Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneuring Models

Johanna Mair · Julie Battilana · Julian Cardenas

Abstract In this article, we use content and cluster analysis on a global sample of 200 social entrepreneurial organizations to develop a typology of social entrepreneuring models. This typology is based on four possible forms of capital that can be leveraged: social, economic, human, and political. Furthermore, our findings reveal that these four social entrepreneuring models are associated with distinct logics of justification that may explain different ways of organizing across organizations. This study contributes to understanding social entrepreneurship as a field of practice and it describes avenues for theorizing about the different organizational approaches adopted by social entrepreneurs.

Keywords Entrepreneuring · Organizational field · Social change · Social entrepreneurship

Introduction

Over the last decade, research on social entrepreneurship (SE) has expanded significantly (Short et al. 2009). As a

J. Mair (✉)
Hertie School of Governance, Friedrichstrasse 180,
10117 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: jmair@hertie-school.org

J. Battilana
Harvard Business School, Morgan Hall 327, Boston,
MA 02163, USA
e-mail: jbattilana@hbs.edu

J. Cardenas
University of Antioquia, Calle 67 N° 53-108,
050035 Medellín, Colombia
e-mail: julian.cardenas@onlinebschool.com

phenomenon SE refers to opportunities and activities that leverage economic activity to pursue a social objective and implement social change (Mair and Martí 2006; Marshall 2011; Van de Ven et al. 2007; Zahra et al. 2009). Similar to conventional entrepreneurship, SE involves the provision of goods or services. However, the provision of the product or service is not an end in itself, but an integral part of an intervention to achieve social objectives, thereby contributing to social change. Thus, rather than being only economic endeavors, SE initiatives aim primarily to pursue a social mission and to ultimately transform their social environment. For this reason, the concept of "entrepreneuring" defined as "efforts to bring about new economic, social, institutional, and cultural environments through the actions of an individual or a group of individuals" (Rindova et al. 2009, p. 477), is particularly relevant to the study of SE. Indeed it highlights both the economic activity and the transformative ambition that characterize SE (Rindova et al. 2009; Steyaert and Hjorth 2006) and pays attention to the local communities this activity is embedded in (Seelos et al. 2011).

The focus on economic activity is important to differentiate SE from pure forms of social movements as well as from charitable and philanthropic initiatives. On the other hand, 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 entrepreneurs do not aim to make money without harming their environment; rather their primary objective is to achieve the social mission that they pursue.

The purpose of this article is to identify and characterize stylized types of entrepreneuring models that exist in the field of SE. Existing research suggests that social

entrepreneurial organizations (SEOs)[1] employ a variety of models, but it does not examine them in a systematic way (Alvord 2004; Seelos and Mair 2005). What are the different models of entrepreneuring that SEOs may adopt and how can a more fine-grained understanding of entrepreneuring models inform research and guide decision making in SE? In addressing these questions, we aim to unpack the heterogeneity of entrepreneuring models associated with the practice of SE—hereafter referred to as social entrepreneuring models—and at the same time provide the necessary understanding of the phenomenon to advance theory and practice.

Analytically, we focus on texts provided by 200 self-identified SEOs. We identify four "ideal type" social entrepreneuring models based on the form of capital that is predominantly leveraged in each of these four models. The four types of capital leveraged are political, human, economic, and social. Furthermore, our results show that these four social entrepreneuring models are associated with different logics of justification (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). We refer to them as principles that act as justifications for the proposed solution.

In the next section, we proceed to describe the components of the social entrepreneuring models. In the section after that, we describe the data and the methods used to identify the four models of social entrepreneuring in our sample and the principles on which they are based. We then proceed to formulate the four stylized social entrepreneuring models that emerged from our exploratory analysis. Finally, we discuss the implication of the typology of social entrepreneuring models that we propose for research on SE.

Social Entrepreneuring Models

Since the term SE first appeared in the management literature of the 1980s, there has been little consensus about how to define it (Dacin et al. 2011). Existing research indicates that SEOs act on new and old social problems (Austin et al. 2006) for which existing private and public organizations fail to provide adequate solutions (Elkington and Hartigan 2008; Seelos and Mair 2005). In so doing, they often overcome established conventions: they span sectorial boundaries (Austin et al. 2006), experiment with different ways of organizing (partnerships, alliances, and joint ventures) (Di Domenico et al. 2009; Seelos and Mair 2007), and use a range of legal forms including for-profit, not-for-profit, and hybrid legal statuses (Dorado 2006).

They do so with the ultimate objective of triggering catalytic or systemic change (Elkington and Hartigan 2008; Waddock and Post 1991). Thus, change in the social system is not a byproduct, but the very essence of their endeavors (Alvord et al. 2004; Christensen et al. 2006; Steyaert and Hjorth 2006).

While these accounts are insightful, they often highlight specific dimensions to categorize SE, such as legal status or the specific problem addressed. To generate a fine-grained and, at the same time, a holistic understanding of social entrepreneuring models, aspects such as what SEOs do, and how and why they do it, need to be analyzed in parallel. We view social entrepreneuring models as configurations, i.e., "multidimensional constellations of conceptually distinct characteristics that commonly occur together" (Meyer et al. 1993, p. 1175). In order to identify these distinct characteristics, it is worth reflecting on how social entrepreneurs develop the social entrepreneuring models, i.e., how they come up with solutions to the social problems that they aim to address and how they enact them.

Typically, social entrepreneurs first engage in a process of conceptualization, whereby they interpret and redefine a social problem that has not been adequately addressed, if addressed at all, by existing organizations. They then craft a specific approach or intervention. Similar to the processes of theorization discussed in the context of institutionalizing change (Greenwood et al. 2002; Murphy and Coombes 2009; Strang and Meyer 1993; Tolbert and Zucker 1996), the process of conceptualization in social entrepreneuring involves two interrelated steps: specifying the approach and justifying it (Strang and Meyer 1993; Tolbert and Zucker 1996).

Beyond the initial step of conceptualization, research in the organizational sociology of social change efforts indicates that change models may be empirically assessed by examining the relations between categories of issues, actors, and types of activities undertaken (DiMaggio and Mullen 2000; Mohr and Guerra-Pearson 2010).[2] For the purpose of this study, we specify the generic social entrepreneuring model as involving: (1) redefining the problem or need; (2) identifying the target constituencies, i.e., those who need to be involved in the initiative—be they beneficiaries, clients, and/or actors with critical knowledge or resources to achieve the SEO's social mission; and (3) selecting the activity set by which the SEO engages the

---

[1] We use the terms social entrepreneur and social entrepreneurial organization interchangeably throughout the article as our empirical and theoretical focus is organizing.

[2] Mohr and Guerra-Pearson (2010), for example, used relations between categories of relief recipients, classes of social problems, and the type of activities undertaken as indicators of models used by 600 welfare organizations in New York City during the Progressive Era. Also focusing on the Progressive Era, DiMaggio and Mullen (2000) selected the type of actors involved, the category of actions taken, and the object of action (i.e., the audience) to surface distinct models that shaped civic rituals related to National Music Week.

identified target constituencies. The components of a social entrepreneuring model can be, therefore, summarized as the issue domain in which SEOs aim to make a difference; the target constituencies that they aim to involve in the process; and the activities in which they engage. In what follows we describe the issues, constituencies, and activities, which taken together typify a social entrepreneuring model.

(Re)defining the Problem: The Issue Domain

SEOs address social needs (Mair and Martí 2006) and complex problems (Waddock and Post 1991) that stubbornly persist or are new (Dees and Anderson 2006; Seelos and Mair 2005). Addressing a social problem or need requires (re)interpreting and (re)defining it, which often involves stepping outside conventional ways of thinking and acting on such issues. Research on strategy and organizations has shown that new business models and market opportunities are created by overcoming or ignoring industry boundaries and categorizations (Durand et al. 2007; Rao and Giorgi 2006). Similarly, social entrepreneuring models might require actors to break categories. Issues such as poverty are multidimensional and typically do not exist in isolation (Cleaver 2005; Sen 1999), which reinforces this category-breaking tendency. Thus, it is problematic to confine SEOs to single categories of issues. For example, a social entrepreneur addressing the problem of high levels of HIV infection in rural Africa might redefine the problem in terms of issues related to health as well as education. While a number of authors have attempted to describe the issues addressed by SE (Neck et al. 2009; Zahra et al. 2009), we still lack a systematic empirical account of the specific issue categories SEOs use to define and address problems. In this article, we aim to generate categories of issues based on how social entrepreneurs "perceive" problems rather than by classifying organizations along existing issue categories.

Identifying the Target Constituencies

SEOs are architects of change and their efforts often lead to new or altered institutional arrangements (see Battilana et al. (2009) for a review of the literature on institutional entrepreneurship). However, they do not act alone. Thus, the second important element after (re)defining the problem is identifying the change agents that are instrumental for social change and, therefore, represent the target constituencies for the SEOs.

