

Where Change Happens: Community-Level Phenomena in Social Entrepreneurship Research

by G. T. Lumpkin, Sophie Bacq, and Robert J. Pidduck

Social entrepreneurship (SE) research has advanced understanding of the dynamics and processes underlying positive social change. Yet only scant attention has been paid to where that change happens. We suggest that a community level of analysis is essential for understanding the extra-organizational settings implied by the “social” in “social entrepreneurship.” We adopt a UNESCO-inspired community typology including geographical communities, communities of interest or solidarity, communities of identity, and intentional communities as an organizing framework. Relying on a wealth creation perspective, we evaluate the social change that takes place by assessing four different types of capital created within communities—physical capital, financial capital, human capital, and social capital. Based on a review of 57 peer-reviewed journals and 8 leading case study outlets, we find that examples of all four community types and all four capital types are evident in the SE literature. We discuss the implications of the community as a locus of SE activity and capital as an indicator of social impact in future research.

Introduction

The term social entrepreneurship (SE) is widely used and its prevalence in pedagogy, scholarship, and practice has grown substantially over the 40 years since the term was first popularized (Bornstein 2007). Though a great deal of progress has been made by entrepreneurship and management researchers in characterizing and understanding SE, it seems that advances in understanding SE have been uneven, reflecting only part of the SE reality (Nicholls 2010). For example, numerous studies published in top-tier journals have investigated the organizational arrangements surrounding SE activities (e.g.,

Battilana, Besharov, and Mitzinneck 2017; Battilana and Dorado 2010; Pache and Santos 2013), but far fewer studies have focused on delineating and assessing the impact¹ of SE (Young 2006).

A key question with regard to impact is the locus of SE activity. The “social” in “social entrepreneurship” is indicative of actions intended to benefit society more so than organizations. In other words, the social impact created by SE is best captured at the societal level rather than the organizational level because the social missions of most SE initiatives are typically extra-organizational, that is, they extend beyond

G. T. Lumpkin is C. S. Trosper Chair and Professor of Entrepreneurship at the Division of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma.

Sophie Bacq is Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship and Innovation at D’Amore-McKim School of Business at Northeastern University in Boston.

Robert J. Pidduck is a doctoral student at the Division of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma.

Address correspondence to: G. T. Lumpkin, Division of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma, 307 West Brooks, Norman, OK 73019. E-mail: lumpkin@ou.edu.

¹In this manuscript, we use the terms “impact,” “social impact,” “change,” and “social change” interchangeably.

organizations and their members. As such, it can be argued that a societal or, more precisely, a community level of analysis is the most suitable for assessing the social impact of SE activities. Most SE projects begin small and are aimed at addressing conditions in a particular community or locale. However, despite the fact that making positive social changes is the driving force behind the emergence and flourishing of the SE phenomenon (Stephan, Patterson, Kelly, and Mair 2016), taking stock of the impact of SE initiatives at community and societal levels has tended to be overlooked by entrepreneurship and management scholars researching SE.

Why have community- and societal-level impacts been investigated relatively more rarely in SE research? One reason is that entrepreneurship- and management-related fields have a long-standing research tradition of focusing primarily on individual, group, and organizational-level phenomena and outcomes (Walsh, Weber, and Margolis 2003). As a result, SE researchers trained in the fields of entrepreneurship and management are less experienced investigating extra-organizational, community-, or societal-level impacts. Another reason is that the impact of SE initiatives is difficult to measure. Despite substantial progress in measurement techniques of noneconomic outcomes and phenomena not easily monetized (Cohen, Smith, and Mitchell 2008) and allowing for comparison across socio-economic and institutional contexts (Kroeger and Weber 2014), societal-level impact measures are often unfamiliar to entrepreneurship and management researchers (Short, Moss, and Lumpkin 2009). Thus, even though entrepreneurship researchers, comparatively, have studied a wider array of outcomes (Davidsson and Wiklund 2007), community- and societal-level entrepreneurship studies remain quite limited.

Although community-level phenomena may not be emphasized in extant SE research, there is clear evidence from a handful of scholarly articles and case studies that SE activity is concentrated at the community level (e.g., Haugh 2007; Mair, Wolf, and Seelos 2016; Peredo and Chrisman 2006). The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to, (1) highlight SE research that has investigated community-level phenomena and specify the types of communities where SE activity is focused, beyond the geographically proximate meaning of the term; and (2) characterize the nature of community-level outcomes that SE researchers are investigating. To do so, we first review a broad selection of the SE

literature and use a community typology informed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) that classifies communities in terms of geography, identity, interest, and intention. Doing so, we provide researchers with a framework for designing studies that explicate the locus of SE phenomena and address community-level impacts of SE initiatives.

Next, we characterize the types of community-level outcomes which SE researchers are examining by relying on a wealth creation perspective (Lumpkin and Bacq 2013). This approach parallels that of Zahra and colleagues, who argue that “total wealth” best characterizes the combination of social and economic wealth referred to in SE research because it accounts for both tangible economic dimensions (e.g., products, clients served, material gains) and intangible social dimensions (e.g., well-being, health, and happiness) of wealth creation (Zahra et al. 2009, p. 522). Wealth creation is commonly associated with entrepreneurship and often reflects stocks of capital such as assets, resources, human capabilities, and technology. Therefore, in assessing community-level SE outcomes, we focus on four types of capital that SE initiatives are intended to create—physical capital, financial capital, human capital, and social capital. This approach contributes to the SE literature by acknowledging that the many forms that wealth creation takes in an SE context can be characterized by utilizing a familiar and parsimonious typology of capital that includes both pecuniary and nonpecuniary benefits emerging from efforts to bring about positive social change.

The paper proceeds as follows. Next, we elaborate on community and its four types, and then propose a wealth creation perspective that can be assessed using four types of capital. Then, we describe our methodology for identifying empirical SE studies focused on different types of community settings and analyze their take-aways. We conclude by discussing implications, limitations, and future research opportunities related to community-level phenomena in SE research.

Background and Literature Review

Types of Community

The term “community” has widespread implications across many disciplines including

sociology, economics, anthropology, and political science. Each of these traditions has its own approach to defining and operationalizing the notion of community and community-level activity. For example, sociological examinations identify a community as tied to a specific locality, with its own social activities, a form of social structure, and an overarching collective sentiment (Clark 1973). Similarly, economic studies of community place an importance on geographical location but also distinguish between micro- and macro-level forms of community dynamics (Grootaert and Van Bastelaer 2002). Anthropological perspectives on community are closely intertwined with culture and center on examining variations in customs, belief structures, and institutions across locations (Igoe 2006). The definition of community in political science research provides tighter boundaries in that it is often conceptualized as groups of citizens participating in activities linked to institutions of law by jurisdiction or local municipalities (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995).

This range of interpretations suggests that the notion of community may defy simple definition. On the one hand, lack of a common definition may be viewed as an impediment to developing a common body of knowledge. On the other hand, a cross-disciplinary interpretation of the construct provides it with an eclecticism that may have utility for SE researchers given the wide range of settings and situations where SE solutions are being initiated and intended for. Indeed, a cursory look at the SE literature reveals elements of several approaches to defining community. For example, Peredo and Chrisman (2006) refer to “community-based enterprises” as a form of organization rooted in local culture that harnesses both community member relationships and assets to improve sustainable economic development in poor populations. An SE study in the nonprofit literature (Heinze, Banaszak-Holl, and Babiak 2016) refers to community-based interventions that leverage collaborations among community actors to change the status quo—for example, improving the health of populations. Such collaborative, community-based processes substantially differ from the market-oriented enterprising processes described by Peredo and Chrisman (2006). Conversely, Haugh (2007) addresses community as a motivating factor for individuals who launch social ventures to fill the gaps in social needs that open between what is provided by the

public sector and what is offered by private enterprises. In such cases, individuals’ motivation to help the community to which they belong can become a driver of idea articulation and entrepreneurial action.

To represent the variety of community types that are found in the SE literature, we rely on an organizing framework that enables us to capture major community components in a comprehensive yet parsimonious fashion. Inspired by the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (www.uil.unesco.org), this framework draws from four major conceptualizations of community in the wider organizational literature. In particular, this framework captures various manifestations of social engagement across four types of communities: geographical community (e.g., Marquis and Battilana 2009), community of identity (e.g., Hsu and Hannan 2005; Ruef 2000), community of interest or solidarity (e.g., Cummings, Sproull, and Kiesler 2002), and intentional community (e.g., Adler, Kwon, and Heckscher 2008; Dahlander and Wallin 2006). In the following four subsections, we provide definitions of each community type and brief examples of how they are found in the SE literature.

Geographical Community. Conceptualizations of communities generally imply geographical and proximal connotations (Marquis and Battilana 2009; Peredo and Chrisman 2006). The idea of geographical community refers to “a local level of analysis corresponding to the populations, organizations, and markets located in a geographical territory and sharing, as a result of their common location, elements of local culture, norms, identity, and laws” (Marquis and Battilana 2009, p. 286). As the form of community on which there is most agreement across the literature, geographical communities have distinct boundaries such as formal borders or naturally occurring demarcations and often coincide with other types of community such as socioeconomic, ethnic, or religious groups. Frank and Shockley (2016) refer to the importance of geographical proximity in understanding the community in that “local owners know their community better than a distant, centralized authority” (p. 2). Additionally, Stephan and colleagues (2016) suggest that geographical community illustrating a distinct location can be important when examining contextual factors stimulating positive social change such as “revitalized deprived neighborhoods, improved educational attainment, reduced community

violence” (p. 4). Indeed, geographical location may be associated with *de facto* exclusion (from infrastructure, from better school systems, etc.) and resulting marginalization. Overall, most SE research examining community-level phenomena—scholarly articles and case studies alike—refers to “community” in terms of the physical location in which the SE initiative is based (Johannisson 1990). Yet other community types are relevant when it comes to examining SE.

Community of Identity. A community characterized by identity contains commonly identifiable features in relation to a shared culture or shared ethnic heritage (e.g., language, music, ethics, consumer subcultures) (Hsu and Hannan 2005; Ruef 2000). In line with social identity theory that defines an individual’s identity by his/her membership in social categories or groups, including nationality, sports teams, or religious affiliation (Tajfel and Turner 1979), an individual derives value and emotional significance from his/her group identification by perceiving a sense of oneness with other members of the group (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail 1994) or, in this case, the community. Though such group membership engenders meaning, belonging, and positive distinctiveness (Hogg and Terry 2014; Whetten and Mackey 2002), the members of a community of identity reciprocally support and strengthen the group (Ashforth and Mael 1989).

