success and the introduction of ambassador system, the number of excited participants increased dramatically, and the role of the founders became less significant. This quality that is inspired by personal interest and motivation promotes
continuous voluntary commitments. The social benefits that these actors get out of their engagements overrule the financial considerations, maintain repeated contribution, and help to spread the idea as a wildfire.

**What are the factors that drive scalability in a non-profit, voluntary organization? –**

**Studying the case of Restaurant Day**

The answer to the main research question includes, but is not limited to the responses for the above sub-research questions. Accordingly, an apt organizational design, the ability and willingness to collaboratively create social value as a community and the continuous contributions of the many passionate actors are the most important factors. However, the “Success factors” (1.3) code in the second layer coding table (See Appendix 3) is a comprehensive list of all the identified key scalability indicators in the case organization. The non-exhaustive list consists of a concise purpose statement, comprehensibility, standardization, spreadable effect, flexibility, common ownership approach and adoptability of the concept to distinct environments.
7. Conclusion

Regardless of the fact that the expression *scalability* most often regards the business architectures of internet based companies, this research has taken the example of Restaurant Day to look into how the concept applies to the non-profit, voluntary sector. Scalability in Restaurant Day implies an operating leverage (Jones, n.d.) that helped the organization to accomplish a remarkable system growth with gradually reduced effort on the founders’ side.

The study attempted to unravel the manners and success factors that a loosely organized, opened organization, which intends to gather people around a non-monetary concept needs to carry out to scale its operation over geographical borders.

The findings suggest that the main key scalability indicators with Restaurant Day are 1. The particularly flexible, flat and open organizational structure 2. The undiminished motivation of the many passionate actors and 3. Their collaborative approach that aims to create social value within the community, which is boosted by the also voluntarily functioning ambassador system. Ambassadors are the most active agents in every participating country, who accelerate the adoption process and initiate local activities.

On the concept level, further success factors emerged through the analysis, such as a very definite value proposition, comprehensibility, and standardization. Moreover, the leveraging scalability type unfolded that the accessibility to technology supports the spread of information and make it easier for people to embrace ideas and invest themselves into a community in a mutually beneficial way while taking part in creating social values.
8. Limitations and recommendations for further research

By the reason of time and financial constraints, numerous limitations were encountered throughout this study. Nonetheless, all the limitations raise possibilities and may be used as opportunities for future research.

The further research recommendations, which are inspired by the described limitations are shown with bold letters.

1.  It is mentioned in the description of the case that over 70 countries have participated on RD. Due to constraints noted above, throughout the fieldwork only from two of these could qualitative data be collected from. In fact, the holistic perspectives of the founder and the expert panels could mitigate this limitation.

   *To cover more countries throughout the further investigation.*

2.  The cross-sectional quality of the research did not capacitate to cover a longer time frame, which could have attracted the attention on variations over time.

   *Spending more time on the field and use a longitudinal time horizon would raise generalizability* (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

3.  Moreover, the single case study type of the research hold down the extent to what the findings can be generalized. The scalability of RD is not be compared with scalability in other non-profit organizations, which have different organizational structure.

   *Involvement of multiple cases would offer the chance of making cross-case comparisons. Furthermore, considering non-profit organizations with distinct structures would increase the generalizability of findings.*
4. The limited number of pages prevented the research from reflecting on all the auxiliary emerging themes that would have increased the thoroughness of the analysis.

*An expanded scope of the paper would grant scrutiny.*

5. Only two empirical data collection methods were used.

*A focus group with the customers would be a valuable source of additional data. Moreover, the qualitative approach combined with a quantitative analytic perspective would strengthen the external validity of the findings.*

6. Even though, theoretical propositions in the literature review were closely related and rather congruent than contradictory with the findings, the novelty of the research topic would have required a wider scope and additional perspectives that the case could have been studied from. However, this limitation at the same time offers opportunities for further research.

*Spending more time on the field and incorporating additional theories in the analysis would allow assimilating supplementary angels.*

7. As Herman and Renz’s (1999) argument was unfolded in the literature review, the effectiveness of a non-profit organization, apart from factual factors depends on the observer’s viewpoint. This subjectivity influences the generalizability of the results.

*Consulting with other researchers would offer new aspects, which would alleviate the sixth and seventh limitations.*

8. The utilization of social media and technology among the participants plays a crucial role in spreading the concept of RD. Therefore, a bigger attention could have been devoted to this area.

*Further research that puts particular focus on the aspects of the media platforms, particularly technology and their role in scalability within the non-profit, voluntary sector would reveal significant findings.*
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Appendix 1: Interview protocol by areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview protocol by areas – founder, ambassador in Denmark, expert panels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main objective of this research is to observe the scalability of the nonprofit voluntarily-run organization through the example of Restaurant Day and understanding the reasons laying behind its unrivaled organization growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you contributed to a research with similar perspective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal background and goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you please tell me about background and your personal motivation in working for RD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was your initial intention, when you brought RD into live in 2011?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you work on the gastro field yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.) Scalability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconditions of scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection of scalability and the organizational form (non-profit, voluntarily-run, project based)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Business model and scalability

Compare RD to other organizations alike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Social enterprise, non-profit organization, flash-mob, project based organization, civic movement or all in one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to other organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can an organization that has RD’s design be scalable, profitable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value co-creation and peer production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value co-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic distances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f.) <strong>Issues, obstacles, legal concerns</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Planning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-middle-long term plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and scalability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anything that should have been done differently and could have been avoided by planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Closing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anything else that we should touch upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep in touch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own arrangement, based on Yin (2011)
## Appendix 2: First layer coding table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scalability</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organization model</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Value co-creation</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own arrangement
## Appendix 3: Second layer coding table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scalability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Leverage existing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>platforms and technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Success factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Spreadability -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-viral effect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>Comprehendability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8</td>
<td>Common objective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.6</td>
<td>Adoptability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Different approaches</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Standardized processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Common ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.9</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.7</td>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Synergies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>Trialability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Lack of hierarchy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Low initial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>investment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Organic development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Social interactions</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Great for making friendships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Initiated conversations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Decentralized communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td><strong>Idea spread</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Word of Mouth (WOM)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced information need from the core team</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get togethers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media platforms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New connections</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Organizational model</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Organizational design</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td><strong>Platform</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>Social Software</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.2</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.3</td>
<td>Replicable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.4</td>
<td>Explainable guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>Task coordination and division</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Project based</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Opened</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Lack of hierarchy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Boundaryless</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Similarity to public holidays</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Loosely organized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participatio</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Social mission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Everybody freely</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3</td>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4</td>
<td>Facultative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Value co-creation</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Social effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Boosts culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>Community building</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>Activist approach</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.5</td>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Mass collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Common ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Social value vs profit generalization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Inner drive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2 Excitement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Persuasiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Personal and social responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Chance of testing ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Obstacles and Threats</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1 Permission and licenses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2 Regulations differ in different countries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Threats of break scalability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1 Ceiling of number of countries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2 Ceiling of number of participants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3 Burnout rate,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4 Break in personal motivation,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.5 Uncertainty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.6 Not enough time invested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.7 Left positions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Actors</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Core team</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Ambassadors</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Restaurateurs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Volunteers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Customers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 Finances</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Fee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Money</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Prices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Financial interest/motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Reasonable pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 Experiences

#### 10.1 Prior experience, not always related but applicable

#### 10.2 Benefits from the participation

| 10.2. | Personal skills | 2 |
| 10.2. | Professional skills | 9 |

#### 10.3 Preparedness

| 10.3 | Preparedness | 5 |

### 11 Environment

#### 11.1 Facilities

#### 11.2 Location

| 11.2. | Anywhere | 4 |
| 11.2. | Unusual settings | 5 |

#### Parks

- Busy neighborhood | 2 |

### 12 Atmosphere

#### 12.1 Friendly

| 12.1 | Friendly | 2 |
| 12.2 | Welcoming | 2 |

### 13 Planning

#### 13.1 Strategic planning

| 13.1 | Strategic planning | 4 |
| 13.2 | Action | 3 |
| 13.3 | Small scope of products | 1 |

