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Abstract

Recent developments in the UK and other countries have seen a change in the relationship between the public and third sector.¹ The third sector has increasingly come to be a provider of public services and the funding basis of that provision has moved from a traditional grants funded mode to a contract based mode.²

These developments have been regarded by each sector from somewhat different perspectives. The Public sector view on third sector provision is based upon such factors as public value, equity and choice in provision. Some public officials regard the third sector as representing a lower cost option than that of either state provision or private providers.

The Third sector perceives the growth in service provision and contractual relations with the public sector with mixed feelings. For some – especially the larger and more commercially orientated organisations – it is seen as an opportunity. For others it is seen as jeopardizing deeply held organizational values and organizational independence. This is exemplified in the UK by a debate over whether the Third sector should take contracts involving loss of liberty or benefits to clients (such as running custodial facilities or assessing disability).³

² NCVO The UK Voluntary Sector Almanac 2006: The State of the Sector, London UK
³ Presentation by Stuart Etherington , CEO of NCVO at London South Bank University Oct 2005
For third sector organisations which have a campaigning or advocacy role accepting government contracts is seen as restricting (either implicitly or explicitly) their freedom of action to engage in this aspect of their role. A key characteristic accepted as defining the nature of the Third Sector is that of independence. This independence is often construed in terms of a mission which has an underpinning set of values. Charities which work, for example, pregnancy may have a value set which acknowledges the woman’s ‘right to choose’ a termination. Yet if such an organisation is to seek government funding or contracts then a clash of values may appear – as was identified by Etzioni writing about the USA.4. In the UK and much of the English speaking commonwealth there has been the growth of devices such as ‘compacts’ to try and acknowledge the independence issue.5

The value differences may appear not just at a ‘mission level’ but also in terms of operational practices. Many public servants are expected to adopt a position of ‘neutrality’ and professional detachment in the conduct of their activities. Indeed this may even extend to their activities outside the workplace and joining the boards of outside organisations may lead to questions of their impartiality. In contrast the Third sector use of networks and ‘cross memberships’ are part of the organizational landscape. At the strategic level non-profit organisations tend to run on a high level of informal contact and trust as opposed to the rules and accountability which are part of the public sector landscape. Indeed members of charity boards are called ‘trustees’ – a term not used to describe their political equivalents in the public sector.

So how might these potentially conflicting worlds interact without erosion of their core value systems?

This paper will seek to explore the normative and ethical boundaries of this debate making use of the discourses which are already taking place. In particular, following Putnam, the paper will explore the use of Social Capital concepts (bridging and bonding capital) to foster the creation of dialogue and understanding with regard to different sector value sets.6

---

4 Etzioni A, The Third Sector and Domestic Missions

5 Murdock ,A (2006) Lessons from the delivery of public services by the Third Sector and the increasing links to citizenship: The emergence and development of contractual partnerships between the Third Sector and Government - Paper at 3rd Sino-US International Conference for Public Administration, June 8-9 2006, Beijing P.R. China


Murdock IRSPMX1 2007 Potsdam 2
Introduction: The evolving nature of the relationship between Government and the Third Sector

On 12th December 2006 Nicholas Deakin gave a lecture hosted by the Baring Foundation. Deakin, N (2006). This lecture was significant both in terms of the lecturer and the hosting organisation. The date was chosen as it represented the 10th Anniversary of a major report on the Third Sector. Professor Deakins’ name is well known to voluntary sector as the prime participant in a major review of the voluntary sector. Commission on the Future of the Voluntary Sector (1996). Indeed his name became synonymous with the report produced by the Commission.

The Commission’ highlighted changes in the nature of the relationship between government and the third sector. It recognised moving towards contractual relationships between government and the third sector was having a major impact upon the way in which third sector organisations had to work. The Commission also highlighted the diverse nature of the third sector, a potential offering enormous potential and challenge to the both government and the third sector.

Perhaps unusually for a number of such Commissions the recommendations had a significant impact. The incumbent government (which had rejected the recommendations) was soon to be replaced by the Labour Government in 1997. The thinking of the incoming government had much in common with the recommendations and sentiments of the Commission.

The Voluntary Sector Compact – a formal memorandum setting out the nature of the relationships between government and the sector was perhaps the most tangible result. Osborne & McLaughlin (2002 & 2004) This compact has had implications not just for the UK but has had significant policy impacts in other countries. Murdock (2006). The Compact, using the dance metaphor, could be described as an attempt to enable the government and third sector to agree a set of rules for behaviour on the dance floor. In particular it could be regarded as an endeavour to ensure that as contracts become more embedded the third sector is recognised as having ‘rights’ and also a degree of independence of movement. Though the government may
be the partner ‘who leads’ in the dance the third sector is not a passive partner but one seen as worthy of respect. (NVCO 2005, 2006) (Osborne 2005)

The compact principles (in terms of the dance metaphor) recognised that the third sector had a right to be consulted and indeed to criticise in terms of both the current and proposed movements on the dance floor. Indeed the sector was recognised as possessing areas of expertise (such as the ability to engage and attract audiences and further participants in the dance). (Osborne & McLaughlin 2002 & 2004, Murdock 2006)

However the critical question is whether the development of contractual relationships between the government and the third sector is affected by a fundamental difference occasioned by the different value and ethical sets which the respective parties bring to the dance floor. The third sector described as ‘diverse’ by Deakin and as a ‘loose and baggy monster’ by academics and researchers 7 (Kendall & Knapp 1995) It is important to note that the term is not necessarily used in a negative fashion to describe the sector. However it does create the image of sector diversity and problems in establishing clear categories and defining rules of behaviour. It implies a lack of predictability and conformity. This imagery is not commensurate with the formalism of regulated government.

Are the sectors in fact separate entities?

The conventional image is of three sectors – public, private and ‘third’. The implication is that there is a some kind of boundary. The location of the Potsdam IRSPM conference may convey some sector imagery from the days of a divided Berlin with a Soviet, American, British and French Sector. By implication when something is divided into sector then a boundary can be established.

---

7 The original term was probably the novelist Henry James who referred to Tolstoy's War and Peace as a "loose and baggy monster."
However this can be challenged and the divisions seen more as overlaps between the sectors. It is suggested that there are in fact four sectors which need to be considered. The informal sector represents the concept of civil society which is to be found in the everyday activities which do not come within the measured bounds of the other sectors but which nevertheless represent a vital element in the generation of social capital. (Putnam 2000) Diagram 1 illustrates this.

Pestoff has depicted the relationship diagrammatically as a series of triangles. (Diagram 2). This diagram places the Third Sector at the centre of a typology embracing the State, Market (private sector) and the community sector. Pestoff suggests that in the areas of overlap ‘mixed’ organisational forms can be found. (Pestoff 1998)

This conception has significant implications for the concept of values which are specific to a particular sector. If the boundaries are unclear and there are overlaps then the implication is that the value sets similarly might overlap ..or lack sector distinctiveness at the boundaries. (Evers 2005) (Brandsen, van de Donk & Putters 2005)

**How might the values of the public and third sectors be similar?**

Both the public sector and the third sector have been described as possessing strong value sets. Writers such as Anheier and Etzioni have examined the nature of the values and mission of the third sector (Anheier 2005) (Etzioni, 1973). The Public sector value literature is extensive and the Beck Jorgensen and Bozeman provided a useful bibliography for the Public Value panel at the 2006 EGPA Conference (Beck Jorgensen and Bozeman
2006). The question of public values has been linked to the reform agenda (Van de Walle 2005). Public Values are also seen as associated with ‘taking tough choices’ (O’Kelly and Dubnick, 2005)

A recent conference paper suggested that there were five aspects of public values (Tijsterman, 2006) Tijsterman suggested that:

- They should make sense
- They should enable policy choice
- They should be collective
- They raise issues in application
- They should be upheld by public institutions

These five aspects would probably be largely accepted by third sector organisations (maybe with a textual amendment to the last one). Perhaps the implication here is of ‘motherhood and apple pie’? Who can be against values which express simple and obvious truths? If so then the difference between the public and third sector in values may be less than the shared territory. Perhaps the public and third sector problems at the dance are along the lines of the oft cited comment about the UK and the USA – Two countries separated by a common language.

Organisational values sometimes get wrapped up with the idea of culture and indeed this is true for all three formal sectors (private, public and third) (Aiken 2001). The conception that values are transmittable - in effect tangible objects – implies that they can be controlled by managers. This, however, understates the importance of the tacit and intangible quality attached to value. Nevertheless governments and the public sector bodies associated with government have sought to expressly set out what the ‘public sector values’ are in tangible form. (HM Treasury 2004)

Concern in the early 1990’s in the UK about standards of public officials led to what has become known as the Nolan report. (Cm 2850-I) For the UK it

---

8 See URL for EGPA 2006 (accessed 27 Feb 2007)

9 Attributed variously to George Bernard Shaw and to Winston Churchill

10 See URL
represents perhaps a common denominator of what should guide the behaviour of those in public office. The Nolan principles are as follows:

**The Seven Principles of Public Life**

**Selflessness**
Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

**Integrity**
Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

**Objectivity**
In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

**Accountability**
Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

**Openness**
Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

**Honesty**
Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

**Leadership**
Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

It is worthy of note that these principles have also been accepted by some of the major third sector umbrella organisations in the UK Third Sector as relevant for their members in the exercise of their third sector responsibilities. Therefore there is a case for arguing that the Nolan principles may represent
a base set of guidelines which can be referred in this context as the ‘rules of the dance’
A number of these principles are in fact explicit in the governance of charitable bodies and in particular with respect to the board members (trustees) of such organisations. Selflessness, integrity, accountability, honesty and objectivity are enshrined in the legal expectation of how trustees of charities will conduct themselves. Openness and leadership are implicit. (Hudson 2004)

So Third Sector Values – do they differ?
Aiken in a couple of key articles has set out what he regards as distinctive about the values of voluntary and co-operative organisations. He indicates that for such organisations their values are often the core of their being. There is no private sector ‘business bottom line’ to fall back on. (Aiken 2001, 2002) The values cannot be maintained by reference to an ‘official government line’ – they need to be sustained and renewed or the organisations concerned will deteriorate. Aiken notes that such organisations do not operate in a social and political vacuum and refers to commentators who question the continued distinctiveness and independence of the sector. (Six &Vidal 1994).
A recent working paper from the London School of Economics undertook a review of the nature of the values in the voluntary sector. (Elson 2006). This is reproduced from the working paper as Table 1.

< insert Table1 here>

Many of the values adduced from the literature by Elson find close echoes in the Nolan principles set out above. Indeed in Governance terms some authors have successfully written to encompass both sectors in the same text. (Cornforth 2003)
However there are a number of values which are not associated with the Nolan Principles and indeed are arguably potentially in conflict with them. Paton refers to values of ‘devotion, compassion, enthusiasm, solidarity and defiance’. (Paton 1992) These are values which may not sit well with such
Nolan principles as ‘objectivity and accountability’. Other values referred to in Elsons’ impressive collation of authorities include ‘Sociability’, ‘Reciprocity’, ‘Collaboration’, ‘Loyalty’ and ‘Trust’. Such values are highly pertinent to many charitable and voluntary organisations.

The actual concept of ‘Charity’ itself is worthy of exploration as a value. One definition describes it as “an unlimited loving-kindness towards all others”\textsuperscript{11}. For some charities this is inherent in the way in which they conduct themselves.

As a small example I recently observed two apparent alcoholics enter a social enterprise run café in a church. (They were carrying a bag full of tins of strong lager and were drinking at 9.00am). They politely advised the cook that they had no money but they would like some food. The cook offered them a free meal (which one accepted and the other declined). The response of the cook was entirely in keeping with the charitable and community values of the café. However if the café had been a public sector establishment then this action would have been almost certainly counter to the explicit values of the organisation and could have been regarded as a manifest abuse of public assets.

**The dance relationship – separation**

If the third sector and the public sector operate separately and their paths do not cross then the potential for value conflict is quite limited. Some charities do not take any money from the public purse whether in the form of grants or contracts. They observe the legal formalities and are relatively detached from the ‘dance moves’ of the public sector. It is as if they are on a separate dance floor but are only affected if a major event happens (such as the dance hall catching fire). Where a charity engages in an activity where the public sector would not become involved (such as the meeting of specific religious needs) then the dance relationship can be distant unless the values of the organisation impinge on public law or cause public disquiet. In the UK post 9/11 there has been a greater public concern about the nature of the activities...

\textsuperscript{11} Source wikipedia.com
of imams in mosques, for example. However the activities of other religious sects may pass without public comment.

The dance relationship – the third sector takes the lead
For some third sector organisations the inherent aim is to leverage some kind of change from a potentially labile or unwilling public sector. This may take a number of forms. The third sector organisation may possess an asset or attribute which can be used to effect change. Some medical charities in the UK have a large donor base and use the financial leverage to pressure the government to change policy and enhance service provision. They are in effect the predatory dance partner and the public sector may have to change its dance step to accommodate them. In short the third sector is able to ‘pay for the tune’ it wants to dance to.
In other situations the third sector possesses resources – perhaps access to celebrities or to a large membership base which enables it to influence or even threaten the public sector in order to get what it wants on the dance floor. The impact of individuals such as Bob Geldorf and the power of media and music are well understood by charities. The public sector is not immune to being seduced by fame and glamour.
If seduction does not work then in some cases the third sector is able to exploit the threat of exposure and political vulnerability. A local issue raised by a charity may threaten the security of re-election of a politician who then accepts the need to ‘dance to a different tune’. This has been exemplified by the spectre recently of government ministers joining protests against policies which they had, in cabinet, acquiesced in. Campaigning charities are often adept at applying pressure through carefully targeted media coverage and letter writing. Amnesty international is able to bring considerable pressure on apparently intransigent foreign governments over the treatment of prisoners by such means.