Previous work on SE has followed the path of entrepreneurship research and put the entrepreneurial actor—either the founder or the leader of the SEO—at the center of attention. Authors have emphasized the individual traits

(Drayton 2002), leadership skills (Prabhu 1999; Waddock and Post 1991), motives (Spear 2006; Zahra et al. 2009), and intentions (Mair and Noboa 2006) of social entrepreneurs. However, at the same time, the literature has also associated SEOs with "systemic change" (Alvord et al. 2004) and "large scale transformational benefits for a segment of society or at large" (Martin and Osberg 2007). This suggests that SE requires distributed agency. Social entrepreneuring models, therefore, need to account for the individuals or groups that are important in achieving change. Targeted constituencies such as public authorities can be the beneficiaries, clients, and/or actors with the critical knowledge or resources to push social change. A systematic examination of who is involved in SE beyond the entrepreneurial actor allows us to compare different approaches and, at the same time, shed light on the mechanisms inherent in social change efforts.

Selecting Activities

Finally, specifying the approach also involves selecting the activity set and, more specifically, the activities that involve the target constituency in the change process. Previous literature on SE has elaborated on the nature of practices and activities in which SEOs engage. Researchers have emphasized commercial activities or market based activities (Fowler 2000; Frumkin 2002) and alluded to practices that measure performance and impact (Austin et al. 2006; Neck et al. 2009). While indicative of the financial viability of the organization or the level of professionalization of tasks and functions, these activities shed little light on how social change occurs. For example, SEOs providing microfinance differ substantively from each other in how they engage their target constituencies. While some of them engage primarily in transaction-based activities, such as providing loans or insurance, others provide training, educational, and networking activities.

The issues addressed, the constituencies involved, as well as the activities deployed, constitute the components of the social entrepreneuring models. However, as mentioned above, conceptualizing social entrepreneurial models also involves justifying the envisioned solution. In order to thoroughly examine social entrepreneuring models, it is thus necessary to uncover the principles on which social entrepreneurs rely to justify their proposed actions.

Justifying the Proposed Solution

To enact change, entrepreneuring models need to be intersubjectively defensible and sustainable (Stark 2009). The process of conceptualizing involves interaction with others. During this process, the model emerges as "rational in the sense that it appears rational to self and others within

a social setting, but not necessarily in some objective external sense" (Biggart and Beamish 2003, p. 457). When justifying their proposed approach, social entrepreneurs are thus likely to use different logics of justification corresponding to their own rationales for choosing a certain course of action.

Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) have found that the principles that actors refer to in such acts of justification are not completely idiosyncratic, although they vary from one actor to another. Indeed, they are based on a set of quasi-universal principles or "orders of worth" on which actors rely to justify their beliefs, opinions, and actions. Boltanski and Thévenot distinguish between these orders of worth: (1) the world of inspiration, within which worth is related to nonconformity—a typical way of acting is to dream and rebel; (2) the domestic world, within which worth rests on trust and respect for tradition and kinship—a typical way of acting is to preserve and to reproduce; (3) the world of fame, within which worth results from other people's opinions—a typical way of acting is to exert influence and achieve signs of public esteem; (4) the civic world, within which worth inheres in the collective interest and individual human beings are relevant when they belong to a group or collective—a typical way of acting is mobilizing people for a collective action; (5) the market world, within which worth results from the mediation of scarce goods and services and price serves as a mechanism to evaluate these scarce goods—a the typical way of acting is competing and spotting market opportunities; and (6) the industrial world, within which worth is based on efficiency, productivity, and operational effectiveness—typical ways of acting are implementing tools, methods, and plans.

These different orders of worth represent evaluative and coordination devices, and constitute the principles for making judgments and taking action (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999, 2006). Applied to entrepreneurship, they represent anchors to form judgments, and regimes for justifying solutions and courses of action (Stark 2009). In justifying their model, social entrepreneurs are likely to rely on one or more of these orders of worth. In the sections that follow, we build on these insights by identifying the principles used in our sample of SEOs and systematically relating these to each of the four entrepreneuring models that we identify.

Data and Methods

Data

Entrepreneuring involves making explicit declarations about the approach and model chosen (Rindova et al. 2009). To examine the different social entrepreneuring

models, we analyzed official texts describing SEOs. As such, we follow a sociological research tradition that uses texts as a "window into human experience" (Bernard and Ryan 1998, p. 595). Text represents an important lever in the process of institutionalizing new ideas for organizing (Phillips et al. 2004).

The texts we analyze were written by social entrepreneurs who had been selected as fellows by a support organization that provided them with resources to develop and grow their venture. In the process of applying to become a fellow in a support organization, applicants self-identify as social entrepreneurs and engage in an explicit process of conceptualizing their social change model. A number of supporting organizations have been established in the last few decades. We focus our analysis on two of the most prominent foundations, Ashoka and the Schwab Foundation (Nicholls 2010).

We chose these two support organizations for several reasons. First, both have been supporting SE over an extended period of time and do so with a global scope. Second, the two foundations provide resources and facilitate access to financial assistance, social networks, and awards. Ashoka, founded in 1980 by Bill Drayton, has focused on "innovators for the public" and provides, among other resources, seed funding over 3 years in the form of a stipend to the fellows it selects. Klaus Schwab, founder of the World Economic Forum, created the Schwab Foundation in 1998 to "identify, reward and disseminate examples of outstanding SE, and to generate general awareness on the significance of SE for societies" (Schwab Foundation, p. 4). Finally, both support organizations engage in a meticulous and comparable selection process before they endorse SEOs. Throughout this selection process, the SEOs must elaborate on the social problem they address and on the entrepreneuring model they pursue, specifying the issues they address, the constituencies they target, and the activities they perform. At the end of the process, a profile for the selected "fellow," in the form of a written text based on information provided by the initiative, is created. This is subsequently posted on the website of the support organization.

The profile descriptions of the social entrepreneurs endorsed by the two support organizations have similar features. Each text is typically organized into four sections of around 1,000–1,600 words which explain the following: (1) the idea or innovation, (2) the background, (3) the strategy, and (4) a personal snapshot of the social entrepreneur representing the initiative.[3] The profiles or texts are not only meaningful from an analytical point of view but also from a conceptual perspective. Texts on organizations

---

[3] For text sampled, refer to www.ashoka.org and www.schwabfound. org.

selected by Ashoka and the Schwab Foundation assume an important role in shaping the meaning of SE.

Our sample includes 200 profiles of SEOs from Ashoka and the Schwab Foundation. More specifically, we examine texts of the entire population of SEOs selected by the Schwab Foundation (98 SEOs) as well as a random sample of 102 SEOs selected by Ashoka[4] (out of a total population of 1440).[5] It is important to note that this is not a representative sample of SEOs. Those organizations which achieve affiliation with Ashoka or the Schwab Foundation survive a very competitive selection process and therefore represent only the most developed and/or successful organizations self-identifying as SEOs. Our sample also reflects Ashoka's and the Schwab Foundation's respective preferences in selecting fellows. Despite these limitations, identifying the entrepreneuring models and justification principles used in our sample gives a valid stylization of some of the models used by well-established SEs. As such, our typology provides a useful starting point for uncovering the range of existing social entrepreneuring models.

Methods

As detailed in the previous section, social entrepreneuring models can be viewed as configurations of issues, constituents, and actions. Analytical approaches that configure and combine various variables have been used extensively in the organizational theory and strategy literatures to develop typologies, i.e., to sort unordered phenomena into relatively similar groups (Fiss 2007).

Our analysis proceeded in four steps. First, using content analysis, we generated categories of issues, constituents, and actions for each SEO from its texts. Then, we used cluster analysis to identify distinct types of social entrepreneuring models. We then employed discriminant analysis and ANOVA to check the robustness of our cluster analysis. Finally, we went back to the texts and coded them to identify the principles used by each. We assessed the association between entrepreneuring models and the principles used to justify these models, which allowed us to derive more robust implications for differences and similarities among entrepreneuring models. We also examined the social entrepreneuring models while controlling for the support organizations and geography.

Instead of relying on existing classifications to categorize issues, target constituencies and activity sets, we allowed categories to emerge from our analysis of the texts. In other words, categories were constructed within their own context and formulated in terms of SE raw material. This inductive open coding procedure is appropriate for theory-building

efforts (Corbin and Strauss 2008; Locke 2001), especially as previous studies have largely ignored these dimensions of social change or have dealt with them in a fragmented manner (Gersick et al. 2000). We developed codes directly from the texts by selectively reducing them into meaning units, which were then abstracted and labeled.

Coding was undertaken by three individual coders, two authors and a research associate, all of whom were familiar with SE research and considered to be experienced in the field. Two coders took the lead in generating categories from text. First, we repeatedly read texts and employed Atlas-ti to code, organize, and index data (Margolis and Molinsky 2008). We coded data by generating categories from the text for each of the three variables using in vivo codes (words which were taken from the texts). Second, we listed the codes for each variable and grouped them into broader, more abstract conceptual higher order codes. Elements that were found to be conceptually similar to previously coded elements were given the same name and were grouped into the same code. The codes referring to the three variables specifying the social entrepreneuring model were revised, merged, and labeled until an exhaustive set of categories was achieved. Appendix 1 illustrates how we moved from initial codes to final categories and Appendix 2 shows the coding schemes of issue domains, target actors and activities.

In the final phase of the coding process, one of the authors and the research associate familiar with SE research independently re-coded the original data along the categories that had emerged from the previous phase. Based on the assumption that SEOs could address various issue domains, involve several target actors, and engage in different activities, we allowed for multiple responses. The coefficients assessing intercoder reliability for each variable ($\kappa = 0.70$ for issue domains, $\kappa = 0.87$ for target groups, $\kappa = 0.85$ for actions) as well as for the overall agreement ($\kappa = 0.80$) were acceptable given the explorative nature of our analysis (Neuendorf 2002).

