

A review of literature into the nature and purpose of collective social entrepreneurship

FESTUS O. EDOBOR
Cardiff Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

JAMES OGUNLEYE
Middlesex University, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT Collective Social Entrepreneurship is becoming a subject of interest in the entrepreneurship literature because of its contribution in economic growth and poverty reduction. This paper examines the nature and purpose of collective social entrepreneurship otherwise referred to as collectivism. This paper examines over fifty literatures and articles on collective social entrepreneurship in order to identify and establish its nature and purpose. The paper finds that collaborations, cooperatives, alliance and movements are important inputs and outcomes of collective social entrepreneurial work, which exist both within and across sector. The paper also finds different forms of collective social entrepreneurs with different social missions, as well as contractual and non-contractual forms of collective entrepreneurship. The paper concludes that although none of the forms collectives captures the unique mix of social and economic incentives that characterize collective social entrepreneurial ventures. However, successful collective social entrepreneurs often simultaneously leverage many of the existing forms including relying on cooperative models and developing cross-sectoral collaborations.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Social entrepreneurship, Innovation, Collective Action

Introduction

Collective action among organisations is often coordinated by other formal organizations such as trade associations, formal political coalitions, producer or agricultural cooperatives, research and development consortia, formal industrial alliances, associations of cultural organizations or government agencies, federations of trade unions, and the like (William, 2000). Although various theories have been applied to understand these collective institutions, the focus has been largely on how such associations help to facilitate exchange and cooperation among member organizations (Streeck and Schmitter 1985; Katz and Ordover 1990; Williamson 1991; Granovetter 1995). Consequently, research has tended to emphasize member organizations as the primary units of analysis, looking at how their strategies, objectives, and performance are affected by their inter-organizational relationships (Keister, 1998). Far less research has focused primarily on collective organizations themselves, so very little is known about their nature, purpose, strategies and structures and even less about the dynamics of their formation and growth. Collective entrepreneurship combines business risk and capital investment with the social values of collective action. It is an event that exists when collective action aims for the economic and social betterment of a locality by means of some transformation of social norms, values, and networks for the production of goods or services by an enterprise (see also David, 1999)

Literature Review

Collective Social entrepreneurship can be characterized as persons conducting business together with at least one partner sharing ownership with them. Wilken (1977) uses collective entrepreneurship to describe the source and structure of economic development, i.e., whether it was an individual, family, a group of unrelated people, or government that formed a business venture. He used this categorisation to describe the economic development of different countries – the form of development undertaken being a reflection of culture, economic conditions, and public policy.

David Wolfe (1997) uses the term to describe the nature of interactions that exists between individual firms. This is in the context of a collective learning process in the acquisition and use of new technical knowledge amid global and institutional restructuring. Collective entrepreneurship, therefore, plays a part in a nation's institutional capacity for adaptation.

Jonsson (1997), on the other hand, uses collective entrepreneurship for the role it plays in the capital accumulation process and innovation. He argues against reducing 'entrepreneurial function' cannot be reduced to an individual or entity and that the entrepreneurial function best realized through a process of collective entrepreneurship involving actors such as central, state and local governments and international organizations who in the main are responsible for regulating and promoting conditions of competition and competitiveness. This use of the term collective social entrepreneurship accomplishes two goals. First, as Jonsson (1997) posits, the

categories of actors involved in collective entrepreneurship and second, the definition of the categories of collective-entrepreneurship interrelationships. For example, the state and the firm may act collectively around procurement, science parks, and tax allowances for innovative firms.

The role of collectives in driving social change is evident in the organizations literature. However, of the many manifestations of collective action, three major forms are social movements, community cooperatives, and cross-sectorial collaboration. The following brief overview of these three types of collectives serves as a background for studying and understanding the unique contribution of collective social entrepreneurship. Social movements play an integral role in the formation of markets and in field level change.

Researchers exploring collective entrepreneurship as a form of socio-political change are referring to entrepreneurial activity that integrates economic, social cultural and political goals (Bataille-Chetodel & Huntzihger, 2004; Chouinard & Forgues, 2002; Connell, 1999). Many of the investigations into collective entrepreneurship focusing on regional and local development stem from initiatives and policies to support the social economy (Graefe, 2006; Laville, 2003; Spear, 2000). Chouinard and Forgues (2002) suggest entrepreneurship may occur on a continuum from private entrepreneurship to collective entrepreneurship focusing on providing services to workers associations of workers and community groups. Practical examples of collective entrepreneurship in the social economy literature include non-profit organizations, cooperatives, foundations, voluntary organizations, public interest groups and social movements (Burruss & Cook, 2009; Spaey, 2004).

The writings on social business have centred on the investigation of either single business visionaries or single social ventures (Dacin et al, 2010; Dacin et al, 2011; Mair et al, 2012; Mair & Martí, 2006). In any case, another perspective has developed as of late, researching another level of examination: a variety of subjects working all in all to acquire a social effect. Montgomery et al (2012, p. 376) proposes the idea of "Aggregate Social Business", which is characterized as the "joint effort among comparative as well as various performing artists with the end goal of applying business standards to tackling social issues".

