

VU Research Portal

Social Enterprises with Exceedingly Tight Resources

Glasbeek, L.

2020

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Glasbeek, L. (2020). *Social Enterprises with Exceedingly Tight Resources: Implications for Work and Leadership*.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

THIS CHAPTER AIMS TO HIGHLIGHT critical aspects of social entrepreneurship. To this end, we first explain the significance of the topic. Next, we outline this dissertation’s problem statement and related research questions. With that, we present the basic layout of this thesis. Then, we provide the conceptual background and overall research approach. Finally, we introduce the key ideas that emerged throughout this thesis and summarize how they have been presented to the broader academic community.

TOPIC SIGNIFICANCE

Six years before Milton Friedman won the 1976 Nobel Prize in Economics, he published what became a controversial essay. In the text, he advanced the argument that the only responsibility of business is to increase its profits (Friedman, 1970). In the ensuing years, scholars, practitioners, and policymakers have vehemently opposed this view (see, e.g., Waddock, Bodwell & Graves, 2002). The antagonistic argument rests on the premise that business has a moral fiber and should foster and use this to genuinely comply with the law, promote civilized market interactions in society, or address social and environmental issues, to name a few (Mulligan, 1986). Since Friedman’s publication, this moral fiber of business has gained visibility, eventually establishing “corporate social responsibility” (CSR) (Wickert & Risi, 2019) and “social entrepreneurship” (Saebi, Foss & Linder, 2019) as legitimate domains of research and practice. The latter is the focal construct in this dissertation.

CSR and social entrepreneurship are similar but not identical. CSR has to do with already-established business firms that, at some later point, begin to emphasize, strengthen, or redefine their ethical orientation (Wickert & Risi, 2019). In contrast, social entrepreneurship relates to ventures that operate with a social mission in mind from their inception onward (Battilana & Lee, 2014). Social enterprises aim to address critical issues in society—such as communal exclusion, impoverished groups, unemployment, poor healthcare, or environmental

destruction (Haugh, 2007; Mair, Battilana & Cardenas, 2012; Santos, 2012)—through business activities (Battilana, Sengul, Pache & Model, 2015). Typically, these are neglected problems (Santos, 2012). Furthermore, social enterprises place the interests of “targeted beneficiaries” above their investors’ stakes (Miller, Grimes, McMullen & Vogus, 2012, p. 616).

Contemporary Drivers of Social Entrepreneurship

The popularity of social entrepreneurship today arises from interrelated forces. For instance, mainstream political parties nowadays favor a marketization of society (Sievers, 2016; Tracey & Jarvis, 2007) and, consequently, governments reduce their funding of not-for-profit organizations (Engelke, Mauksch, Darkow & von der Gracht, 2016; Gianfaldoni & Morand, 2015; Peredo & McLean, 2006). This move often stimulates (or it forces) not-for-profits to devise business models and effectively turn into social enterprises. Scholars have subsequently begun to wonder whether the rise of businesslike thinking in areas of society traditionally shielded from such influences is “neoliberalism in disguise,” thereby expressing concerns about potentially prioritizing the diffusion of market mechanisms and public spending cuts over social impact (Davies, 2015, p. 433).

Furthermore, there are persistent social and environmental problems that institutional players and conventional businesses have thus far not tackled successfully, which attract social enterprises in a bid to turn things around and do good (Ansari, Munir & Gregg, 2012; Engelke et al., 2016; Loosemore, 2015). For instance, the inability of governments to resolve structural unemployment has led to the rise of work integration social enterprises (Battilana et al., 2015). Sometimes, governments might incentivize social enterprises to go to market (Nasioulas, 2018), for example, through policies.

Academic Interest in Social Entrepreneurship

In step with society’s growing attentiveness to ethics-driven ventures, there has been a surge in academic interest in social entrepreneurship (Graddy-Reed & Feldman, 2015; Rey-Marti,

Ribeiro-Soriano & Palacios-Marques, 2016; Santos, 2012). Research data platform Dimensions (<https://app.dimensions.ai>) lists 12,203 articles that contain the term “social entrepreneurship” (measurement on February 21st, 2019), showing a steady increase in academic output and non-linear growth in citations over the past decade.