As a result, members of communities of identity may actively search to identify with it. For example, identities can emerge around consumer subcultures such as micro-breweries whereby individuals buy into the community as a form of self-expression (Hsu and Hannan 2005). Alternatively, membership could be formed on the basis of sharing a core identifier of the group. For instance, a study of Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISEs) in Poland illustrates a focus on a community of “persons who have been long-term economically inactive” (Rymsza 2015, p. 835). Tracey and Phillips (2016) report the study of a U.K.-based SE initiative focused on helping a group of ethnic migrants by changing British people’s negative views on this community. These examples illustrate that a community of identity can include members who are part of it on account of their circumstances.

Community of Interest or Solidarity. Communities based on interest or solidarity are

centered on areas of specific concern such as minority-group rights or equal access to public goods (e.g., clean air and other environmental goods). As a result, a community of interest or solidarity may be large in potential scope as it contains individuals bonding together over a particular issue of interest or kinship concurrently in different geographical spaces (Peredo and Chrisman 2006). As such, members of a community of interest may feel connected to the social issue at a local and/or global level. For example, microfinance that tackles the issue of financial exclusion could be framed as a locally bound community of interest, taking action “to alleviate poverty by providing small, unsecured loans to local indigent entrepreneurs” (Sun and Im 2015, p. 101), or as a global one, which is the approach taken by the large microfinance social enterprises such as ACCION or Opportunity International. Tracey and Jarvis’s (2007) study of the U.K.-based social venture, *Aspire*, shows that it was common interest in alleviating homelessness via employment that formed the impetus for its creation.

Moreover, by not necessarily being bound by local geography, SE initiatives can also form to assuage particular widespread globally relevant issues, such as the state of the natural environment. For example, Bagnoli and Megali (2011) examine the case of *Ulisse*, a community-based enterprise that sprung out of a shared concern for the cleanliness of the environment. This shared concern cultivated a community of interest which then enabled the venture to launch a range of seemingly unrelated services—including a bulk waste collection service and bike rental service—that were linked by their positive impact on the natural environment.

Intentional Community. Intentional communities are defined by the methods in which its members participate. Intentional communities differ from those based on interest or solidarity in that they are initiated and engaged in by people for their own purposes who are in a position to provide help and support to each other. Specifically, individuals who form intentional communities come together voluntarily to support each other as they face the same issue, condition, or situation (e.g., professional networking groups or self-help groups). An example of intentional community is the Hong Kong-based Community Growers Group which focuses on sharing best farming practices. The intention of this community initiative was to provide technical assistance

and organic agronomy advice to local farmers (Ip and Wong 2009).

Within intentional communities, the level of commitment and intensity can vary significantly. An example of low commitment communities might be play groups at the neighborhood park for mothers with young children, or study groups organized by students or learning enthusiasts. More substantially high commitment examples might be intentional living communities such as the Israeli kibbutz whereby members voluntarily join and subscribe to specific ways of living (Helman 1992). For reaching SE goals more effectively, Drayton (2002) suggests the importance “to build a community where its leading practitioners can come together...” (p. 124), further highlighting the instrumental reasons and voluntary actions supporting an intentional community. With regard to instrumentality, intentional communities can also coalesce around particular activities, such as worship in religious groups or reading in book clubs (Pitzer et al. 2014).

Given the wide array of motivations, objectives and community types that underlie the spectrum of SE initiatives (Roper and Cheney 2005), it is no surprise that there are many perspectives on what constitutes community-level social impact across SE research. In the next section, we argue that the positive social change outcomes that result from SE initiatives can be captured by assessing different types of capital—physical, financial, human, and social—that are created *in* the various communities where SE activities take place.

Total Wealth, Capital, and SE Outcomes

To gain new insights and a deeper understanding of community-level phenomena in SE research, and consistent with the field of entrepreneurship (Hitt et al. 2001), we adopt a wealth creation perspective. Following Mair and Martí (2006) and Zahra and colleagues (2009) who highlight the importance of both social wealth and economic wealth creation in understanding the impact of SE, we use a broad conceptualization of the term “wealth,” which suggests the notion of aggregated resources and cumulative endowments, both tangible and intangible. Such a “total wealth” perspective is consistent with the original meaning of the term wealth, and inclusive of intangible outcomes such as well-being, good fortune, happiness, and prosperity (Thompson and MacMillan 2010; Venkataraman 2002; Zahra and Wright 2016). As an example, recent family business research

highlights “socioemotional wealth” as the affective, noneconomic sense of fulfillment that comes from identifying with and sharing the values of a family system (Berrone, Cruz, and Gómez-Mejía 2012).

As evidence of the aggregated resources and cumulative endowments suggested by a total wealth perspective, both pecuniary and nonpecuniary, we propose to conceptualize the community-level outcomes of SE initiatives in terms of the capital that they create. By focusing on the stocks of capital—physical, financial, human, and social—that accrue to a community as a consequence of SE activity, we are able to capture both tangible and intangible forms of wealth.

We often think of capital in terms of its role as a factor of production or an input or means for creating wealth. In this context, by contrast, our focus is on capital as an outcome—the results of SE efforts to add to a community’s resources and endowments. Our analysis focuses on four types of capital that capture the wealth that might result from SE activities: physical capital, which refers to hard assets such as manufactured goods and agricultural produce, and resources such as buildings and equipment; financial capital including income from commercial activity and other efforts to secure funding; human capital, which refers to the capabilities and skills of individuals as a result of knowledge, education and experience; and social capital that arises from enhancing a community’s networks of interactions or fostering structural changes that enhance relationships. We review these notions of capital in more detail later and provide examples of how they translate within communities affected by SE activity in the next subsections.

Physical Capital. Inherent in the idea of geographical community is the land that the community occupies, and its natural resources. These elements are classified as physical capital, along with the buildings and other structures on the land, and the machinery, equipment, furniture, inventory and other “hard” assets present in the community (Audretsch and Keilbach 2004; Samuelson and Nordhaus 2004). These resources, even when they are privately owned, represent the physical wealth of a community. SE activity often leverages, enhances or adds to a community’s physical capital. Examples of physical capital associated with SE projects include refurbishing a building or constructing a new one for use as a community center, providing

medical equipment that is used to treat children in a neighborhood health center (Rangan 2004), installing systems that provide clean drinking water in remote areas (Nwankwo, Phillips, and Tracey 2007), and supplying smallholder farmers with asset-based financing of agricultural tools to reduce hunger and poverty (One Acre Fund; Santos, Pache, and Birkholz 2015).

Financial Capital. Financial capital typically refers to cash resources but may also include stocks, bonds, receivables, promissory notes, and other assets that can be converted to cash. In terms of generating financial capital, SE initiatives fall into two related categories. The first involves the economic empowerment of community members through commercial SE ventures that generate revenues and transfer some of that pecuniary wealth to the community in which they are active. An example from India is Aakar Innovations, a venture created by two villagers to economically empower rural women by employing them to produce—and then sell for a personal profit—low-cost, high-quality sanitary pads, thus addressing an urgent but culturally taboo women’s health problem. Microfinance is another well-known SE initiative that exists to provide financial capital to communities and their members through loans that generate income for their users. Indeed, by providing local indigenous entrepreneurs access to financial capital in the form of small loans, microfinance provides them with opportunities to transform such capital into goods or services that they can sell for a profit (Sun and Im 2015). As a result, profitable entrepreneurs benefit from higher disposable income and financial wealth.

A second type concentrates on creating economic self-sufficiency for the community through SE. Community nonprofit organizations often launch earned-income strategies or innovative funding strategies primarily as a means to generate financial resources, bolster the community economically, and lower dependence on donations and grants (Chell 2007). Drawing on fewer grant/donation dollars leaves more funding for the benefit of the community at large. In some cases, finally, the goals of empowerment and self-sufficiency are combined. Greyston Bakery, with the motto “We don’t hire people to bake brownies, we bake brownies to hire people,” employs homeless people to operate a for-profit bakery (Greyston Bakery 2017; Wilburn and Wilburn 2014).

Human Capital. Human capital refers to the collective cognitive abilities that arise in individuals as a result of their knowledge, education, and experience (Becker 1964; Davidsson and Honig 2003). As such, some SE initiatives focus on enhancing human capital to build capabilities that benefit both individuals and communities (Weaver 2016). An example of such an initiative is Sowers Action, an SE venture in rural China that aims to develop new skills and to “turn the huge population burden into a pool of intellectual and productive resources” (Wong, Chung, and Wang 2009, p. 1). A similar example is found in Europe where WISEs provide training that enables disadvantaged and disabled people to enter the workforce (Rymysza 2015). In general, the human capital of a community is increased by SE efforts that provide skills training, extend formal education, arrange managerial experience, and increase exposure to entrepreneurial practices that promote self-sufficiency (Bates 1990).

Social Capital. Social capital is defined as “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam 1995, p. 2). One of the key challenges that communities face when trying to enact positive social change is coalescing and building consensus around ways and means for tackling social problems. As a result, some SE initiatives focus on helping communities with various types of capacity building for more effective social interactions. Such efforts address both bridging (external) and bonding (internal) forms of social capital. Within social groups, active participation in community networks induces collective learning (Nga and Shamuganathan 2010) and illustrates how bonding social capital is generated. Proactive interactions across the various constituents of a community, such as collaborations of scientists toward eradicating a global disease (Grossman and Ross 2010a), is an example of bridging social capital. According to Borch and colleagues, SE initiatives that generate social capital often help “facilitate cooperative entrepreneurial action” (Borch et al. 2008, p. 1).

By zeroing-in on four types of communities and four types of capital that might be harnessed or produced by SE efforts in those communities, we frame our investigation of the SE literature in a fashion that reveals evidence of “where” SE happens (community, broadly construed), and of

positive (or negative) social change (capital creation) at a community-level of analysis. Although capital generated through SE efforts may subsequently be *captured* at varying degrees by specific individuals (micro-level) or regions (macro-level), we propose that the nucleus of value *created* by SE activity lies predominately at the community-level. We turn next to our methodology and our review of scholarly articles and case studies, and our findings.

Methodology

The purpose of this paper is to advance understanding of SE research by identifying the various perspectives on community that are found in the SE literature, and characterizing community-level outcomes in terms of capital created. To do so, we examined the prevalence of four types of community and four types of capital evident in SE research, and explored their commonalities and differences among SE studies.