Sud et al., (2008) contend that social business cannot be required to tackle social issues on an extensive scale if these are handled by single social associations in light of the fact that, characteristically to the setting in which social ventures work, there are issues whose arrangement require a communitarian exertion of numerous on-screen characters crosswise over distinctive areas and institutional limits. Pies et al., (2010) propose that social business ought to act at diverse levels of operation suggesting a participation of a few performing artists, subsequently raising the level of investigation from the single social entrepreneurs to a group of associations and subjects. This viewpoint is advanced by Santos (2012), who proposes a hypothesis of social business enterprise where social entrepreneurs, concentrated on quality creation instead of on worth catch, typically work in portions of the economy where externalities are critical and wild. The understood result is that we are liable to discover social undertakings in connections where the social effect they create is grown all things considered with the beneficiary subjects of their externalities. Additionally, Kania & Kramer (2011) propose such point of view

focusing on the contrast between aggregate effect and detached effect Writing Survey Today, "Social enterprise" can be extensively conceptualized as undertakings and entrepreneurs that mirror the two components of an) an all-encompassing social mission and b) entrepreneurial imagination (Corner & Ho, 2010; Mair & Martí, 2006; Peredo & McLean, 2006). Be that as it may, as noted by Montgomery et al. (2012), Dacin et al. (2011) and Lance (2006), early entrepreneurs at characterizing social enterprise were for the most part affected by the "immense man" school (Lance, 2006), with a solid concentrate on the deeds accomplished by single, chivalrous business people emphatically dedicated to tackle a social issue, and on the arrangements they authorized.

Work by Beater (1997) emphatically centred on the figure of a social business visionary, which is broadly investigated in her own qualities, attributes and systems for activity. Average of this flood of exploration is narrating, used to present the picture of the social business visionary. This sort of centre can likewise be distinguished in the work of Dees (1998, 2007), who predominantly alludes to single people when depicting the distinction between social business visionaries and excellent business visionaries (1998); and when examining the capability of social business enterprise in correlation to government's and ordinary philanthropy's activities in managing social issues (2007). Alvord et al., (2004) give a few stories of effective social entrepreneurs and, examining their qualities to locate a typical example, unequivocally concentrate on the attributes of the social business visionaries that established them, similar to social foundation, nationality, past occupations, and so on. Moreover, Seelos & Mair (2005), exploring the plans of action sanctioned by social entrepreneurs, concentrate on social business visionaries and their stories of achievement. Another prominent occasion of the attention on the single business visionary is given by Tan et al., (2005), who, learning the substance of the "social" and the "entrepreneurial" component inside social business, do as such by alluding to what it implies for an individual to be entrepreneurial and socially dedicated.

The emphasis on the single individual has all the more as of late advanced into an attention all in all entrepreneurs. As analysts began to concentrate on the social undertakings as associations, social business has been progressively related in writing with associations more than with people. This is the present most far reaching position in writing and numerous writers give plainly association based meaning of social business (e.g. Dart, 2004; Harding, 2004; Haugh, 2006; Hockerts, 2006; Lasprogata & Cotten, Marya, 2003; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). Seelos & Mair (2007) examine the authoritative plans of action of social undertakings in "Base of the Pyramid" situations. Austin et al (2006), when examining the contrast in the middle of social and business enterprise, do as such by pondering hierarchical models and looking at social and business entrepreneurs, not business people. Sprout (2009) examines social entrepreneurial associations when characterizing the run of the mill ways took after by social business to get the last point of neediness decrease. He likewise utilizes the same hierarchical concentrate in Blossom & Smith (2010) when proposing a hypothesis of the components driving the scaling up of social ventures' effect. Mair & Marti (2009) work on how social business identifies with institutional voids concentrates on an association overall, despite the

fact that piece of the information had people as the unit of examination. Analysts chipping away at the issue of social effect estimation do as such by considering the routines associations utilization to evaluate their effect (Nicholls, 2009), and/or proposing appraisal techniques connected by social ventures (Lepoutre et al, 2013; Nicholls, 2009). Friedman & Desivilya (2010) demonstrate the constructive outcome in provincial advancement of social ventures activities when related with clash engagement arrangements, and their proposed model spotlights on associations establishing social business enterprise. Mair et al (2012) offer a typology of conceivable models of social entrepreneurial associations, researching the sorts of capital utilized by social ventures.