Literature review papers are valuable tools in understanding the breadth and depth of social entrepreneurship research. For instance, Maier, Meyer, and Steinbereithner (2016) evaluate research into not-for-profit social enterprises, Burga and Rezanian (2015) examine accountability, Rawhouser, Cummings, and Newbert (2019) appraise social impact measurement, and Battilana and Lee (2014) and Doherty, Haugh, and Lyon (2014) reconsider how social enterprises combine business and social logics.

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND SUBSEQUENT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Despite progress in social entrepreneurship research, we observe significant ongoing issues. Our problem statement underlying this dissertation consists of three parts, leading to a single, overarching research question. Subsequently, each chapter in the body of this thesis contains follow-on research questions. In Chapter 6, we shall revisit our problem statement and research questions.

Three-Part Problem Statement

Notwithstanding conceptual advances, academic literature on social entrepreneurship is said to be immature (Sievers, 2016; Terjesen, Bosma & Stam, 2016). One persistent challenge in social entrepreneurship research remains the lack of definitional clarity (Bacq & Janssen, 2011; Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum & Shulman, 2009). For instance, whereas the literature is rife with typifications of social enterprises as ventures attempting to balance business and social “logics” that are inherently “conflicting” (see, e.g., Doherty et al., 2014), one could question whether this uniquely defines social enterprises. This reasoning leads to the first part of our problem statement:

There is an insufficient scholarly understanding of what precisely is social entrepreneurship and how its underlying theories come into being.

Another pressing topic of inquiry is how social enterprises operate under resource-constraints (Doherty et al., 2014; Short, Moss & Lumpkin, 2009). Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey (2010) emphasize that resource *acquisition* is distinctly challenging for innovative social entrepreneurs, arguing that “While most entrepreneurs operate under conditions of resource scarcity, social entrepreneurs face a specific set of challenges because they purposely locate their activities in areas where markets function poorly” (p. 683).

Only a few studies along the lines of Desa and Basu (2013) and Verreynne, Miles, and Harris (2013) extend this argument by investigating how social enterprises eventually *utilize* such hard-earned resources for newness (Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O’Regan & James, 2015). To understand the utilization of scarce resources in social enterprises—i.e., *ventures*—the literature typically draws on the concept of bricolage, which means “making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities” (Baker & Nelson, 2005, p. 333). Nonetheless, the ensuing conceptualizations of such research are mostly static. This limitation is questionable, and provides the second part of our problem statement:

Research has until now failed to appreciate the dynamic potential of bricolage in social enterprises facing resource-constraints.

Furthermore, research has thus far scarcely looked into how social entrepreneurs—i.e., *individuals*—respond to environmental dynamics, uncertainty, and resource constraints combined. Although institutional entrepreneurship theory (Tracey, Phillips & Jarvis, 2011) is commonly used in such cases, this dissertation argues that it has paradigmatic shortcomings in messy empirical contexts. For instance, its cardinal principle of intentionality, meaning that entrepreneurs deliberately change their social environment (Garud, Hardy & Maguire, 2007), is based on the assumption of individual ability (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009) and

rationality, both of which are questionable under challenging circumstances. We subsequently posit that alternative, non-institutional approaches are scarce, which puts the third part of our problem statement into focus:

Studies on the interplay of complexity and leadership of social entrepreneurs in dynamic and resource-deprived environments are lacking.

The above composite research angle connects with some of society's principal practical challenges, too. As government institutions increasingly provide fewer public services and funds to help vulnerable groups or protect the environment, and traditional market mechanisms insufficiently compensate for that, social enterprises are expected to move in and plug the gaps (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006; Maier et al., 2016). Social enterprises that operate in such institutional voids plausibly experience resource-scarcity. Thus, the dissertation's focus not only adds to the scarce scholarly research on this precise topic but also provides acting social entrepreneurs with knowledge on how their peers respond to resource-scarcity.

Overarching Research Question

From the above three-part research problem, we infer this dissertation's overarching research question:

How do social enterprises and their leaders operate when resources are exceedingly scarce, and circumstances change rapidly?