#### 13.4 Dependency on uncontrollable factors

| 13.4. | Weather | 3 |

#### 13.5 Meetings

| 13.5. | Discussion of goals | 3 |

### 14 Technology

<p>| 14 | Technology | 10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.1</th>
<th>Used technology on Restaurant Days</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Internet democratization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Digitalism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Cheaper and more accessible for the many people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own arrangement
Appendix 4:

P1: February 21st 2016 – Restaurant Day Copenhagen - Cake a lot Source: Facebook, RD

P2: November 21st 2016 Restaurant Day Budapest - Basic Bone Dog-bistro Source: Facebbok, RD Budapest
Appendix 5: Interview and observation transcript

Timo Santala (The founder and chairman of board of RD) Interview Transcript
17.07.2015

Hi Timo, thank you very much for offering me the chance to have this interview. Just let me introduce my background and topic really briefly.

Yeah, sure.

So, I have been writing my Master Thesis at Copenhagen Business School, and I decided to choose Restaurant Day as a topic. The main objective of this research is to observe the scalability of the nonprofit voluntarily-run organization, Restaurant Day and understanding the reasons laying behind its unrivaled organization growth.

Last year I along with two of my fellow students carried out a research project on RD as well from a different perspective. We were looking at what RD was in order to find out we took part a RD in
Copenhagen. During this research I found the organization interesting enough to choose it as a case company for my Master Thesis as well.

I would like to make it clear that it is a semi-structured interview with no rigid outline and there are no good or bad answers, I am interested in your opinion and please answer the questions according to your personal experiences and at the best of your knowledge.

All right.

What was your initial intention, when you brought RD into live in 2011?

First of all if your subject is organization or business model we do not really have any of those, they do not exist. So it is not a traditional business or organization. You are probably also interested in it because of that. But yeah, when we started it in 2011 a friend of my at the university heard about it and he proposed it to me. But yes, what was the intention, I don’t know maybe this whole universe that was not defined by anyone. Probably my intention was to only have fun. We found out that it did not really exist. But the ideas was oh yeah, take out some bicycles from time to time, so that is what we did, we took out 3 bikes and were selling gin and tonic. So the idea was that this is something really nice to have as a customer. Biking from park to park and ask the people what they want to drink, but with the legislations it was impossible to have it all done legally. But we realized that it was something fun happening, but at that point it was something that we could see happening. We did not want to control the people but rather let them do whatever they want. It is not something where everybody competes.
How standardized the processes of RD needed to be in order to make it a scalable organization? (Were the processes in all the participating countries? Have you been to other countries where and when RD was going on?)

We did not have a standardized process as a usual business or company would have had it, of course there were involved, like in the field of marketing and communication and some other people from different fields. But still for the first time we did it just for the fun on it just to try out what happens. We had so much fun, that we decided another time. Already from the beginning I organized quite a lot of events before ass well, and had so much fun, that already from the beginning it was quite clear that this was such a good idea and we frame the basic concept well it is scalable up to infinity. And it practicly is. So RD is an event where the whole idea is this freedom of anyone doing whatever they want and letting it go out of the control that is not really an event. We do not control anything on RD. All we practically do is deciding the dates. And control a brand a bit in some ways, but otherwise we do not really organize anything. We are just providing the initiative, and then we provide means and facilities for people to be able to do and communicate with each other. But after all it is all up to the people what they do. The first time we thought that we would be happy with 10 pop up restaurants in Helsinki, that would make a nice event, a nice tour, when you could go around the city and eat different places, but we had 45 in 30 cities. So already from the first time it was not just in Helsinki, it was all over.

Was it only in Finland for the 1st time?

For the first time yes, but the second time it was already in 4 countries. Though the other countries it was just single up pop-up restaurants, in Finland, Bulgaria etc. So it was clear from the beginning that it was
not a traditional event, it is just an initiative, it can practically happen anywhere. Since we do not control it any way, anyone can just take it up and participate. No matter in which country or city they are in. And of course we encourage people to do that, but we did not have a strategic plan of growing abroad and in different countries or wherever. And of course RD is a completely voluntary organization, we have absolutely no budget. Nobody is getting paid, we have no external resources no funding, nothing. So we do not have any means for the event, or we were not doing any strategic work or spreading RD day around the world, it was not even possible. What we absolutely rely on that people talk to each other and writing about it. And you know, that is kind of the beauty of it This is not centrally organized and it is not centrally marketed. We have 10s of thousands of people talking for us and about us. And that is what we invented, because they are not talking about something, like let’s say people are talking about Airbnb. They are talking about a company that they do not own. They are talking about a product, but in case of RD people are not actually talking about something that is not theirs. They are talking about something that belongs to them. That they are themselves. And that makes a big difference. Because I have always said that RD is not a product or a company or anything like this. It resembles much more a national holiday, like Christmas or Eastern or something like this. When people just do something and everybody can participate, nobody has to organize it. Because everybody knows what to do. And that is I think pretty essential for RD to go abroad and go to any country and city. All it requires that people participate and start doing it and that is it. So did not really have any plan or strategy for going abroad. Of course we have done a lot of communication and marketing especially for international media and press releases, contacting people. We did a cooperation, with a company called VisitHelsinki, and the Foreign Ministry and all those. So we had a lot of approach from journalist form different TV channels, newspapers and magazines from all around the world and they wrote about us. So when you read an article about RD for example in Politiken, of course that you know it launches RD itself. Because when people hear about it
they want to participate. And when they see that it is happening all over the world, they are like, wow I can do it as well.

How do you think that RD being a non-profit organization influence its scalability? (If it was a for-profit and more structured organization, would it be able grow and scale to the same rate that it has?)

Yes and No, it depends on how is it framed and how the whole story is told, but. It is a difficult question, if it was a for-profit business and let’s say we had 1M USD or EUR, yeah sure. There is a lot of things that we could do and try. But then again when is non-profit and it is completely not owned by anyone it is people together, everybody owns it and everybody can participate. It is much easier for people to get excited about it, when they see that they are doing something for themselves and for the community. It is not forced by someone or by some entity. If RD was brought to you by Coca Cola or Mc Donald’s you wouldn’t really want to participate eagerly. Of course, I think people realize that running a thing on this scale it really requires some resources, funds and some money and things do not happen by themselves. You know running a website on 17 different languages and mobile applications and all that. Those are things that do not come just like themselves.

Were these things carried only by volunteers?

Yes nobody has ever got paid, not even the person who is behind the website and all tech development. For the mobile application was done in a workshop where about 30 people got together for a weekend and just made it happen. Especially the mobile app it is something could not get just like that, if you were
a business. We got 30 professionals working on a mobile application from zero to a ready product. And then the same year we won the best mobile service in Finland and we were competing in the same league as the National Post Office and one of the biggest diary company and you big spenders with a budget of millions. The mobile app that we made for RD if you ordered that from a company as a service it would be like 150,000 EUR or something like that. And you would not get it in 3 days. There is no such delivery time for those businesses. And still this is something we did completely without any money, it was only voluntary work. So of course these kind of things would not be possible if RD was not a completely opened non-profit organization. Then again people do a lot of a work also for NGOs or they do also for businesses. There might be a festival, and people would volunteer there a lot. So it is not impossible, but in my opinion what makes RD is exactly the possibility of everyone participating and be completely opened and that is something I really want cherish because otherwise we would loose some the whole idea that is the essence of RD. Of course along the years we had so many moments when we could have used some money easily and could have done things so much better and we kept on thinking all the time that if we managed this rate of scalability you know 71 different countries 2 million customers, 20,000 pop-up restaurants, what could have we done if we had had a proper budget to actually spread RD around the world. A lot more for sure. But then again, I don not know, it is hard to say, if it did or did not work and how would work, and what would be the best way, but since RD is not built with any kind of business model, I do not think that it is worthwhile implementing it. Because you know are the options? Starting to charge all the pop-up restaurants for participating. 