As the purpose of this paper is to advance understanding on the various perspectives and conceptualizations of community and community-level outcomes in SE research—as opposed to provide a formal review article per se—we conducted two complementary searches: one within peer-reviewed scholarly articles, which we supplemented with a second search of SE case studies designed to capture alternative perspectives of SE phenomena.

To begin, we searched within the 43 scholarly journals identified by Battilana, Besharov, and Mitzinneck (2017) as being important to SE research.² We then supplemented this list by including *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Small Business Management*, and *International Small Business Journal*, which we thought were important to

include in this analysis. Finally, we add to our search list nine other journals which Moss, Lumpkin, and Short (2010) identified as having published at least a modest amount of SE articles: *Business Strategy Review*, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, *International Journal of Public Administration*, *International Journal of Social Economics*, *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, *Journal of World Business*, *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, and *Public Administration Review*. As a result, we conducted our structured literature search in 57 peer-reviewed journals.

During the search process, we used the electronic databases ABI/INFORM global database and Web of Science, and the following search keywords: “social entrepreneur” OR “social entrepreneurship” OR “social enterprise” OR “social venture” OR “social business” AND “community.” Our scholarly journals search generated 49 peer-reviewed articles.

To extend our understanding and grasp the meaning(s) of community-level phenomena among practitioners, we also conducted a search of SE business cases. We restricted our search to the following eight leading case series and publishers: *Asia Case Research Center*, *Darden School of Business Case*, *Harvard Business School Case*, *IIESE Business School Case*, *Ivey Business School Case*, *Kellogg School of Management Case*, *SEKN (Social Enterprise Knowledge Network) Case*, and *Stanford Business School*. Our search, using the same keywords, yielded 54 business cases. The 49 peer-reviewed scholarly articles and the 54 case studies are listed in the reference list, preceded by an asterisk.

We then followed the same coding procedures for both the peer-reviewed scholarly articles and the case studies. First, we placed each of them in the relevant community and

²The journals included in Battilana, Besharov, and Mitzinneck's (2017) structured literature search are the following: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Annals*, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *American Behavioral Scientist*, *Organization Science*, *Management Science*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Studies*, *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, *Harvard Business Review*, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *California Management Review*, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *Voluntas*, *World Development*, *Development*, *Global Governance*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *Ethics*, *Journal of Applied Ethics*, *Episteme*, *Business History Review*, *Business History*, *Enterprise and Society*, *Human Relations*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *American Review of Public Administration*, *Public Administration*, *Public Organization Review*.

Table 1a
Community Focus in SE Research

Community Types	Articles	Cases
Geographical community	30 (61 percent)	27 (50 percent)
Community of identity	8 (16 percent)	4 (7 percent)
Community of interest or solidarity	10 (20 percent)	18 (34 percent)
Intentional community	4 (8 percent)	5 (9 percent)

capital categories. As these categories are not mutually exclusive, a focal article or case study could be placed in multiple categories of community or capital. For example, in a study on institutional entrepreneurship in the emerging field of HIV/AIDS treatments, Macguire, Hardy, and Lawrence (2004) examine the HIV/AIDS community but also discuss the SE efforts aimed at the geographical area in which the patients lived. Accordingly, we classified Macguire, Hardy, and Lawrence's (2004) article in both community of interest and geographical community. In addition, some articles or cases referred to multiple forms of capital as an outcome of SE activity. For instance, Khoja and Lutafali (2008) examine the Grameen Bank and the Self-Employed Women Association and find that economic and sociocultural developments were key achievements, thereby highlighting the generation of both financial and social capital as outcomes of the SE initiatives.

Next, we proceeded to a descriptive statistical analysis of the repartition of scholarly articles and case studies across types of communities and types of capital. Finally, we selected exemplary quotes that best capture the conceptualizations of each type of community and community-level outcomes found in the SE literature, and the types of capital created. To comprehensively illustrate those conceptualizations,

we selected multiple quotes that show the various ways in which each type of community and capital emanate in SE research. We present these and our findings in the next section.

Findings

Communities and Capital in SE Research

Table 1a summarizes the types of communities that SE researchers are focusing on, whereas Table 1b provides insights into the types of capital that SE researchers are analyzing. Both tables distinguish between the types of communities and capital that are found in scholarly articles (49) versus case studies (54).

To provide representative examples of the types of community and capital investigated in the articles and cases, we also developed tables of illustrative quotes. Table 2a is comprised of exemplars of different facets of community from the peer-reviewed scholarly articles and case studies, whereas Table 2b provides illustrations of the four different types of capital in SE research.

Table 1a reveals that the majority of community-based studies are set in geographical communities. The focus on geographical community is especially prevalent in scholarly articles (61 percent) and is also the largest category among case studies (50 percent). This is

Table 1b
Capital Focus in SE Research

Capital Types	Articles	Cases
Physical capital	8 (16 percent)	11 (20 percent)
Financial capital	24 (49 percent)	14 (26 percent)
Human capital	10 (20 percent)	26 (48 percent)
Social capital	21 (43 percent)	7 (13 percent)

Table 2a
Community Types

Community Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
Geographical community	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“...we first find the main strength of social entrepreneurship is that local, decentralized social entrepreneurs usually are the most appropriate and best-positioned—indeed, the most efficient—actors to solve their communities’ social problems.” (Frank and Shockey 2016, p. 1)</p> <p>“The aim of this study is to investigate how the agrarian communities in rural Burundi accommodate the model of a social enterprise: a market-based community organization with a social mission.” (Cieslik 2016, p. 1)</p> <p>“...community enterprise...is playing an increasingly prominent role in local regeneration in the UK.” (Tracey, Phillips, and Haugh 2005, 328)</p> <p>“...community-led social ventures which, by necessity, have to be embedded within their local community context in order to achieve their social mission.” (Roy, Sato, and Calo 2015, p. 2536)</p> <p>“...defining the community by its geographical location is essential, as the enterprise is embedded within the social context of the community.” (Valchovska and Watts 2016, p. 213)</p> <p>“The geographic proximity of donor and agent is likely to foster a relationship where less direct oversight is deemed necessary, as the donor may see the effect their funds have on activity within their own community or region.” (Smith and Stevens 2010, p. 21)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Cieslik (2016)</p> <p>Frank and Shockey (2016)</p> <p>Gonin (2015)</p> <p>Gutiérrez-Nieto, Serrano-Cinca, and Camón-Cala (2016)</p> <p>Hall et al. (2012)</p> <p>Mendoza-Abarca, Anokhin, and Zamudio (2015)</p> <p>Pless and Appel (2012)</p> <p>Roy, Sato, and Calo (2015)</p> <p>Rymysza (2015)</p> <p>Smith and Stevens (2010)</p> <p>Stephan et al. (2016)</p> <p>Tracey, Phillips, and Haugh (2005)</p> <p>Valchovska and Watts (2016)</p>
	<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“RMPs [Rural Medical Practitioners] participated in village community activities, and were respected and regarded as friend, philosopher and guide by many village people.” (Rangan 2007, p. 6)</p> <p>“[Acumen Fund was] building a cadre of entrepreneurial leaders who could have substantial impact on their local communities.” (Meehan, Healy, and Hoyt 2007, p. 7)</p>	<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>Ickis (2008)</p> <p>Iyer, Macomber, and Arora (2009)</p> <p>Kaplan (2001)</p> <p>Meehan, Healy, and Hoyt (2007)</p> <p>Phills, Drabkin, and Hanley (2007)</p> <p>Rangan (2007)</p> <p>Rangan and Barton (2009)</p> <p>Vernis, Lamolia, and Arenas (2009)</p>

Table 2a
Continued

Community Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
Community of identity	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“businesses [within the BoP community] preserve and foster cognitive bonding social capital by being respectful of local social codes, traditions, values, and identities, it may maintain cultural cohesion in the community.” (Ansari, Munir, and Gregg 2012, p. 830)</p> <p>“...a community is different: its members come together around shared values and ideals, and they build a common identity. It’s about deep and meaningful relationships, not connections or ‘contacts.’” (Pfortmüller and Luchsinger 2014, pp. 47–48)</p> <p>“Traditional lands are the ‘place’ of the nation and are inseparable from the people, their culture, and their identity.” (Anderson, Dana, and Dana 2006, p. 46)</p> <p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“The recruiter, who lives among the job seekers and, being from the same community and social background, has their trust because he or she is “one of them” and knows who is who.” (Koljatic, Silva, and Herrera 2009, p. 5)</p> <p>“The school [a social initiative of Alpina, Inc.] was a bridge to construct strong ties with the community and an elevated sense of belonging to the company.” (Trujillo 2009, p. 8)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Anderson, Dana, and Dana (2006)</p> <p>Ansari, Munir, and Gregg (2012)</p> <p>Pfortmüller and Luchsinger (2014)</p> <p>Tapsell and Woods (2010)</p> <p>Toivonen (2016)</p> <p>Yusuf and Sloan (2015)</p>
Community of interest or solidarity	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“...their purpose was to guarantee the survival of the working community. In those first social enterprises, the worker stopped being a mere resource for the exploitation of the bourgeoisie and moved to be part of the owner class of the production environments.” (Goncalves, Carrara, and Schmittel 2016, p. 1588)</p> <p>“...commitment to social justice motivated them to do something when it seemed that John’s school would not meet a relatively modest fund-raising goal to support a local food drive. John and Lisa also believed in the importance of educating their students and other members of the school community about hunger and food insecurity that existed in their own local community.” (Anderson, Coffey, and Dixon-Fowler 2014, p. 1238)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Anderson, Coffey, and Dixon-Fowler (2014)</p> <p>Calton et al. (2013)</p> <p>Goncalves, Carrara, and Schmittel (2016)</p> <p>Nga and Shamuganathan (2010)</p> <p>Pavlovich and Corner (2014)</p> <p>Somerville and McElwee (2011)</p>

