

Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneurial Models

Johanna Mair
Hertie School of Governance / Stanford University

4th EMES Conference on Social Enterprise Research
Liege (Belgium), 1-4 July 2013

This presentation is based on Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Cardenas, J. 2012. Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneurial Models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3): 353-373.

The Study

Move focus of investigation from “a society of organizations” to “organizing for society”

- Unpack heterogeneity of organizing models associated with the practice of Social Entrepreneurship
- Practical and theoretical meaningful typology
- Four stylized models differentiated by form of capital leveraged: Political, human, economic, and social
- Each associated with a principle that serves as justification for proposed solution and anchor for courses of action
- Inspire future research by prompting more questions

Social Entrepreneurship defined here ...

- Social entrepreneurship (SE) refers to opportunities and activities that leverage economic activity to pursue a social objective and implement social change.
- Focus on economic activity is important to distinguish SE from social movements, charitable and philanthropic initiatives.
- The transformative social ambition distinguishes SE from “entrepreneurship with a conscience” (Vasi 2009) and other organized (corporate) forms of “doing good” such as corporate social responsibility or corporate philanthropy.
- Social change is not a byproduct, but the very essence of their endeavors. Entrepreneurship as a useful concept (Steyart & Hjorth, 2006);

... efforts to bring about new economic, social, insitutional and cultual environment through the actions of an individual or a group of individual (Rindova et al., 2009)

Social Entrepreneurial Models

- **Conceptualizing** a model: interpret and redefine a social problem that has not been adequately addressed, if addressed at all, by existing organizations. This involves *specifying* and *justifying* the approach
- Analyzing **what** SE organization's do, **how** and **why** they do it. Do so in parallel to generate fine grained and holistic understanding
- Social entrepreneurial models as **configurations**, as “multidimensional constellations of conceptually distinct characteristics that commonly occur together” (Meyer et al. 1993)

Specifying the Components of Model

- **Re-defining the problem:** issues such as poverty are multidimensional and typically do not exist in isolation which reinforces category-breaking.
- **Identifying the Target Constituencies:** need to account for the individuals or groups that are important in achieving change.
- **Selecting Activities:** deciding on activities that engage the target constituency in the change process.

Justifying the Proposed Solution

- Different logics of justification corresponding to SE's own rationales for choosing a certain courses of action.
- Rationales are influenced by a set of quasi-universal principles or “orders of worth” (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006) on which actors rely to justify their beliefs, opinions, and actions.

World	Worth rests on
Inspiration	nonconformity, a typical way of acting is to dream and rebel
Domestic	the trust and respect for tradition and kinship, a typical way of acting is to preserve and to reproduce
Fame	other people's opinions, a typical way of acting is to exert influence and achieve signs of public esteem
Civic	the collective interest; individual human beings are relevant when they belong to a group or are representative of a collective, a typical way of acting is mobilizing people for a collective action
Market	the mediation of scarce goods and services and price serves as a mechanism to evaluate these scarce goods, the typical way of acting is competing and spotting market opportunities
Industrial	efficiency, productivity and operational effectiveness, typical ways of acting are implementing tools, methods and plans

...serve as calculative devices and make action possible by reducing uncertainty (Stark, 2009)

Data and Methods

- 200 profiles of SE Organizations (SEO) from Ashoka and the Schwab Foundation.
- Analysis of texts (declarations of models) of the entire population of SEOs selected by Schwab Foundation (98 SEOs) as well as a random sample of 102 SEOs selected by Ashoka.
- Content analysis to generate categories of issues, constituents, and actions for each SEO.
- Cluster analysis to identify distinct types of social entrepreneuring models.
- Discriminant analysis and ANOVA to check the robustness of cluster analysis.
- Closed Coding to identify the principles.
- ANOVA to relate clusters and principles.

Content Analysis

Issues ^a	Target actors ^a	Actions ^a
Economic	Communities	Training
Civil & Public	Civil Society	Networking
Law & Rights	Organizations	Educating
Environment	Public	Counseling
Education	Children	Lending
Health	Farmers	Treating medically
Food	Women	Supplying
Housing	Youth	Employing
Technology	Families	Organizing
Culture	Teachers	No Actions
Family	Disabled	Lodging
	Business Sector	Others Actions
	Poor	
	Government	
	Homeless	
	Students	
	Others actors	