On a fundamental note, Sud et., al (2008) contend that social entrepreneurs/business visionaries are hindered in tackling social issues on an extensive scale when they handle only them. The characteristically complex nature of the issues handled by social entrepreneurial activity makes it more probable that such issues can be explained just through a collective exertion of numerous on-screen characters, crosswise over diverse segments and institutional limits, who can in this manner influence on distinctive abilities and assets. An attention on aggregate activity is additionally proposed by Kania & Kramer (2011, 2013) and Hanleybrown et al (2012) whose works advocate for the need of "aggregate effect" (Kania & Kramer, 2011, p. 36) so as to attain to enduring results in handling imperative social issues. Contrary to secluded effect, aggregate effect is characterized as the "responsibility of a gathering of critical performing artists from distinctive divisions to a typical motivation for explaining a particular social issue" (Kania & Kramer, 2011, p. 36). The contrasts between separated effect and aggregate effect are then considered top to bottom by Hanleybrown et al. (2012) and predominantly respect the way that aggregate social effect obliges numerous subjects cooperating with an aggregate mentality brought about by being a piece of a framework, contrary to the subjective/individualistic methodology of regular single social endeavours. At long last, this point of view is additionally suggested by Santos (2012). In Santos' work, social endeavours are described as being centred on worth creation instead of on quality catch - dissimilar to fantastic business revenue driven endeavours - and hence they locate their common place in fragments of the economy where externalities are vital and wild.

The Term "Collective"

Wide variations in the use of the term collective entrepreneurship have left little common ground on which to build a comprehensive theory of collective entrepreneurship. Substantial discrepancies in the usage of the term leave researchers open to criticism that points to a lack of precise definitions or citations to the collective entrepreneurship literature (Weissert, 2002). Among the authors surveyed for this paper, we noted the descriptor collective is utilized in three primary ways: 1) to recognize multiple parties engaged in entrepreneurship 2) to refer to the type of economic good generated by the entrepreneurial process and 3) to denote asset

ownership. When collective, in fact, refers to multiple actors engaged in the entrepreneurial process, wide variation exists as to whether collective entrepreneurship is among risk-capital providers, among employees, among firms, among governments officials, among universities, or among a combination of these actors. The stage in which multiple actors become engaged in the entrepreneurial process (e.g. opportunity identification, venture financing, opportunity development) also affects whether authors choose to utilize the collective entrepreneurship label (Byrd, 1990; Tardieu, 2003).

When entrepreneurs are primarily interested in the generation of public, common pool, or club goods, we find certain authors utilize the term collective to distinguish from entrepreneurial endeavours in the pursuit of private goods (Frederick & Henry, 2004; Vaillancourt & Chartrand, 2005). This connotation of collective is most often present in the social economy and ethnic entrepreneurship literature. Several authors have also coupled the creation of collective goods with Hofstede's cultural dimensions of individualism and collectivism (Hofstede, 1980). This has been the cause for some debate, however, as multiple actors can cooperate to generate a collective good without displaying cultural traits of collectivism. And, true collectivism is argued to be incompatible with basic components of the entrepreneurial process such as change and innovation (Morris, et. al. 1994).

Finally, a proportion of literature surveyed for this paper also view entrepreneurship by socialist collectives as collective entrepreneurship. Resources are owned by the collective; the collective makes decisions with respect to the employment of these collective assets; and the collective bears investment risk (Zupanov, 1975). Thus, entrepreneurial endeavours utilizing collectively owned assets constitute another manifestation of collective entrepreneurship. This concept was explored in depth by socialist regimes in an attempt to improve worker motivation in labour-managed firms (Obradovic, 1994).

Concept of Entrepreneurship

Various interpretations of the word collective often constitute an initial stumbling block to opening dialogue among researchers as different interpretations of the term collective are often a direct result of stark ideological differences as to the normative role of the individual and the entrepreneur in society. These differences are compounded by differing views as to what constitutes entrepreneurship—business ownership, innovation, arbitrage, or creativity (Foss & Klein, 2005). Thus, of primary interest to scholars of collective entrepreneurship is the advancement of a theory of entrepreneurship.

The entrepreneurial element in the definition

Research on entrepreneurship has been marked by the emergence of various streams focusing on different aspects of the phenomenon. An early stream centered on the question of how the personality or background of the entrepreneur determines entrepreneurial behavior (McClelland, 1961; Kets De Vries, 1977). Because of methodological and definitional problems (Low & MacMillan, 1988) inherent in the approach based on the traits and/or psychological profiles of entrepreneurs (see Sexton and Bowman (1985) for a review of this literature), various authors suggested in the mid-1980s that the focus of entrepreneurship research should be the entrepreneurial process or entrepreneurial behavior (Gartner, 1985, 1988; Sandberg & Hofer, 1987). Today it is widely recognized that the phenomenon is far more complex and heterogeneous than was assumed in the 1980s (Bryat & Julien, 2004). Also, an increasing number of researchers have studied entrepreneurial processes outside of the business sector (Morris & Jones, 1999; Zerbinati & Souitaris, 2005) and the role of entrepreneurship in society (Steyaert & Katz, 2004). Although the field is still characterized by multiple paradigms, the notion of opportunities has been widely accepted as a defining element of entrepreneurship (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Venkataraman, 1997; Ardichvili, Cardozo, & Ray, 2003). Shane and Venkataraman (2000), for example, describe entrepreneurship as a field that analyses how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited.