Building on the content analysis, we applied cluster analysis to identify distinct types of social entrepreneuring models. Cluster analysis has been widely employed in strategy research to detect similarities within, and divergences between groupings, and to derive typologies (see Ketchen and Shook 1996; Short et al. 2008 for reviews). Thus, cluster analysis is appropriate to tackle under-theorized phenomena such as SE and to organize social entrepreneuring models into groups suggested by the data.[6] The

---

[4] A stratified and weighted random sample was constructed in the case of Ashoka fellows to reflect the distribution across regions and year elected.

[5] We collected all profiles on the web in July 2007.

[6] Unlike other statistical methods for studying configurations such as deviation scores, where the researcher defines ideal types and then calculates distances between the ideal profiles (Delery and Dote 1996), and fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA), where the selection of attributes is based on theoretical knowledge about their relationship with the outcome (Fiss 2007, p. 1183), cluster analysis makes no prior assumptions about differences in the sample and does not predict outcomes in advance.

quality of a cluster solution depends on: (1) choosing the attributes (corresponding to categories identified through content analysis) that will be included in the analysis; (2) selecting the appropriate clustering method; (3) determining the optimal number of clusters; and (4) validating the cluster results or solutions (Ketchen and Shook 1996; Ketchen et al. 1993).

The categories resulting from content analysis were used to create binary vectors of attributes (using 0 and 1 to represent either a category absent or present). Given the large number of attributes and to maximize the likelihood of uncovering meaningful differences, we dropped attributes with very restricted distribution. In other words, attributes with <10 % were not included (Hambrick 1983; Punj and Stewart 1983). As a result, we selected 16 out of the 39 attributes identified (six issues, six target groups, and four actions) to characterize social change models to perform cluster analysis.

Cluster analysis is conducted in two steps to optimize the benefits of each algorithm. First, a hierarchical cluster analysis is performed using Ward's method to select the appropriate number of clusters and obtain the estimated centroids.[7] These results are employed in the second step to set a nonhierarchical k-means clustering (where k is the number of clusters chosen). Research has confirmed that this two-stage procedure increases the validity of solutions (Hair et al. 1998; Milligan 1980; Punj and Stewart 1983) and it is widely applied in management and organizational inquiry (Ketchen and Shook 1996) even when attributes are binary (Henriques and Sadorsky 1999). To determine the optimal number of clusters (stopping rule), we use Calinski and Harabasz's (1974) method, and Duda and Hart's (1973) Je (2)/Je (1) ratio, both reported as the best stopping rule (Milligan and Cooper 1985).[8] The indexes derived from following both approaches suggested that four clusters were the most appropriate solution. Using the centroids estimated by Ward's procedure, we ran k-means clustering to classify the cases into the four clusters identified.

To enhance confidence in, and robustness of, our results, we complemented our cluster analysis with additional techniques (Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984; Ketchen and Shook 1996). We decided to test for appropriateness and to validate our four-cluster solution by applying discriminant analysis and ANOVA as additional multivariate techniques (Carter et al. 1994; Hambrick 1983; Kabanoff et al. 1995). Our discriminant analysis produced three functions with significant Wilks' lambdas ($p < 0.0001$) and more than 90 % of the cases were correctly classified. The ANOVA-based test revealed that all 16 attributes contribute to differentiating the four clusters ($p < 0.05$), which indicates that our selection of attributes supported the identification of distinct clusters. Finally, we validated the cluster solution by testing whether the clusters exhibit significant statistical differences over external variables that were not included in defining clusters (Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984). Significant differences are yielded between the four clusters across support organizations ($p < 0.001$).

Finally, we adopted a closed coding procedure to measure the principles applied in each SEO. The principles (civic, domestic, fame, industrial, inspired, and market) were taken from the theoretical framework provided by Boltanski and Thèvenot (1999, 2006). First, a categorization matrix with operational definitions of the six principles (or "orders of worth") was constructed. We closely followed Boltanski and Thévenot who use four major dimensions to define principles: paradigmatic worth, typical behavior, forms of relationship and expressions (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999, 2006). For instance, in inspired order, worth is defined by creativity and nonconformity—dreaming, imaging, and rebelling are typical behaviors; relationships are valued in terms of emotions and passion—engaging in the arts are characteristic ways of expression. In addition, we created key words for each principle to support and facilitate the coding procedure (see Appendix 3 for a detailed categorization matrix of principles).

In the second stage, SEOs texts were coded according to the six principles at work. We interrogated the text asking "which principles are applied" to classify SEOs into the six broad categories. Two coders—one of the authors and a research associate—independently coded organizations with an agreement of $\kappa = 0.83$. Discrepancies were reviewed and discussed by the authors.

Results

Issues, Target Constituencies, and Actions

Our content analysis identified 11 distinct categories of issue domains addressed by SEOs in our sample. The

---

[7] Of the hierarchical procedures, Ward's algorithm has provided superior clustering solutions over other algorithms across distinct applications (Blashfield 1976; Milligan 1980; Mojena 1977). We re-ran k-means cluster analysis using average linkage algorithm to define the initial seed and the results scarcely changed (Cohen's kappa inter-agreement = 0.76).

[8] The Calinski and Harabasz pseudo-F stopping rule index calculates the ratio of total variation between clusters versus total variation within a cluster. Larger values indicate more distinct clustering. The maximum hierarchy level was used to indicate the correct number of partitions in the data (Calinski and Harabasz 1974). Duda and Hart (1973) proposed a ratio criterion where Je(2) is the sum of the squared errors within a cluster when the data are broken into two clusters, and Je(1) provides the squared errors when one cluster exists. The rule for deciding the number of clusters is to determine the largest Je(2)/Je(1) value (0.8466) that corresponds to a low pseudo-T^2 value (10.15) and has a higher T^2 value above and below it.

classification that emerges from our inductive research process differs from the categorization schemes used by both Ashoka, which classifies social entrepreneurs into six fields of work, and the Schwab Foundation which provides 29 sector categories. See Table 1 for a complete list of categories resulting from content analysis. The most prominent categories of issue domains referred to the economic sphere (45.5 % of the SEOs in our sample), civic engagement (38.5 %), law and rights (17.5 %), and environment (15.5 %). Almost half of the SEOs in our sample tackled more than one issue (42.5 %), which discloses the multidimensional and complex nature of the problems addressed by SEOs.

The dominant categories of target constituencies included communities (21 % of all SEOs target this category), civil society organizations (CSOs) (16 %), the public (15.5 %), children (12 %), farmers (11.5 %), and women (11 %). According to our analysis, 55.5 % of the SEOs analyzed (111 cases/SEOs) focused on only one constituency category. An additional 35.5 % involved two categories, 8 % involved three constituency categories and only 1 % involved four constituency categories.

The most recurrent activities involving the target constituency included: training (59 % of all SEOs focused on training or used training as one element in their action portfolio), networking (36 %), educating (32.5 %), counseling (29 %), and lending (11 %). SEOs typically performed various activities. Our data suggest that only 28.5 % of the SEOs perform a sole action. 39.5 % perform two actions and 26.5 % perform three actions in parallel. Training often occurred in tandem with networking (18.5 % of SEOs performed this duo of actions), and also educating (18 %), counseling (11 %), and lending (7 %). As our analytical goal was to detect meaningful differences between clusters, we excluded training from the list of attributes used for cluster analysis. Training was uniformly distributed across the SEOs in our sample and typically occurred simultaneously with other activities. As previous studies have shown that the inclusion of such attributes limits the ability of clustering algorithms to derive optimal solutions (Milligan 1980), we opted for excluding this attribute.

As we conducted cluster analysis on the results of the content analysis, four different social entrepreneuring models emerged. Table 2 displays the profiles of the four types of social entrepreneuring models which are based on the dominant attributes of issue domains, constituencies targeted and actions. Because Levine's test for equality of variances showed significant differences ($p < 0.05$), we employed a Dunnett's T3 post hoc test for unequal variance to assess differences in group means. The Dunnett T3 multiple pairwise comparisons test indicated the distinguishing attributes and enabled the profiling of clusters. In

Table 1 Content analysis results

Issues[a]	
Economic	45.5 (91)
Civic engagement	38.5 (77)
Law and rights	17.5 (35)
Environment	15.5 (31)
Education	14.5 (29)
Health	11.5 (23)
Food	3.0 (6)
Housing	2.5 (5)
Technology	2.0 (4)
Culture	1.5 (3)
Family	1.0 (2)
Target constituencies[a]	
Communities	21.0 (42)
Civil society organizations	16.0 (32)
Public	15.5 (21)
Children	12.0 (24)
Farmers	11.5 (23)
Women	11.0 (22)
Youth	8.5 (17)
Families	6.5 (13)
Teachers	5.5 (11)
Disabled	5.0 (10)
Business sector	4.5 (9)
Poor	4.0 (8)
Government	3.5 (7)
Homeless	3.0 (6)
Students	2.5 (5)
Other actors	24.5 (49)
Actions[a]	
Training	59.0 (118)
Networking	36.0 (72)
Educating	32.5 (65)
Counseling	29.0 (58)
Lending	11.0 (22)
Treating medically	9.0 (18)
Supplying	9.0 (18)
Employing	7.5 (15)
Organizing	7.0 (14)
No actions	4.5 (9)
Lodging	2.0 (7)
Other actions	3.5 (4)

The percentage of projects is displayed. The number of cases is in parentheses

[a] Multiple response possible

what follows we describe and label the configuration of attributes (gestalt) that become indicators of the social entrepreneuring model adopted by an SEO.