The Dance relationship – the public sector takes the lead
The area of provision of public services is where a major focus has been in recent years in the UK (National Audit Office  2005). The Government has seen the third sector as a potential ‘partner’ in the dance. Many charities have the history in the identification of a need for service provision followed by the actual provision to meet that need. (Kendall 2003)   Indeed there is one major organisation in the UK which provides a rescue service for those at peril on the sea and does it without recourse to public funds. (The Royal National Lifeboat Institution).  However in general the pattern has been of a charitable provision being set up to meet a particular need ( hospitals and orphanages, for example) and over time the state steps in to take over the provision.  

Now the state is keen for the third sector to take a more active role in delivery of many of these services through contracts, grants or other arrangements.  There are commentators on the third sector which have also explored this. (Blake, Robinson & Smerdon 2006 ) (Cairns, Harris & Young 2005)  

One lure to the dance floor in the UK has been something described as ‘full cost recovery’ -  This means not just the disbursement of the immediate costs of provision of the service but also what has been described by sector organisations as ‘core costs’ such as:

- Management and leadership
- Infrastructure and accommodation
- Finance, governance and controls
- Strategic development

In dance terms the third sector would argue that in order to join the dance chosen by the public sector they feel that it is not just the bar drinks and immediate dance participation costs which need to be met but also the longer term expenses such as changing the ball gown, the cosmetics, hair stylists together with the costs of learning and managing the new dance hall repertoire.

There are also those who feel that the loss of independence associated with joining a dance form determined by the public sector is a price too great to

12 For more information on the nature of full cost recovery see www.acevo.org.uk
pay. The constraints of government contracts are seen as restricting the ability of charities to offer a range of services and also may limit the choice of beneficiary. Furthermore many charities see themselves as agents of societal change. The ability to criticise and pressure the government may be affected by having a substantial dependency on that same government for income.

The Charity Commission, the regulatory body for charities in England and Wales, recently published a key report examining the effects of charities accepting a greater role in public service delivery. A large number of charities took part (approx 3800). The report perhaps quixotically entitled ‘Stand and Deliver ‘ was published in February 2007 and the findings make disturbing reading.

Over 60% of the charities who responded with an income of over £0.5 million were involved in public service delivery. Of the charities involved in public service delivery a third were dependent on this for 80% or more of their total income. However only 12% reported that they were getting full cost recovery (Charity Commission 2007b). Diagram 3 shows this and also shows that by far the largest proportion (43%) report that they did not recover full costs in any case.

< insert Diagram 3 here>

In dance hall terms it could be assumed that the stronger (ie. Largest) third sector organisations might be more likely to achieve full cost recovery. Table 2 suggests that this is not the case for the very largest (though they are less likely to report not getting any full cost recovery). What is also surprising is that the very largest organisations appear more likely to report not even knowing if their funding had covered their costs.

<insert Table 2 here>

Possibly the nature of the service delivery arrangement was a factor. Maybe there might be a difference between contract, grants, service level
agreements\textsuperscript{13} and a ‘mixture’ of these? The results reported in Table 3 prove interesting. Grants are most likely to be associated with a failure to meet full cost recovery with service level agreements coming second. The commentary on the report suggests that it may be possible that some respondents were unclear as to what were the nature of the agreements they had with the public sector. In any event it suggests that participation in this particular dance had not been to the benefit of the third sector.

<insert Table 3 here>

One argument advanced by third sector leader is a plea for longer duration funding. This seems eminently sensible. In dance hall terms it is offering an assurance that the public sector will give a degree of continuity on the dance floor and not ‘change partners’ or ‘dance form’ so often. However the Charity Commission findings suggest that longer duration contracts may be associated with poorer financial returns. Diagram 4 shows that contracts longer than 3 years appear to be a worse deal than those which are shorter. It looks like ‘long dance commitments’ may not necessarily be to the third sectors benefit.

<insert Diagram 4 here>

Finally there is the question as to whether the third sectors’ independence (‘virtue’ in dance terms?) has been compromised through entering into public service delivery. The findings from the survey suggest that respondents do feel this is the case. Organisations which did not deliver public services were more likely agree to statements showing mission conformity, independence and trustee involvement in key decisions. Diagram 5 shows the extent of the differences.