You do not want create any barriers, so of them are making big money among the pop-up restaurants on RD. They make thousands of euros on a single day. But I do not really want that I do not want create any kind of barrier for people to re-do it, because the intention is not generate any money with RD, of course the pop-up restaurants will do so, some of them. But some of them will keep low prices and just cover the costs and some of them will donate for charity
and some of them will not even reach breakeven, and you know some of them are giving it away for free and all that. But if we charged some participation fees I think 1/3 of all the pop-up restaurants just would not participate or they would not sign up on our system. I already know a lot of pop-up restaurants that do not sign up on the website, because they do not need to. Because you know if you do it Helsinki you get plenty of customers even without all our communication system and mobile application and all that. Then I know several people, who are like I do not wanna sign up because I already have too many people coming and I just need to send them away. So you know they would not need us in any way, and I do not really want to use the data, because that is what makes RD RD, I mean everything on the same website, on the same date. That is what makes it a carnival that is what makes it world-wide. If you lose that it would be just single pop-up restaurants, which is also fine but it does not encourage people to participate in the future in the same way. It does not create the bugs, it does not create the excitement. And that is what are all the options, selling ads on the website is a lot of work, it does not really make a good profit. I do not know there are several options but all of them require quite a lot of work and who wants to do that kind of work with any payment? Maybe you could make something out of it, but I do not know what the use is? I think it works better as completely non-profit voluntary organization and the scalability is community in what people want to participate that is why we have the ambassadors all around the world they want to make sure that the same thing happens as it is happening in Finland. And some of them are doing more successfully and some of them less successfully. You do not need the ambassadors for RD to happen, but of course they help and emphasize the effect the more they are the people who are excited about it and talk for it and work for it the more it will happen definitely.
Has RD ever encounter any obstacles? If yes, what were or are the main ones that the organization had to overcome and how would you tackle with these?

We did not have to deal with legislation or bureaucracy, simply because we have not asked for any permissions or any licenses for anything. Not in the beginning and all these years done, we still have not asked for permission to do what we do. So we are just ignoring it completely and since it is something that should be able to happen, I do not think that people need to ask for permission on this one. So definitely did not have any trouble saying that RD is an organization, single pop-up restaurants might have experienced some trouble, in Finland I have not heard of anybody having any fine, but he police made some inspection and they gave some warnings. But that was only one time and then they have not done anything. And I really have not heard of any kind of trouble in Finland. In Germany some girls had some trouble with their landlord, and some others who got a small fine to sell something in a park without a permit. But other than that I have not heard of any trouble or any obstacles on the legislation side. I think the biggest obstacle is in people’s head, because the first questions that we always had is, is it legal? Is it allowed? Is it possible? How can I? And they think that it is not allowed, and they do not even bother to find out really and sometimes is even too difficult to find out, because it such a particular thing. But otherwise I do not call them obstacles in any way, but of course we have deal with a lot of information coming in and you know on the first RD I was emailing with 45 different pop-up restaurants about what they were gonna do, then we did a PDF and all that kind of staff. And then it was 200 and then I was emailing with all of them. And then I was trying to get it altogether in one piece about what it was actually happening and where and after that we created the website and all that. So of course there have been a lot of challenges on how to actually communicate with them in the best way possible. And since we cannot handle that on a single day, when the customer wants the information it is during the day and the
day before. So our website has a huge peak on one day and then it is just lost down again. So we had a lot challenges of a 100,000 people wanting to enter the website on a single day, how do you manage that traffic, how do manage that workload? How do you do it 17 different languages? And all the different time-zones... all of those kind of things meant some kind of challenges. And a lot of work has been done to be able to create a system that works for all the people and can handle the huge amount of information that people wanted to access. And how to actually present the data and the best ways customers can find out what was happening and where. Irrespectively of which country they are or which language they speak. So of course our website has crashed several times and we got in all kinds of trouble. There is also a funny story for that, when you are talking about how RD is a common project, when everybody fells that they own it and that it belongs to them and it is not really about the profit of anyone but for the community. And it was 2012 when in May on the first anniversary our website crashed because there was just too many people trying to access the map. 15 minutes after I got a phone call from the biggest newspaper in Finland, which has about 1M readers, and they were like, I heard that your website had crashed, how can we help you? And when you do marketing and communication for an event, you try to send out press releases hoping that the in media they will write about you and you know that you would get some publicity and even pay money to have an ad in the newspaper or on websites or wherever and we were suddenly in situation when the biggest newspaper in Finland calls and ask how can they help you. And they ended up publishing all our data and all the maps all the restaurant information on their website as a news peaks. And that is something that you cannot get with money and that is something that as a traditional event you would never be able to get. They might to an interview, they might write an article about you but to publish everything that you have, it turns the whole thing upside down, but it also shows that by doing it, the newspaper of course they get a benefit, because they get a lot of visitors on their website, because everybody wants to access the information, but they would not do it for any
other business. And they do it just because they feel that RD belongs to them as much as it belongs to anyone else. And their cause as just anything else. So in the same way that they, let’s say in midsummer there is a big celebration in Finland, and they publish everything that happens on midsummer in the same way. It is curious how it really is a common cause for so many people. And everybody has their own motivation to participate and spread the word. And for somebody it might be the food for somebody it might be the community for somebody it might be coming together with other people, for somebody it might trying out a new concept, for somebody it might be just having fun. Whatever it is, all the possibilities are as valid as the others and just creates a huge amount people behind a single a theme, that seems unified but it is not really unified.

But for communication and marketing perspective that is also pretty revolutionary!! Because of course RD happens whether if we do communication and marketing but in Finland for example we would not need to do it anymore it is already so established that all we need to do is to set out the dates and it will happen. And that is when it is already transformed into tradition, into a holiday kind of thing, a celebration.

What do you think that there is a reason, why RD is more or less in popular in certain countries than in others? Do you think that people’s lifestyle effects on how many pop-up restaurants are being opened on that day and how many people are attending those?

Not really, of course it does a little bit, I think that the main facts of why RD grows bigger in some cities or countries than in others are the people. If all the places where it really is blooming there has been or is a group of people or single individuals who got really excited about RD and they have really started
to push it and promote it and talk to their friends and take photos and videos, talk to bloggers, talk to media, talk to press, get the word out there and they do it themselves, encourage their friends to open pop-up restaurants and that is, you know Montreal and Russia and Prague, Budapest, Paris, Copenhagen, all the places where it is really going there has been these strong individuals or groups who had kind of adopted the idea and started pushing it forward at their place. But all the other places there have been maybe single pop-up restaurants, or 5 or 10 or something like this but in all the places where you have over 20 there has been a really strong involvement from local people who really had RD on their priority list and have rally done a lot of network for it. So I think that is definitely the biggest factor that contributes to RD blooming somewhere. I do not think that the circumstances or the country or the city or the culture, I do not think effects it really that much. For example we had a Russian journalist visiting in 2012 and she was like well this looks really nice and works really well here in Helsinki, but this could never work in Russia, people are afraid of each other and they would not let strangers into their homes and if you go sell on the streets the police would beat you up, because you that is Russia and you know it just does not work this way. And then half a year after that we had 200 pop-up restaurants in St. Petersburg. So in some countries people have said that you do not need RD, because there is already so much street food, while in those countries even if someone’s home is a new novelty. So it always has something to offer for all the places and all the people. And what people get excited about is being able to their own things. I do not think that we have such a country in the world that would allow complete freedom to their citizens. That is you know food is just the medium just the nice thing on the side, but what really makes RD RD is the freedom and trust that is given to people. For the first time you a asked what do you really want to do, go ahead and do it. Realize your dreams. And you are encouraged to instead of saying that well, we have these and these regulations and this and this papers that you have fill out and actually you cannot this or you cannot to do that, and you are not allowed, and this is illegal and
all that. So the whole idea is to turn that upside down and say to all the people around the world that okay here is your chance, we are gonna do this together and where is the restaurant or bar, that you wanna make. Go ahead and make it happen. And it is so much easier, when all the people are involved already. For the first ones it is always the most difficult but then you know 10 other pop-up restaurants are already participating it is so easy to join along. If the police comes to stop you it is not only you, everybody else is in trouble. It is just like when everybody was going to school and they were like okay let’s skip class, if you skip class alone, but if everyone does you are safe. It is really difficult to punish everyone.