Table 2 Profile of clusters

	Post hoc Dunnett's T3 test[†]	Political capital $n = 28$	Human capital $n = 52$	Economic capital $n = 74$	Social capital $n = 46$	F test
Issues						
Law and rights	PC > HC, EC, SC	0.96 (0.19)	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)	0.23 (0.43)	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*
Economic	EC > PC, HC, SC	0.25 (0.44)	0.06 (0.24)	1.00 (0.00)	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)	0.85 (0.36)	26.86***
Target constituencies						
CSO	PC > HC, EC	0.36 (0.49)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.16)	0.41 (0.50)	20.30***
	SC > HC, EC					
Children	PC > SC	0.25 (0.44)	0.17 (0.38)	0.09 (0.29)	0.02 (0.15)	3.63**
Public	HC > PC, EC, SC	0.14 (0.36)	0.44 (0.50)	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)	0.18 (0.38)	0.09 (0.28)	2.79*
Communities	SC > HC	0.14 (0.36)	0.12 (0.32)	0.20 (0.40)	0.37 (0.49)	3.68**
Actions						
Counseling	PC > HC, EC, SC	0.82 (0.39)	0.13 (0.34)	0.23 (0.42)	0.24 (0.43)	19.73***
Educating	HC > PC, EC, SC	0.29 (0.46)	0.67 (0.47)	0.20 (0.40)	0.15 (0.36)	16.45***
Lending	EC > PC, HC, SC	0.04 (0.19)	0.02 (0.14)	0.24 (0.43)	0.04 (0.21)	7.85***
Networking	SC > PC, HC, EC	0.32 (0.48)	0.21 (0.41)	0.24 (0.43)	0.74 (0.44)	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

Our interpretation of the four types of social entrepreneuring models, which emerged out of the cluster analysis, revealed that each model leveraged different forms of capital to achieve social change. We use the term capital in the sense of a generalized resource and with it we created stylized models of the way in which social entrepreneurs work. We propose that the four social entrepreneuring models that we identified through cluster analysis are based on four types of capital: political, human, economic, and social.

The stylized social entrepreneuring model for SEOs in *Cluster 1* addresses law and rights issues. It predominantly leverages counseling activities and targets CSOs, with children being the targeted beneficiary. In this entrepreneuring model, we observe social entrepreneurs building and leveraging *Political Capital* to bring about social change, where political capital refers to citizens' endowment, empowerment, and political identity (Sørensen and Torfing 2003) and involves the capacity to mobilize individuals around a common goal, to formulate collective policies, or be actively involved in a political party (Kauppi

2003). The Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa (IHRDA), founded by Alpha Fall and Julia Harrington, is an example of an SEO belonging to this cluster. IHRDA trains African organizations and NGOs to monitor and enforce human rights established in the African Charter and embodied in the African Commission. IHRDA not only provides pro bono legal counsel to victims of human rights violations in Africa but also aims to raise the number of African experts able to take action and bring about change at the national and Pan African levels.[9] In order to do so, the organization publishes books and legal cases on human rights laws and trials in Africa, and has created an online database for African case law. Moreover, it also organizes specialized workshops to train human rights workers on various issues and processes related to the defense of victims of human rights violations. An example of the IHRDA's work is the case it won in 2012 at the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and

---

[9] Information about the IHRDA was collected from the organization's website, http://www.ihrda.org/, and retrieved on June 27, 2012.

Welfare of the Child (ACERWC).[10] The IHRDA defended the right to nationality, as well as the equal access to health and education for children of Nubian descent in Kenya. The ACERWC ruled in favor of the IHRDA and issued recommendations to the government of Kenya to amend those violations.

SEOs in *Cluster 2* address a range of issues such as the environment, education, and health. They predominantly leverage educating activities and target the broader public. As such, we find these types of SEOs put *Human Capital* at the center of their efforts to generate social change, where human capital refers to individuals' knowledge, skills and acquired expertise. Soul City Institute for Health and Development Communication, founded by Garth Japhet, is representative of SEOs adopting a human capital entrepreneuring model of social change. Soul City, based in South Africa, is a national, multimedia "edutainment" initiative that seeks to positively impact people's lives by integrating health and development issues into serialized prime-time television programmes, radio dramas, and easy-to-read booklets. According to Soul City, the solution—making education entertaining—fosters social change because knowledge would be retained, debate stimulated and core values, such as responsibility, forgiveness, perseverance, self-control, honesty, and compassion, would be promoted.[11] To date, Soul City has produced 11 series for prime-time television in South Africa. Through these programs Soul City aims to educate its audience and thereby help address issues such as the spread of HIV and violence due to alcohol abuse.

Cluster 3 comprises SEOs that tackle economic issues such as poverty, poor working conditions, unemployment, or lack of access to markets. They target mostly farmers or women, and engage predominantly in lending actions. This type of social entrepreneuring model leverages *Economic Capital* to bring about social change, where economic capital includes money and other material resources. Honey Care Africa, founded by Farouk Jiwa, is illustrative of this social entrepreneuring model.[12] Honey Care's objective is to support development—i.e., to improve life expectancy, education and economic well-being—by revitalizing Kenya's national honey industry. Honey Care begins by providing microfinance and beekeeping training to small-holder farmers. Upon completion of the training, farmers have the option to enter into a contract with Honey Care in which they agree to sell their honey at a guaranteed price. Honey Care in turn sells this honey to finance the loans and training which it provides to other farmers. Beekeepers trained by Honey Care now work in most of Kenya and the organization collaborates with NGOs to expand its reach even further.

Finally, social entrepreneuring models represented in *Cluster 4* focus on issues related to civic engagement. They predominantly leverage networking activities and target CSOs and communities. SEOs pursuing this model rely primarily on strengthening and mobilizing *Social Capital* as a means to create social change, where social capital refers to networks of relationships through which individuals can mobilize power and resources. The Taproot Foundation, created by Aaron Hurst, is representative of SEOs grouped in the Social Capital cluster. The Taproot Foundation bridges the corporate and citizen sectors in a peer-to-peer relationship. The basic assumption is that citizen organizations do not have access to marketing, accounting, and management resources, which hampers growth and scaling. At the same time, business professionals seek to engage and contribute to their community but have difficulty finding opportunities that fit their skills. The Taproot Foundation engages business professionals pro bono, to work side-by-side with professionals in the citizen sector for the benefit of their communities.[13] An example of Taproot's work is the case of Teen Living Programs (TLP), a Chicago-based nonprofit that has been addressing teen homelessness since 1975. TLP was having trouble maintaining and augmenting its donor base and so requested assistance in building and promoting a website from Taproot. After reviewing their application, Taproot decided to put together a team of volunteers—all professionals from the business sector—who created a world-class website for TLP. The website helped educate people about the problems TLP has been addressing, as well as its achievements, which helped TLP improve the marketing and branding of its activities.

Entrepreneuring Models and Principles

In order to derive a more robust understanding of the underlying justifications for each of the four social entrepreneuring models, the identified entrepreneuring models

---

[10] The ACERWC is a committee of 11 experts appointed by the general assembly of the heads of states of the African Union (AU). These experts examine cases against nations, investigate them and decide whether there is a violation of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, which is a charter ratified by the members of the AU. This committee has no legal power, only the ability to make resolutions and declarations to the members of the AU.

[11] Information about Soul City was collected from the organization's website, http://www.soulcity.org.za/, and retrieved on June 27, 2012.

[12] Information about Honey Care was collected from the organization's website, http://www.honeycareafrica.com/, and retrieved on June 27, 2012.

[13] Information about Taproot Foundation was collected from the organization's website, http://www.taprootfoundation.org/, and retrieved on June 27, 2012.

Table 3 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 (0.41)	0.54 (0.50)	0.20 (0.40)	8.69***
Civic	SC > HC, EC	0.50 (0.51)	0.31 (0.47)	0.28 (0.45)	0.70 (0.47)	3.96**
Fame	PC > EC	0.46 (0.51)	0.44 (0.50)	0.16 (0.37)	0.20 (0.40)	6.47**
	HC > EC, SC					
Domestic	HC > EC, SC	0.04 (0.19)	0.21 (0.41)	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.	0.46 (0.51)	0.48 (0.50)	0.47 (0.50)	0.37 (0.49)	10.05***

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

were associated with Boltanski and Thèvenot's principles. In this study, patterns in the use of principles are indicative of different anchors of value used to justify social entrepreneuring models (i.e., what is valued and how judgments are made).

We used ANOVA to determine whether the clusters were associated with a specific principle. The F statistics indicate whether significant differences exist in mean values for each of the principles (Hair et al. 1998). Significant differences between clusters were observed in four out of six principles: market ($F = 10.05$; $p < 0.001$), civic ($F = 8.69$; $p < 0.001$), fame ($F = 6.47$; $p < 0.01$), and domestic ($F = 3.96$; $p < 0.01$). We also conducted post hoc Dunnett T3 multiple pairwise comparison tests to determine which cluster means were significantly different for each principle Table 3.