Table 2a
Continued

Community Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
Intentional community	<p>“The social base for a non-profit is typically a community of supporters, who share the aims and objectives of the organization.” (Somerville and McElwee 2011, p. 318)</p> <p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“Another old African concept that Tutu and others frequently used was Ubuntu, which expressed a sense of community among all people, characterized by mutual respect, commitment, and common interests.” (Isenberg 2008, p. 14)</p> <p>“Our principal educational commitment focuses on inner-city, teenage students who have expressed a serious interest in the arts and self-improvement.” (Heskett et al. 2000, p. 1)</p>	<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>Ebrahim, Pirson, and Mangas (2009)</p> <p>Goldberg and Herman (2006)</p> <p>Grossman, Wei-Skillern, and Lieb (2007)</p> <p>Heskett et al. (2000)</p> <p>Hess and Glinksa (2009)</p> <p>Isenberg (2008)</p> <p>Wong, Chung, and Wang (2009)</p>
	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“The involvement of volunteers is especially often referred to as important for community-building. Typically, commercialization and professionalization entail the use of more paid work and unchanged amounts of voluntary work.” (Maier, Meyer, and Steinbereithner 2016, p. 76)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Campin, Barraket, and Luke (2013)</p> <p>Maier, Meyer, and Steinbereithner (2016)</p> <p>Mazzanti et al. (2016)</p> <p>Weaver (2016)</p>
	<p>“Each <i>m</i>BCR [micro-Business Community Responsibility] type was at least partly driven by enlightened self-interest (ESI). In addition to a pure ESI approach, findings revealed ESI combined with philanthropic approaches and ESI combined with social entrepreneurial approaches.” (Campin, Barraket, and Luke 2013, p. 1)</p> <p>“...in collaboration with the Watts Towers area residents, employ art as an economic and community development engine to promote and enhance the quality of residential life.” (Mazzanti et al. 2016, p. 26)</p>	<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>Edmondson, Eccles, and Sinha (2009)</p> <p>Ip and Wong (2009)</p>
	<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“The firm gained a reputation for being “green” designers and Sharukh was regularly called upon to represent the voice of the design community at industry forums.” (Edmondson, Eccles, and Sinha 2009, p. 5)</p> <p>“The Federation of Vegetable Marketing Co-Operative Societies Limited set up the Community Growers Group Office to provide technical assistance.” (Ip and Wong 2009, p. 14)</p>	

Table 2b
Capital Types

Capital Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
Physical capital	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“Nine participating village solidarity groups (child protection committees) have been equipped with energy generators. By selling energy, the groups became self-sustainable economic structures.” (Cieslik 2016, p. 2)</p> <p>“This paper examines the different mechanisms used by multinational corporations [MNCs] in Nigeria seeking to make long-term social investments by meeting the critical challenge of improving water provision.” (Nwankwo, Phillips, and Tracey 2007, p. 91)</p> <p>“The results support that the third sector can be an effective partner in managing and restoring the goods (confiscated assets) to their community.” (Mazzanti et al. 2016, p. 21)</p> <p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“[His] purpose in building the new town is to form a modern dwelling community for his employees and their families.” (Koehn and Helms 2007, p. 13)</p> <p>[WaterHealth International on their mission:] “It’s time for dramatic change—a revolution that will make potable water available, affordable, and accessible more rapidly, and on a wider scale than has been possible before.” (Meehan, Healy, and Hoyt 2007, p. 1)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Cieslik (2016)</p> <p>Korosec and Berman (2006)</p> <p>Mazzanti et al. (2016)</p> <p>Nwankwo, Phillips, and Tracey (2007)</p> <p>Yusuf and Sloan (2015)</p>
Financial capital	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“... food retail business selling locally produced fruit and vegetables. The surpluses generated from these ventures were combined with public money to fund a series of social projects designed to promote community well-being.” (Tracey and Phillips 2016, p. 15)</p> <p>“...create opportunities to serve poor borrowers with lower interest rates while pursuing moderate levels of profit.” (Sun and Im 2015, p. 106)</p> <p>“...their surpluses (if any) are principally invested or used to benefit people within that area.” (Somerville and McElwee 2011, p. 319)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Gonin (2015)</p> <p>Grieco, Michelini, and Iasevoli (2015)</p> <p>Parkinson and Howorth (2008)</p> <p>Smith and Stevens (2010)</p> <p>Somerville and McElwee (2011)</p> <p>Squazzoni (2009)</p> <p>Sun and Im (2015)</p> <p>Tapsell and Woods (2010)</p> <p>Tracey and Phillips (2016)</p>

Table 2b
Continued

Capital Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
	<p><i>Case studies:</i> “We are talking about literally creating wealth through business enterprise, nonprofit enterprise and cause-marketing relationships, which direct profits back into the community.” (Austin and Pearson 1998, p. 1) “The MCC (Millennium Challenge Corporation) was thus designed from the outset to provide multi-year grants, rather than loans, and to support activities that would yield long-term measurable economic returns.” (Ebrahim and Rangan 2009, p. 4)</p>	<p><i>Case studies:</i> Austin and Pearson (1998) Ebrahim and Rangan (2009) Hess and Glinksa (2009) Lobo, Gutierrez, and Sanabria (2006) Wei-Skillern (2006)</p>
Human capital	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i> “The initiative ran education campaigns to build targets’ knowledge and motivation, provided cooking lessons to enhance the women’s capability to produce healthy meals. . .” (Stephan et al. 2016, p. 9) “Community entrepreneurs build self-respect and competencies of other community members. . .” (Gray et al. 2014) “Social value manifests itself as benefits to society in the form of work, employment, community, and personal development.” (Meyskens, Carsrud, and Cardozo 2010, p. 447) “Social enterprise SEPs are a two-dimensional human capital investment strategy. They consist of advancing human capital of aspiring social entrepreneurs in an effort to create social enterprises that, in turn, invest in the human capital of a local community.” (Weaver 2016, p. 14)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i> Frank and Shockley (2016) Gray et al. (2014) Maclean, Harvey, and Gordon (2013) Meyskens, Carsrud, and Cardozo (2010) Stephan et al. (2016) Toivonen (2016)</p>
	<p><i>Case studies:</i> “Mehta’s plan viewed the residents of Dharavi as a vital human resource to the economy of Mumbai and sought to eventually integrate the Dharavi community with the rest of the city.” (Iyer, Macomber, and Arora 2009, p. 6) “The organization served as a broker, placing young people who had demonstrated potential as community leaders, into ten-month</p>	<p><i>Case studies:</i> Ebrahim, Pirson, and Mangas (2009) Iyer, Macomber, and Arora (2009) Kaplan (2001) Koljatic, Silva, and Herrera (2009) Wong, Chung, and Wang (2009)</p>

Table 2b
Continued

Capital Types	Exemplary Quotes	Exemplary References
Social capital	<p>internships with a variety of governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations.” (Kaplan 2001, p. 1)</p> <p>“To turn the huge population burden into a pool of intellectual and productive resources...[Sowers Action aims to]... bring poor children back to classrooms, build safer schools and enhance the quality of teaching.” (Wong, Chung, and Wang 2009, p. 1)</p> <p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>“...professionalized advocacy organizations may build less bonding but more bridging social capital.” (Maier, Meyer, and Steinbereithner, p. 76)</p> <p>“We propose that local contingencies, such as external environment, leadership and social capital, play a role in influencing organizational culture in community-led social ventures.” (Roy, Sato, and Calo 2015, p. 2536)</p> <p>“Generating social capital between individuals and communities.” (Rymsza 2015, p. 830)</p> <p>“By redefining poverty not just as a lack of income, but also as a lack of ‘capabilities’ in Sen’s sense that can be developed through leveraging social capital.” (Ansari, Munir, and Gregg 2012, p. 813)</p> <p>“...active participation in networks induces collective learning and fosters better understanding of social community norms.” (Nga and Shamuganathan 2010, p. 265)</p> <p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>“This discovery represented IAVI’s [International AIDS Vaccine Initiative] most recent achievement brought about through collaboration among scientific researchers.” (Grossman and Ross 2010a, p. 1)</p> <p>“Prolonged positive impact comes from the development of trust and, in turn, social capital.” (Khoja and Lutafali 2008, p. 6)</p>	<p><i>Peer-reviewed articles:</i></p> <p>Ansari, Munir, and Gregg (2012)</p> <p>Chell (2007)</p> <p>Haugh (2007)</p> <p>Maier, Meyer, and Steinbereithner (2016)</p> <p>Roy, Sato, and Calo (2015)</p> <p>Rymsza (2015)</p> <p>Pavlovich and Corner (2014)</p>
		<p><i>Case studies:</i></p> <p>Grossman and Ross (2010a)</p> <p>Kanter and de Pinho (2008)</p> <p>Khoja and Lutafali (2008)</p> <p>Rangan (2007)</p> <p>Vernis, Lamolia, and Arenas (2009)</p>

not unexpected and reflects perspectives set forth by several authors including Peredo and Chrisman who limit the definition of community to a “shared geographical location” (2016, p. 315) and Vlachovska and Watts who state, in the context of understanding social enterprises that, “defining the community by its geographical location is essential” (2016, p. 213).

The second most frequent community category is communities of interest or solidarity. In this instance, cases studies (34 percent) are substantially more likely to focus on communities of interest or solidarity than scholarly articles (20 percent). This difference may reflect the more narrative style of cases which allow for more exposition around community of interest topics such as “mutual respect, commitment and common interests” (Isenberg 2008, p. 14). The rich description around single cases may also help explain why intentional communities were third most prominent in the case studies (9 percent) but least important among scholarly articles (8 percent). The reverse was true for communities of identity which were more common in scholarly articles (16 percent) and the least important type among cases (7 percent). This finding could be reflective of the fact that SE scholars have relied on social identity theory to a relatively great extent to shed light on SE phenomena (e.g., Moss et al. 2011; Nason, Bacq, and Gras 2017; Wry and York 2017).

Turning to capital, Table 1b indicates that financial capital is the most prevalent type of SE outcome identified in the scholarly articles (49 percent). This is not surprising considering our focus on entrepreneurship and management journals, and the importance placed on commerce in many SE studies. For the same reasons, however, it is somewhat surprising that only 26 percent of the case studies focused on financial capital. Indeed, the most prominent category among cases is human capital (48 percent). This supports our contention that a substantial portion of community-level SE activity aims to make positive social changes in ways other than financial and in particular, through human development. Human capital is the third most important category among scholarly articles (20 percent). Second among scholarly articles is social capital (43 percent) (though it was least prevalent among cases—7 percent) reflecting that a key focus of many SE initiatives is to address what Ansari and colleagues identify as “a lack of ‘capabilities’ in Sen’s sense that can be developed through leveraging social capital”

(2012, p. 813). Both social capital and human capital may be especially important in community contexts because so much SE activity is focused on improving the capabilities and well-being of whole groups. Finally, physical capital was the least prominent outcome in both scholarly articles (16 percent) and case studies (20 percent), though not trivial in either instance.

In general, these findings support the view that a community level of analysis can shed new light on our understanding of where SE efforts are focused on, and provide evidence that SE initiatives generate a wide range of outcomes, both pecuniary and nonpecuniary, that take place in multiple forms of communities.