Almost half of the SEOs (42.5%) tackled more than one issue

Only 28 % perform solitary action

55 % focused on one constituency, rest on two or three

^aMultiple Response Possible

Results of Cluster Analysis

		Post hoc Dunnett's T3 test [†]	Political capital <i>n</i> = 28	Human capital <i>n</i> = 52	Economic capital <i>n</i> = 74	Social capital <i>n</i> = 46	<i>F</i> test
Political Capital Citizen's endowment, empowerment and political identity • IHRDA – Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa	Issues						
	Law and rights	PC > HC, EC, SC	<u>0.96 (0.19)</u>	0.04 (0.19)	0.05 (0.23)	0.04 (0.21)	154.43***
	Health	HC > PC	0.03 (0.18)	0.27 (0.45)	0.04 (0.20)	0.11 (0.31)	4.04**
	Environment	HC > PC	0.00 (0.00)	<u>0.23 (0.43)</u>	0.11 (0.31)	0.07 (0.25)	3.41*
	Education	HC > PC	0.04 (0.19)	0.25 (0.44)	0.15 (0.36)	0.09 (0.28)	2.93*
Human Capital Individual's' knowledge, skills and acquired expertise • Soul City	Economic	EC > PC, HC, SC	0.25 (0.44)	0.06 (0.24)	<u>1.00 (0.00)</u>	0.15 (0.36)	165.92***
		PC > HC					
	Civic engagement	SC > PC, HC, EC	0.39 (0.50)	0.27 (0.45)	0.18 (0.38)	<u>0.85 (0.36)</u>	26.86***
	Target constituencies						
	CSO	PC > HC, EC	<u>0.36 (0.49)</u>	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.16)	<u>0.41 (0.50)</u>	20.30***
Economic Capital Money and other material resources • Honey Care		SC > HC, EC					
	Children	PC > SC	<u>0.25 (0.44)</u>	0.17 (0.38)	0.09 (0.29)	0.02 (0.15)	3.63**
	Public	HC > PC, EC, SC	0.14 (0.36)	<u>0.44 (0.50)</u>	0.04 (0.20)	0.02 (0.15)	19.76***
	Farmers	EC > PC	0.00 (0.00)	0.04 (0.19)	0.19 (0.39)	0.15 (0.36)	3.90**
	Women	EC > HC	0.14 (0.36)	0.02 (0.14)	<u>0.18 (0.38)</u>	0.09 (0.28)	2.79*
Social Capital Network of relationships through which individual can mobilize power and resources • Tap Root Foundation	Communities	SC > HC	0.14 (0.36)	0.12 (0.32)	0.20 (0.40)	<u>0.37 (0.49)</u>	3.68**
	Actions						
	Counseling	PC > HC, EC, SC	<u>0.82 (0.39)</u>	0.13 (0.34)	0.23 (0.42)	0.24 (0.43)	19.73***
	Educating	HC > PC, EC, SC	0.29 (0.46)	<u>0.67 (0.47)</u>	0.20 (0.40)	0.15 (0.36)	16.45***
	Lending	EC > PC, HC, SC	0.04 (0.19)	0.02 (0.14)	<u>0.24 (0.43)</u>	0.04 (0.21)	7.85***
	Networking	SC > PC, HC, EC	0.32 (0.48)	0.21 (0.41)	0.24 (0.43)	<u>0.74 (0.44)</u>	15.44***

Means are displayed. Standard deviations are in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

[†] Dunnett's T3 pairwise multiple comparisons to test the difference between each pair of means. For each attribute, the abbreviations indicate the cluster with larger mean and the smaller ones at 0.05 significance level

Entrepreneuring Models and Principles

Principles across clusters

	Post hoc Dunnet's T3 test [†]	Political capital	Human capital	Economic capital	Social capital	F test
Market	EC > PC, HC, SC	0.14 (0.36)	0.21 (0.47)	<u>0.54 (0.50)</u>	0.20 (0.40)	8.69***
Civic	SC > HC, EC	0.50 (0.51)	0.31 (0.47)	0.28 (0.45)	<u>0.70 (0.47)</u>	3.96**
Fame	PC > EC	<u>0.46 (0.51)</u>	<u>0.44 (0.50)</u>	0.16 (0.37)	0.20 (0.40)	6.47**
	HC > EC, SC					
Domestic	HC > EC, SC	0.04 (0.19)	<u>0.21 (0.41)</u>	0.07 (0.25)	0.04 (0.21)	0.52
Inspired	N.S.	0.07 (0.26)	0.06 (0.24)	0.01 (0.12)	0.04 (0.21)	0.83
Industrial	N.S.	<u>0.46 (0.51)</u>	<u>0.48 (0.50)</u>	<u>0.47 (0.50)</u>	<u>0.37 (0.49)</u>	10.05***

Worth results from other people's opinion

Worth rests on trust and respect for tradition and kinship

Worth inheres in collective interests

The mean value differences between clusters are displayed. Standard deviations are in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

[†] Dunnet T3 pairwise multiple comparisons to test the difference between each pair of means. For each principle, the abbreviations indicate the cluster with larger mean and the smaller ones at 0.05 significance level

Worth results from mediation of scarce goods and resources

Worth is based on efficiency, productivity, and operational effectiveness

Differences across support organizations

Clusters and support organizations

	Ashoka	Schwab	Total
1. Political capital	21* (19.4)	7 (7.6)	28 (14.0)
2. Human capital	28 (25.9)	24 (26.1)	52 (26.0)
3. Economic capital	24 (22.2)	50** (54.3)	74 (37.0)
4. Social capital	35** (32.4)	11 (12.0)	46 (23.0)
Total	108	92	200

Number of cases displayed. Column percentage is in parentheses

Cramer's $V = 0.373$, sig. = 0.001

z test, two-tailed: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Findings

- Landscape of SE not composed of uniform models
- Social entrepreneuring models vary in how they *justify*: political capital model associated with fame principle, human capital model with fame and domestic principles, social capital model with civic principle and economic capital model with market principle.
- SE models have one commonality: rely on a principle reflecting an industrial logic of justification.
- SE models are distinct from the larger population of organizations addressing social issues through their declared attachment to do so effectively and efficiently.

Thank you!