The occurrence of high mean values across all clusters demonstrates the pervasive use of the industrial principle of judgment in social entrepreneuring models. However, significant differences arise in the use of other principles. Our findings suggest that the Social Capital entrepreneuring model is associated with a civic principle. Value, according to this principle, is associated with the collective interest and a typical application of the civic principle is mobilizing for collective action (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999). The entrepreneuring models leveraging predominantly political and human capital exhibited elevated use of the principle of fame, in which the opinions of others are valued highly and actions include exerting influence and achieving signs of public esteem (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999). However, the human capital model can be distinguished from others using domestic principle, which values tradition, culture, family, and stability. As expected, the market principle, according to which value results from the exchange of goods and services and actions involve competing and spotting market opportunities (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999), was the key differentiator between economic

capital-based models and the others. To control for the effect of support organizations and region, we ran three-way ANOVA, and the same significant differences were again obtained.

In sum, we found that the four types of social entrepreneuring models can be associated with a different combination of dominant principles. In addition to being associated with the industrial principle, the political capital model is significantly associated with the fame principle, the human capital model with fame and domestic principles, the economic capital model with the market principle, and the social capital model with the civic principle.

The Effect of Support Organizations and Geography

We further examined the relationship between the type of social entrepreneuring model pursued and the support organizations. Cross-tabulation between Clusters and Support Organizations, displayed in Table 4, revealed that a significantly larger (z test $p < 0.01$) proportion of SEOs in the economic capital cluster were selected by the Schwab Foundation. Alternatively, SEOs from the Ashoka sample featured more prominently (z test $p < 0.05$) in the political and social capital clusters. Overall, the cross-tabulation analysis provided evidence of differences between support organizations (Cramer's $V = 0.373$; $p < 0.001$).[14] These results are reflective of the objectives and meanings of SE advocated by the two support organizations. Ashoka promotes the idea of SEOs as change agents for the public, while the Schwab Foundation associates SE more directly with business and market activities (Table 4).

---

[14] The Cramer's V is a χ^2-based measure of nominal association which assesses the association strength between two variables where 1 is a perfect relationship and 0 is no relationship. Cramer's V overcomes the requirement to fill every cell of crosstab matrix.

Table 4 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: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Finally, we examined the relationship between geography and the type of entrepreneuring model. Table 5 provides a cross-tabulation of clusters and regions of activity to determine if regional differences exist in the development of specific entrepreneuring approaches aimed at social change. Using Cramer's V index, we found no significant differences (Cramer's $V = 0.171$; sig. $= 0.291$).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to identify different social entrepreneuring models that social entrepreneurs may adopt. In contrast to previous research on SE that used in-depth case studies to support and illustrate preconceived definitions and conceptualizations of SE, we derived different models of social entrepreneuring from texts generated by social entrepreneurs themselves. In doing so, we unpacked the heterogeneity that exists in SE as a practice. Using a fine-grained analysis of social entrepreneuring models, we identified the commonalities SEOs share in a sample of 200 SEOs attempting to achieve social change.

Our analytical approach allowed us to identify different categories of issues, target constituencies, and actions that constitute the building blocks of social entrepreneuring models. In addition, our interpretation of the four clusters that we obtained enabled us to create a typology of social entrepreneuring models, which leverage different types of capital. Our findings further reveal that the four

entrepreneuring models identified are associated with different principles that act as anchors of judgment about what is valuable. In a metaphorical way, these principles represent proxies for different types of rationalities that justify the model.

Although the "SE" label is used to designate a variety of organizations, our findings suggest that these organizations have one commonality: their reliance on a principle reflecting an industrial logic of justification, which they then, respectively, combine with one or more other logics of justification. According to the industrial logic, value is based on efficiency, productivity, and operational effectiveness; and typical ways of acting are implementing tools, methods, and plans. Our findings, therefore, empirically corroborate the widely held assumption that SEOs, no matter what social entrepreneuring model they embrace, distinguish themselves from the larger population of organizations addressing social issues through their declared attachment to do so effectively *and* efficiently.

Our findings also revealed some differences across social entrepreneuring models when it comes to the logic of justification with which they are associated. Indeed, in addition to being associated with the industrial principle, the political capital model is also associated with the fame principle, the human capital model with fame and domestic principles, the social capital model with the civic principle, and the economic capital model with the market principle. This finding is particularly interesting for future empirical research that attempts to assess the performance of SEOs. As social entrepreneuring models vary in how they justify and, therefore, judge courses of action a "one variable fits all" approach to measure performance across SEOs needs to be applied with great caution.

Contributions

This study offers several contributions to the research on SE. First, it speaks to the recent momentum in entrepreneurship research and emphasizes "ways of organizing" and the "everyday unfolding" of entrepreneurship as the focus of empirical analysis (Rindova et al. 2009; Steyaert

Table 5 Clusters and regions

	Africa	Asia	Europe	North America	South America	Oceania	Total
1. Political capital	4	8	6	6	4	0	28
2. Human capital	5	12	10	9	14	2	52
3. Economic capital	10	23	5	15	21	0	74
4. Social capital	5	16	6	4	15	0	46
Total	24	59	27	34	54	2	200

Cramer's $V = 0.171$ sig., $V = 0.291$ no sig

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

and Hjorth 2006). In contrast to the popular research tra-
dition in SE on business models, which highlights the
importance of specific resources (Seelos 2013; Meyskens
et al. 2010; Seelos and Mair 2005), the research approach
we put forward centers on models of organizing and, more
explicitly, as models of how to combine issues, constitu-
encies, and activities when pursuing social change. Our
approach also differs from previous studies as we turn the
implicit assumption of more than one "rationality" guiding
and evaluating the efforts for social change into an explicit
part of our empirical analysis.

We mobilize research in economic sociology, as devel-
oped by Boltanski and Thévenot, to interpret social entre-
preneuring models based on their anchors of judgment and
value. Not surprisingly, we find heterogeneity in the ways
social entrepreneurs organize and justify their organizational
choices. This reminds us that it is the way of organizing that is
the pivotal-independent variable in research on how organi-
zations seek to impact society. As Perrow 1991 would argue,
we need to move the focus of investigation from "a society of
organizations" to a focus on "organizing for society."
Building on this line of thinking, in this study, we uncovered
different forms of "entrepreneuring for society."

In addition, by examining ways of organizing, our
typology complements existing typologies in the field of
SE. Previous efforts have emphasized motives (Spear
2006), outcomes (Neck et al. 2009), or search process
(Zahra et al. 2009) or have specifically focused on identi-
fying successful models for achieving social change
(Alvord et al. 2004; Chetkovich and Kunreuther 2007).
While this literature is very valuable from a motivational
point of view (Walsh et al. 2005), the role organizing plays
in enacting social change is largely unexplored.

Future Research Directions

Our goal with this project was to enhance our under-
standing of SE and at the same time provide fertile ground
for future research. The typology associated with types of
capital and specific anchors for judgment provides impor-
tant theoretical and empirical insights for research on SEOs
at the organizational level, as well as at the field level. At
the organizational level, it allows research to examine
trajectories of SEOs and to more explicitly examine
changes in the models SEOs adopt. It is widely recognized
that, similar to most organizations, SEOs change models in
the course of their lifetime. Also, changes in funding or
resource provision might trigger not only a change of the
model but also the underlying principles/logics of justifi-
cation. Tracking such dynamics is valuable for research at
the organizational level.

While we have identified four "basic" models of en-
trepreneuring, these models are not mutually exclusive.

Social entrepreneurs may combine two or more of these
models. Models other than the ones we identified may also
exist. Future research will need to further examine the
variety of models that social entrepreneurs use, when and
how they combine models of social entrepreneuring and
under which conditions these models are successful in
bringing about social change.

Out of the four social entrepreneuring models that we
identified, the one that leverage economic capital and
combine the industrial and market principles deserves
particular attention. Indeed, an ever increasing number of
social entrepreneurs create ventures that primarily pursue a
social mission while engaging in commercial activities
(Battilana et al. 2012). These organizations are hybrid
organizations combining aspects of the social and market
sectors (Battilana and Dorado 2010). As they are increas-
ingly regarded as a promising alternative way of producing
both social and economic value—different from typical
for-profit, not-for-profit, and public organizations (Sabeti
2011)—future research will need to analyze the conditions
under which their social entrepreneuring model is effective.
In particular, we need to understand how SEOs can adopt
such a model over time without risking giving priority to
profit seeking rather than their social mission. Because the
risk of mission drift is inherent to SEOs that adopt an
economic capital entrepreneuring model (Christen and
Drake 2002; Haight 2011; Jones 2007; Mersland and Strøm
2010; Weisbrod 2004), we need to understand the factors
that enable SEOs to remain committed to their social
mission while sustaining effective operations. The findings
of this study also have implications for understanding the
evolution of the field of social enterprise. While our study
is limited to two support organizations, future research
could include more support organizations and adopt a
longitudinal design to investigate which models and which
logics of justification are used. Tracing these patterns of
dominance and relating them to powerful field actors or
field shaping events provides a fruitful avenue to under-
stand the evolution of the field of social enterprise.