Research on social entrepreneurship has to some extent replicated the empirical and theoretical evolution of entrepreneurship. Researchers have focused on the personality of the Social entrepreneur, the particular behavior or process involved, or the social opportunity, in order to emphasize the entrepreneurial nature of the phenomenon and thus differentiate it from other phenomena. A popular –early– stream of research has focused on the *personality of the social entrepreneur*. According to studies following this approach, social entrepreneurs are characterized by very special traits (Drayton, 2002), special leadership skills (Henton, Melville, & Welsh, 1997; Thompson et al., 2000), a passion to realize their vision (Bornstein, 1998; Boschee, 1995), and a strong ethical fiber (Bornstein, 1998; Drayton, 2002). To become a legitimate field of scholarly investigation this stream of research needs to overcome methodological problems such as a bias towards studying successful entrepreneurs or the limited ability to differentiate between successful entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, managers, politicians and social activists. Despite the ongoing momentum of research aimed at identifying distinctive entrepreneurial personality traits, we are skeptical whether this approach will elucidate key differences between social entrepreneurs and other actors. It has been repeatedly pointed out that “who the entrepreneur is” is not the right question to ask (see also Gartner, 1988). Building on a behavioral tradition in entrepreneurship, we argue that examining the set of activities underlying

social entrepreneurship as a process may be a more fruitful approach. A number of researchers have emphasized the entrepreneurial process, i.e., “how” entrepreneurs act, as a way of differentiating between social initiatives and social “entrepreneurial” initiatives. For instance, building on traditional entrepreneurship literature, Dees describes what social entrepreneurs do as “engaging in a process of continuous innovation and acting boldly without being limited by the resources they currently have in hand” (1998:4). Finally, a recent stream of research has focused on the “social value creating” nature of the opportunities entrepreneurially discovered and exploited, in order to distinguish social entrepreneurship from other entrepreneurial phenomena (Hibbert, Hogg, Quinn, 2002; Mort, et al., 2002; Guclu, et al., 2002).

The concept of social entrepreneurship

The concept of social entrepreneurship means different things to different people and researchers (Dees, 1998). One group of researchers refers to social entrepreneurship as not-for-profit initiatives in search of alternative funding strategies, or management schemes to create social value (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skiller, 2003; Boschee, 1998). A second group of researchers understands it as the socially responsible practice of commercial businesses engaged in cross-sector partnerships (Sagawa & Segal, 2000; Waddock, 1988). And a third group views social entrepreneurship as a means to alleviate social problems and catalyze social transformation (Alvord et al., 2004; Ashoka Innovators, 2000). Numerous definitions, stressing different aspects and dimensions of social entrepreneurship, have been offered. It is important to note the conceptual differences between definitions. Definitions of social *entrepreneurship* typically refer to a process or behavior; definitions of social *entrepreneurs* focus instead on the founder of the initiative; and definitions of social *enterprises* refer to the tangible outcome of social entrepreneurship. Despite the large number of definitions, systematic attempts to map initiatives and definitions are rare (see Boschee (1995) and Waddock and Post (1995), for two exceptions). While complementary definitions, each focusing on different aspects of the phenomenon, are not necessarily an impediment in the search for theory (Baumol, 1993), we still do not have a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon and lack a clear understanding of how social entrepreneurship should be studied.

The social element in the definition

Probably, the greatest challenge in understanding social entrepreneurship lies in defining the boundaries of what we mean by *social* (Seelos & Mair, 2005a). Viewed broadly, the term “social” refers to initiatives aimed at helping others (Prabhu, 1999). At first glance, social entrepreneurship might be thought to differ from entrepreneurship in the business sector in that while the latter is associated with the profit motive (Cole, 1968), social

entrepreneurship is an expression of altruism. We argue against such a dichotomous line of thinking for two reasons. First, although social entrepreneurship is often based on ethical motives and moral responsibility (Bornstein, 1998; Catford, 1998), the motives for social entrepreneurship can also include less altruistic reasons such as personal fulfillment. Secondly, and more importantly, entrepreneurship in the business sector also has a social aspect. Venkataraman (1997, p. 133) made this point forcefully:

“As Schumpeter (1934) pointed out several decades ago (and Adam Smith much earlier), the personal profit motive is a central engine that powers private enterprise and social wealth. Entrepreneurship is particularly productive from a social welfare perspective when, in the process of pursuing selfish ends, entrepreneurs also enhance social wealth by creating new markets, new industries, new technology, new institutional forms, new jobs, and net increases in real productivity”

In other words, although the profit motive might be ‘a central engine’ of entrepreneurship (Schumpeter, 1934; Baumol, 1993), it does not preclude other motivations. As Velamuri (2002) pointed out, altruism and entrepreneurship differ only in degree, not in kind. Previous research on entrepreneurial motivation, such as McClelland’s seminal piece on the need for achievement (McClelland, 1961) or studies on the desire for independence (Hisrich & Brush, 1986) or the propensity to take risks (Brockhaus, 1980; Liles, 1974), has compellingly demonstrated that entrepreneurship is not only based on motives to increase personal wealth. (See Shane, Locke, and Collins (2003) for a review of the importance of motivation to the study of entrepreneurship.)