This question shapes the use of follow-on research questions in subsequent chapters, each in their way addressing newness in social enterprises under resource constraints.

Study 1: A Review of the Literature on Social Enterprises

To lay the foundation of the thesis, we conduct a literature review on social entrepreneurship in Chapter 2. Its analytical point of departure is an examination of how researchers define the concept, known to be a problematic area in social entrepreneurship studies. From there, we

evaluate how scholars draw on existing theories in their studies and assess their methodological considerations. The following three research questions guide our efforts:

1. *What is the scholarly perspective on social entrepreneurship definitions?*
2. *From where do researchers draw theories to develop their understanding of social entrepreneurship?*
3. *How do scholars conduct empirical research methodologically?*

Study 2: A Framework for Bricolage

After our perusal of what is social entrepreneurship and how its underlying theories come into being, Chapter 3 examines the mechanisms of newness and strategy in social enterprises under situations of resource constraints.

It generally appears that our informants do not have the means to follow “lengthy innovation processes” (Senyard, Baker & Davidsson, 2011, p. 1); instead, they operate more organically. A key theoretical concept that we associate with the pragmatic practices we encountered is “bricolage,” which, as stated, means “making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities” (Baker & Nelson, 2005, p. 333). We find that bricolage and strategy intertwine in different ways, often influenced by the maturity of the social enterprise. In this chapter, the leading research question is:

How do strategy and bricolage in resource-constrained social enterprises correspond with one another?

Study 3: An Inquiry into Generative Leadership

Further, in Chapter 4, we shift our attention from social enterprises to social entrepreneurs. We argue that the literature often depicts social entrepreneurs as individual innovators and heroes (Dey & Steyaert, 2010). We, however, find reasons to challenge this perspective after initially exploring the following broad research question:

How do we characterize the practices of social entrepreneurs facing exceptionally challenging circumstances?

Our subsequent findings prompt us to change the commencing research question and aim it toward a leadership function in social enterprises, which we refer to as “generative leadership.” A shorthand definition of generative leadership describes it as “foster[ing] innovation, organizational adaptation, and high performance” (Surie & Hazy, 2006, p. 13). We note, however, that the literature has not yet moved beyond this one-dimensional depiction of what generative leaders *do*. Hence, our revised research question aims to produce a more comprehensive view of generative leadership, as follows:

What is contained in the idea of generative leadership?

Study 4: Reflections on Unknown Unknowns

As the thesis progressed, I became intrigued by the problem of uncertainty and doubt, which is so prevalent for social entrepreneurs facing resource constraints in a dynamic context. Therefore, in Chapter 5, we examine in a conceptual essay the fundamental issue of what is, in fact, *not knowing*? It turns out that there are substantial gaps in scholarly understanding, particularly of so-called “unknown unknowns.”

We chose the essay form because the concept is still in a nascent state, and we hoped that the essay form would facilitate the kind of abductive reasoning we deemed suitable to explore and develop the topic. With the essay, we also intend to challenge some conventional views on organizations and epistemology. Overall, this motivation is in line with Gabriel’s (2016) view: “The essay gives a voice to an author’s creative imagination, enabling him or her to critique assumptions that are rarely questioned and explore new possibilities for intellectual and social change” (p. 244). The central research question in this chapter is:

What are the critical properties of unknown unknowns in organizations?

Our answers to the research questions above not only advance the scholarly understanding of the dynamics of social enterprises but should also help practitioners better cope with scarcity and uncertainty.

Finally, the Chapter 6 discussion section summarizes the dissertation's main messages and key theoretical and practical contributions.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

While academic research into social entrepreneurship is young, scholars have notably framed it as a form of general entrepreneurship (Martin & Osberg, 2007), which is a field with a much longer history of intellectual inquiry. Thus, the foundations of social entrepreneurship research contain the classic elements of inquiries into private enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Foundations of Social Entrepreneurship Scholarship

Some of the most widely known classical economists have written about private enterprise (e.g., Hayek, 1944), rewards for incurring business risks (Mill, 1885), and entrepreneurship (e.g., Keynes, 1936; Smith, 1776). Perhaps most prominently, the World War II-era Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter strongly emphasized the role of entrepreneurs as innovators (Schumpeter, 1939) and wholesale reformers (Schumpeter, 1942).