What is the long term plan with RD?

There is not really plan or strategy. The whole history of RD is that we did not plan, we planned to have the first RD and then we have planned to have a second one. And then when everything went well we were like, it is 3 months since it happened and we moved on. One of our long term plans is trying to create the system and the facility as self-sufficient as possible. So that it would not be dependent on me or anyone else doing something for RD. The organization or the pop-up restaurants that are the core essences of RD are completely spread wide. We are not scaling up we are scaling wide. Which is that we do not want RD to be bigger, we want to become wider in the sense that it happens more and more places all the time. So the pop-up restaurant part got to take care of itself. But there is of course a lot of work in the background, like spreading the word and providing the facility and the website and mobile application, the photos and videos, social media, communication and what not. So there is a lot of stuff to do definitely. That is why we created the ambassador system to provide other people with the possibility of doing the same kind of things that we did here in Helsinki and we are still doing. My idea is to try to open it up as much as possible, so that every single piece is the kind of that you can contribute.
I would be really happy if we managed to create the website and mobile application completely open source in the way that everybody can prove it is a common afford to help to develop. We pretty much have that already, that everybody can contribute photos and videos. We still have like everybody controls the website and we try to keep it as minimal as possible. And just to have bare essence and anything else just happens on people’s own channels, they write about it on their Facebook or on their blogs, or you go with hashtag RD, then you get thousands of results. We just create an Instagram account and then we give the password publicly to everyone, and anyone can post RD related photos there. So sometimes unfortunately is not possible to make it completely free, but in addition we try to establish RD so that we do not need to do marketing anymore. You can think of let’s say Christmas. Christmas has low marketing, a lot of people do marketing for Christmas but it is not by millions of people or companies, they kind of all benefit from Christmas or let’s say it is a common cause that people just talk about. And I kind of want to take RD to that direction that everybody feels that it just is. And it is every year on this day or these days. And you know people will talk about it or they will not. You know not everybody wants do to things for Christmas either, somebody wants to escape it and all that. But you know everybody knows that it is coming and you know there is a certain expectations. You get several holidays here in Finland that are very well established and have a certain tradition. And you know it has becoming a really international, everybody presses their own demand in their spooky ways 😊 and that is it. So my idea is to take RD all the time towards that direction, less and less control and communication less and less marketing and just let the people do what they do. They have the basic initiative. Actually RD would not be anything else than just the center. A food event where anyone can set up a pop-up restaurant, coffee or bar anywhere they want. That is all you need to know essentially about RD. Of course there are the all the website, mobile app, photos and videos and they all help, but at this point if just quit all that it would still happen in Finland! Elsewhere in the world it would not yet, but my idea is just try establish
it as international tradition so much that after 10 or 20 years we will not really need mention it anymore. It just is.

Is there something that you would have done differently as you look back now?

Yes and no, you can always figure out a lot of things that could have been done differently, but these are small things. I think that the success of RD proves it pretty well, that we did exactly the right thing on a big scale. We had what we had, which is practically nothing and it is completely absurd, you know what we tried to do, and what we have been actually doing is establishing an international holiday where people are doing a lot of work for, because opening a pop-up restaurant is not an easy task! They are possibly even breaking the law and they are doing it just because of couple of guys had a fun idea, that people should do like this. So it is really absurd to think that tens of thousands of people around the world are opening pop-up restaurants just because we thought it would be fun for them to do so. Then we are not even providing them any concrete facilities, they take care of everything themselves, the locations the cooking facilities the food, the customers and basically everything. And that is kind of like, sometimes it is compared to you walk up to a complete stranger on the street and say jump, except that jumping is really easy to do, you just hop and that’s it. But if a stranger comes to you on a street and say come on could you work for a couple of days and break the law, because I think it would be fun. It is absurd, but still it is so appealing to people, that they are willing to that and that is also what makes is beautiful. It really is a team that unifies. It is not all the people in the world, but a lot of them for what is a common factor for all of us. But it some small details that would work differently but on the big scale c we have done things as well as it was possible with these kind of resources.
If you think as an organization of RD we have an association, which basically an NGO, because we got some awards and needed some official entity to receive them and have the members of the board of the association and this is actually the group that decides what happens. Which is now basically the dates. I wanted to say controls or runs but it is more kind of guides the progress or RD, so it makes public announcements that something is not right and we communicate through the website and social media channels and all that. And then you got the ambassadors but that is a completely open system, anyone can be an ambassador anywhere in the world there can be several of them in one city. It is anyone who wants to help in some way can be an ambassador. But otherwise we do not really have any organization and the whole core RD team is extremely small, even though we have the association and the members of the board. Two of them have not anything for RD in over a year, even though they are the members of the board, I do not even remember when the last time when we had a board meeting or anything was.

Everybody contributes what they can and at some points it is more people some points is less. In the beginning it was more people and now it is less and on the other hand there are much more people involved internationally at the moment. But still you know we got photographers who take photos every once in a while and then they are sending them, and that is their contribution. And there is someone who does social media for half a year, because they have some loose time and they are off. So whoever can provide, provides. And it is free to provide, but otherwise we do not really have business. In Finland at least there is a certain type of mentor-ownership, which is around pretty much me and Antii and Jyrki mainly. So if say something in the media, people kind of listen to it and there is certain kind of responsibility. So people take it as an authority but not something that they have to obey or listen to, but a lot of people want to, because we have been working so much for it. But other than that there is not really any official organization and the association is not really structured in any way. It is just a group of people who provide what they can and when they can and the same applies internationally.
Thank you very much for your time and all the valuable information a hopefully talk to you in the future.

Sure just seek me out in case you have any additional questions.

Anne Nymand-Grarup (Ambassador of Restaurant Day Denmark) Interview Transcription 11.08.2015

Bold: researcher

Plain text: interviewee

Thank you for having me here today.

Sure

As I told you my perspective on this research is the scalability of RD and the reasons laying behind its unrivalled organizational growth.

I do not necessarily want to follow these questions strictly, I just have them prepared as a guideline throughout the interview.
What was your initial intention when you joined RD as an ambassador?

I think, I guess I just really much liked the concept and since I am personally passionate about food and professionally as well then it was very natural for me to become an ambassador. Then I visited RD, I think it was the first one we had in Denmark in 2013 August. And I liked it, and I’ve known Cathrine, who was the former ambassador and I had many talks with her about RD.

Are you a chef yourself?

No, I am educated and have some education in integrated food studies. So the past year I’ve been working with an EU project in regards with local and global ecosystems. So where is the food from and sustainability and so on?

Does it have anything to do also with the New Nordic Cuisine?

I has a touch upon that, but it hasn’t been the main focus.

Were you familiar with the organizational structure when you joined RD? What did you think about it business model?

I had actually done a small paper on RD during my studies. So I knew a little bit about the structure and the scale and how I had be developed.