Types of collective social entrepreneurs

Co-operatives

Co-operatives may be the clearest example of collective entrepreneurship. They are, by definition, a collective effort. Accordingly, co-operatives are a group initiative to self-manage combined resources and to share the organisation’s success or failure (Jonsson, 1997). From another perspective, co-operatives correspond to the logic of collective action. First, co-operatives are *privileged* groups: it is expected that the net benefit to at least one individual is positive. For example, this is achieved through securing a market for the co-operatives goods or from the distribution of profits to the membership. Second, convention may also play a role in keeping co-operatives functioning. As (Spear, 2006) stated, entrepreneurship is more likely to occur when embraced as a social value. This underlies the importance of articulating the values of co-operatives, as the International Co-operative Alliance has done (Thordarson, 1990, p. 1).

Jonsson (1997) cites factor contributing to success in remote fishing communities that applies well to the many co-operative experiences. That is, a homogenous

population with a clear sense of identity stemming from common culture, language and religion. This, too, has implications for the role of convention. It may also lend support to the proposition that larger groups are more likely to succeed if made up of overlapping smaller groups.

Social Capital

Social capital, like collective entrepreneurship, is a term used in various capacities. As Wall et al., (1998, p. 319) suggests with reference to social capital, “elasticity in applicability might threaten its utility as a social construct”. The authors suggest that one appeal of social capital is its possible links to other disciplines such as economics. According to Wall et al., (1998 p. 312), social interactions and networks “are construed as capital when some transformation takes place based on incorporating those resources”. Green (1996) illustrates this connection more explicitly – he links the importance of social capital to entrepreneurship and small business development.

Purpose of collective social entrepreneurs

Inter-organisational gains

Literature on collective entrepreneurship that has evolved considers mutual gains that can be achieved through dynamic cooperation and organizational hybrids in markets. Inter-organizational gains literature focuses on explicit or tacit inter-firm coordination for the purpose of rent-seeking through mechanisms such as networks and alliances, clusters and industrial districts, and franchise agreements (Gordon, 2008). Although there is some mention of efficiency gains due to coordination, the literature on alliances and franchise agreements addresses the generation of rents which may be best described as positive payoffs from a game theoretic point of view. When considering collective entrepreneurship in the form of industrial districts, however, economic rent-generation is more closely related to the concepts of positive externalities or agglomeration economies (Gordon, 2008).

Networks and Alliances: formal and Informal

Mourdoukoutas (1999) describes collective entrepreneurship as a fluid organizational structure that provides opportunities to the hundreds or even thousands of entrepreneurs-hipsters scattered often found among suppliers, distributors, customers, and collaborators to come forward with the information they possess and to join forces for the discovery and the exploitation of new business opportunities (Mourdoukoutas, 1999, p. 134; Mourdoukoutas & Papadimitriou, 2002). From this starting point, Mourdoukoutas includes what he labels as internal and external (i.e. intra-firm and inter-firm) collective entrepreneurship in his study of the development of entrepreneurial networks.

Mourdoukoutas also makes an important contribution in distinguishing between contractual and non-contractual forms of collective entrepreneurship. This criterion

can be applied across various types of collective entrepreneurship described in this article. Further investigation of the structure of collective entrepreneurship, contractual or non-contractual, formal or informal, is warranted if scholars are to understand the mechanisms and incentive structures that sustain collective entrepreneurship. Two possible avenues for development include the (1) development of a continuum from non-contractual to contractual to describe collective entrepreneurial networks and (2) an evolutionary framework that explores variations in contracting among co-operators over time (Moudoukoutas, 1999). Collective entrepreneurs may begin by cooperating under informal agreements, developing contractual arrangements over time. Or, the opposite may be the case: as parties develop familiarity and trust they may discontinue the use of formal contracts in some instances.

Concluding remarks

Literature reveals different dimensions to collective social entrepreneurs. Collective entrepreneurship adds a further dimension of complexity—the propensity for collective action. This dimension is significant because it sets collective entrepreneurship apart from other economic development strategies. It requires a deliberate choice to pursue collectivism over individualism. Where there is a choice, there must also be a balance. Ultimately, rural communities will have to embrace a range of development strategies. They will have to find ways to link bottom-up and top-down efforts, to find synergy between individualism and collectivism. Toward this balance, collective entrepreneurship embraces the social benefits of collective action with the innovation and power of the market.

The literature clearly shows the relevance of the collective dimension. First of all, each actor adhering to the collective had to make collective-specific investments to adapt to the shared processes underpinning the collective's activities. The collective generate many activities and meetings dedicated to the project's values promotion, so that those who decide to join the project can be aware of the related commitment and tasks. Literature also revealed that investment in getting to know each other collective was crucial. In particular, it is necessary to invest in the management of relations with those who want to be part of the project. Acquiring generic skills or general information about the project is just the beginning. It is very important to know each other very well, to develop trust and tacit coordination in such a way that the collective's activities develop according to the set of shared values.