Discussion

In the quest to understand the who, what, how, when, and where of SE, in this paper, we have focused on “where,” a topic and level of analysis that has not often been emphasized in the SE literature. Further, we have argued that extant SE research has paid too little attention to the community as a centrally important locus of SE activity, and a distinguishing feature of the SE domain. In contrast to most studies that appear in entrepreneurship and management journals, the “social” in SE implies an extra-organizational level of analysis. Our findings suggest that the role of the community has been both prevalent and influential in SE research, even though few extant studies explicitly focus on the community as a distinct level of analysis (see Peredo and Chrisman 2006 for an important exception). To more explicitly account for community, we employed a UNESCO-inspired typology of communities and found all four types—geographical, identity, interest, and intentional—to be important in SE research. Even though communities are most frequently characterized in terms of their geography as expected, we found that each of the other perspectives regarding what constitutes community were also important to understanding where SE change happens.

Our study has important implications for researching SE by providing evidence of the influential role of community-level dynamics in bringing about solutions to social problems through SE. A key contribution of our study lies in shedding light on various conceptualizations of community by providing SE researchers with a framework for designing studies that explicate the locus of SE phenomena. Whether

community is based on a geographical locale or a shared group identity, intentionality or solidarity around a common interest, it is useful to specify the nature of the bond that holds a community together. In fact, failure to explicitly define community at the outset of an SE research project may have direct implications for accurately assessing the social change induced by the SE initiative.

Further, although geographical locale is the dominant conceptualization of community, researchers will likely find it valuable to take into account other types of community that may have been subsumed within a geographical community such as interest or identity. For example, employing measures of well-being as a basis for examining social impact may yield an implicit assumption that the outcomes of SE initiatives affect all individuals equally within the geographical locale. However, if sub-communities of interest or identity are prevalent within the geographical community but are not acknowledged—such as disabled veterans or a particular socio-economic group—then certain types of outcomes salient to those sub-communities—such as group-specific well-being or employment in certain vocations—may be overlooked. It follows that, to measure the antecedents and outcomes of particular SE initiatives more precisely, SE researchers will need to clearly specify the meaning of “community.”

Accordingly, the perspective that we advance changes the way we approach SE research. Indeed, adopting measures that take specific types of community into account will provide more clarity, and possibly more accuracy, in assessing the social change that SE ventures are having on their communities, and their corresponding effectiveness in doing so. For instance, a decrease in unemployment rates may be a relevant metric to capture positive social change in a geographical community characterized by a high proportion of college graduates. Conversely, an increase in community college enrollment may serve as a pertinent metric of community-level outcomes in a community dealing with a large proportion of veterans. In sum, mis-specifying “where” social change takes place could result in searches for impact in the wrong place and hence, may lead to false positives or inconclusive results.

Because the types of outcomes generated by SE activities add to a wide range of resources, endowments and capabilities, such wealth, broadly construed, may translate not only into

tangible forms of capital (products, sales, material gain), but also into intangible forms of benefits (well-being, happiness, social relations) for the communities involved (Haugh and Pardy 1999). Indeed, our findings support the contention that both community-level tangible outcomes such as financial and physical capital, and community-level intangible outcomes such as social and human capital are important outcomes across the scholarly articles and case studies we analyzed. Our study thus contributes to SE research by enabling SE researchers to broaden the current conceptualizations of SE impact by setting forth a familiar and parsimonious set of both pecuniary and nonpecuniary types of capital as a way to capture positive social change. To our knowledge, this analysis is the first one to perform a holistic review of the community-level outcomes in SE research and organize them in terms of types of capital.

This capital perspective is all the more meaningful when considered in relation to the types of communities in which change happens. Indeed, we suggest that the predominant form of capital generated by an SE initiative may vary depending on the type(s) of community in which it takes place. For example, studies of SE initiatives explicitly focused on geographical communities—for example, rural areas in developing countries—may find that physical capital is the best proxy for the positive social change brought in the geographical community in the SE initiatives. Alternatively, intentional communities—for example, senior citizens clubs—could be more likely to experience a positive change in their community in terms of heightened social capital and feelings of interconnectedness.

Our study is thus particularly relevant given that entrepreneurship and management researchers are likely less familiar with the kinds of measures that might be needed to assess community-level phenomena. Indeed, a look at extant SE empirical research sheds light on common practices such as relying on organizational-level scales to capture extra-organizational phenomena (e.g., Lumpkin et al. 2013) or resorting to the social entrepreneur’s self-reported perceptions of change on the intended communities of beneficiaries (e.g., Bloom and Smith 2010). Our study paves the way to novel theoretical avenues and measurement techniques from other disciplines such as political science, sociology, and anthropology. In the next section, we detail these future

research avenues, as well as some limitations of our study.

Limitations and Future Research Avenues

Although our study offers a practical organizing framework for future community-focused SE research, it is not without its limitations. Conceptualizing the various types of community in line with the UNESCO-informed typology enabled us to establish that geographical locale is indeed the most prevalent form in extant SE research. However, while this typology proved instrumental in mapping out the current state of the field, future empirical efforts should consider the intertwined nature of community-level dynamics, irrespective of stating a priori definitions. For example, while geographical community may be an overarching boundary, the fact that communities of interest or identity are likely to exist within a particular locale has implications for researchers examining the effectiveness of social enterprises and the suitability of methodological tools used. As suggested earlier, future research should therefore explicitly specify the type of community under study, otherwise running the risk of misaligning the assessment of the SE-induced change with the specificities of the community where it happens.

Additionally, the inter-connectedness of the various forms of community implies that future research building on our findings should acknowledge these nuances and be aware that community types are not mutually exclusive. Though unlikely, for example, one individual could ostensibly be a member of all four types of community concurrently. Moreover, one individual's various interests or identities may make him/her belong to several communities of identity or of interest simultaneously. Belonging to or disassociation with certain community types may also evolve over time as, for instance, geographical location, or interests change. In sum, the complexities in defining community provide many opportunities for further examination of this multifaceted construct beyond extant research efforts. To assist in this task, review works such as the taxonomy of community relations developed by James and colleagues (2012) may be a source of inspiration. One potentially fruitful area for subsequent research would be to examine SE studies that adopt similar theoretical perspectives (e.g., social identity theory) and assess whether redefining the community

context—along the four categories in our framework—would lead to different findings.

Further, our use of capital does not capture all the types of wealth that might be created through SE activities. Examples of potentially important omissions include the overall health and well-being of a community, or the ideas expressed by socioemotional wealth. Dimensions such as these are not typically found in entrepreneurship and management research but suggest other types of capital that may need to enter into conversations about outcomes of SE activity. Nevertheless, our suggestion to conceptualize SE outcomes in terms of capital paves the way to theoretical frameworks and sophisticated impact measurement techniques from other disciplines that could help advance the SE domain. For example, epidemiology and community health research in particular holds promise in shedding light on the measurement of the effectiveness of community interventions—as they pertain to health and overall well-being (for a recent review of the methods in the field see Dronavalli and Thompson 2015). Specifically, instruments such as the Community Wellbeing Index (Forjaz et al. 2011) and the Personal Well-being Index (Lau, Cummins, and Mcpherson 2005) are established tools useful for assessing both the intangible and tangible forms of capital identified in our study. Yet these methods are largely overlooked in SE research in part due to a dearth of studies explicitly assessing community-level outcomes. Future research could benefit from implementing these approaches to studying community-level SE phenomena. For instance, epidemiology's focus on community resource accessibility could yield promising avenues for future studies by leveraging techniques like geographical information systems to track neighborhood accessibility (e.g., Pearce, Witten, and Bartie 2006) to SE initiatives.

Last, if the community level of analysis matters in SE research, as well as the role of capital in capturing SE community-level outcomes, what are the implications for the role of SE in creating wealth? Following Zahra and colleagues' (2009) notion of "total wealth," we have argued that a distinct focus on community has profound implications for accurately assessing the full extent of SE wealth creation. Therefore, future research should further investigate community as an overlooked link in the total wealth that is created by SE initiatives. Such wealth creation could span from macro-level wealth (e.g., a nation's cultural capital or GDP

Table 3
Future Research Questions

Future Research Inspired by Other Disciplines	Potential Focus for Community-Level Research	Possible Research Questions
Tangible wealth creation	Traditional approaches for assessing pecuniary wealth such as financial capital and physical capital	Which metrics are best suited for measuring the financial and physical capital generation of SE activities in a community?
Intangible wealth creation	Traditional approaches for assessing nonpecuniary, people-related aspects of wealth such as social capital and human capital	Can levels of tangible wealth creation be predicted by different types of community in which the SE initiative takes place? Do SE happening in communities of identity generate financial capital more effectively than other types of communities (for instance, because of the value members see in community membership)? Which theoretical perspectives best explain and predict gains in intangible forms of capital within a community?
Total wealth creation	Combining all possible forms of wealth using multidisciplinary approaches	Are there cultural aspects of communities that lead to higher human capital generation? What community types are associated with increased social capital? How does the effectiveness of community-focused SE ventures change when measures of total wealth creation are applied? How does community-level wealth created by SE activity relate to micro-level wealth? Does community-level wealth equate aggregate micro-level wealth or is there more to it? How does community-level wealth created by SE activity relate to macro-level wealth? How does a nation's cultural capital or GDP growth translate at the geographical community? In other types of community?

Table 3
Continued

Future Research Inspired by Other Disciplines	Potential Focus for Community-Level Research	Possible Research Questions
Epidemiology	Drawing from established methods to explore community engagement and impact of initiatives	<p>To what extent do epidemiology-informed well-being indices inform the measurement of nonpecuniary community wealth?</p> <p>Does community resource accessibility affect our understanding of the effectiveness of SE initiatives?</p> <p>Can ecological perspectives help to explain the indirect influences on communities in relation to total wealth creation?</p>
Community psychology	Drawing from established instruments to explore psychosocial factors influencing community dynamics	<p>How does the concept of community empowerment—the process of enabling communities to increase control over their lives—help us shed light on SE outcomes?</p>
Sociology	Drawing from meso-level perspectives such as “Coleman’s boat”	<p>Which types of community have the strongest effect on social engagement—the degree to which individuals participate in community activities?</p> <p>Can SE ventures influence the prosocial behaviors of commercial ventures operating in the same geographical community?</p> <p>Does the wealth generated by SE initiatives at the geographical community level influence the institutional environment for entrepreneurship at a national level?</p> <p>What can we say about the effects of SE activity in communities other than geographical community?</p>

growth) to micro-level wealth (e.g., workers' morale in a large corporate or financial gains). Viewed through the prism of "Coleman's boat"—a sociological model outlining multilevel causal mechanisms—wealth created uniquely at the community level may also underpin missing meso-level dynamics that more comprehensively explain the positive change of SE initiatives (Kim, Wennberg, and Croidieu 2016). Consequently, conceptualizing the "wealth" created by SE initiatives through the four types of capital could inform future empirical efforts to measure the outcomes of SE initiatives in relation to the type of community settings in which they take place. Future research questions include: What kinds of wealth does SE activity create? Is thinking of SE wealth creation in terms of "capital" the best approach? How might the characteristics of the community setting influence the type of capital/wealth that is created? Under what circumstances in an SE context might capital/wealth be destroyed rather than created? Table 3 offers additional ideas for future research questions along the lines just described.