Finally, the capital perspective we used to interpret our
findings is not only theoretically relevant for future
research but also inform decision-making on the ground.
Entrepreneuring models that leverage economic capital or
human capital might address individuals or organizations
as the more direct locus of change, while the locus of
change in entrepreneuring models leveraging social capital
or political capital lies at the level of collectives or the
context. This insight can help practitioners to realistically
assess spatial and temporal aspects of change processes and
guide expectations regarding how change unfolds. Overall,
our perspective might help resource providers—be they
foundations, private donors, public authorities, banks, or
social impact investors—make more informed decisions

about which models to support, how to support them and also how to assess performance.

To conclude, this study speaks to a frequently asked question about whether SE should be an independent field of scholarly inquiry (Dacin et al. 2011; Mair and Martí 2006). We see SE as an "area of study"—an arena for scholars from a variety of different disciplines who are ultimately studying the same thing: the active role of organizations in social change processes. It is our hope that our study will stimulate further research on the mechanisms at play in achieving social change through social ventures. Our analysis helped to identify some of the building blocks of social entrepreneuring models. Future research needs to explore how and under what conditions different models can successfully be used. This should not only account for the decisions and actions of social entrepreneurs but also for the role of their support networks, the beneficiaries they target and the broader ecosystem in which they operate.

Appendix 1

Coding Process

We analyzed qualitative data (texts) and proceeded in three large stages, although we moved back and forth in an iterative and systematic process that we will detail to show how we got from the data to the findings. The reliability was calculated at the last phase of content analysis.

First Stage: Creating First-Order Codes

We interrogate SEO's texts, asking questions along three dimensions: (1) which issues are addressed, (2) who needs to be involved, and (3) how these agents of change are involved. We created categories directly from the texts by applying an open coding procedure/inductive approach. Both authors started reading texts about the 200 organizations to develop categories for the dimensions of social change. First, we used in vivo codes to facilitate identification of general code labels. The words taken from the text formed the basis for generating categories of issues, actors and actions. This stage of analysis produced 210 codes for issues, 266 codes for actors, and 69 codes for actions. Summary sheets were constructed for each dimension and a review was conducted to group codes with a clear similar meaning.

Second Stage: Grouping Codes into Higher Abstracted Categories

In the second stage, codes of each dimension were compared and related to be grouped into higher order categories. We reduced the list of codes into increasingly abstract categories. Elements that were found to be theoretically similar to previously coded elements were given the same name and were grouped into the same code. Authors met several times to discuss and brainstorm how these categories related to one another. During several meetings the tentative categories were compared, discussed and revised by the authors to reach the highest abstraction and were assigned a more abstract name. Each time provisional categories were created we went back to the texts and re-coded data to check if it fitted into the higher abstracted categories. When it did not, coders revised categories. For example, when coding which actions are performed we initially created the category "charity" to reflect the activities where actors were provided with free services such as "free eye care." However, after re-reading texts the category was dropped because it did not reflect the activity performed but rather the cost of the service. Finally, it was coded into the category of "treating medically." While cost of the service is an important variable in assessing "business" models it is not the subject of this analysis, especially since our data did not include this information for all SEOs. Disagreements with respect to the allocation of codes and the labeling were solved by discussion between the authors and consulting with experts in the field. After refining categories, a coding scheme was created with definitions, sub-categories, and examples.

Third Stage: Re-coding Original Data

At the third stage, we re-coded all the texts using the defined abstracted categories. We went back to the original text data to code texts once again with respect to the generated categories of issues, actors and actions. Any unit of text that could not be categorized with the coding scheme was given a new code and coding scheme was modified. Some categories were re-named to be comprehensive and representative of all codes. The purpose was to achieve categories mutually exclusive and exhaustive. In the final coding scheme, no data could fall into more than one category (mutually exclusive) and no data could be excluded due to the lack of suitable category (exhaustive).

For issues, we created a draft list of issues that we then refined. An issue was defined as the need or problem that concern the SE. Examples of provisional categories were "poverty," "discrimination," "illiteracy," "environment exploitation," "lack of job opportunities," or "no access to justice." We reduced this list of codes into a comprehensive

set of categories. Categories were condensed into broader ones on the basis of the domain where issues occur. By domain we mean the specific sphere of norms and structures in which the SEO operates. This criterion of aggregation facilitates the identification of the opportunity spaces where SEs are located. To illustrate, we identified at first "poverty," "lack of job opportunities," and "economic crisis" as different categories of issues addressed. In a next step of abstraction, we decided to integrate them into the single category "economic domain" because all of them share a common environment characterized by the lack/deprivation of economic incomes. This process led to the final 11 categories demarcating the variety of issues addressed by SEOs in our sample.

A similar process of reconciliation was undertaken for actors. We identified 15 distinct categories including individual and collective groups. Categories of actors that applied to <2 % of our sample were aggregated into the category "other target actors." The analysis of data revealed that SEOs used widely diverse actions to engage the actors, and nine categories of actions were identified. Action categories that applied to <2 % of the SEOs were aggregated in the category "other actions" and cases where texts did not reveal any actions were grouped into the category "no actions." We discussed and revised categories with research associates and external experts. We also validated these categories by coding an additional sample of SE text from Ashoka.

Appendix 2

Coding Schemes

Issues

Categories	Definition	Provisional categories	Codes	Example
Civic engagement	SEO responds to civic engagement issues	Failure/ inefficiency of civil society	Failure of charity, failure of civil sector organizations, inefficiency of volunteer work, inefficient civil sector organizations, there is no grass-roots movement, local conflicts among villagers	Communal rivalries and even interpersonal conflicts were expressed through spurious accusations of sympathy with the PKI. This discrimination, when combined with efforts to block any investigations into the massacres themselves, has long precluded any hopes for transparency and reconciliation (Syarikat)
		Civic disengagement	Community disengagement	
		Limited participation in civic life	Lack of participation, low democratic participation	
		Discrimination/ marginalization	Black stereotypes, blind risks, development projects don't involve community, difficult integration for prisoners, discrimination against mentally ill and drug addicts, discrimination against Roma, disempowered role of youth, ethnic conflicts, homeless children, homelessness, isolation, tribal divisions in labor force, marginalization, orphans, racial polarization, discrimination against disabled, social discrimination, structural discrimination, vulnerability of children, vulnerability of young girls, discrimination against women, discrimination within labor force, youth stereotypes	
		Failure/ noninvolvement of government	Failure of government, government cut-off in health system, government cuts off support, lack of government concern, noninvolvement of government	
		Failure of social services	Failure of children's social services, failure of social services, failure of youth social services, no access to child care	

Categories	Definition	Provisional categories	Codes	Example
Culture	SEO addresses values and culture issues	Repression of traditional values	Cultural repression, traditional culture discouraged, traumas of the past	Young people in particular suffer from a lack of cultural identity (Oficina MUSCUI)
		Contestation	Lack of cultural identity	
Economic sphere	SEO responds to economic issues	Economic crisis/ unprofitable	Agriculture collapse, agriculture underdeveloped, economic crisis, dependence on handouts, failure of industry, high debts, inefficient land use, socioeconomic devastation, uncompetitive farmers, uncompetitive producers, unprofitable because of intermediaries, unsustainable agriculture	Due to the lack of economic opportunity, many become beggars, prostitutes, collectors/scavengers or vendors of recyclable scraps (Hagar)
		No access to markets/credit unavailability	Credit unavailability, lack of economic opportunity, market void in exports, no access to credit, no access to market, noninvolvement of private sector, no access to land, lack of entrepreneurship	
		Poverty	Poverty	
		Poor working conditions	Inadequate working conditions, low working conditions, mismanagement of solid waste management, poor communication among agricultural stakeholders, uncompetitive farmers, uncompetitive producers, work exploitation	
		Unemployment/ lack of job opportunities	Agriculture collapse, lack of job opportunities, unemployment	
Education	SEO tackles educational and skill limitations	lliteracy and lack of skills	Illiteracy, lack of skills	Existing educational programs had little effect because they did not reach enough people and the information was delivered in a dry, bureaucratic manner not conducive to learning (Soul City)
		Failure/collapse of educational system	Burnout of teachers, education system collapse, failure of educational programs, failure of formal education, lack of appropriate educational programs for children	
		Limited/no access to education	Little public education, no access to formal education	
Environment	SEO responds to environmental concerns	Environment exploitation/ sustainability	Deforestation, environmental exploitation, environmental pollution, pollution, strain on natural resources, trade in wild animals, uncontrolled commercial forestry	Unfortunately, however, years of uncontrolled exploitation have left a large portion of Indonesia's coral reefs in an endangered state (Meity Mongdong)
		Lack/failure of environmental programs	Failure of environmental programs, human disconnection from nature, lack of consciousness of environmental problems, low environmental practices, mismanagement of environmental policies, mismanagement of solid waste management, failure of environmental education	
Family	SEO focuses on family relationships	Family crisis	Children run away, family crisis	The family unit in Poland suffered during the dramatic social upheaval of the 1990s (Fatherhood Center)