From the foregoing discourse, the collectives creating a social impact might be individuals that are not necessarily social enterprises (Alvord, 2004). That is, the collective as a whole might act as a social enterprise (when considering the aggregated results of its action) even though all its components are not individually acting as social enterprises. In particular, the collective's social impact can be actually related to that of a social enterprise. This means that using a collective point of view can allow us to detect cases of social entrepreneurial action that could be missed when focusing on the single actors. Furthermore, as social entrepreneurial action takes place only at the collective level, it means that all actors have the same importance in the social entrepreneurial action. If one of them leaves, whether it is

profit or non-profit organization, the collective might lose the ability to act as a social enterprise.

Also, collaborations, cooperatives, alliance and movements are important inputs and outcomes of collective social entrepreneurial work and they exist within sector or across sector. Literature also revealed different forms of collective social entrepreneurs with different social missions, as are different contractual and non-contractual forms of collective entrepreneurship. In conclusion, social movements, community cooperatives, and cross-sectoral collaboration provide an insight into collective social entrepreneurship. These latter forms of collective action highlight the importance of acquiring and deploying resources from multiple actors through a variety of activities and strategies to share ideas, mobilize supporters, bring together diverse viewpoints, and collaborate to drive change. Although related, none of these forms captures the unique mix of social and economic incentives that characterize collective social entrepreneurial ventures. Also, successful collective social entrepreneurs often simultaneously leverage many of these existing forms including relying on cooperative models and developing cross-sectoral collaborations.

Correspondence

Festus O. Osabor
School of Management
Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK
Email: festusedobor@yahoo.co.uk

References

- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260–282.
- Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(1): 105-133.
in *Society*, 30(3-4), 339-347.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2003). *Social Entrepreneurship and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?* Working Paper Series, No. 04-029, Harvard Business School.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30 (1), 1–22.
- Bataille-Chetodel, F., & Huntzinger, F. (2004). Faces of Governance of Production Cooperative: An Exploratory Study of Ten French Cooperatives. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75(1), 89-111.
- Baumol, W. J. (1993) Formal Entrepreneurship Theory in Economics: Existence and Bounds. *Journal of Business Venturing* 8(3): 197-210.
- Bornstein, D. (1998). Changing the world on a shoestring. *Atlantic Monthly*, 281 (1): 34-39.
- Boschee, J. (1995). Social entrepreneurship. *Across the Board*, 32(3): 20-25.
- Boschee, J. (1998) *Merging mission and money: A board member's guide to social entrepreneurship*: 19(4): 15-18.
- Branstad, A. (2008). Exploring Collective Entrepreneurship through a Case Narrative. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 635–659
- Brockhaus, R. H. (1980) Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3): 509-520
- Bruyat, C., & Julien, P. A. (2001) Defining the Field of Research in Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(2): 165-178.
- Burress, M. J., M. L. Cook, and P. G. Klein. (2008). “The Clustering of Organizational Innovation: Developing Governance Models for Vertical Integration.” *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 11(4): 49-75.

Byrd, W. A. (1990). Entrepreneurship, Capital, and Ownership. In W. A. Byrd & L. Qingsong (Eds.), *China's Rural Industry: Structure, Development, and Reform* (pp. 189-217). Washington, DC: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the US Brewing Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(3), 715–762.

Catford, J. (1998) Social entrepreneurs are vital for health promotion – but they need supportive environments too. *Health Promotion International*, 13 (2): 95-97.

Chouinard, O., & Forgues, É. (2002). Collective Entrepreneurship and Regional Development: Case Study of a New Brunswick Cooperative. *Journal of Rural Cooperation*, 30(2), 79-94.

Connell, D. J. (1999). “Healthy Economic Development: A New Framework Based on Quality of Life Principles.” In *The Economic and Technology Development Journal of Canada*. Vaughan, ON: Pentone Communications.

Connell, D. J. (1999). Collective Entrepreneurship: In Search of Meaning. *Encyclopaedia of Entrepreneurship*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Cook, M. L., & Plunkett, B. (2006). Collective Entrepreneurship: An Emerging Phenomenon in Producer-Owned Organizations. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 38(2), 421-428.

Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 635–659.

Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don't Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37– 57.

Dart, R. (2004). The legitimacy of social enterprise. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 14(4), 411– 424.

de Bruin, A., & Lewis, K. (2005). Green Entrepreneurship in New Zealand: A Micro-Enterprise Focus. In M. Schaper (Ed.), *Making Ecopreneurs: Developing Sustainable Entrepreneurship* (pp. 61-71). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. *Comments and suggestions contributed from the Social Entrepreneurship Funders Working Group*, 1–6.