Conclusion

In the face of increasingly pressing and complex societal problems, the SE phenomenon is flourishing and SE ventures increasingly dominate the organizational landscape (Huysentruyt, Mair, and Stephan 2016). Yet extant SE research has tended to focus on understanding organizational-level arrangements that support the concurrent achievement of social and commercial goals to the detriment of "where" SE aims to bring about social change—the community. In this study, we review the importance of the community construct as the locus of SE activity and a distinguishing feature of the SE domain. Our analysis underlines the prevalence of different types of communities—beyond geographical locale—and concludes that SE outcomes occur predominantly in some type of community. We identify community-related SE research and highlight the implications for the conceptualization and measurement of SE outcomes at the community level. We suggest that framing extra-organizational SE outcomes in terms of capital, both tangible and intangible, enables researchers to capture the wide range of resources, endowments, and capabilities generated by SE activity. In doing so, our study opens the way for more research that explores

the link between the locus of SE initiatives and their outcomes.

References

- Adler, P. S., S. W. Kwon, and C. Heckscher (2008). "Perspective—Professional Work: The Emergence of Collaborative Community," *Organization Science* 19(2), 359–376.
- Allison, T. H., A. F., McKenny, and J. C. Short (2013). "The Effect of Entrepreneurial Rhetoric on Microlending Investment: an Examination of the Warm-Glow Effect," *Journal of Business Venturing* 28(6), 690–707.
- *Anderson, R. B., L. P. Dana, and T. E. Dana (2006). "Indigenous Land Rights, Entrepreneurship, and Economic Development in Canada: 'Opting-in' to the Global Economy," *Journal of World Business* 41(1), 45–55.
- *Anderson, S. E., B. S. Coffey, and H. Dixon-Fowler (2014). "The Empty Bowls Project: Creating, Leading, and Sustaining a Social Enterprise," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 38(5), 1237–1245.
- *Ansari, S., K. Munir, and T. Gregg (2012). "Impact at the 'Bottom of the Pyramid': The Role of Social Capital in Capability Development and Community Empowerment," *Journal of Management Studies* 49(4), 813–842.
- Ashforth, B. E., and F. A. Mael (1989). "Social Identity Theory and the Organization," *Academy of Management Review* 14(1), 20–39.
- Audretsch, D., and M. Keilbach (2004). "Entrepreneurship Capital and Economic Performance," *Regional Studies* 38(8), 949–959.
- *Austin, J. E., and M. D. Pearson (1998). Community Wealth Ventures Inc. Harvard Business School Case, 399–023.
- Austin, J., H. Stevenson, and J. Wei-Skillern (2006). "Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 30(1), 1–22.
- *Bagnoli, L., and C. Megali (2011). "Measuring Performance in Social Enterprises," *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(1), 149–165.
- Bates, T. (1990). "Entrepreneur Human Capital Inputs and Small Business Longevity," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 72, 551–559.
- Battilana, J., and S. Dorado (2010). "Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations," *Academy of Management Journal* 53(6), 1419–1440.

- Battilana, J., M. Besharov, and B. Mitzinneck (2017). "On Hybrids and Hybrid Organizing: A Review and Roadmap for Future Research," in *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Eds. R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, and R. E. Meyer. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 133–169.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berrone, P., C. Cruz, and L. R. Gómez-Mejía (2012). "Socioemotional Wealth in Family Firms: Theoretical Dimensions, Assessment Approaches, and Agenda for Future Research," *Family Business Research* 25(3), 258–279.
- Bloom, P. N., and B. R. Smith (2010). "Identifying the Drivers of Social Entrepreneurial Impact: Theoretical Development and an Exploratory Empirical Test of Scales," *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 1(1), 126–145.
- Borch, O., A. Førde, L. Rønning, I. Klucken Vestrum, and G. Agnete Alsos (2008). "Resource Configuration and Creative Practices of Community Entrepreneurs," *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 2(2), 100–123.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Brady, H. E., S. Verba, and K. L. Schlozman (1995). "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation," *American Political Science Review* 89(2), 271–294.
- *Calton, J. M., P. H. Werhane, L. P. Hartman, and D. Bevan (2013). "Building Partnerships to Create Social and Economic Value at the Base of the Global Development Pyramid," *Journal of Business Ethics* 117, 721–733.
- *Campin, S., J. Barraket, and B. Luke (2013). "Micro-Business Community Responsibility in Australia: Approaches, Motivations and Barriers," *Journal of Business Ethics* 115(3), 489–513.
- *Chell, E. (2007). "Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship: Towards a Convergent Theory of the Entrepreneurial Process," *International Small Business Journal* 25(1), 5–26.
- *Chu, M., and J. S. Hazell (2007). *Micro Insurance Agency: Helping the Poor Manage Risk*. Harvard Business School Case, 307-089, 1–23.
- *Cieslik, K. (2016). "Moral Economy Meets Social Enterprise Community-Based Green Energy Project in Rural Burundi," *World Development* 83, 12–26.
- Clark, D. B. (1973). "The Concept of Community: A Reexamination," *The Sociological Review* 21(3), 397–416.
- Cohen, B., B. Smith, and R. Mitchell (2008). "Toward a Sustainable Conceptualization of Dependent Variables in Entrepreneurship Research," *Business Strategy and the Environment* 17(2), 107–119.
- Coleman, S. (2007). "The Role of Human and Financial Capital in the Profitability and Growth of Women-Owned Small Firms," *Journal of Small Business Management* 45(3), 303–319.
- Cooper, A. C., F. J. Gimeno-Gascon, and C. Y. Woo (1994). "Initial Human and Financial Capital as Predictors of New Venture Performance," *Journal of Business Venturing* 9(5), 371–395.
- *Cordes, E., and J. Mair (2005). *Project Impact—The Affordable Hearing Aid Project*. IESE Business School Case, IES125, 1–24.
- *Cornelius, N., M. Todres, S. Janjuha-Jivraj, A. Woods, and J. Wallace (2008). "Corporate Social Responsibility and the Social Enterprise," *Journal of Business Ethics* 81(2), 355–370.
- Cummings, J. N., L. Sproull, and S. B. Kiesler (2002). "Beyond Hearing: Where the Real-World and Online Support Meet," *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice* 6(1), 78–88.
- Dahlander, L., and M. W. Wallin (2006). "A Man on the Inside: Unlocking Communities as Complementary Assets," *Research Policy* 35(8), 1243–1259.
- Davidsson, P., and B. Honig (2003). "The Role of Social and Human Capital Among Nascent Entrepreneurs," *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(3), 301–331.
- Davidsson, P., and J. Wiklund (2007). "Levels of Analysis in Entrepreneurship Research: Current Research Practice and Suggestions for the Future," in *Entrepreneurship: Concepts, Theory and Perspective*. Eds. A. Cuervo, D. Ribeiro, and S. Roig. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 245–265.

- *Dees, J. G., and J. Elias (1997). Normative Foundations of Business. Harvard Business School Case, 897-012, 1–19.
- *Dees, J. G., and A. Oberfield (1991). Steve Mariotti and NFTE. Harvard Business School Case, 391-169, 1–16.
- *Di Domenico, M., P. Tracey, and H. Haugh (2009). “The Dialectic of Social Exchange: Theorizing Corporate—Social Enterprise Collaboration,” *Organization Studies* 30(8), 887–907.
- Drayton, W. (2002). “The Citizen Sector: Becoming as Entrepreneurial and Competitive as Business,” *California Management Review* 44(3), 120–132.
- Dronavalli, M., and S. C. Thompson (2015). “A Systematic Review of Measurement Tools of Health and Well-Being for Evaluating Community-Based Interventions,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 69, 805–815.
- *Ebrahim, A., M. Pirson, and P. Mangas (2009). “Brummer and the bracNet Investment,” Harvard Business School Case, 309-065, 1–24.
- *Ebrahim, A., and V. K. Rangan (2009). “The Millennium Challenge Corporation and Ghana,” Harvard Business School Case, 310-025, 1–29.
- *Edmondson, A. C., R. G. Eccles, and M. Sinha (2009). “Mistry Architects A,” Harvard Business School Case, 609-044, 1–26.
- *Farhoomand, A., and P. Choudhary (2009). “Microfinancing in Tanzania,” Asia Case Research Centre, 414C, 1–21.
- *Farmer, J., T. De Cotta, K. McKinnon, and H. Douglas (2016). “Social Enterprise and Well-being in Community Life,” *Social Enterprise Journal* 12(2), 235–254.
- *Feddersen, T., and S. R. Wheeler (2007). “The Environmental Entrepreneur.” Kellogg School of Management Case Study, 1–7.
- Forjaz, M. J., M. E. Prieto-Flores, A. Ayala, C. Rodriguez-Blazquez, G. Fernandez-Mayoralas, F. Rojo-Perez, and P. Martinez-Martin (2011). “Measurement Properties of the Community Wellbeing Index in Older Adults,” *Quality of Life Research* 20(5), 733–743.
- *Francish-Huidobro, M., and C. Woo (2009). “Green Rubber—The Revolution of the Rubber Recycling Business,” Asia Case Research Centre, 436C, 1–16.
- *Frank, P. M., and G. E. Shockley (2016). “A Critical Assessment of Social Entrepreneurship: Ostromian Polycentricity and Hayekian Knowledge,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45(4_suppl), 61S–77S.
- *Freeman, D., J. L. Heskett, R. Roopchand, and J. Wallack (2000). “Manchester Craftsman Guild and Bidwell Training Center,” Harvard Business School Case, MCG-005, 1–28.
- *Goldberg, R., and K. Herman (2006). “Nestlé’s Milk District Model—Economic Development for a Value-Added Food Chain and Improved Nutrition,” Harvard Business School Case, 906-406, 1–22.
- Goncalves, C. P., K. Carrara, and R. M. Schmittel (2016). “The Phenomenon of Social Enterprises: Are We Keeping Watch on This Cultural Practice?,” *Voluntas* 27(4), 1585–1610.
- *Gonin, M. (2015). “Adam Smith’s Contribution to Business Ethics, Then and Now,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 129(1), 221–236.
- *Gonzalez, R. A., and P. Marquez (2005). “Ron Santa Teresas Social Initiatives,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-059, 1–22.
- *Gray, B. J., S. Duncan, J. Kirkwood, and S. Walton (2014). “Encouraging Sustainable Entrepreneurship in Climate-Threatened Communities: A Samoan Case Study,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 26(5–6), 401–430.
- Greyston Bakery. (2017). *Social mission*. Retrieved February 2017, from <http://greyston.com/blog/page/6/>
- *Grieco, C., L. Michellini, and G. Iasevoli (2015). “Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 44(6), 1173–1193.
- Grootaert, C., and T. van Bastelaer (2002). *The Role of Social Capital in Development—An Empirical Assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- *Grossman, A. S., J. E. Austin, M. M. Hart, and S. Peyus (1999). “Explore Inc.,” Harvard Business School Case, 300-011, 1–15.
- *Grossman, A. S., and J. D. Kalafatas (2000). “Bridgespan Group,” Harvard Business School Case, 301-011, 1–21.
- *Grossman, A. S., and A. McCaffrey (2001). “Jumpstart,” Harvard Business School Case, 301-037, 1–22.
- *Grossman, A. S., and C. Ross (2010a). “International AIDS Vaccine Initiative,”

- Harvard Business School Case, 310-015, 1–22.
- (2010b). “United Way,” Harvard Business School Case, 310-014, 1–29.
- *Grossman, A. S., J. Wei-Skillern, and K. Lieb (2007). “Guide Dogs for the Blind Association,” Harvard Business School Case, 303-006, 1–23.
- *Gutiérrez-Nieto, B., C. Serrano-Cinca, and J. Camón-Cala (2016). “A Credit Score System for Socially Responsible Lending,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 133(4), 691–701.
- *Hall, J., S. Matos, L. Sheehan, and B. Silvestre (2012). “Entrepreneurship and Innovation at the Base of the Pyramid: A Recipe for Inclusive Growth or Social Exclusion?,” *Journal of Management Studies* 49(4), 785–812.
- *Hardymon, F., N. T. Wasserman, C. B. Rogers, and A. Leamon (2007). “Village Ventures,” Harvard Business School Case, 806-080, 1–27.
- *Haug, H. (2007). “Community-Led Social Venture Creation,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 31(2), 161–182.
- Haug, H. M., and W. Pardy (1999). “Community Entrepreneurship in North East Scotland,” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* 5(4), 163–172.
- Heinze, K. L., J. Banaszak-Holl, and K. Babiak (2016). “Social Entrepreneurship in Communities,” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 26(3), 313–330.
- Helman, A. (1992). “The Israeli Kibbutz as a Socialist Model,” *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 148, 168–183.
- *Hess, E., and G. Glinksa (2009). “Mellace Family Brands Inc.—Building a Socially Responsible Enterprise,” Darden School of Business Case, UV-2031, 1–11.
- Heskett, J. L., D. Freeman, R. Ramgolam, and J. Wallack (2000). “Manchester Craftsmen’s Guild and Bidwell Training Center: Governing Social Entrepreneurship,” Harvard Business School Case, MCG005, 1–28.
- Hitt, M. A., R. D. Ireland, S. M. Camp, and D. L. Sexton (2001). “Strategic Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Strategies for Wealth Creation,” *Strategic Management Journal* 22(6–7), 479–491.
- Hogg, M. A., and D. J. Terry (2014). *Social Identity Processes in Organizational Contexts*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Hsu, G., and M. T. Hannan (2005). “Identities, Genres, and Organizational Forms,” *Organization Science* 16(5), 474–490.
- Huysentruyt, M., J. Mair, and U. Stephan (2016). “Market-Oriented and Mission-Focused: Social Enterprises Around the Globe,” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 14.
- *Ickis, J. (2008). “Butterflies of Costa Rica,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-114, 1–20.
- Igoe, J. (2006). “Measuring the Costs and Benefits of Conservation to Local Communities,” *Journal of Ecological Anthropology* 10(1), 72–77.
- *Ip, S., and G. Wong (2009). “New Life—Scaling Up Social Enterprise Start-Ups,” Asia Case Research Centre, 438C, 1–24.
- *Isenberg, D. J. (2008). “Lapdesk Company—A South African FOPSE,” Harvard Business School Case, 808-008, 1–28.
- *Iyer, L., J. D. Macomber, and N. Arora (2009). “Dharavi—Developing Asia’s Largest Slum,” Harvard Business School Case, 710-004, 1–26.
- James, P., Y. Nadarajah, K. Haive, and V. Stead (2012). *Sustainable Communities, Sustainable Development: Other Paths for Papua New Guinea*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Johannisson, B. (1990). “Community Entrepreneurship-Cases and Conceptualization,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 2(1), 71–88.
- *Kanter, R. M. (2005). “Even Bigger Change—A Framework for Getting Started at Changing the World,” Harvard Business School Case, 305-099, 1–12.
- *Kanter, R. M., and R. R. de Pinho (2008). “Banco Real—Banking on sustainability,” Harvard Business School Case, 305-100, 1–24.
- *Kaplan, R. S. (2001). “New Profit, Inc.—Governing the Nonprofit Enterprise,” Harvard Business School Case, 100-052, 1–16.
- *Khanna, T., V. K. Rangan, and M. Manocaran (2006). “Narayana Hrudayalaya Heart Hospital—Cardiac Care for the Poor,” Harvard Business School Case, 505-078, 1–24.
- *Khoja, F., and S. Lutafali (2008). “Micro-Financing—An Innovative Application of Social Networking,” Ivey Business School Case, 1–10.
- Kim, P. H., K. Wennberg, and G. Croidieu (2016). “Untapped Riches of Meso-Level

- Applications in Multilevel Entrepreneurship Mechanisms," *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 30(3), 273–291.
- *Koehn, N., and E. Helms (2007). "Candy Land—The Utopian Vision of Milton Hershey." Harvard Business School Case, 805-066, 1–45.
- *Koljatic, M., M. Silva, and J. Herrera (2009). "Empleados Ya—A Headhunter for the Poor," Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-129, 1–16.
- *Korosec, R. L., and E. M. Berman (2006). "Municipal Support for Social Entrepreneurship," *Public Administration Review* 66(3), 448–462.
- Kroeger, A., and C. Weber (2014). "Developing a Conceptual Framework for Comparing Social Value Creation," *Academy of Management Review* 39(4), 513–540.
- Lau, A. L., R. A. Cummins, and W. Mcpherson (2005). "An Investigation into the Cross-Cultural Equivalence of the Personal Well-being Index," *Social Indicators Research* 72(3), 403–430.
- *Leguizamon, F., J. Ickis, and N. Vasquez (2005). "Pantaleon," Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-069, 1–29.
- *Leonard, H., M. J. Epstein, and W. Smith (2008). "Digital Divide Data—A Social Enterprise in Action," Harvard Business School Case, 307-106, 1–21.
- *Lobo, I. D., R. Gutierrez, and R. Sanabria (2006). "Profamilia—Planning to Survive," Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-090, 1–24.
- *Lozano, G., A. Maass, and C. Moxon (2003). "Let's Build Their Dreams—Danone Mexico and the Casa de la Amistad para Ninos con Cancer," Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-010, 1–27.
- *Lozano, G., C. Romero, and A. Maass (2003). "Recyclable by Nature," Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-010, 1–27.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and S. Bacq (2013). "Social Entrepreneurship and the Multiple Logics of Societal Impact," *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2013(1), 15844.
- Lumpkin G. T., T. W. Moss, D. M. Gras, S. Kato, and A. S. Amezcua. (2013). "Entrepreneurial Processes in Social Contexts: How Are They Different, if at All?" *Small Business Economics* 40, 761–783.
- Macguire, S., C. Hardy, and T. B. Lawrence (2004). "Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Fields: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada," *Academy of Management Journal* 47(5), 657–679.
- *Maclean, M., C. Harvey, and J. Gordon (2013). "Social Innovation, Social Entrepreneurship and the Practice of Contemporary Entrepreneurial Philanthropy," *International Small Business Journal* 31(7), 747–763.
- *Maier, F., M. Meyer, and M. Steinbereithner (2016). "Nonprofit Organizations Becoming Business-Like: A Systematic Review," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45(1), 64–86.
- Mair, J., and I. Martí (2006). "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight," *Journal of world business* 41(1), 36–44.
- *Mair, J., and C. Seelos (2005). "Sekem—Liberating a Vision an Artistic Approach to Entrepreneurship," IESE Business School Case, DG-1466-E, 1–21.
- Mair J., M. Wolf, and C. Seelos (2016). "Scaffolding: A Process of Transforming Patterns of Inequality in Small-Scale Societies," *Academy of Management Journal* 59(6), 2021–2044.
- Marquis, C., and J. Battilana (2009). "Acting Globally but Thinking Locally? The Enduring Influence of Local Communities on Organizations," *Research in Organizational Behavior* 29, 283–302.
- *Mazzanti, G. M., G. Ecchia, T. Komatsu, and T. Komatsu (2016). "Innovative Partnerships for the Utilization of Confiscated Assets Previously Owned by Mafias," *Social Enterprise Journal* 12(1), 21–41.
- *McFarlan, F. W., and J. Elias (1997). "Mt Auburn Hospital," Harvard Business School Case, 397-083, 1–36.
- *McGinn, K. L., D. M. Kolb, C. B. Hammer, and A. S. Acosta (2009). "Congo River Basin Project—Role for Dr. Beni," Harvard Business School Case, 909-041, 1–10.
- McMullen, J. S., and B. J. Warnick (2016). "Should We Require Every New Venture to Be a Hybrid Organization?," *Journal of Management Studies* 53(4), 630–662.
- *Meehan, W., J. F. Healy, and D. Hoyt (2007). "Acumen Fund and WaterHealth International—The Role of Venture Philanthropy," Stanford Business School Case, SM-158, 1–17.
- *Mendoza-Abarca, K. I., S. Anokhin, and C. Zamudio (2015). "Uncovering the Influence of Social Venture Creation on Commercial Venture Creation: A Population Ecology