\textsuperscript{13} Service level agreements are typically agreements where professional services (such as expert social work input or legal advice) is being provided. They are usually costed on a different basis to conventional contracts.
Conclusion
The relationship between the public sector and the third sector is a varied one. There is a sharing of values in that many of the public sector values (as represented by the Nolan Report in the UK) would be found in the charitable sector. However voluntary and charitable organisations in many cases espouse values which are potentially at variance with public sector ones. This may not be a problem in ‘dance floor’ terms. In some cases the parties do not interfere with each other beyond the usual civilities. In other cases the third sector may be more influential and possess desired resources. Here the terms of the dance may even rest significantly with the third sector partner. However the increasing involvement of the third sector in the delivery of public services seems to be associated with both inadequate resourcing and a perceived loss of independence. This is clearly a source of concern to the Chair of the Charity Commission, Dame Suzy Leather, who made the following observation as part of her speech introducing the findings of the survey.

"Under-funding threatens the very survival of charities delivering public services. Charities themselves, commissioning authorities and Government all have to address this urgently. If they don’t, they will end up killing the very thing they believe in.

Does our report entitled Stand and deliver signify a sector taken hostage, or a sector standing firm to deliver public services on equal terms? Everyone in this room instinctively knows it should be the latter, but many will fear that we are actually facing the former. What factors might influence which way it falls?

Much as John Donne’s bell tolled for everyone, so one charity’s loss of reputation, mission or integrity could have an impact on the way in which charities are generally viewed. Reputation at best is a fragile thing and must be protected."14

14 Dame Suzy Leather (Charity Commissioner) speech to NCVO Annual Conference 21.2.2007
The Third sector organisations may be engaging in ‘high risk’ behaviour in this particular aspect of the dance hall. It is likely that some may leave saddened through financial losses which may – at the extreme – threaten their viability.

Perhaps however the more insidious threat is the ‘loss of virtue’ which as some might argue has no price since once lost it cannot be repurchased. Furthermore such loss may serve to damage not just the repute of the immediate owner but to erode the repute of other third sector organisations seen as partaking in a similar activity.
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Diagram 1: The different sectors

Diagram 2: The Third sector in the Welfare Triangle (Pestoff 1998)
**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (reference)</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Gerard, D. (1993) Charities in Britain: conservatism or change?</em></td>
<td>Authority, Hierarchy, Equity, Compassion, Freedom, Beneficence</td>
<td>Context: organisations – social order (adherence to moral and spiritual values) [stability, unity, cohesion] and service to those in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy, Participation, Equality, Tolerance, Individual rights, Solidarity</td>
<td>Social change – (secular and material values) and identify with those in need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeavons, T.H. (1994) Ethics in nonprofit management: Creating a culture of integrity</td>
<td>Integrity, Openness, Accountability, Service, Charity, Reciprocity</td>
<td>Organisational ethical values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeavons, T.H. (1992) When the Management is the Message: relating values to management practice in non-profit organisations</td>
<td>Organisational honesty, Accountability, Service (to public good). Dignity and respect (for workers and volunteers)</td>
<td>Critical importance of consistency between values in organisational purpose and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Otto, S. (1997) Comparative Study of role issues and structures in voluntary and statutory organisations</em></td>
<td>Power combined with commitment to public good, Personal and professional development, Empowerment, Collaboration</td>
<td>Trustee Chairs and senior managers in agencies for the homeless and statutory schools (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paton, R. (1996) How are values handled in the voluntary sector?</td>
<td>Equal opportunity, User empowerment Social Justice</td>
<td>Social ideals Organisational values Personal conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paton, R. (1997) The Social Economy: Value-based Organisations in the Wider Society</td>
<td>Devotion, Compassion, Enthusiasm, Solidarity, Defiance</td>
<td>Commitment to a common or public benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tonkiss, F., Passay, A. (1999) Trust, Confidence and Voluntary Organisations: Between Values and Institutions</em></td>
<td>honesty, fairness, trust</td>
<td>Trust-base relations in civil society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Empirical evidence provided:
Diagram 3

Does the funding cover all the costs?

Table 2

**Full cost recovery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>In all cases</th>
<th>In most cases</th>
<th>In some cases</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under £10,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10,000 - £100,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100,000 - £250,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 - £500,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500,000 - £1 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1 million - £10 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £10 million</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
**Full cost recovery by type of funding agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of funding agreement</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Grant(s)</th>
<th>Contract(s)</th>
<th>Service level agreement(s)</th>
<th>A mixture/more than one</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In all cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In most cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 4**

Length of agreements held by charities achieving full cost recovery - shown by percentage
Diagram 5

Percentage of respondents that agree with statements A - C

![Diagram showing percentage of respondents' agreement with statements A, B, and C.](image_url)