What do you think the processes are that make RD a scalable organization?
I think RD works pretty fluently and at least according my perception I don’t think that there is a specific structure of how RD should be growing. I think that each and every country has its own ways to do it. And I think that there are some cultural differences that influence how they approach it. But yes we have some structure, we some things that we do each time for RD and we have like a division of task.

**Do you strictly stick to these processes?**

No we are really open to trying out things, and find out what works and I think that with a concept like RD you have to be able to flexible because when you start something new up that was interesting in the beginning and you have to find out how to keep it interesting. And I think that is where we are right now to keep RD interesting. Because in the beginning there were a lot of restaurateurs and a lot of restaurants and a lot of people visiting. At the moment it is more kind of calm so we need to think about how to bring attention back to it.

**How does RD overcome its main obstacles, if there is any? (Regarding legislation and permissions or whatever that you can think of?)**

In my times there has not been any great obstacles of course, people wanting to open restaurants, always ask about the regulations regarding to Food Control and Food Safety and those issues, and what is okay and what they can and cannot do. Then are some things about where you can have a restaurant in public spaces. So in Copenhagen Dronning Louises Bro and Blågarsgade are all right, but last RD there were two restaurants that wanted to open at Kongens Nytorv and at the same time there was a little flea market there and the people running the flea market didn’t want the restaurants to be there. So they hadn’t really
looked into the regulations about it. So these times there is a RD during what some of us goes around and visits everybody just to see how it is and if everything is running how it should be and we just kind of figure it out if there was something wrong. And then they internally found out that it was okay.

*When you wanted to find out whether it was okay or not did you have to consider some kind of requirements by the authorities?*

Yes exactly and then we had to consider if it is okay to open a restaurant at Kongens Nytorv, because it is a very public space in Copenhagen. And I think we kind of try to bend through as well, because it is supposed to be a day where everybody gets paid and it has to be fun.

*Could you please tell me about the reasons why people join RD? And not solely as a pop-up restaurant but also as an ambassador as yourself 😊*

In Denmark we have a tradition that people get together and kind of get in touch and talk to each other even though they do not know each other. And it is not part of the natural culture, and I think that is what some people like about restaurant day as well that you can go out and meet new people and for restaurateurs is fun that people you have not even met might show up and visit your restaurant. And I think if it a successful restaurant, which has a lot of visitors and everything is sold out. Then I think you get a felling a success out of it that you might not be a chef or you might not be a foodie, you just like to cook and the feeling of making other people happy through the food gives you a motivation to keep on doing it. My husband and me we did it last time and he was very anxious about it beforehand, but
afterwards he was like “I just wanna do this again, it would be fun” 😊 And we really hope to do it again in November.

How do people get to know about RD, and how does it attract more and more people?

(What is or are the key platforms for reaching a growing base of people who are interested?)

I think that it is a mix of everything. So of course it is a World of Mouth, when you tell people about it and I talk to people at my work and even though they work with food as well, they did not know about the concept, but they came and visit. So I think a lot of people join because they know somebody that is opening a restaurant. But then we use social media, like Facebook as well, as a media to connect with people and to just to inform them about when it is and where to sign up. And there is a RD website where you have to sign a restaurant up. So you can go in and find a restaurant and then visit. And it means that as a restaurateur people show up at your pop-up restaurant that you have not met before, just because they visited the website. And I really that concept as well.

I have seen that there was also an application, with a short description of what kind of food a restaurant will serve and where exactly etc. Even though it only exists for IOS and not for Android this year.

To be honest I myself have never used that app. We have talked about it, but all of us that are in the group now are pretty new so some of the background information we to contact Cathrine (the former ambassador of RD Denmark) or some of the other people. Maybe just because it was simpler to make it IOS. But I do not know who actually developed the app.
You mentioned that the members of the current group are new. Do the members of RD in Denmark have to fluctuate? Or did they just decide to leave and let new people to come and take their roles?

No, I think that the last group felt that they had been doing it for quite a while and they wanted or they needed new inspiration and people that take over their positions. And I think it was a natural process.

Which industry do you think RD falls into?

I think that it is more event based than it might be food based because it is only 4 times a year so it is not really a competition to reopen a restaurant. And the focus of RD is not to earn a lot of money but more to be the part of it. So of course it has a lot to do with food but not on a real restaurant level. Because again RD is supposed to open to everybody and not only for specific personals, and based on this I think it is more event based.

Can you think of any other organization that you can compare RD to?

No I do not know of any, I think it is quite particular.

Do you think that if RD was a for-profit organization or company and their main focus would be generating money then it could be as successful as it is and grow as fast as it has been?

I do not think so, because RD is for everybody. Everyone can participate, so I think if it was only focusing on profit it would exclude a lot of people from taking part of in it. Because the purpose then would be that if you want to take part you have to have profit. And you are not sure that you will, and you might
not participate. And when the focus is not on profit but it is on having fun, and it has been inclusive it opens up for more people to join, children and elderly as well. I think it should be broader and I think that is what RD can do.

So the people who are opening up these pop-up restaurants, do they just want to cover their expenses?

Yes, I think most of the people do of course and there are some restaurants that have been the part of it from the very beginning and have a lot of experience now. And have something that you can see on the menu and they can charge a little bit more. But their surroundings and the set up can be more personal and they might have a profit now, but I do not think that they had in the beginning.

What does the organizational form of RD resemble?

In the group we talk a lot about RD as it was like Christmas Eve that is not an organization but something everybody knows about and it is something that everybody or at least a lot of people in their own way celebrate. You do not have to celebrate it in one specific way but everybody gets to be the part of it if they want to. So yes I agree with them. 😊

Is there a long term plan for RD Denmark, like how should it be in 5 years, or should it be different from how it is now?
There is not a 5 year plan, no 😊 But we have talked about, how we want to develop or how to include different segments, how to expand to more than just Copenhagen and we do not have a set 5 year plan.

**So is it just to cover more bigger cities?**

It does not need to be that way but it is easier to cover the bigger cities because people in the bigger cities that can be Ambassadors or there might be more people in the bigger cities. But we would like RD to known in all the cities a lot more restaurants.

**Have there been restaurants in any other cities than Copenhagen?**

There were some on Fyn in Odense. And restaurants in Århus have participated as well. But I think it has to about ambassadors, then they should spread the word, because people know somebody who does it in Copenhagen.

**If you want to think about one reason, why RD could grow this fast what would that be?**

Lack of planning, or the lack a really structured organizational design or is it purpose of getting passionate people together and try to share this experience with everyone. (Researcher’s words, observation note from the interview)

It definitely has something to do with passion, and there is no set frame of how RD should look like and there are kind of no rules, so you can do exactly what you want to, if you want to make lemonade and sell that on RD, you can do that and if you want to make a 3 course menu you can do that as well. So I think it has something to do that it is very approachable by a lot of very different people. So the freedom,
the lack of rules in regards to what you are able to provide as a restaurant. There is no regulation which tells you that how many customers you need to have and so on. So yes it is the freedom and the accessibility of it that people like the most.

**Are there no regulation coming from the authorities that would challenge this freedom?**

Since it is only 4 times a year then you cannot call them a normal restaurant and since people having the restaurants are not literally paid, therefore it does not have to live up the same regulations as other restaurants. So it has made it a lot easier. But I know that food regulations differ in other countries.

**Do you think that there is a reason why there are more or less pop-up restaurants in one participating country than another?**

There might some cultural things and differences that might set limits to make it easier in some places. Then I think it has to do with the group and how much time they invest in it. Because each country and group does it on a voluntary basis so nobody is getting paid for anything. So I think that sets limits as well. So the lack of hierarchy also makes the organization flexible.
The topic of this research and the interview is the Scalability of the international organization Restaurant Day.

What kind of organization is Restaurant Day?