- Perspective,” *Journal of Business Venturing* 30(6), 793–807.
- *Meyskens, M., A. L. Carsrud, and R. N. Cardozo (2010). “The Symbiosis of Entities in the Social Engagement Network: The Role of Social Ventures,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22(5), 425–455.
- Moss, T. W., G. T. Lumpkin, and J. C. Short (2010). “Social Entrepreneurship: A Historical Review and Research Agenda,” in *Historical Foundations of Entrepreneurial Research*. Eds. H. Landström and F. Lohrke. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 318–342.
- Moss, T. W., J. C. Short, G. T. Payne, and G. T. Lumpkin (2011). “Dual Identities in Social Ventures: An Exploratory Study,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35(4), 805–830.
- Nahapiet, J., and S. Ghoshal (1998). “Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage,” *Academy of Management Review* 23(2), 242–266.
- Nason, R., S. Bacq, and D. Gras (2017). “A Behavioral Theory of Social Performance: Social Identity and Stakeholder Expectations,” *Academy of Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2015.0081>.
- *Nga, J., and G. Shamuganathan (2010). “The Influence of Personality Traits and Demographic Factors on Social Entrepreneurship Start Up Intentions,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 95(2), 259–282.
- Nicholls, A. (2010). “The Legitimacy of Social Entrepreneurship: Reflexive Isomorphism in a Pre-Paradigmatic Field,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34(4), 611–633.
- *Nwankwo, E., N. Phillips, and P. Tracey (2007). “Social Investment Through Community Enterprise: The Case of Multinational Corporations Involvement in the Development of Nigerian Water Resources,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 73(1), 91–101.
- Pache, A. C., and F. Santos (2013). “Inside the Hybrid Organization: Selective Coupling as a Response to Competing Institutional Logics,” *Academy of Management Journal* 56(4), 972–1001.
- *Parkinson, C., and C. Howorth (2008). “The Language of Social Entrepreneurs,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 20(3), 285–309.
- *Pavlovich, K., and P. D. Corner (2014). “Conscious Enterprise Emergence: Shared Value Creation Through Expanded Conscious Awareness,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 121(3), 341–351.
- Pearce, J., K. Witten, and P. Bartie (2006). “Neighbourhoods and Health: A GIS Approach to Measuring Community Resource Accessibility,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60(5), 389–395.
- Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman (2006). “Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise,” *Academy of Management Review* 31(2), 309–328.
- Pfortmüller, F., and N. Luchsinger (2014). “The Power of Trust: Learnings from Six Years of Building a Global Community of Young Leaders (Innovations Case Narrative: Sandbox),” *Power* 8(3–4), 43–54.
- *Phills, J., D. Choy, J. McNabney, E. Vaughan, and Y. Zhou (2005). “Teach for America—The Bay Area Expansion,” Stanford Business School Case, SM-149A, 1–11.
- *Phills, J., and L. Denend (2005a). “Social Entrepreneurs—Correcting Market Failures A,” Stanford Business School Case, SI-72-A, 1–36.
- *——— (2005b). “Social Entrepreneurs—Correcting Market Failures B,” Stanford Business School Case, SI-72-B, 1–4.
- *Phills, J., D. Drabkin, and D. Hanley (2007). “Waste Concern,” Stanford Business School Case, SI-71, 1–25.
- Pitzer, D. E., D. E. Janzen, D. Lewis, and R. Wright-Summerton (2014). “Communes and Intentional Communities,” in *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. Eds. M. Parker, G. Cheney, V. Fournier, and C. Land. New York: Routledge, 89–103.
- *Pless, N. M., and J. Appel (2012). “In Pursuit of Dignity and Social Justice: Changing Lives Through 100% Inclusion—How Gram Vikas Fosters Sustainable Rural Development,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 111(3), 389–403.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital,” *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), 65–78.
- *Ramirez, J. S. (2003). “A Roof for the South-Building with Love: FUPROVI-Represetel-Mutual Heredia,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-014, 1–23.
- Rangan, V. K. (2004). “Lofty Missions, Down-To-Earth Plans,” *Harvard Business Review* 82(3), 112–119.
- *——— (2007). “Population Services International—The Social Marketing Project in

- Bangladesh,” Harvard Business School Case, 586-013, 1–19.
- *Rangan, V. K., and B. Barton (2009). “Advanced Energy—Programs for Energy Conservation,” Harvard Business School Case, 508-003, 1–21.
- *Romero, C., and A. Maass (2003). “Bimbo Group and Papalote Museo del Niño,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-018, 1–22.
- Roper, J., and G. Cheney (2005). “The Meanings of Social Entrepreneurship Today,” *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 5(3), 95–104.
- *Roy, M. J., K. Sato, and F. Calò (2015). “Further Limits to Institutional Isomorphism? Introducing the ‘Neo-Contingency Approach’ to the Field of Community-Led Social Ventures,” *Voluntas* 24(5), 602–622.
- *Ruebottom, T. (2013). “The Microstructures of Rhetorical Strategy in Social Entrepreneurship: Building Legitimacy Through Heroes and Villains,” *Journal of Business Venturing* 28(1), 98–116.
- Ruef, M. (2000). “The Emergence of Organizational Forms: A Community Ecology Approach,” *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3), 658–714.
- *Rymasz, M. (2015). “The Role of Social Enterprises in Shaping Social Bonds,” *International Journal of Social Economics* 42(9), 830–840.
- Samuelson, P. A., and W. D. Nordhaus (2004). “Economics, Chapter 18,” in *Protecting the Environment*. Eds. P. A. Samuelson, and W. D. Nordhaus. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Santos, F., A. C. Pache, and C. Birkholz (2015). “Making Hybrids Work,” *California Management Review* 57(3), 36–58.
- *Short, J. C., T. W. Moss, and G. T. Lumpkin (2009). “Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities,” *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3(2), 161–194.
- *Smith, B. R., and C. E. Stevens (2010). “Different Types of Social Entrepreneurship: The Role of Geography and Embeddedness on the Measurement and Scaling of Social Value,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22(6), 575–598.
- *Somerville, P., and G. McElwee (2011). “Situating Community Enterprise: A Theoretical Exploration,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 23(5–6), 317–330.
- *Squazzoni, F. (2009). “Social Entrepreneurship and Economic Development in Silicon Valley: A Case Study on the Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38(5), 869–883.
- *Stephan, U., M. Patterson, C. Kelly, and J. Mair (2016). “Organizations Driving Positive Social Change: A Review and an Integrative Framework of Change Processes,” *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 1250–1281.
- *Sun, S. L., and J. Im (2015). “Cutting Microfinance Interest Rates: An Opportunity Creation Perspective,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 39(1), 101–128.
- Tajfel, H., and J. C. Turner (1979). “An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict,” in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Eds. W. G. Austin and S. Worchel. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 33–47.
- *Tapsell, P., and C. Woods (2010). “Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation: Self-Organization in an Indigenous Context,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22(6), 535–556.
- Thompson, J. D., and I. C. MacMillan (2010). “Business Models: Creating New Markets and Societal Wealth,” *Long Range Planning* 43(2), 291–307.
- *Toivonen, T. (2016). “What Is the Social Innovation Community? Conceptualizing an Emergent Collaborative Organization,” *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 7(1), 49–73.
- Tracey, P., and O. Jarvis (2007). “Toward a Theory of Social Venture Franchising,” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 31(5), 667–685.
- *Tracey, P., and N. Phillips (2016). “Managing the Consequences of Organizational Stigmatization: Identity Work in a Social Enterprise,” *Academy of Management Journal* 59(3), 740–765.
- *Tracey, P., N. Phillips, and H. Haugh (2005). “Beyond Philanthropy: Community Enterprise as a Basis for Corporate Citizenship,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 58(4), 327–344.
- *Trujillo, D. M. (2009). “Aplina Inc,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-125, 1–23.
- *Valchovska, S., and G. Watts (2016). “Interpreting Community-Based Enterprise: A Case Study from Rural Wales,” *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 7(2), 211–235.
- Venkataraman, S. (2002). “Stakeholder Value Equilibration and the Entrepreneurial Process,” in *The Ruffin Series No. 3: Ethics*

- and Entrepreneurship*. Eds. R. E. Freeman and S. Venkataraman. Charlottesville, VA: Philosophy Documentation Center, 45–57.
- *Venot, J. P. (2016). “A Success of Some Sort: Social Enterprises and Drip Irrigation in the Developing World,” *World Development* 79, 69–81.
- *Vernis, A., L. Lamolia, and D. Arenas (2009). “La Fageda,” Social Enterprise Knowledge Network Case, SKE-119, 1–14.
- *Vestrum, I. (2014). “The Embedding Process of Community Ventures: Creating a Music Festival in a Rural Community,” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 26(7–8), 619–644.
- Walsh, J. P., K. Weber, and J. D. Margolis (2003). “Social Issues and Management: Our Lost Cause Found,” *Journal of Management* 29(6), 859–881.
- *Weaver, R. L. (2016). “Social Enterprise Self-Employment Programs: A Two-Dimensional Human Capital Investment Strategy,” *Social Enterprise Journal* 12(1), 4–20.
- *Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). “September 11th Fund—The Creation,” Harvard Business School Case, 302-083, 1–14.
- Whetten, D. A., and A. Mackey (2002). “A Social Actor Conception of Organizational Identity and Its Implications for the Study of Organizational Reputation,” *Business and Society* 41(4), 393–414.
- Wilburn, K., and R. Wilburn (2014). “The Double Bottom Line: Profit and Social Benefit,” *Business Horizons* 57(1), 11–20.
- *Wong, G., Chung, P., and I. Wang (2009). “Sowers Action—The First Ten Yards,” *Asia Case Research Centre*, HKU-871, 1–24.
- Wry, T., and J. G. York (2017). “An Identity-Based Approach to Social Enterprise,” *Academy of Management Review* 42(3), 437–460.
- Young, R. (2006). “For What It Is Worth: Social Value and the Future of Social Entrepreneurship,” in *Social Entrepreneurship—New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Ed. A. Nicholls. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 56–73.
- *Yusuf, J. E., and M. F. Sloan (2015). “Effectual Processes in Nonprofit Start-Ups and Social Entrepreneurship: An Illustrated Discussion of a Novel Decision-Making Approach,” *The American Review of Public Administration* 45(4), 417–435.
- *Zahra, S. A., E. Gedajlovic, D. O. Neubaum, and J. M. Shulman (2009). “A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges,” *Journal of Business Venturing* 24(5), 519–532.
- Zahra, S. A., and M. Wright (2016). “Understanding the Social Role of Entrepreneurship,” *Journal of Management Studies* 53(4), 610–629.