Categories	Definition	Provisional categories	Codes	Example
Food and Water	SEO tackles limited access to food and water	Food/water shortage	Food crisis, malnutrition, no access to water supply	Only 35 % of Nepalis have access to adequate, modern water supply systems. Even those who have benefited from these investments, including much of Kathmandu's population, often do not have reliable, safe supplies (Nepal Water Conservation)
Health	SEO tackles healthcare access and conditions	Diseases/addictions	Diseases, drugs, HIV/AIDS	Mali's citizens did not have access to sufficient health care (Mutuelle de Santé Communautaire)
		Insufficient infrastructure/ human resources in health	Dehumanization of hospitals, failure of traditional medicine, inadequate home health care, inefficiency of healthcare management, lack of delivery of health services, lack of doctors, lack of medical professional help, overcrowded public hospitals, unhygienic, no access to healthcare, unaffordable medicines for poor, lack of information on health, government cut off in health system	
Housing	SEO addresses housing access and conditions	Deficiencies in urban housing	Housing crisis, urban slums, urban sprawl	Such housing generally lacks basic infrastructure and services (Community-Based Information Network—Combine)
Law and rights	SEO addresses law access and enforcement	Lack of legal protection/human rights not enforced/ no access to justice	Failure of law enforcement, failure of previous public legal services, human rights not enforced, lack of legal protection, low legal protection of workers, can't afford lawyers, no access to justice	By engaging the legal system he demonstrates the absence of legal protection for the Roma and stimulates public discussion about civil rights (NEKI)
		No political voice/ lack of advocacy	Failure of elite women to mobilize, failure of traditional labor unions, lack of advocacy/no political voice, no access to politics	
		Violence/abuse/ criminal activities	Child abuse, domestic violence, girls forced into prostitution, human rights abuses, violence against women, violence, conflicts, corruption, mistrust of security systems, violent crime	
Technology	SEO tackles technology issues	Lack of/inadequate technology	Lack of technology, inadequate technology, limited reach of social innovations	Absence of cheap food-preservation technologies (Jariisu Jama Dema Kafoo—JJDK)

Target constituencies

Category	Definition	Codes	Example
Business sector	SEO engages private corporations	Business sector, corporations, companies, private sector	In addition, founder Safia Minney works to convince conventional companies to sell Fair Trade products and reviews their sourcing strategies (Fair Trade Company)
Communities	SEO focuses on communities	Communities	Using health as an entry point, SA began helping 16 communities to improve their lives through solar-based electrification, environmental education and access to IT (Saúde e Alegria)
Civil society organizations	SE engages civil organizations	Civil sector organizations, nonprofit organizations, voluntary organizations, NGO, local organizations	NGOs from more than 12 countries participated in the Institute's training (Institute for Human Right Development in Africa—IHRDA)

Category	Definition	Codes	Example
Children	SEO assists children	Children	The center is Lithuania's first active network of child psychology and prevention specialists (Ausra Kuriene)
Disabled	SEO assists disabled people	Disabled people, mentally disabled, physical disabled, blind people, visually impaired	Jaime's first aim is to break this vicious cycle by simultaneously making public spaces more accessible to the visually impaired (Corporacion Red Punto Vision)
Families	SEO targets families	Families	She is helping families join together to help themselves (…) Utis Buddhasud has developed a strategy that supports, educates and nurtures the family unit (Foundation for Rural Child Development)
Farmers	SEO targets agricultural workers and farmers	Farmers	Farouk Jiwa and Honey Care have revitalized Kenya's national honey industry by focusing on small-holder farmers across the country (Honey Care)
Government	SEO engages politics and government institutions	Government, policy-makers	Ajantha (…) convinced the Ministry of Cooperatives to buy waste from people in rural areas and transport it to recycling industries (Ajantha Perera)
Homeless	SEO focuses on homeless	Homeless	Mel Young founded the Homeless World Cup as an annual street soccer tournament, uniting teams of homeless people from around the world to fight poverty (Homeless World Cup)
Poor	SEO focuses on poor people	Poor people	In 1987, Tasneem Siddiqui conceived of The Khuda-ki-Basti approach because the urban poor, particularly in developing countries, cannot afford to buy "fully serviced land" (land equipped with water, sanitation and electricity) or a completed house (Saiban)
Public	SEO targets the whole population	Public	To achieve this massive national attitudinal change, RENCTAS works on three fronts. First, it raises national awareness of animal trafficking, educating the general public on this issue (Rede Nacional de Combate ao Tráfico de Animais Silvestres—RENCTAS)
Students	SEO engages students	Students, graduates	Ash and Ben have succeeded in getting their pilot Centre certified for purposes of providing law graduates with their "articles," the final step in the lawyer's qualification. (Zwane-Sambo Associates)
Teachers	SEO turns to educators	Teachers, educators	The CCE began by helping teachers to learn the active teaching method (Centre For Citizenship Education—CEE)
Women	SEO focuses on women	Women	Constance therefore sees it as her mission of sorts to use her own privilege to benefit the hundreds of thousands of women throughout Cote d'Ivoire who find themselves trapped in webs of regressive, often violent, traditions (Association for Defense of Women's Rights in Ivory—AIDF)
Youth	SEO targets young people	Youth	César's work shows that training youth to develop effective voices (Mi Cometa)
Others	Those actors involved in <2 % of the sample	Agricultural stakeholders, animals, artisans, battered women, caregivers, community leaders, doctors, drug addicts, ecosystems, educational institutions, elderly, entrepreneurs, fathers, gang leaders, garbage workers, HIV affected, independent workers, judiciary, land stakeholders, law stakeholders, marginalized, minorities, prisoners, producers, professionals, judges, rural people, scientists, unemployed, victims of crime, volunteers, war victims, widows	Novica works directly with artists and artisans to reduce the effect of the two most significant factors preventing them from earning a living from their craft and keeping traditions alive: geographic distance and multiple layers of middlemen. (Novica.com)

Actions

Category	Definition	Codes	Example
Educating	SEO provides educational services or encourages schooling	Educating, schooling, provide education, curriculum, teaching,	…to educate people on the dangers of drugs and bring into the open taboo subjects like premarital sex and conflicts between the older generation and the young (Theater Group)
Training	SEO emphasizes activities to build skills of actors	Training, skill building activities, providing vocational services, building capabilities	Swayam organizes training in types of work where there is demand for workers, including sectors that have traditionally been reserved for men such as electrical services, plumbing and horticulture (Swayam)
Networking	SEO applies methods to connect people and organizations	Networking, interlocking, linking, connecting, bridging, build relationships, exchange programs, facilitate meeting, forums, summits	With just US\$ 250,000 a year, he has been able to organize five World Summits that have brought together around 400 participants from 25 countries (World Toilet Organization)
Counseling	SEO advises and guides actors	Counseling, advising	The services Fenestra offers include crisis assistance and consultancy, counseling, legal advice and advocacy (Fenestra ZZZ)
Organizing	SEO develops management services	Managing, organizing	Gram Vikas works with the villagers to create and manage a "village corpus," a fund that draws cash and in-kind contributions from all families based on ability to pay (Gram Vikas)
Lending	SEO provides loans and financial services	Lending, provide financial services, credits, loans, financing	The mission of BASIX is to promote a critical mass of opportunities for the rural poor and attract commercial funding by proving that lending to the poor can be a viable business. (BASIX)
Treating medically	SEO provides healthcare services	Health services, provide healthcare, medical treatment	CEGIN SRL is a completely self-financed and profitable company, which offers accessibly priced health services to mothers, their children and women in poor rural areas (Centro Ginecológico Integral—CEGIN SRL).
Supplying	SEO supplies or commercializes products	Supplying, buying, selling	To date, Freeplay Energy has sold more than 4.5 million products worldwide, the largest markets by far being North America and Europe (Freeplay Energy)
Lodging	SEO provides shelter or lodgings to actors	Lodging, provide shelter	To gain access to these women—a difficult problem, given their very long workdays and scattered housing—she has decided to create a series of self-sustaining safe residential hostels (Nari Uddug Kendra—NUK)
Employing	SEO employs actors or provides jobs	Hiring, employing, provide jobs	Each year, Job Factory offers 250 unemployed young people a six-month internship in one of 15 divisions (Job Factory)
Others	Those actions performed in <2 % of the sample	Certifying, building houses, provide security services, provide translation, editing services, collecting waste materials	They recognize demonstrated growth in student achievement with RISE Rewards, certificates that teachers can redeem for a wide range of classroom supplies (Resources for Indispensable Schools and Educators—RISE)

Appendix 3

Categorization Matrix

Principles

Principles	Worth	Typical Behavior	Relationship	Expressions	Key Words
Civic	Collective interest	Mobilizing people for a collective action	Common interest, solidarity	Cooperatives, federations, assemblies	Citizenship Collaboration Community approach Cooperative Participatory Representative Unity: cohesion
Domestic	Trust and respect for tradition, hierarchy and kinship	Preserving and reproducing	Kinship, face-to-face	Household, customs, habits	Culture Family: home Stability Tradition
Fame	Public opinion, opinion of others	Influencing, sensitizing and achieving signs of public esteem	Recognition	Press conferences, media campaigns	Campaign dissemination Media Public opinion Publishing Raise awareness
Industrial	Efficiency, productivity and operational effectiveness	Implementing tools, methods and plans	Functional, standardized, measurable	Organization	Efficiency Experts Functional Method: standardize Organization: management Productive Professionalize
Inspired	Creativeness, nonconformity	Dreaming, imagining and rebelling	Emotional, passion	Arts	Arts Dreams Games Innovation: creativity Wealth: profits Valuable: salable
Market	Mediation of scarce goods and services; price serves as a mechanism to evaluate these scarce goods	Competing and spotting market opportunities	Exchange, competitive	Salable and marketable things	Commercial Competitive Income-generation Ownership

Boltanski and Thévenot (2006, pp. 159–210) argue that there is a plurality of modes of justification. People justify situations appealing to principles or "orders of worth". Justifications fall into these six main principles

References

Aldenderfer, M. S., & Blashfield, R. K. (1984). *Cluster analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Alvord, A. S., Brown, D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 40*(3), 260–282.