I think it is the combination of many organizational forms. So it is hard define or classify. RD is basically many people, who gather around a specific idea or concept of RD. And they make this event happen in many cities around the world. So I would say that it is a loosely organized network of a people, who use this format of RD to bring some value into their life and into the cities where it takes place.

What do you think that difference is between the organizational growth and the organizational scalability and what makes RD so scalable?

When you think about scalability, first of all you have to understand that RD it relies on the contribution of many independent actors, who are not participating and contributing to RD because of monetary or financial and commercial reasons, but because of personal motivation. And I think it is the most important thing to understand.
The second one is how it started in Helsinki and spread to many other cities was the that idea or the concept of RD was something that could be easily adopted and translated to the local context. And it hat sense what I mean by the scalability of RD is that it can be spread by people, who see some value in it and they can easily adopt it to their local environment.

**In this sense is it more suitable to RD to talk about a growth strategy?**

I do not think that you can literally plan growth in such a movement or at least I do not think the founders did. I think that there are ways that you can support and help growth but RD and others bottom-up initiatives alike and this is a pull mechanism or pull strategy. So it is not that the people who invented the concept in Helsinki have the power, the capital and the interest in pushing and make it happen in other cities. So they do not push it, but instead there are people, who learned about RD. They either attended the one Helsinki or some of their friends told them about it and they like the concept so much that they decide to make it happen in the city where they are from. And this means that they need active agents, who are touring the concept and establish it other cities. This means a number of things, first of all the concept should be attractive and easy to understand. So even without fiscally be at a RD you can understand through their descriptions and the photos on the internet that wow what a nice event it could be. That is the first part, and the second is that everybody must be able to make it happen in your local context. So if live in for example in Budapest, you should be able to establish it there. Which means that you should be able to learn how it works, like logistics and how to make it successful and what the basic rules are. And you have to able to afford to push it forward. Because this whole movement of RD has a non-commercial nature, which means that you as someone who organizes it in a city for the first time you cannot not expect to earn money from it, you will not. You have to find other reasons that motivate
you and you have to be able to do it next to your daily job. You can separate it from your basic needs, your job in order to sustain yourself and earn money and do it as a side project. So I do think that the scalability of RD is dependent on many people understanding the concept and being able to pull it into their environment. In Format Project we call it a Cultural Software. Because it is like running a software on people, basically to make RD happen in your city you need a bunch of people doing a bunch of things like setting up restaurants, some others are taking photos of them some people try the food. And these things are not difficult to comprehend and everyone can easily decide whether they want to participate or not. If they want to they can do it not as a full-time commitment, but they can do it in their free-time. Even if you want to open up a small restaurant you do not have to invest more than around a 100 euros to buy the ingredients. So there is a very low threshold to get involved. So you as a local ambassador you want to make it happen it is like software, we know how it works in Helsinki for example and we adopt it very easily in other environments. So you run the software on the local environment, on the local people. So you get people involved by informing them about the concept and why is nice, and how they can also get involved and just make it happen.

Do you think that the active participants of RD and I mean the restaurateurs who open their pop-up dineries or take photos and spread the concept are the actors who mainly contribute to the scalability, or also the customer base is as important as they are?

In my opinion it is both of them, it is very important to the successful growth. The concept would not work without any of them. It is like a theater that would not work without the actors and the director but also would not work without the audience. So you need them both to contribute to its scalability. In case of RD it is the HQ, the guys in Helsinki who decide when it takes place and some basic ideas behind the concept.
And they got out all the news, photos, do some social media marketing the ones who run (and maintain) the website. And the local ambassadors, who kind of facilitate the idea in new environments and communicate with the HQ. They spread the news in the media and they talk to the press. They help to find the photographs taken at the event. And there are the people, who cook and there are the people who come eat. And usually it is very interconnected. So of course if you start a restaurant on RD in your home, you will first invite your friends and also people who you do not know will come, but you will definitely invite your friends. And this is also kind of the way you spread and by doing that scaling the concept. And also the people who first eat, they are more likely to try cooking and hosting a restaurant next time as well. So both the existence and the successful growth of RD are dependent on all of these actors.

**What do you mean by social or cultural software?**

Social software or cultural software, it is difficult because social software is usually is understood as social networking software, but in the sense that as RD as software is running on people it is either social or cultural software.

**Are there any prerequisite conditions for an organization such as RD to scale? Do these differ from a for-profit organization, would it compromise the scalability or RD if it had a revenue source?**
I think that it would definitely effect, but I do not think that it would necessary kill the scalability of RD if it turned into a for-profit business. There are some examples, that organizations started as non-profit and then turned into a for-profit organization. One of them is Couchsurfing, which used a non-profit and turned into a for-profit. Or Meetup that started as a for-profit business from day 1 but it was relying the free contribution of the many Meetup organizers from all around the world and then after a while they wanted to get revenue by charging for the venue that hosts the Meetups or advertising and stuff, but then the 95% of Meetup organizers dropped out in a month, but it did not kill them. But it rather set up a better filter for more professional Meetup organizers.

I think that are many ways that RD can turn into a for-profit organization, but you have to understand that most people who contribute these days, would contribute less if they saw that at the end of the day some people would get paid for working on this. So if the goal of the organization would be to create a venue and generate profit it would deter even more people. Of course NGOs and non-profit organizations (Non-Governmental Organizations) can have paid employees, so it does not mean that everyone has to contribute for free, but at the same time it would probably make it less appalling for people who would like to contribute for free.

**Should we expect any break in organizational growth and the level of scalability of RD? If yes/no why?**

I think that there are a couple things that can influence the scalability of RD. One of them is of course the total ceiling of the total number countries and the cities where it can take place. It cannot grow any further than that, but that is really far. The second one is the number of people that are interested in the
event. But this is also a really far goal to reach. It would be nice to see statistics on how many times one person hosts restaurants over and over again. (Repeatedly) And probably there is a burnout rate, so that some hosts a restaurant in your home or office or in a park, wherever she wants to, for let’s say five times and then they start having the feeling that this was enough, but I do not know about it exactly. And another thing that affects the scalability is similar to any other non-profit organization, which is basically the commitment of the founders, of the core team. Which in case of RD is the guys in Helsinki. Right now it is still a very motivating thing to do and if they can sustain their lives, which means that they can get money from other resources and they can afford to work on RD as a side project, for free and still remain motivated because they do not burn out and they do not lose interest. Because for four years it is fun, but nobody knows what comes after. Losing their interest can break to growth rate of the organization. It does not mean that they cannot be replaced, so if any NGO wants to recreate the positions of the founders and get replace the old staff with newcomers they can do it. This is also something that they have to figure out in the future. So the most important thing that should be able to afford to push RD forward otherwise they have to turn RD into a for-profit organization in order to sustain themselves. And they have to stay motivated and interested on keep working on it. If their level of excitement is dropping they have to find other people who are as motivated as they were to take it over.

**Which field or industry do you think that RD falls into?**

It is hard to decide, because there is nothing new about food festivals right, and there is nothing new about people hosting other people and serve them food. What is new about RD are two things in my opinion. How far technology is helping this process, so basically you can just create a website and a group on Facebook and inform a lot of people with a minimum effort. So the whole process of running
the organization has become easy, fast and more affordable in this sense. The second thing, what new
about it is how fast such a thing as RD can gain momentum globally. I think that the second one is even
more interesting, because social institutions and the evolution of them have always been around. Let’s
just think about a library or a university, they have been around for many centuries now, and it has
globally developed and many cities have used to concept of founding a university or a library to achieve
something. Basically to provide access to knowledge and education or literature and books for a mass of
people. This has developed throughout centuries now the whole process become much faster and you
launch an online library or university with far less effort and time. The same with RD, basically people
can freely copy the concept and open up new RDs in Budapest or Hong Kong. What is even a little bit
of frightening that this all is happening so fast, so within a couple years more than 30 countries are taking
part, which is a really rapid change. It is really similar what happens to IT and software companies, they
are rising really fast. If they find a business model that works for scalability they can grow really fast
globally. Everything is connected, people are connected the language barriers are smaller because of
more and more people speaking English. They have tools, like computers and laptops, which they also
use for watching movies but these technologies can also be used to organize something as RD as well.
Technology is getting cheaper and more accessible for people. Their knowledge is obvious and
international travels are getting cheaper as well. So all of these things are supporting the fact that these
initials are easier to start nowadays.