Contemporary depictions of entrepreneurship preserved critical elements from these intellectual figures' conceptualizations. Typically, modern entrepreneurship is thus understood as a commercial, opportunity-focused, future-oriented, and risk-bearing undertaking for private gains (Austin et al., 2006). Additionally, citing Schumpeter's point on disruptive innovation, Chell (2007) finds that entrepreneurship "is fundamentally about change" (p. 15).

To a large extent, social entrepreneurship researchers build on this narrative, incorporating the classic elements mentioned above in their conceptualizations. For instance, Martin and Osberg (2007) embed the "change" element in the social entrepreneurship domain, stating that unless there is considerable potential for large-scale and positive societal change,

an organization should not be called a social enterprise. Likewise, other scholars (e.g., Austin et al., 2006; Tracey & Jarvis, 2007), see “innovation” as pivotal in their depictions of social entrepreneurship.

Scholars, however, disagree on whether (and, if so, how) to integrate the profit motive in conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship (e.g., Jackson, 2016). Some perspectives barely differentiate social entrepreneurship from mainstream charity work or activism (O’Neil & Ucbasaran, 2016), though, with their focus on direct aid and absence of earned income strategies, they seem to stretch the concept too far to be of much help. We shall explore such matters in greater detail in our review of the social entrepreneurship literature in Chapter 2.

Issues of Conceptual Clarity on Key Terms

The terms “social entrepreneur,” “social enterprise,” and “social entrepreneurship” are key concepts in this dissertation, but although strongly related, they are not quite the same (see, e.g., Cho & Sultana, 2015; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Sievers, 2016). Furthermore, scholarly disagreement on the precise meaning of each of these terms, individually, further inhibits conceptual clarity in the social entrepreneurship domain.

Social entrepreneur. According to Chell (2007), a key feature of the social entrepreneur is the ability to see and pursue opportunities that create value. This resonates with the archetypical image of the commercial entrepreneur as a visionary, goal-oriented, and wealth-creating individual. Even though the social entrepreneur has often been described as a compassionate (Miller et al., 2012) and heroic individual (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011; Sepulveda, 2015) with exceptional leadership skills (Ellis et al., 2016) and celebrity status (Nicholls, 2010), the person should be seen as firmly embedded within, and interacting with, a social environment (Chell, 2007; Roy, Sato & Calo, 2015; Weerawardena & Mort, 2006).

Researchers generally portray social entrepreneurs in a stylized (Dacin et al., 2011) and romanticized manner. A well-known remark is that “everyone can become an entrepreneur”

(Daskalaki, Hjorth & Mair, 2015, p. 421). This view, however, seems to unjustly focus on perceived individual strengths and successes, while ignoring weaknesses, failures, specific contexts, and ethical challenges (also see, e.g., Andersson & Self, 2015; Battilana et al., 2015; Kidd et al., 2015; Pache & Santos, 2013; Tracey & Jarvis, 2007).

Social enterprise. Social entrepreneurs, through their activities, create and run social enterprises (Loosemore, 2015; Sievers, 2016). Social enterprises “operate as [...] a collection of complex systems working together to achieve an overall outcome in line with its mission” (Robb & Gandhi, 2016, p. 111). One example of the latter would be social enterprises in regional innovation systems (Rinkinen, Oikarinen & Melkas, 2016).

Many scholars (see, e.g., Battilana et al., 2015; Doherty et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2012; Pache & Santos, 2013; Townsend & Hart, 2008) note that social enterprises are “hybrid” organizations combining two “institutional logics,” i.e., a market and social rationale. Marshall and Novicevic (2016) assert that such institutional pluralism could impede obtaining legitimacy. In social enterprises, each logic may be connected with different groups of stakeholders and different expectations, for instance, when customers and beneficiaries are different groups, each with different needs and expectations (Pache & Santos, 2013).