Austin, J., Wei-Skillern, J., & Stevenson, H. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 30*, 1–22.

Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*, 1419–1440.

Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*(1), 65–107.

Battilana, J., Lee, M., Walker, J., & Dorsey, C. (2012). In search of the hybrid ideal. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 10*(3), 51–55.

Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. W. (1998). Text analysis: Qualitative and quantitative methods. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology* (pp. 595–645). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Biggart, N. W., & Beamish, T. D. (2003). The economic sociology of conventions: Habit, custom, practice, and routine in market order. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*(1), 443–464.

Blashfield, R. K. (1976). Mixture model tests of cluster analysis: Accuracy of four agglomerative hierarchical methods. *Psychology Bulletin, 83*, 377–388.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1999). The sociology of critical capacity. *European Journal of Social Theory, 2*(3), 359–377.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Calinski, T., & Harabasz, J. (1974). A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications in Statistics, 3*, 1–27.

Carter, N. M., Stearns, T. M., Reynolds, P. D., & Miller, B. A. (1994). New venture strategies: Theory development with an empirical base. *Strategic Management Journal, 15*(1), 21–41.

Chetkovich, C., & Kunreuther, F. (2007). *From the ground up: Grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Christen, R. P., & Drake, D. (2002). Commercialization. The new reality of microfinance. In D. Drake & E. Rhyne (Eds.), *The commercialization of microfinance, balancing business and development*. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.

Christensen, C. M., Baumann, H., Ruggles, R., & Sadtler, T. (2006). Disruptive innovation for social change. *Harvard Business Review, 84*(12), 94–101.

Cleaver, F. (2005). The inequality of social capital and the reproduction of chronic poverty. *World Development, 33*(6), 893–906.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science, 22*(5), 1203–1213.

Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2006). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: building on two schools of practice and thought. *ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series, 1*(3), 39–66.

Di Domenico, M., Tracey, P., & Haugh, H. (2009). The dialectic of social exchange: Theorizing corporate–social enterprise collaboration. *Organization Studies, 30*(8), 887–907.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Mullen, A. L. (2000). Enacting community in progressive America: Civic rituals in National Music Week, 1924. *Poetics, 27*(1), 135–162.

Dorado, S. (2006). Social entrepreneurial ventures: Different values so different process of creation, no? *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 11*(4), 319–343.

Drayton, W. (2002). The citizen sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business. *California Management Review, 44*(3), 120–132.

Duda, R. O., & Hart, P. E. (1973). *Pattern classification and scene analysis*. New York: Wiley.

Durand, R., Rao, H., & Monin, P. (2007). Code and conduct in French cuisine: Impact of code changes on external evaluations. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(5), 455–472.

Elkington, J., & Hartigan, P. (2008). *The power of unreasonable people: How social entrepreneurs create markets that change the world*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fiss, P. C. (2007). A set-theoretic approach to organizational configurations. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1180–1198.

Fowler, A. (2000). Ngdos as a moment in history: Beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly, 21*(4), 637–654.

Frumkin, P. (2002). *On being nonprofit*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gersick, C. J. G., Bartunek, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1026–1044.

Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 58–80.

Haight, C. (2011). The problem with fair trade coffee. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 3*, 74–79.

Hair, J. E., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hambrick, D. C. (1983). An empirical typology of mature industrial-product environments. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(2), 213–2302.

Henriques, I., & Sadorsky, P. (1999). The relationship between environmental commitment and managerial perceptions of stakeholder importance. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(1), 87–99.

Jones, M. B. (2007). The multiple sources of mission drift. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(2), 299–307.

Kabanoff, B., Waldersee, R., & Cohen, M. (1995). Espoused values and organizational change themes. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(4), 1075–1104.

Kauppi, N. (2003). Bourdieu's political sociology and the politics of European integration. *Theory and Society, 32*(5), 775–789.

Ketchen, J. D. J., & Shook, C. L. (1996). The application of cluster analysis in strategic management research: An analysis and critique. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*(6), 441–458.

Ketchen, J. D. J., Thomas, J., & Snow, C. (1993). Organizational configurations and performance: A comparison. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(6), 1278–1313.

Locke, K. (2001). *Grounded theory in management research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 36–44.

Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. In J. Mair, et al. (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121–135). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Margolis, J. D., & Molinsky, A. (2008). Navigating the bind of necessary evils: Psychological engagement and the production of interpersonally sensitive behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(5), 847–872.

Marshall, S. R. (2011). Conceptualizing the international for-profit social entrepreneur. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98*, 183–198.

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 1*, 29–39.

Mersland, R., & Strøm, R. Ø. (2010). Microfinance mission drift? *World Development, 38*(1), 28–36.

Meyer, A. D., Tsui, A. S., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(6), 1175–1195.

Meyskens, M., Robb-Post, C., Stamp, J. A., Carsrud, A. L., & Reynolds, P. D. (2010). Social ventures from a resource-based perspective: An exploratory study assessing global Ashoka fellows. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 661–680.

Milligan, G. W. (1980). An examination of the effect of six types of error perturbation on fifteen clustering algorithms. *Psychometrika, 45*(3), 325–342.

Milligan, G. W., & Cooper, M. C. (1985). An examination of procedures for determining the number of clusters in a data set. *Psychometrika, 50*(2), 159–179.

Mohr, J. W., & Guerra-Pearson, F. (2010). The duality of niche and form: The differentiation of institutional space in New York City, 1888–1917. In G. Hsu, O. Kocak, & G.Negro (Eds.) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (pp. 321–368). Volume Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution. Emerald Press.

Mojena, R. (1977). Hierarchical grouping methods and stopping rules: An evaluation. *Computer Journal, 20*(4), 359–363.

Murphy, J. P., & Coombes, M. S. (2009). A model of social entrepreneurial discovery. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*, 325–336.

Neck, H., Brush, C., & Allen, E. (2009). The landscape of social entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons, 52*, 13–19.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 34*(4), 611–633.

Perrow, C. (1991). A society of organizations. *Theory & Society, 20*, 725–762.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review, 29*(4), 635–652.

Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social entrepreneurship leadership. *Career Development International, 4*(3), 140–145.

Punj, G., & Stewart, D. W. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research, 20*(2), 134–148.

Rao, H., & Giorgi, S. (2006). Code breaking: How entrepreneurs exploit cultural logics to generate institutional change. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 27*, 269–304.

Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen, J. D. (2009). Entrepreneuring as emancipation. *Academy of Management Review, 34*(3), 477–491.

Sabeti, H. (2011). The for-benefit enterprise. *Harvard Business Review* November (Schwab Foundation, N.D.: 'Five Year Evaluation Report: 2000–2005', 07 April 2010).

Seelos, C. (2013). Theorizing and strategizing with models: Generative models of social enterprises. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing, 5*(5) (forthcoming).

Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons, 48*(3), 241–246.

Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2007). Profitable business models and market creation in the context of deep poverty: A strategic view. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(4), 49–63.

Seelos, C., Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Dacin, T. (2011). The embeddedness of social entrepreneurship: Understanding variation across local communities. In C. Marquis, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood (Eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. Communities and Organizations (vol. 33, pp. 333–363). Emerald Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 3*(2), 161–194.

Short, J. C., Payne, G. T., & Ketchen, J. D. J. (2008). Research on organizational configurations: Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 34*(6), 1053–1079.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2003). Network politics, political capital, and democracy. *International Journal of Public Administration, 26*(6), 609–634.

Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A different model? *International Journal of Social Economics, 33*(5), 399–410.

Stark, D. (2009). The sense of dissonance: Accounts of worth in economic life. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Steyaert, C., & Hjorth, D. (2006). *Entrepreneurship as social change*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. W. (1993). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society, 22*, 487–512.

Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1996). The institutionalization of institutional theory. In S. R. Clegg, et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 175–190). London: SAGE.

Van de Ven, A. H., Sapienza, H. J., & Villanueva, J. (2007). Entrepreneurial pursuit of self-and-collective interests. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1*, 353–370.

Vasi, I. B. (2009). New heroes, old theories? Toward a sociological perspective on social entrepreneurship. In R. Ziegler (Ed.), *An Introduction to social entrepreneurship: Voices, preconditions, contexts* (pp. 155–173). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Waddock, S. A., & Post, E. J. (1991). Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change. *Public Administration Review, 51*(5), 393–401.

Walsh, J. P., Kress, J. C., & Beyerchen, K. W. (2005). Book review essay: Promises and perils at the bottom of the pyramid. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*(3), 473–482.

Weisbrod, B. (2004). The pitfalls of profits. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2*(3), 40–47.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing, 24*(5), 519–532.