The novelty is the open nature of RD cultural organization that can spread really fast. And what is new
about it that it is quite literally opened and people can freely participate and technology has been enabling
much faster.

What is new about RD is that it can spread so fast.
How can people who do not know each other, who are not geographically close to each other work for a common goal so effectively?

I think that the concept of RD is that very important, that is why we call our project the Format project, because if you can summarize a social movement in a very simple and understandable way. How it works, what it does, it is very easy to comprehend and enjoy. It makes it very easy to spread.

This loosely organized organization form has a critical role in this, because you cannot say that they are not organized at all. They are loosely grouped around this concept, this format. It helps them to adjust and decide if they want to participate in it and find their ways of contributing. Just sign up on this form, pick a location and cook some food. This concept facilitates the organization scalability. In our study we found that these concepts give a certain structure for the people, but at the same time they give a lot of freedom. So for RD there are only a few rules that you have to obey, you just have to understand the concept and the few rule, that you cannot promote a commercial purpose and that it takes place four times a year on these specific days. There are rules but these are only to guide you throughout the process and how can get involved. It combines the flexibility and freedom with some structure that helps everyone to organize. This structure helps to organize both from the organizer (top) level and also for the people who want to participate and get involved. This is key for this kind of organization, because this is what facilitates the contribution of the many people. This is what social software does.

(standardization??)
Dalma Berkovics (Researcher, the interview was conducted in Hungarian and therefore only the relevant parts were transcribed) Interview transcription 16.01.2016

What kind of organization do you think RD is?

I think it is platform that everyone can freely join to, which defines the way the organization works. They basically provide a framework with some tips and hints as a best practice but does not limit the participants’ freedom beyond that.

It is non-profit, because apart from the pop-up restaurants revenues, which are mainly to cover their own expenses, generating profit is not in the focus. It’s not a social enterprise in the classical term, because there is not an actual social problem that they are willing to solve, but they rather found a phenomena for what there is a huge demand and can swing huge crowds into action. This is executed through a sleekly but at the same time loosely organized framework or organization.

So according to the classical definition of a social enterprise it does not try to solve a social issue (for example poverty alleviation) which does not mean that it doesn’t have positive social effects because it does. But as I see its first goal is not to reflect on a major social problem with some sort of business solution that invests the profit back to the enterprise. So all in all my point is that RD compared to a social enterprise that is dealing with bigger social trouble is rather just something nice to have.
Scalability is mostly used in the context of for-profit online businesses, how does RD as an organization fit into the concept?

According to the online business architecture context, RD is not a classical scalable business, but they have come up with an organizational form that is fairly suitable to scale. The non-profit nature does not make it less suitable to scale however. And there is one more considerable feature that is need to be mentioned namely that RD has something that most of the scalable online for-profit startups do not possess and this is the power of the community. This is the engine of scalability within RD I believe so.

**How can a group of people that are not closely related can create value for an organization?**

Who do you mean?

**Those people from the participating countries, who are building this concept, community and organization with their free labor force.**

There is a common interest among them, particularly I love to cook I love to cook for others, I love to eat with other people, I would like to get know people with similar interest and I’m willing to do things to make this happen even with an activist approach. So the similarity in terms of personal and attitude is pre-requisite. On the other hand it is concise and straightforward what and how the ambassadors and the pop-up restaurateurs are supposed to do these things.
So they all belong to a community but at the same time they have the freedom of doing basically whatever they like to in a presentable and visible way. So even though it is not financial compensation, these people benefit from their participation.

On the other hand the commitment that these people are required to do is not big. And this where a lot of initiation fail that they set a lot of rules and commitment for their members, which on long term disincline them to do keep contributing, this is not RD’s approach.

Those couple of times in a year when ambassadors are supposed to work on motivating the local communities and organizing the practical things, using RD’s toolkit and framework are feasible, beyond that every contribution is appreciated. It is not a huge time investment, whereas in other communities it happens that members become overwhelmed and they either have to ask salary for the work that they are doing or they have to look for other opportunities to cover their expenses.

Keywords: It is a Distributed community platform.

**Could RD be more scalable if the organization had some type of revenue sources? Why?**

I am not familiar with the founding team members’ personal background, but I assume that they must be doing something else on the side in order to sustain themselves. So I think there is going to be a point in their life when they have to make the decision of investing more time in RD and start working in the
organization full-time would raise the problem of how to cover their daily expenses and then it would just remain as a hobby project.

So if there was a for-profit activity that uses RD as a brand that could generate some profit, the personal dilemma of how could we spend more time on a hobby project, while working for money at the same time would be gone. In this way it might be able to scale even more continuously.

I don’t believe that without having some sort of income directly from RD it can be taken all the way to the limits neither on a personal nor on an organizational level.

**How do you think that collaborative creation and consumption model influence scalability in this domain?**

I don’t think that it could work in any other way because, by involving not just the ambassadors but the pop-up restaurateurs as well, you empower and motivate them in a really human way. If they were given more than just a framework their freedom of choice would be constrained and they would have the feeling of working for someone. It would not be as motivating and inspiring for them anymore.

Regarding the consumption, if these restaurants opened on these days would not have any customers then people would not spread the world and recommend to others within their network because of the lack of good experience.

The organization functions as platform, which consist of different elements. The initiators, who came up with the idea, the ambassadors, the executors or restaurateurs and the customers. Everyone in this system is considered to be partners on the exact same level. Without this platform organization type it wouldn’t be functioning this well. Since it doesn’t matter how bad a situation turns out, for example in
the case of a food poisoning they cannot shift the responsibility to someone else, and the organization itself could not be brought to account for something that someone did wrong.

So because of not practicing micromanagement and dealing with all issues in all the separate cases you open the door to scalability.

**How does the prerequisite conditions to scale differ for RD from other organizations?**

It depends on what kind of service are we talking about, but they all have to have some features which help the service to reach a viral effect.

An organizational form that in the particular case of RD makes it possible to employ more energy when one more pop-up restaurant is being registered for a RD. Additionally through the ambassador system the global system of RD can make a use of local brunches.

So these are the first three things that popped into my mind, the scalability of the service and the whole organization around it, and the concept’s spreadability as well.

It would be hard to anticipate whether it is going to last or if it is just a temporary trend.

**Should we expect any break in the organizational growth?**

It also depends on what proportion do participants return to future events and pass on the ideas to their friends.
The number of cities and the people that might potentially be interested in the theme are limited as well. I’ve never seen the statistics, but I suppose that the demographic characteristics of the participants are similar in the different cities.

As long as the people that have been working on the project long term keep up their motivation and can carry out RDs without working more and more for it then it’s not a big risk.

Appendix 5: Observation notes

Observation notes from the interviews

Timo

It was clear that Timo has been prepared for any kind of question, which disambiguated how deep his involvement in the organization was. Despite the loose organization form and the lack of business and strategic plan Timo, who as a founder, chairman of board and according to the current meaning of RD ambassador as well as the former ambassador of RD Helsinki was really sharp and assertive throughout the whole interview. His decisive and well set up style made me feel ease while conducting the interview.