Social entrepreneurship. Strictly speaking, the term “social entrepreneurship” is a derivative form of “social entrepreneur” in the same way as “craftsman” and “craftsmanship” are related; that is, the variation of the direct first-person form (“social entrepreneur”) elevates its properties to a more generic plane (“social entrepreneurship”), thereby opening up for more abstract analyses. Correspondingly, social entrepreneurship research addresses topics that concern individuals in entrepreneurial roles, such as their identities (Yitshaki & Kropp, 2016), behaviors (Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004), and decision-making styles (Yusuf & Sloan, 2015).

However, in the literature, the meaning of “social entrepreneurship” also extends to issues that are manifest in social enterprises, i.e., at the organizational level of analysis. This

includes, but is not limited to, social impact assessment (Ansari et al., 2012), shared identity among employees (Tracey & Phillips, 2015), or mechanisms aimed at controlling conflicting logics within organizations (Pache & Santos, 2013).

Table 1 contains some widely-used definitions of social entrepreneurs, social enterprises, and social entrepreneurship. Even though the table usefully illustrates different shades of meaning in each of the three categories, we argue against dogmatically using these depictions. We found that, in writing on social entrepreneurship (or social enterprises and social entrepreneurs), it is hardly feasible to use only one form throughout a text consistently. For instance, even at times when we examined the actions and behaviors of social entrepreneurs, such as in Chapter 4, we often used the term “social entrepreneurship” in instances where we felt it conveyed more meaning or clarity.

Furthermore, our depiction of definitions merely gives a flavor of how scholars perceive social entrepreneurship. There is an ongoing debate on what exactly is social entrepreneurship, which will likely continue for years to come. As indicated earlier, this dissertation explicitly aims to contribute to this discourse. Our essential position is that we do not aspire to use a “single best account” of social entrepreneurship (Gergen & Thatchenkery, 1996). This stance means that we do not adopt a single definition of social entrepreneurship in this thesis. Instead, we propose using a cluster of definitions, offering a rich account of its meaning and scope.

OVERALL RESEARCH APPROACH

Data Sampling

I engaged with social enterprises in Greece to gather empirical data. Like no other country within the EU, Greece has been in a state of perpetual crisis since 2009. Political, institutional, demographic, and social structures have since changed beyond recognition. Hence, throughout the course of research, we expected grim contextual conditions for entrepreneurial action

Table 1: Definitions of Social Entrepreneur, Social Enterprise, and Social Entrepreneurship

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR	
Source	Definition
Eikenberry and Kluver (2004, p. 135)	“Social entrepreneurs are nonprofit executives who pay attention to market forces without losing sight of their organizations’ underlying missions and seek to use the language and skills of the business world to advance the material well-being of their members or clients.”
Bacq, Hartog, and Hoogendoorn (2016, p. 703)	“[S]ocial entrepreneurs are assumed to draw on the guiding principle of beneficence (‘actively doing good’) instead of the principle of non-maleficence (‘doing no harm’).”
Andre and Pache (2016, p. 660)	“As entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs are likely to engage in the iterative process of opportunity recognition, opportunity filtration, venture creation, and exchange, whereby they adapt their venture on the basis of the feedback received from customers and partners.”
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	
Source	Definition
Battilana et al. (2015, p. 1658)	“[S]ocial enterprises [...] primarily pursue a social mission while also engaging in commercial activities to sustain their operations through sales of products and/or services.”
Miller et al. (2012, p. 616)	“Social enterprises seek to create value for customers, but instead of full remuneration going to investors, as is the case with commercial ventures, the surplus benefits of organizational activity accrue primarily to targeted beneficiaries.”
Nicholls (2008, p. 23)	“[I]nnovative and effective activities that focus strategically on resolving social market failures and creating opportunities to add social value systematically by using a range of organizational formats to maximize social impact and bring about change.”