Drayton, W. (2002) The citizen sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and

- competitive as business. *California Management Review*, 44(3): 120-132.
- Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3): 517-554.
- Foss, N. J., & Klein, P. G. (2005). Entrepreneurship and the Economic Theory of the Firm: A reappraisal, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 505-516.
- Frederick, H. H., & Henry, E. (2004). Innovation and Entrepreneurship amongst Pakeha and Maori in New Zealand. In C. Stiles, H. & C. Galbraith, S. (Eds.), *International Research in the Business Disciplines* (Vol. Volume 4, pp. 115-140). New York: JAI.
- Friedman, M. (1953). Part I—The Methodology of Positive Economics. In *Essays in Positive Economics* (pp. 3-43). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, V. J., and Desivilya, H. (2010). Integrating social entrepreneurship and conflict engagement for regional development in divided societies. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 22(6), 495-514.
- Gartner, W. (1988) Who is the entrepreneur? is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4): 11-32.
- Gordon Nembhard, J. (2008). Alternative Economics—A Missing Component in the African American Studies Curriculum: Teaching Public Policy and Democratic Community Economics to Black Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Black Studies*, 38(5), 758-782.
- Graefe, P. (2006). The Social Economy and the American Model Relating New Social Policy Directions to the Old. *Global Social Policy*, 6(2), 197-219.
- Granovetter, M. (1985) Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3): 481-510.
- Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 27–48.
- Guclu, A., Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2002) The Process of Social Entrepreneurship: Creating Opportunities Worthy of Serious Pursuit, *Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship*: Duke - The Fuqua School of Business.
- Harding, R. (2004). Social Enterprise: The New Economic Engine? *Business Strategy Review*, 15(4), 39–43.

- Haugh, H. (2006). Social enterprise: beyond economic outcomes and individual returns. *Social entrepreneurship*, 180–205.
- Henton, D., Melville, J., & Walesh, K. (1997) The age of the civic entrepreneur: restoring civil society and building economic community. *National Civic Review*, 86(2): 149-156.
- Hockerts, K. (2006). Entrepreneurial opportunity in social purpose business ventures. *Social entrepreneurship*, 1, 142–154.
- Hofstede, G. J. (1980). Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Jonsson, I. (1994). Collective Entrepreneurship and Microeconomies. In T. Greiffenberg (Ed.), *Sustainability in the Arctic: Proceedings from Nordic Arctic Research Forum Symposium 1993* (pp. 145-168). Aalborg, Denmark: Nordic Arctic Research Foundation, Aalborg University.
- Jonsson, I. (1995). *West-Nordic Countries in Crisis: Neo-structuralism, Collective Entrepreneurship, and Microsocieties Facing Global Systems of Innovation*. Copenhagen: New Social Science Monographs.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, winter, 35–41.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2013). Embracing emergence: How collective impact addresses complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1–7.
- Keister, L. A. (1998) 'Engineering growth: Business group structure and firm performance in China's transition economy'. *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 404–40.
- Kets De Vries, M.F.R. (1977) The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. *Journal of Management Studies*, 14(1): 34-57.
- Lasprogata, G. A., & Cotten, Marya, N. (2003). Contemplating “enterprise”: The business and legal
- Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur* (p. 115). Demos.
- Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S., & Bosma, N. (2013). Designing a global standardized Methodology for Measuring Social Entrepreneurship Activity: The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Social Entrepreneurship Study. *Small Business Economics*.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explana-

tion, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 419–435.

McClelland, D. C. (1961) *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

Morris, M. H., & Jones, F. F. (1999) Entrepreneurship in established organizations: The case of the public sector. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(1): 71-91.

Morris, M. H., Davis, D. L., & Allen, J. W. (1994). Fostering Corporate Entrepreneurship: Cross-Cultural Comparisons of the Importance of Individualism versus Collectivism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(1), 65-89.

Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003) Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1): 76-88.

Mourdoukoutas, P. (1999). *Collective Entrepreneurship in a Globalizing Economy*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Mourdoukoutas, P., & Papadimitriou, S. (2002). *Nurturing Entrepreneurship: Institutions and Policies*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Nicholls, A. (2009). “We do good things, don’t we?”: “Blended Value Accounting” in social entrepreneurship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 34(6), 755–769.

Obradovic, J. (1994). Sociology as a Mirror of Croatia Society. In M. F. Keen & J. Mucha (Eds.), *Eastern Europe in Transformation: The Impact on Sociology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56–65. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007.

Pies, I., Beckmann, M., & Hielscher, S. (2010). Value creation, management competencies, and global corporate citizenship: An ordonomic approach to business ethics in the age of globalization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(2), 254–278.

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–17.

Schumpeter, J. (1934) *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy*. New York: Harper & Row. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005a) Entrepreneurs in service of the poor – Models for business

Schumpeter, J. A. (1949). Economic Theory and Entrepreneurial History. In *Change and the Entrepreneur; Postulates and Patterns for Entrepreneurial History* (pp. 63-84). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

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

Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2007). Profitable Business Models and Market Creation in the Context of Deep

Sexton, D., & Bowman, N. (1985) The entrepreneur: A capable executive and more, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(1):129-140.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000) The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 217-226.

Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003) Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human resource management review*, 13(2): 257-279.

Spear, R. (2000). The Nature of Social Entrepreneurship - Some Findings. Paper presented at the International Society for Third-Sector Research: Fourth International Conference. Dublin.

Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a different model? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 399–410.

Stevenson, H. H., Roberts, M. J., & Grousbeck, H. I. (1989) *New Business Ventures and the Entrepreneur*. Homewood, IL.: Irwin.

Steyaert, C., & Katz, J. (2004) Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 16(3): 179-197.

Sud, M., VanSandt, C. V., & Baugous, A. M. (2009). Social Entrepreneurship: The Role of Institutions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(S1), 201–216.

Thompson, J., & Doherty, B. (2006). The diverse world of social enterprise: A collection of social enterprise stories. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 361–375.

Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Less, A. (2000) Social entrepreneurship: A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5): 328-338.

Vaillancourt, Y., & Chartrand, S. (2005). Le tiers secteur au Canada, un lieu de rencontre entre la tradition américaine et la tradition européenne. Paper presented at the First Conference of the International society for Third-Sector Research

(ISTR) and the EMES European Research Network. Conservatoire National des Arts et des Métiers (CNAM), Paris, 27-29 avril.

Velamuri, S. R. (2002) Entrepreneurship, altruism and the good society. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Special issue, The Ruffin Series No. 3.

Venkataraman, S. (1997) The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. Pp. 119-138 in J. Katz, & R. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Waddock, S. A. (1988) Building successful partnerships. *Sloan Management Review*, 29(4): 17-23.

Waddock, S. A., & Post, J. E. (1995) Catalytic alliances for social problem solving. *Human Relations*, 48(8): 951-972.

Wall, T., Ellen, A., Gabriele F., & Frans, S. (1998). "Getting the Goods on Social Capital." *Rural Sociology* 63(2), 1998, pp. 300-322.

Weissert, C. S. (2002). Book Review: The Politics of Breast Cancer by Maureen Hogan Casamayo. *The American Political Science Review*, 96(3), 632-633.

Wilken, P. H. (1979). *Entrepreneurship: A Comparative and Historical Study*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Wilkinson, P., & Quarter, J. (1996). *Building a Community-Controlled Economy: The Evangeline Co-operative Experience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wilkinson, Paul and Jack Quarter (1996). *Building a Community-Controlled Economy: The Evangeline Co-operative Experience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

William P. B., Gary A. M., William, R. K. (2000). *The Evolution of Collective Strategies among Organizations* SAGE Publications, Incorporated Vol. 5.

Wolfe, D. A. (1997). The Emergence of the Region State. In T. Courchene (Ed.), *The Nation State in a Global Information Era: Policy Challenges*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Yunus, M. (1999) *Banker to the poor: Microlending and the battle against world poverty*. New York: Public Affairs.

Zerbinati, S., & Souitaris, V. (2005) Entrepreneurship in the public sector: a framework of analysis in European local governments. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 17(1): 43-64.

Zupanov, J. (1975). Participation and Influence. In B. Horvat, M. Markovic & R. Supek (Eds.), *Self-governing Socialism, Volume 2, Sociology and Politics Economics*. White Plains, New York: International Arts and Sciences Press.

Appendix 1: Forms of Collective Entrepreneurship

| Actors | The state: governments, municipalities and institutes | Organized interests | Firm | Individual |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The state: governments, municipalities and institutes | Supporting international R&D projects, e.g. EUREKA, ESPRIT, ERASMUS; developmental plans for R&D on regional level; Establishing R&D funds and institutions, science parks etc.; tax reductions for R&D, procurement etc. | Collaboration between employers organizations, trade unions and the state in developing R&D and innovative institutes run by organized interests | Procurement, science parks, tax allowances for innovative firms etc. Technological transfer via foreign MNCs (c.f. Taiwan, S-Korea, Singapore etc.) | Centres and laboratories for inventive individuals |
| Organized interests of capital and labour | R&D projects in the welfare state, health and work conditions. Collaboration in the field of transformation of skills and flexibility of labour and technology as well as spatial flexibility of labour | R&D funds and institutes established and run by employers organizations and/or trade unions from different branches of industry | R&D funds and institutes established and run by collaboration and run by employers' organizations and/or trade unions from different branches of industry | R&D contracts with individuals and access to laboratories and other facilities |
| New social movements: environmentalist s, consumer organizations, women's movements | R&D projects related to the improvement of the environment, consumer information and health standards and gendered technology and discrimination | R&D collaboration by new social movements related to the interests of the new social movements | Collaboration as concerns definition of market niches and access to laboratories and other facilities | R&D contracts with individuals |
| Firm | | | R&D and innovation networks of firms; user-producer networks | firms provide innovative individuals with risk capital, mass produce prototypes and bring them to the market |
| Individual | | | | Groups of individuals initiate and finance R&D projects |

Source: Jonsson (1997)