I assume that his extremely passionate approach, unfaded excitement and professional and persuasive negotiation skills must have been essential when emerging the concept of RD into new countries, briefing the local stakeholders.
He believes in the idea and clearly see its potential and the successes that the organization has reached, however does not see his role that crucial anymore; as he also mentioned that RD could and would happen even without the committee members in the headquarter doing anything at least in Helsinki.

**Anne**

First and foremost the passionate approach, the crushing excitement to the whole concept of RD was the first similarity to Timo’s style that marked out from her first tokens.

She as it turns out from the interview transcript has other duties next to the RD related activities as well as expecting a child and therefore does not always have the sufficient amount of time to spend on the RD. Due to maternity leave her position has been taken over by the new.

**Attila**

Professional researcher’s approach, however positive personal opinion about the case organization. As the co-author of The Format Project, that is yet to be published he is aware of the related theories, alike organizations and maintains a good personal relationship with the founders of the organization.

**Dalma**

She is an expert academic and author of multiple influential articles on the field of peer production a value co-creation. She could bring in characteristic personal opinions on the proposed fields of interest that were real contribution to the richness of the data. Some of the proposed questions took her by surprise
however that further contributed to her uninfluenced and unbiased answers due to lack of personal or emotional attachment to the case organization, she maintained this professional and objective approach throughout the whole interview.

2015 - November the 21st Restaurant Day Budapest - Basic Bone Kutya-bisztró / Dog-bistro

The initiators:

Two passionate youngsters, who normally do not work in the hospitality industry, they hold experience in graphic and industrial design.

It is not their first time that they participate

They feel responsible to spread the word to as many people as they can about Restaurant Day, and use the platform to address a social problem, dog welfare

The revenue is enough to cover their expenses and they are not interested in lucrative ends.

They offer three different types of snacks for dogs: pumpkin-turmeric, cheese-parsley and banana-oat

They offer one piece of the same kind of dog snack to an animal sanctuary as a donation that takes care of unfortunate dogs that are waiting for being adopted.

Coffee is served to the owners while the dogs are having their snacks.

The peculiarity, informality and friendliness of the whole setting are moving and touching. It initiated conversations between strangers and potential friendships were made.
They managed to sell over 100 pieces and sold out completely throughout the day on what they kept their pop-up bistro opened for 6 hours.

There is a detailed description on their Facebook event about where they are, that they welcome everyone with or without dogs.

They financially support animal shelters as far as it lies within their power (with hand-made dog snacks)

“If you are a dog lover person with or without a furry friend, come with us to the shelters to donate those bones! We believe that each bite could be a first step of a new friendship.”

“If you’re already an owner the easiest way to help is to bring your pooch to your favorite coffee shop, to your office and enjoy each other’s company. Don’t forget to snack on something yummy! :)

Physical settings:

It is the first pop-up restaurant for dogs within Restaurant Day in Budapest.

They are located in a green yet busy area of Budapest in the 11th district that is suitable for taking dogs for a walk but also for jogging and the table is visible for the cars that are passing by as well.

They accept only cash.

Emotions:
People are laughing there is a fantastic atmosphere.

“We are urbans. We believe that owning a dog in the city have one clear purpose: to love and get love in return. We want to give you the possibility to bring your best friend with you wherever you go, and have fun together. - Because LOVE IS BASIC.”

“We are lucky. Just as all people who’s living with a dog already. With your help we support the work of dog shelters so they can rehome more dogs in the city we live in. We donate the same amount of quality food that you give to your best friends, to those who have nobody to love. - Because FOOD IS BASIC.”

2016 - February the 21st Copenhagen - Cake a lot

The initiators:

Six trained pastry chefs, who were all or still are educated in Copenhagen Hospitality College. Not all of them could take part of the today’s event, but they have former experience from former RDs.

They normally work within the hospitality industry.

Their motivation of taking part is that they wanted to try themselves in real life and test whether their ideas and conceptions work as well in real settings as in their home or test kitchen.

They mention that it is not easy to find an employment within their profession in Copenhagen. RD is an option to gain practical experience and test how well they can get along as a one day entrepreneur.
They really like the concept that there is a platform where anyone can set up the restaurant of their imagination for a day.

On previous occasions they got in contact with other pop-up restaurants that were registered close their intended location, in order to build a good personal relationship upfront and make use of any possible synergies that might derive from their different approaches. This collaboration was a really good experience for both parties and according to them could also mean the beginning of a friendship.

The offered deals, which were combination of coffee and cake or multiple cakes.

Accept cash or mobile pay.

For previous events they had their own boxes produced in order to serve cakes also for take away, however this time it was not necessary because of the terrible weather and the fixed location.

**Physical settings:**

Really bad weather outside, therefore they made this partnership with a coffee bar in Copenhagen that could accommodate their small pop-up stand.

In a coffee bar in Nørrebro, close to Dronning Louises Bro, called Mellemrummet.

Comfortable furnishing, armchairs, couches and smooth music.

Really welcoming environment that also turns out based on the brief description of the venue on their Facebook page:
“Welcome to our world of fair trade, ecology, exuberant creativity and warm-hearted unity - the space where there is room for diversity!”

They relate to these set of values.

They are occupying one of the room’s corner and make it visible that they are part of Restaurant Day of putting a sign on the table where they are serving the cakes from. (Visible on the attached pictures.)

Not every customers of the coffee bar came only because of RD on that day, however as they see some of them got tempted and bought a slice of cake.

**Emotions:**

Open-minded, charming and helpful girls who are passionate about their profession and admire RD. They have been passing on the idea, and many of their friends got to know of RD thanks to them both as customers and pop-up restauranteur.

Really calm and friendly atmosphere, people were smiling, talking and resting in armchairs.

**Secondary Data 2014 Business Project** - (Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014)

From previous participation in 2014: - Cake a lot
They were using and electric generator that was creating enough electricity to make a pair of loudspeakers, fridge and coffee machine work. There was a DJ playing music.

Detailed and premade decorations that attract people’s attention even when they do not specifically arrived their because of RD.

They provided blankets for customers who wanted to sit down on the grass, eat their cakes and listen to some music.

Their customers started mingling and friendly conversations were initiated. (Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014)

1.) Restaurant interviewed:

Eat it raw, Dronning Louises Bro from 11am in the morning, 17 May 2014

On table set up, with one kind of home-made pastry for 10dkk each piece. It is not the first time for them to take part in the event. This year they will invest their income on a sushi dinner, however last year they donated their revenue for charity to a children foundation.
Hand drawn poster, with the name of the restaurant, the price and some colorful decoration on it. One girl and a guy, who were doing it for fun, passion about food and social interactions, and social responsibility.

They are not from the hospitality industry, but they hold some experience from bars, restaurants.

Creative industry workers

They do not think that the people are well aware of the existence and dates of Restaurant Day.

2.) Restaurant interviewed:

Nomma, Nørrebroparken

Two guys, not for the first time

Paper bags with the name of their restaurant on it, healthy home-made, pita bread, sauces, own grown seeds

They used an old door as a table with two trestles holding it.
Also from the creative industries (graphic designers), they love food, preparing and sharing it, real enthusiasts.

They do not think that enough people know about RD. They suggested to set up a place where the organizers/ambassadors can brief both the customers and participants about the concept, give them some advice in advance.

They were trying to catch people’s attention with music, flyers, flags, colorful decoration.

Their conclusion for the next time: either simplify their menu, or gather more people. So it would be less busy for them and easier to coordinate.

Their definition of success at Restaurant Day is to create an environment where is pleasant to stay and hard to remain an outsider.

Nice and sunny weather helped them a lot to attract more customers.

4.) Restaurant interviewed - Gourmet Hotdogs, Falkoner Allé, Frederiksberg
Three people, one at the cashier, one preparing the food, one who is helping out.

Well defined tasks. Not from the industry, foodies with passion about food. (Lang, Penkova, Ioanei, 2014)