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Source	Definition
Mair and Marti (2006, p. 37)	“First, we view social entrepreneurship as a process of creating value by combining resources in new ways. Second, these resource combinations are intended primarily to explore and exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change or meeting social needs. And third, when viewed as a process, social entrepreneurship involves the offering of services and products but can also refer to the creation of new organizations.”
Zahra et al. (2009, p. 522)	“Social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner.”
Austin et al. (2006, p. 2)	“We define social entrepreneurship as innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors.”

in Greece (Austin et al., 2006) and our presumption at the outset of this study was that the country would be a valuable “extreme case,” amplifying ventures’ responses to resource constraints, as compared to social entrepreneurship under more resourceful circumstances. The issue is that Greece is not a far-away country. It is neither “them” nor “once upon a time.” For the EU member states, with their many fiscal, economic, political, and cultural interdependencies, Greece is here and now. This makes the unfolding story of Greece relevant to millions of people in Europe.

Research Design

The research questions in this thesis warrant a qualitative research approach, which means seeking to understand how things work by using relatively “soft” material—including semi-structured interviews, informal conversations, field notes, observations of physical working spaces, and so on—rather than aiming to quantify relationships between known constructs based on structured questionnaires and hard economic data.

Also, whenever possible, we followed the social enterprises that participated in our studies over a prolonged period, allowing for the emergence of unique insights. For example, one informant revealed in our third interview that he had been diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis. He also expanded on how he saw his disease shape his leadership style and influence the direction his company was taking. It is highly unlikely he would have volunteered this information when submitting a standardized digital survey to an anonymous research team and, yet, it seemed a crucial piece of information in understanding his social venture and his role in it.

By conducting a qualitative, longitudinal study, the aim was to make interpretive films of the informants' organizational ups and downs, rather than attempting to take one-off snapshots in a bid to suggest singular causations (Plowman et al., 2007; Teisman & Klijn, 2008).

Interviews as Conversations

After having conducted the first round of interviews with Greek social entrepreneurs over the phone, I meticulously prepared the first field trip. However, soon after having arrived in Greece for the first field trip, I immediately sensed that it would be better to relax my attitude to the questionnaires. I reckoned that the magnitude and complexity of the crisis required a more intuitive, conversational—and less formulaic (Alvesson & Gabriel, 2013)—interview approach. On more than one occasion, at the end of what had seemed a valuable meeting, the interviewee remarked that “it did not feel like an interview.” I found these comments positive feedback because they suggested that interviewees felt at ease within the interview setting and, hence, responded naturally and openly to the talking points rather than, perhaps subconsciously, somehow being force-fitted into the interviewer's worldview.

Data Overlap

We used the material from the field trips in the thesis' two empirical chapters. These chapters address different topics, and although the material stems from the "same data collection effort" (Colquitt, 2013, p. 331), there is no overlap in the literal sense. Specifically, different parts of the various interviews were used in different sections of the two chapters but never was a single section in an interview used in both chapters. Furthermore, the benefit of the approach taken is that it helped to naturally align the two empirical chapters because the same practical context was probed in both instances.

KEY INSIGHTS ARISING IN THE DISSERTATION

The body of this dissertation consists of Chapters 2 to 5. In each chapter, several essential insights arise concerning the overall research problem and its subsequent research questions.

Guidelines for Better Definitions, Borrowing Theory, and Methodological Orientation

In the literature review of Chapter 2, we provide a bird's eye perspective of social entrepreneurship research. In doing so, we first address a critical scholarly issue, namely a lack of clarity on social entrepreneurship definitions. Thereby, we uniquely draw on Suppes (1957) to propose a framework for better social entrepreneurship definitions.

We subsequently urge social entrepreneurship researchers to more clearly reveal their choice criteria, underlying assumptions, and added value of the theoretical lenses they use in their work. Similarly, we propose that scholars explain their methodological positions more thoroughly.

In drawing the literature review chapter to a close, we call for a postmodern turn, allowing for varied perspectives in social entrepreneurship research. This change of direction opposes current efforts to arrive at a "single best account" of the phenomenon (Gergen & Thatchenkery, 1996).

Bricolage as a Dynamic Concept

Chapter 3 gravitates around a concept called “bricolage,” used by social entrepreneurship researchers to explain how organizations deal with resource scarcity. Baker (2007) argues that much of the thinking around bricolage originates in Lévi-Strauss’ work. This French anthropologist and ethnologist emphasized impromptu problem solving and limited resources of the bricoleur, so that “the rules of his game are always to make do with whatever is at hand, that is to say with a set of tools and materials which is always finite” (Lévi-Strauss, 1966, p. 17). This view matches the well-established short definition of bricolage as *making do*, placing it firmly in the realm of acting under resource constraints while leaving little room for strategic thought.

