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SI Research Trends

- Relationship of Constructs
- Mainstreaming
- Impact Focus
- Multi-level analysis
Social Entrepreneurship

Social Enterprise

Social Innovation

Relationship of Constructs

Structures: Power Dynamics

Outcomes: Impact

Hybridity: Management

Ideas, models, discourses, frames, inspirations, focused on structural change

Organizations, projects, social movements that enact social innovation

Social businesses, profit-with-purpose
Mainstreaming

- Widespread adoption by business, government and civil society globally
- Many top universities now have dedicated centres, initiatives, institutes or courses in SE/SI
  - Home disciplines
    - Management
    - Public Policy
- Papers in top journals
  - Dedicated research tracks at AoM, EGOS, ARNOVA etc
Widespread Adoption
Dedicated Research Centres
Dedicated Research Centres
Publishing: Management

- Venturing for Others with Heart and Head: How Compassion Encourages Social Entrepreneurship
  - Tsyah L. Miller, Matthew O. Osimos, Jeffrey S. McMillen, and Timothy J. Voss

- Developing a Conceptual Framework for Comparing Social Value Creation
  - Anne Kroeger and Christiane Weber

- Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don't Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here
  - Peter A. Dacin, M. Tim Dacin, and Margaret Metcalfe

- Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations
  - Julie Bartlett and Silvio Donato

- Building Inclusive Markets in Rural Bangladesh: How Intermediaries Work Institutional Voids
  - Johanna Mert, Ignasi Mert, and Merc J. Vennema
Publishing: Management

- **Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal**
  - Research Article: Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities
  - Jeremy C. Short, Todd W. Moss, G. T. Lumpkin

- **Organization Science**
  - Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions
  - M. Tina Dacin, Peter A. Dacin, Paul Tracey

- **Journal of Business Venturing**
  - Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research
  - Nia Choi, Satyajeet Majumdar

- **Accounting, Organizations and Society**
  - ‘We do good things, don’t we?’: ‘Blended Value Accounting’ in social entrepreneurship
  - Alex Nichols

- **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**
  - The Legitimacy of Social Entrepreneurship: Reflexive Isomorphism in a Pre-Paradigmatic Field
  - Alex Nichols
Publishing: Public Policy
Impact Focus

- Knowledge translation to practice
  - Publishing in HBR, CMR, SSIR
- Building 360 degree links to policy and practice
  - UK REF
  - EU FP7, H2020
- Creating knowledge translation and brokerage mechanisms
  - Third Sector Research Centre (UK)
- Better research on impact measurement and management
  - Impact Management Project
Multi-Level Analysis

Introduction to the special issue

Social Innovation:
Integrating Micro, Meso, and Macro Level Insights From Institutional Theory

Jakomijn van Wijk, Charlene Zietsma, Silvia Dorado, Frank G. A. de Bakker, and Ignasi Martí

Figure 1. Three-cycle model of social innovation.
Multi-Level Analysis

Social Entrepreneurship as a Multistage, Multilevel Phenomenon

Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises

Tina Saebi
Norwegian School of Economics
Nicolai J. Foss
Bocconi University
Stefan Linder
ESSEC Business School
Multi-Level Analysis: Hybridity

Community

Social Enterprises

Multi-Sector Collaborations

Shadow State

Private Sector

Public-Private Partnerships

Public Sector
SI Research Opportunities

- Think structurally
  - Draw on sociology and social movement theory
  - Focus on institutions, cognitive frames, and social networks
- ‘Map the system’
  - Explore inflexion points for change
- Analyse bottom-up and collaborative action
- Design research methodologies with long(er)-time horizons
- Consider power and ‘political’ elements more deeply
Power and Distributive Mechanisms in Institutional Dynamics

Nadia von Jacobi

Alex Nicholls
CRESS will explore the economic underpinnings of social innovation and how policy and practice can enhance the lives of the most marginalized and disempowered citizens in society.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 613251.
Beckert: Social Grid Model

- **Social Networks**: structures of social relations and relational patterns in society
- **Institutions**: constraining rules and norms of a given society
- **Cognitive Frames**: commonly shared meanings and interpretive material by which to make sense of society and its actions
Social Grid Model

Institutions

Establish collective power to shape institutions

Influence structure of social networks

Social Networks

Provide legitimation and shape perception of institutions

Call for global legitimacy

Shape perception of network structures

Cognitive Frames

Make values socially relevant

Shape and diffuse cognitive frames
Extended Social Grid Model

The extended grid model (static version)

Entwined power structures with their cognitive frames, social networks and institutions

Socio-environmental context

Structuration of agency via sources of power (CESPNA)