In this chapter, however, we also emphasize that bricolage is not necessarily a static phenomenon. Moreover, we explain that bricolage in a social enterprise startup can be fundamentally different from bricolage in a mature one. This assertion highlights an elemental difference between scholarly depictions of bricolage and our understanding of it. We, hence, conceptualize bricolage as potentially *evolving* with the development of a social enterprise, and, in the process, shaping or being shaped by venture strategy.

Using Complexity Theory to Develop “Generative Leadership”

Chapter 4 extensively draws on complexity theory, which we use to understand how social entrepreneurs work when experiencing severe resource constraints. The messy nature of our empirical context prompted us to consider a framework of ideas that is inherently about nonlinear systems thinking. Complexity theory does precisely that; it abandons a questionable paradigm of order and linear causality, as eloquently phrased by Thiétart and Forgues (1995, p. 19):

From books proposing recipes for managerial success to academic research, literature in management is still frequently based on an implicit assumption of

stability and a quasi-mechanistic view of organization. For some, management has achieved the status of science. Prediction and replicability are seen possible.

Hence, complexity theory aims to provide an alternative angle to analyze organizational phenomena. It presumes nonlinear behavior among and within dynamic systems with unclear and permeable boundaries (Anderson, Meyer, Eisenhardt, Carley & Pettigrew, 1999; Davis & Marquis, 2005). We use such ideas to develop the concept of “generative leadership,” whereby social entrepreneurs have little means to control the systems of which they are part. Correspondingly, social entrepreneurs typically instigate change indirectly.

Apprehending “Unknown Unknowns” as “Organizational Dark Matter”

In Chapter 5, we adopt the logic of abductive reasoning to examine “unknown unknowns,” which, we argue, commonly affect social enterprises operating in dynamic environments. Neither abductive reasoning nor unknown unknowns are popular in social entrepreneurship research. Hence, this chapter helps progress scholarly knowledge in both respects.

Using metaphor, we cast unknown unknowns as “organizational dark matter,” thereby attributing the concept with features of “dark matter” in physics, which is hard to detect although strongly shapes the universe’s development. Likewise, casting unknown unknowns as organizational dark matter makes scholars aware of its invisible existence and, crucially, its agency.

ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENTS

Finally, Table 2, below, presents my participation in academic seminars and peer review conference attendance, which were important means to share the unfolding ideas of this thesis with fellow researchers and solicit their feedback.

Table 2: Academic Community Engagements¹

Chapter and Short Title	Type	Academic Seminars and Conferences	Publication Status
(2) A Review of the Literature on Social Enterprises	Conceptual/ systematic literature review paper.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted for presentation at the <i>Academy of Management Annual Meeting</i> (2020). 	In preparation for submission to <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> .
(3) A Framework for Bricolage	Empirical paper / grounded theory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented at the <i>Business & Society Paper Development Workshop</i> at the Vrije Universiteit Brussels (2018). Presented at the <i>Academy of Management Annual Meeting</i> (2019). 	Submitted to <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> .
(4) An Inquiry into Generative Leadership	Empirical paper / grounded theory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented at the <i>Business & Society Conference</i> at the University of Mannheim (2018) Presented at the <i>Business & Society Seminar</i> at Amsterdam Business School (2018). Presented at the <i>Academy of Management Discoveries Paper Development Workshop</i> at Amsterdam Business School (2019). Accepted for presentation at the <i>Academy of Management Annual Meeting</i> (2020). 	In preparation for submission to <i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i> .
(5) Reflections on Unknown Unknowns	Conceptual essay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted for presentation at the <i>Business & Society Conference</i> at the University of Namur (2020); event cancelled due to COVID-19. 	In preparation for submission to <i>Organization Studies/X and Organization Studies</i> .

¹ Accurate as of April 6th, 2020.