Individual agency

Goods & services

Personal, social and environmental conversion factors

Capability set

Choice

Achieved functioning

Reproduction of power structures
Neo-Institutionalist Puzzle

- Most organizations aiming to address ‘wicked’ problems fail (cf. Lounsbury, Ventresca and Hirsch, 2003). Why?
  - Focus on remedying *effects* rather than their *structural* causes - leaving core problems unresolved
- Neo-institutional theory should help solve this puzzle
  - Tradition of analysing structural and systemic mechanisms in societies
- But is has largely failed to do so. Why?
Theoretical Gap

- Neo-Institutional theory
  - Rules and constraints
  - Normative framings
  - Legitimacy
  - Structure-agency
- Problem: tends to neglect issues of *power, hierarchy and politics*
- Solution: bring back sensibility of power dynamics from ‘Old’ Institutionalism
  - Institutions are *not* neutral but rather dynamic arenas of competing claims to power
Every organization is existentially dependent on the degree to which they exert influence over the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of people and [other] organizations (Greenwood et al. 2017)
Contribution 1

• Bring back a structuralist sensibility from sociology/Old Institutionalism to focus on power dynamics and inequality/marginalization (eg. Hirsch and Lounsbury, 1997; Hassard, Cox and Rowlinson, 2013)

• Examine effects that institutional arrangements have on socio-structural power and hierarchy

• Connect Sen's Capability Approach to institutional theory for the first time
  • Structuralist analysis of individual and group opportunities to flourish or become marginalized
  • Identity and opportunity are linked
Institutions and Power

Institutional Norms
- Reified in Organizations and Their Actions

Power Enactments
- ‘Institutional Politics’ > Distributive Effects and Social Positions

Societal Consequences
- Level of Access To Available Opportunities To Flourish

Level Of Access To Available Opportunities To Flourish
Contribution 2

• ‘Institutional politics’ (Lawrence and Buchanan, 2017; Lawrence, Winn and Jennings, 2001)
  • Articulate competing claims to power and position
    • Object of the claims to power are focused on competing meanings and connected legitimacy claims

• **Institutional control**: structuralist expressions of power
  • Enacted by either *discipline* or *domination*

• **Institutional agency**: individual expressions of power
  • Enacted by *influence* or *force*
## Politics And Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemic Power</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agentic Power</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>DOMINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutes identities that structure the subjective experience of reality</td>
<td>Distribution of available opportunities through constraints on types of actors/actions or their effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFLUENCE</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of one actor to affect the choices and behaviours made by another actor</td>
<td>Overcomes the intentions and behaviours of others, but without attempting to change them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lawrence and Buchanan (2017)
Contributions 2

• Focus on institutional politics and dimensions of power reveals *distributive effects of institutional arrangements*
  • Institutional arrangements translate into structural power dynamics: *institutional externalities*
  • Drives distribution of individual 'positions' in society
    • Inequality, marginalization and injustice
  • Highlights intrinsic implications of power relations on human identities, capabilities, and the individual’s ability to flourish
Contribution 3

- Expand the micro-foundations of institutional change theory (e.g., Barley, 2008; Lawrence, Suddaby and Leca, 2009; Powell and Colyvas, 2008; Powell and Rerup, 2017)
  - Combine social movements theory, critical theory and politics-focused perspective on institutions from ‘Old’ Institutionalism
- Develop multi-level approach in which social structures and individual decision-making are densely intertwined and interdependent
  - Inter-subjective conceptions of identity/positions (e.g., Carr, 1998; Wry and York, 2017) link to power and position
Contributions 3

Cognitive Frames
- Conceptions of truth and of rationality

Social Networks
- Structured patterns of social ties

Individual positioning facilitates/constrains ability to flourish

- Structured opportunities for (legitimate) action
- ‘Institutions’ and Governance
CrESSI publications

As the project progresses, we aim to make as much material as possible freely available mainly in the form of a series of CrESSI Working Papers.

The Working Papers are based on the project Work Packages and Deliverables (D) for which they were initially drafted. Further information on the CrESSI Work Packages.

CrESSI publications fall into these categories:

- Policy Briefs and recommendations
- CrESSI Theoretical Framework
- Measuring Social Impact
- Public Policy and Social Innovation
- Lessons from Innovation Studies
- Empirical studies
- CrESSI Publications in Academic Journals
- Special Issues

Policy Briefs and recommendations

Based on findings from the CrESSI research programme, a number of policy briefs and papers have been produced. The following publications offer an assessment of EU-level social innovation policy agendas and a series of policy recommendations to enhance the capacity and impact of social innovation tackling marginalisation: