

Topic: Management Challenges for Purpose-Driven Companies

**Title: A UNIFYING APPROACH TO PURPOSE-DRIVEN COMPANIES´ TYPOLOGIES.  
UNDERLYING BUSINESS STRUCTURES AND MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES.**

**Author: Mag. Fernanda Figueroa.**

Doctoral Fellow CONICET- Faculty of Business Studies, Universidad Austral (Argentina)

[mfigueroa@austral.edu.ar](mailto:mfigueroa@austral.edu.ar)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In Latin America and, specifically, in Argentina, the research related to Social Entrepreneurship (SEship) and Hybrid Organizations (HO) is at an incipient stage, most of the papers were published from 2010 onwards. They are generally reports or surveys trying to understand the SEship's and Inclusive Business's (IB) ecosystem (Abramovay et al. 2013; Pels and Sucarrat 2013; Buckland and Murillo 2014; BID 2016; Grupo de Trabajo de Inversión de Impacto en Argentina 2017).

There is also research related to social entrepreneur's characteristics and Hybrid Enterprises (HE) through successful case 'studies, as a way to reach a greater understanding of the phenomenon and develop knowledge in an inductive way (Musso, N., & Ulla 2009; Márquez, Reficco, and Berger 2010; FOMIN & Sistema B 2012; P. Ed. Jaramillo Martínez 2010; Groppa and Sluga 2015; Granthon and Correa 2015).

Despite the positive evolution of this research topic in the region, there is a problem regarding the conceptual clarity and delimitation of the object of study when approaching the phenomenon. Only for the fact of generating social and/or environmental impact, the same categories of analysis are applied to different objects of study, mixing, for example, the study of civil society organizations with commercial enterprises, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), large corporations and cooperatives (Pels and Sucarrat 2013; Grupo de Trabajo de Inversión de Impacto en Argentina 2017).

This lack of conceptual clarity and delimitation of the object of study affects the understanding of the management challenges faced by the different kinds of organizations that act in the SEship field.

Therefore, the main goal of this work is unify typologies emerging from purpose-driven companies' (PDC) literature to gain conceptual clarity in later description of business structures and management challenges faced by these companies.

This objective will be achieved by identifying the main terms used to refer to the PDC's (thus named for this conference's topic) and their definitions, detecting PDC typologies in the international and regional literature; analyzing typologies' characteristics, finding common patterns that allows a typological unification; exploring business structures underlying these typologies and identifying management challenges concerning each business structure.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

This is a theoretical paper, designed as an exploratory study (Hernández Sampieri, et. al., 2006). The unit of analysis is the PDC, the theoretical framework is the social entrepreneurship theory, focusing in hybrid organizations.

The data collection method was the literature review, which was done in two steps: A first search in specialized data bases, with a combination of the following keywords: purpose-driven company/enterprise, hybrid company/enterprise/organization and social company/enterprise; typology; management challenge; business/organizational structure/design/approach. The resulting articles were prioritized by citation rating, (some

were included because of their relevance to the subject even though they weren't the most cited).

The second step consisted in the reverse search technique, in which additional papers were sourced from citations in the papers selected in the first step.

The data was analyzed in five steps: First, identifying the main terms used to refer to the PDC's and their definitions. Second, detecting PDC typologies. Third, coding and categorizing typology's characteristics to explore differences and similarities between them. Fourth, unifying typologies. Fifth, based on the unified typologies, business structures and management challenges were searched.

## **ACRONYMS**

Base of the Pyramid (BOP)

Hybrid Enterprises (HE)

Hybrid Organizations (HO)

Inclusive Business Model (IBM)

Inclusive Businesses (IB)

Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)

Not Governmental Organization (NGO)

Purpose-driven company (PDC)

Small and medium enterprises (SMEs)

Social Business Model (SBM)

Social Enterprise (SE)

Social Entrepreneurship (SEship)

United Nations (UN)

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

## **3. MAIN TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

Trying to identify the main terms used in the literature to refer to PDC's, a first data base search was made using the following keywords:

- Purpose-driven company/enterprise
- Hybrid company/enterprise/organization
- Social company/enterprise

Each of this keywords were search next to the following terms:

- Typology
- Management challenge
- Business/organizational structure/design/approach

70 articles were found, 61 were pertinent to this papers objectives and 33 had more than 100 citation in google scholar.

**Chart I:** Papers/books found by publication name

Publication	Q Papers
Journal of Business Ethics	7
Social Enterprise Journal	4
Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan	4
Voluntas	3
California Management Review	3
Business Horizons	2
Annals of public and cooperative economics	2
Social Responsibility Journal	2
Journal of World Business	2
Oxford: Oxford University Press	2
Academy of Management Review	2
London: Routledge.	1
Stanford Social Innovation Review	1
Small Business Economics	1
Harvard Business Review	1
American Business Law Journal	1
Health Care Strategic Management	1
Business Ethics Quarterly	1
International Journal of Emerging Markets	1
Business Strategy Review. London Business School	1
International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research	1
Systems Research and Behavioral Science	1
International Journal of Management Reviews	1

Publication	Q Papers
Business and Society Review	1
International Journal of Social Economics	1
New York: Public Affairs	1
International Small Business Journal	1
Seattle, WA: Virtue Ventures LLC, 2007	1
Academy of Marketing Studies Journal	1
Barcelona: IESE Business School, University of Navarra	1
Journal of Business Venturing	1
Society	1
Journal of Economic Issues	1
Stanford University: Draft Report for the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership	1
Journal of Global Responsibility	1
Upper Saddle River: Wharton School Publishing.	1
Journal of nonprofit & public sector marketing	1
Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	1
Journal of Small Business Management	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>

From those 61 papers pertinent to this papers objectives, the most used terms are, in order of importance:

**Chart II:** Most used terms

Most used terms	Total
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	31
SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP	11
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	8
HYBRID ENTERPRISES	6
SOCIAL PURPOSE BUSINESS VENTURES	2
PURPOSE-DRIVEN COMPANY	2
SOCIAL BUSINESS	2
SOCIAL BUSINESS HYBRIDS	1
FIRMS OR ENDEARMENT	1
SOCIAL PROFIT ENTERPRISE	1
SOCIAL BUSINESS VENTURE	1
SOCIAL VENTURE	1
HYBRID SOCIAL PROFIT ENTERPRISE	1
HYBRID BUSINESS	1
<b>GENERAL TOTAL</b>	<b>69*</b>

\*note: there are 69 results due to some papers mentioned more than one term

The most used term is “Social” and all their derivatives: social enterprise, entrepreneurship, purpose business ventures, business, business hybrids, profit enterprise, etc. In second place, there is the “Hybrid” prefix: Hybrid organizations, enterprises, social profit enterprise, business. Finally, the term “Purpose-driven company” is not often used in the literature.

Analyzing the terminology from a chronological perspective, we can assume some terms are older than others and that’s why were found most frequently. The literature revised goes from 1998 to 2018. In the earliest papers the term usually found is social enterprise (SE) or social entrepreneurship (SEship), these expressions are also used in recent papers. Then, in 2003 hybrid enterprises (HE) and organizations (HO) started to be named, and still in use. The term purpose-driven company (PDC) was detected for the first time in a paper from 2015.

As mentioned in the Introduction, in the literature review was found that same terms have different meanings or definitions and point to different objects of study. For instance, some authors consider only nonprofit organizations as SE, and others include for profit companies; some contemplate only organizations with collective decision making and surpluses reinvestment, others includes organizations with hierarchical decision making and profit distribution among shareholders.

In order to clarify criteria and understand which kind of organizations authors talk about when they use each main term, the organizational attributes included in their investigations were tried to be deducted (Doty and Glick 1994). From this organizational attributes review, most quoted ones were detected among authors using each main term.

#### **Organizational attributes:**

**Organization studied:** Legal structure, if they are for or nonprofits or if the author study both kind of organizations in the same paper.

**Main Objective:** it refers to the organization’s mission. Authors may include just organizations with social/environmental objective as principal, organizations with an economic objective as principal one, or organizations that try to balance both objectives.

**Profit Distribution:** Authors may study organizations that reinvest surpluses in the social mission or in the business, organizations that distribute profits among shareholders, or may study both kind of organizations.

**Main Activity:** could consider only organizations with social activity as the main one (and commercial activities as secondary), organizations with commercial activity as the principal one (and social activities as secondary), or organizations trying to balance both activities in their structure.

**Decision Making:** organizations with collective decision making, with hierarchical decision making or both types of organizations could be included indistinctly.

**Ownership:** organizations that have individual owners (investors), collective ownership, or both options could be accepted by authors in the same papaer.

## **Social Entrepreneurship**

SEship is the wider term analyzed, could be examined from an individual or organizational level (Mair, Robinson, and Hockerts 2006, pp 143-145). From its individual level, studies the entrepreneurial process, focusing in social entrepreneurs and their characteristic, from its organizational perspective, embraces organizational types built as a consequence of that entrepreneurial process.

The literature review shows that SEship is used as general term that contemplates the other terms, such as SE, HO, HE and PDC.

Authors that use the terminology SEship mainly refer to nonprofit organizations or, to a lesser extent, to both kind of organizations, but never to for profit organizations only. Mostly include organizations with a social/environmental mission as the main objective, although some authors also include, less often, organizations with social/environmental and economic objectives balanced.

Preferences about profit distribution and decision making process were not detected, and just one paper talks about ownership, including only those organizations that have collective ownership.

Authors using SEship term include in their definitions mostly organizations with social and commercial activities balanced.

### Definitions from the most cited papers using this term:

- SEship are those enterprises led by social entrepreneurs who have the following characteristics: 1. Are change agents in the social sector 2. Adopt a mission to create and sustain social value, this social mission is explicit and central, this is what distinguishes social entrepreneurs from business entrepreneurs, even from socially responsible businesses 3. Exhibit a heightened sense of accountability, take steps to assure they are creating value, they make sure they have correctly assessed the needs and values of the people they intend to serve and the communities in which they operate (Dees 1998 b., pp. 4).
- SEship is an innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors. The authors focuses mainly in nonprofit type of SE (Austin et. al. 2006, pp. 2).

## **Social enterprises**

This expression goes directly to the SEship organizational level.

Authors that use this terminology mainly refer to nonprofit organizations or, to a lesser extent, to both kind of organizations, but never to for profit organizations without social goals or activities. Their main objective as organizations is their social/environmental mission, although authors also include, less often, organizations with both objectives balanced.

Generally, authors study organizations that have social and commercial activities balanced, but in some cases include nonprofits organizations with no commercial activities -only philanthropy depending- (Teasdale 2010) or with commercial actions in a secondary place (Dees 1998; Spear, et. al 2009; Haigh et. al, 2015).

Profit distribution is mainly reinvested and decision making processes are mostly collective. Generally refer to organizations with collective ownership.

### Definitions from the most cited papers using this term:

- Private organizations dedicated to solving social problems, are businesses that trade for a social purpose. They combine innovation, entrepreneurship and social purpose and seek to be financially sustainable by generating revenue from trading. Their social mission prioritizes social benefit above financial profit, and when a surplus is made, this is used to further the social aims of the beneficiary group or community, not distributed to those with a controlling interest in the enterprise. (Mair and Martí 2006, pp. 37-39).
- Any business venture created for a social purpose and to generate social value while operating with the financial discipline, innovation and determination of a private sector business. The author considers SE as nonprofit organizations only. Nevertheless, SE are considered part of the HO, which include in their spectrum a wider range of organizations (also for profit). Not all HO are SE (Alter 2007, pp.18).

### **Hybrid organizations and Hybrid enterprises**

HO and HE also tackles the SEship organizational level. Authors using these terms refer always to both types of organizations, for and nonprofit. In their papers study organizations that balance their economic and social/environmental objectives.

Most of times, they take into account organizations with social and commercial activities at the same level of importance, but sometimes, same as SE, include nonprofits organizations with commercial actions in a secondary place. Some other times, also include for profit organizations that have social activities as secondary ones (Alter 2007; Haigh, et. al. 2015). Decision making processes seems to be not so important for the hybrids' definition, due to authors include both kind of organizations, those with hierarchical and collective decision making processes. The same happens with ownership and profit distribution, considering organizations with individual or collective ownership and including organizations that reinvest and also those that distribute profits among their shareholders.

### Definitions from the most cited papers using this term:

#### Hybrid organizations

- Organization that combines different institutional logics in unprecedented ways, development and commercial logics (Battilana and Dorado 2010, pp. 1419).
- Hybrids are the offspring of two different species, organizations that span institutional boundaries and draw on at least two different sectoral paradigms, logics and value systems (private, public, nonprofit sector). The SE are a form of HO (Doherty et. al. 2014 a., pp. 418-419).

#### Hybrid enterprises

- For profit business from the outset (a corporation), but its specific mission is to drive transformational social and/or environmental changes (Michelini and Fiorentino 2012, pp. 563).
- Private undertaking committed to achieve a social purpose, incorporating traditional resources of nonprofit organizations (donations and voluntary participation), commercial revenue and business activity. Although the authors recognize hybrid organizational forms can develop within and between all three sectors (private,

public, nonprofit), they particularly focus on the development of hybrids in the context of the nonprofit sector, that's why they use SE and HE as synonymous (Mair and Noboa 2003, pp. 2-3).

### **Purpose-driven companies**

As chart II showed, only two papers using this term were found. In spite of the low representativeness this fact may imply, results will be exposed as done with the other terms.

Purpose-driven companies always refer to for profit organizations that balance their social/environmental and economic objectives, they distribute profit among shareholders, who are their owners. Their main activity is commercial and could have hierarchical or collective decision making processes.

#### Definition:

Just one of the two papers defines PDC, in the other one, authors use the term only once, quoting another paper, and do not define it. They speak in general about B corps.

The one that develops a definition affirms that PDC are business driven by goals beyond profit, considering a triple-bottom line approach. They have financial goals in addition to meeting social and environmental standards of performance, accountability, and transparency. Based in an eco-systemic framework to foster innovation for business sustainability, where the business operates as a system similar to a living organism (Sun et. al.2017, pp. 1-5).

Comparing organizational attributes of SE and HO/HE, we may conclude that SE term is more associated with nonprofit organizations that have a social/environmental mission and try to adopt business logics in order to increase their efficiency and effectiveness in managing social value creation. Even though SE organizations try to balance social and commercial activities, this terminology is used by some authors to refer to nonprofits organizations with no commercial activities (only philanthropy depending) or in a secondary place.

Instead, HO/HE are terms that refer to organizations mostly combining different institutional logics, sectors and value systems. It does not matter if they are for or nonprofit, if they reinvest or distribute surpluses, if they are hierarchical or collective decision making or if they have collective or individual ownership. Their main feature is balancing economic and social/environmental objectives and activities.

Some authors affirm that SE are a form of HO (Alter 2007; Doherty, et. al. 2014; Grassi 2011; Rüdiger and Inan 2016) and others sustain that SE and HE are synonymous (Mair and Noboa 2003; Jackson 2016; Haigh, et. al. 2015).

Finally, considering the PDC's organizational attributes, we may deduct there are included in HO/HE definitions, due to they are companies trying to balance their social/environmental and economic objectives.

All main term's definitions found in the literature review are shown in section 8 (Appendix)

**Chart III:** Main terms / most quoted organizational attributes

Organization Studied	MAIN TERMS			
	SEship	SE	HO/HE	PDC
For profit				X
Non Profit	X	X		
Both			X	
<b>Main Objective</b>				
Social/environmental	X	X		
Economic				
Both			X	X
<b>Profit Distribution</b>				
Reinvested	-	X		
Distributed	-			X
Both	-		X	
<b>Main Activity</b>				
Social				
Commercial				X
Both	X	X	X	
<b>Decision Making</b>				
Collective	-	X		
Hierarchical	-			
Both	-		X	X
<b>Ownership</b>				
Individual				X
Collective	X	X		
Both			X	

Note: Here are exposed the most quoted organizational attributes by main term. Some papers include other attributes in their definitions, but in a smaller proportion.

#### 4. TYPOLOGIES OR CLASSIFICATIONS

Only 11 articles developed typologies or classifications, from the 61 founded pertinent to this papers objectives.

Historically, in organizational studies the expressions typologies and classifications were used interchangeably (Carper and Snizek 1980). Nevertheless, there are important differences among both concepts.

Classification is a system that categorize phenomena into mutually exclusive and exhaustive sets with a series of discrete decision rules. Typologies refer to conceptually derived interrelated sets of ideal types, do not provide decision rules for classifying organizations, instead identify multiple ideal types, each of which represents a unique combination of the organizational attributes that are believed to determine the relevant outcomes (Doty and Glick 1994).

In the literature review carried out for this paper, most authors appear to have used typologies or classifications as synonymous, for this reason, will be analyzed altogether.

Chart IV shows this typologies, presented by main terms used (as analyzed in previous section) and dimensions considered by the authors to develop such typologies or classifications.

Dimensions are described with the words used by the authors in their papers. These, were considered relevant for the analysis, since they indicate a particular combination of the organizational attributes, as mentioned earlier.

**Chart IV:** Typologies-Classifications

Terms	Dimensions	Typologies/Classifications	Author	Year
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	1. Decision Making Structure 2. Primary Purpose of the organization.	<p><b>1. Community Business:</b> Collective decision making and common ownership, with economic purpose. Eg. Cooperatives. Surplus reinvestment.</p> <p><b>2. Community Enterprise:</b> Collective decision making process involving local community, with social purpose. It could be a group of people with a common goal, not necessarily an organization</p> <p><b>3. Non-profit Enterprise:</b> social enterprise as income generation to pursue a social purpose, with individual decision making structure.</p> <p><b>4. Social Business:</b> Economically viable businesses with hierarchical decision making process and economic orientation, but has a social mission.</p>	Teasdale, S.	2010
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Origins	<p><b>1. Mutuals:</b> Formed to meet the needs of a particular group of members through trading activities (e.g. consumer cooperatives, credit unions)</p> <p><b>2. Trading Charities:</b> Commercial activities established to meet the charities primary mission, or as a secondary activity to raise funds (e.g. charities that charge for services, charities with trading subsidiaries e.g.)</p> <p><b>3. Public sector spin-offs:</b> Social enterprises that have taken over the running of services previously provided by public authorities (e.g. Some health and social care social</p> <p><b>4. New-start social enterprises:</b> set up as new businesses by social entrepreneurs (e.g. some fair trade and green enterprises)</p>	Spear et. Al.	2009
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	1. Earned income strategies and 2. Financial Objectives	<p><b>EARNED INCOME:</b></p> <p><b>1. from Intended Beneficiaries:</b> In an ideal world, social enterprises would receive funding and attract resources only when they produced their intended social impact. The best strategy in this ideal world would be to ask the intended beneficiaries to pay full cost for</p> <p><b>2. from Third-Party Payers with a Vested Interest:</b> The most likely direct payers are government agencies and corporations that have a vested interest in an intended beneficiary group or in the enterprise's mission. In many cases, the beneficiaries share some of the costs through co-payments and deductibles.</p> <p><b>3. from others:</b> Non profits can receive indirect sources of earned income from third parties. One common form of indirect commercial support is advertising. Because this source of earned income is the one least directly related to mission performance, it can risk pulling the organization off course by diverting valuable management resources away from activities related to the organization's core mission (pp. 60-63)</p>	Dees, J. G.	1998

Terms	Dimensions	Typologies/Classifications	Author	Year
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	1. Earned income strategies and 2. Financial Objectives	<p><b>FINANCIAL OBJECTIVES:</b></p> <p><b>1. Full Philanthropic Support</b></p> <p><b>2. Partial Self-Sufficiency</b></p> <p><b>3. Cash Flow Self-Sufficiency:</b> Self-funding and even generate excess cash to cover the costs of strapped mission-related activities, but they still depend on non-cash philanthropic subsidies.</p> <p><b>4. Operating Expense Self-Sufficiency:</b> Cover all operating expenses, even if those expenses are at market rates. They might obtain donations or below-market loans to cover some startup expenses and capital expenditures, but after that, the operation would stand on its own without relying on additional philanthropy of any kind, including volunteer and in-kind donations.</p> <p><b>5. Full-Scale Commercialization:</b> When an organization is fully commercial, revenue covers all costs at market rates, including the market cost of capital, without a hint of philanthropic subsidy even for startup expenses. Because nonprofits cannot accept equity investments and it is difficult to be financed totally with debt, such organizations often are structured as, or convert to, for-profit enterprises. They will have to do so within the constraints of their mission.</p> <p><b>6. Mixed Enterprises:</b> Multi-unit operations that run programs with different financial objectives and funding structures: nonprofit with for profit affiliates or vice versa</p>	Dees, J. G.	1998
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND HYBRID ENTERPRISES	Hybrid Legal Structures	<p><b>1. For profit companies with social mission:</b> in US (Low-Profit Limited Liability Company (L3C), Benefit LLC, Benefit Corporation and Flexible Purpose Corporation); in UK (Community Interest Company -CIC-)</p> <p><b>2. Non Profit</b></p> <p><b>3. Mixed entity hybrid:</b> are contracts or agreements between 2 organizations (non and for profit). Examples of this type are: a. For-Profit Donates Cash to Nonprofit b. Nonprofit Distributes For-Profit's Products to Humanitarian Markets c. Nonprofit Owns Shares in the For-Profit d. Nonprofit Owns Intellectual Property Licensed by the For-Profit e. Merger (a for profit buys a purpose for profit or a non profit, eg. Danone and Stonyfield Farm) (pp. 61)</p>	Haigh, et. Al.	2015
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Hybrid Spectrum based on 3 DIMENSIONS: 1. Mission 2. Responsibility-Accountability 3. Distribution of income.	<p><b>1. Nonprofit with Income- Generating Activities:</b> is motivated by the mission, focused in stakeholder accountability and the income is reinvested in the mission. The activities generating income could be occasional (cost recovery) or ongoing (related or unrelated to mission)</p> <p><b>2. Social Enterprise:</b> is motivated by the mission, focused in stakeholder accountability and the income is reinvested in the mission. Their commercial activities could be mission-centric, mission-related or unrelated to mission.</p> <p><b>3. Socially Responsible Business:</b> is motivated also by profits, worried by shareholder accountability and the income could be distributed among shareholders. Are for profit companies that operate with dual objectives, making profit for their shareholders and contributing to a broader social good</p> <p><b>4. Corporation Practicing Social Responsibility:</b> motivated by profits, focused in shareholder accountability and the income is distributed among shareholders. Are those for profit companies that practice strategic philanthropy (unrelated to mission) (pp. 14-20)</p>	Alter, K.	2007
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Social Enterprise's Classification, form the previous Hybrid Spectrum. DIMENSION: SE's relation to the mission	<p><b>1. Mission-Centric SE:</b> The business activities are fully integrated to the organization's social mission. Financial and social benefits are achieved simultaneously, the clients are the beneficiaries</p> <p><b>2. Mission-Related SE:</b> commercial activities are related to mission, provides surpluses that allow the mission could be reached, but they do not depend each other strategically</p> <p><b>3. Unrelated to Mission SE:</b> The objective of this enterprise is generate income for the social programs, could be an activity unrelated to mission or a total separated organization (pp. 14-20).</p>	Alter, K.	2007
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	HO's Beneficiaries	<p><b>1. WISE Hybrids:</b> bring individuals at risk of permanent exclusion from the labor market back into employment thus receiving an income, not from government support but from a productive activity.</p> <p><b>2. BOP Hybrids:</b> provide essential products at an affordable price to poor customers who would otherwise not have access.</p> <p><b>3. Fair Trade Hybrids:</b> manipulate trade relations, creating income for poor marginalized producers by charging premiums to conscious consumers (pp. 87).</p>	Hockerts, K.	2015

Terms	Dimensions	Typologies/Classifications	Author	Year
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	1. Integration of social and commercial value and 2. Degree of overlap between clients and beneficiaries.	1. <b>Hybrid Ideal:</b> This hypothetical organization is fully integrated, everything it does produces both social value and commercial revenue.	Battilana, et. Al.	2012
		2. <b>Multiple-entity approach:</b> two separate legal entities, one a for profit and the other a nonprofit, to exploit the benefits of both legal structures. Entails complex design requirements and administrative separation that can burden management (pp. 52)		
HYBRID ENTERPRISES	1. Enterprise origin (alliance or individual) 2. Profit destination	1. <b>Social Business Model:</b> Based on the Yunus model, where the enterprises arises as an alliance between a for profit and a non profit organization (eg. Danone and Grameen), the enterprise has commercial activities that generates surpluses, but they are reinvested (not distributed among shareholders) and don't depends on donations, grants or subsidies	Michellini L Fiorentino D	2012
		2. <b>Inclusive Business Model:</b> Model associated with UN and WBCSD definitions, where a big company sells products or services to the base of the pyramid (BOP), generates profits and they are distributed between shareholders (p. 563)		
SOCIAL PURPOSE BUSINESS VENTURES	Sources of social entrepreneurial opportunities	1. <b>Activism:</b> led by activists that aim to generate social awareness about different problems faced as humanity. This activists groups provides legitimization to the social enterprise, access to their communications and distribution networks .	Hockerts, K.	2006
		2. <b>Self-help</b> (clients are beneficiaries): their social mission is to attend beneficiarie's social needs		
SOCIAL BUSINESSES	1. Source of social benefit 2. Priority between profit maximizing and social benefit creation.	3. <b>Philanthropy:</b> the social mission is defined by the donors who give charitable grants, business advise and networking acces to the social enterprise (pp. 148-151)	Yunus,M.	2007
		1. <b>Social Business:</b> Social benefit created by the nature of their products, services, or operating systems, there are companies that focus on providing a social benefit rather than on maximizing profit for their owners.		
SOCIAL BUSINESS HYBRIDS	1. Value spill over and 2. Degree of overlap between clients and beneficiaries	2. <b>Profit-maximizing businesses owned by the poor or disadvantaged:</b> the social benefit is derived from the fact that the dividends and equity growth produced go directly to benefit the poor and disadvantaged, because they are the owners of te business. Goods or services produced might or might not create a social benefit. The social benefit created by this kind of company comes from its ownership	Santos, et. Al.	2015
		3. <b>Combination:</b> a social business could also combine both forms of benefit to the poor: It could follow a business plan designed to produce social benefits through the nature of the goods and services it creates and sells and also be owned by the poor or disadvantaged. E.g. Grameen Bank (pp. 32.)		
		1. <b>Market Hybrid:</b> the client is the beneficiary and the value spill over is automatic, the social impact happens at the same time as the economic value (profit) is captured. Both values are spilled in the same transaction, this indicates that the more products or services they sell, the more people are benefited. Are commercial business models that do not require additional efforts and are easily scalable.		
		2. <b>Bridging Hybrid:</b> the client is also the beneficiary but the value spill over is contingent. The social impact requires greater efforts to be effective (education, change of habits, beneficiarie's mentoring), which implies higher costs for the company and a higher price for the beneficiary. It requires personnel not only with commercial experience but also with knowledge of social impact.		
		3. <b>Blending Hybrid:</b> the value spill over is automatic but the client is no longer the beneficiary. This requires the company to apply various strategies that help unify interests between beneficiaries and clients: strategy of joining complementary needs; subsidy of crossed segments, etc.		
		4. <b>Coupling Hybrid:</b> This is the most complex hybrid to manage since it has differentiated customer and beneficiary segments and, in addition, it does not maintain the same value chain (different Products or services), or even differentiated organizations are needed. The value spill over is always contingent. The risk of disassociating the social mission from the business model (and neglecting the beneficiaries) is very high		

Even though the typologies developed by each author have different names and are established from diverse dimensions, analyzing Chart IV we can observe some dimensions are more used by the authors than others.

Those most used dimensions were coded and analyzed as follows:

- Organizational purpose,
- Profit distribution,
- Main activity,
- Overlap between clients and beneficiaries, and
- Value creation and capture.

**Organizational purpose** dimension, try to identify organizations regarding their preferences between social/environmental and economic purpose.

Each author express this dimension in diverse ways. Some differentiates if the organizations have an economic or social purpose (Teasdale 2010, pp. 92-93), others if the enterprise goals are exclusively social or if their influence in the organizational priorities decrease in presence of other organizational goals (Peredo and McLean 2006 pp. 63), there are those who talk about what motivates organizations the most, their mission (referring to the social one) or their profits (Alter 2007, pp.14-20) and those that wonders about the relations between profit maximizing and social benefit creation (Yunus 2007, pp. 32).

**Profit distribution** dimension, authors considering this dimension wonders if the surpluses generated by the commercial activities are reinvested in the community or business or if there are distributed among the shareholders (Alter 2007, pp.14-20; Yunus 2007, pp. 32; Michelini and Fiorentino 2012, pp. 563).

**Main activity** dimension, try to identify organizations regarding their preferences between commercial exchange and social impact activities among the organizational structure. While some authors study organizations that goes from purely social activities without commercial exchange to organizations mainly commercial with social activities subordinated to profits goals (Teasdale 2010), others show commercial activities as central, related or unrelated to social activities (Alter 2007, pp.14-20). There are also authors that only study organizations with social and commercial activities fully balanced in the organizational structure (Santos, et. al. 2015).

**Overlap between clients and beneficiaries** dimension, identify organizations regarding their capacity to converge clients and beneficiaries in the same person, in order to obtain genuine incomes directly from their beneficiaries (Dees 1998 a.; Battilana et al. 2012; Santos et. al. 2015).

**Value creation and capture** dimension, categorize organizations regarding their ability to integrate value creation and capture. Value creation refers to real impact generated for the beneficiaries (social, environmental and economic) and value capture refers to the capacity of generating surpluses or profits for the organization, that serve for mission sustainability (Battilana et al. 2012; Santos et. al. 2015).

There are other dimensions less used, as decision making structure, enterprise origins, sources of entrepreneurial opportunities, legal structure, among others.

Due to dimensions are used with diverse purposes among authors, they result in different typologies that could not be compared with each other. This is a limitation for the typology unification purpose.

**Chart V:** Typologies compared by dimensions and main terms

Note: The dimensions exposed in this chart are the coded ones.

Terms	Author	Year	Purpose	Profit	Main Activity	Clients-Benef.	Value	Origins	Legal Structure	Benef.	Entrep. Opport.	Decision Making
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Teasdale, S.	2010	X									X
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Spear et. al.	2009						X				
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Dees, J. G.	1998			X	X						
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND HYBRID ENTERPRISES	Haight, et. al.	2015							X			
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Alter, K.	2007	X	X	X							
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Hockerts, K.	2015								X		
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Battilana, et. al.	2012				X	X					
HYBRID ENTERPRISES	Michellini L and Fiorentino D	2012		X				X				
SOCIAL PURPOSE BUSINESS	Hockerts, K.	2006									X	
SOCIAL BUSINESS	Yunus M.	2007	X	X								
SOCIAL BUSINESS HYBRIDS	Santos, et. al.	2015				X	X					

This chart shows that dimensions are used indistinctly among main terms, this could mean authors analyze the same organizational attributes between different types of organizations.

In order to check this, papers were reviewed to find more details about different kind of organizations studied between typologies.

**Chart VI:** Typologies by dimensions and organizations studied

Main terms	Author	Year	Dimensions	Organizations studied
SE	Teasdale, S.	2010	Purpose	Social groups that are not necessarily an organization (with or without commercial activity)
				Nonprofits (e.g. NGO's)
				Cooperatives
				For profits (with social activities as principal or secondary)
SE	Spear et. al.	2009	Origins	Charities (commercial activity could be principal or secondary)
				Cooperatives
				For profits with a social mission
SE	Dees, J. G.	1998	1. Main activity 2. Clients-beneficiary	Nonprofits (with commercial activity as principal or secondary)
				mixed enterprises (e.g. nonprofit with for profit affiliates or viceversa)
SE and HO	Alter, K.	2007	1. Purpose 2. Profit 3. Main Activity	Nonprofits (with commercial activity as principal or secondary)
				Alliances between for and Nonprofits.
				For profits (only when they are a nonprofit's subsidiary for SE and with social activities as principal or secondary for HO)
SE and HE	Haigh, et. al.	2015	Legal Structure	Nonprofits (with commercial activity as principal or secondary)
				Alliances between for and Nonprofits.
				For profits (with social activities as principal or secondary)
HO	Hockerts, K.	2015	Beneficiaries	Nonprofits (with commercial activities as principal or secondary)
				Cooperatives
				For profits
HO	Battilana, et. al.	2012	1. Clients-Benef. 2. Value	Nonprofits
				For Profits
HE	Michelin L and Fiorentino D	2012	Profit	Big corporations with a social mission
SOCIAL PURPOSE BUSINESSES	Hockerts, K.	2006	Entrepreneurial Opportunities	Nonprofits
				Alliances between for and Nonprofits.
				For profits
SOCIAL BUSINESSES	Yunus, M.	2007	1. Purpose 2. Profit	For profits with a social mission
SOCIAL BUSINESSES HYBRIDS	Santos, et. al.	2015	1. Clients-Benef. 2. Value	Nonprofits (only when have for profit's subsidiaries)
				Alliances between for and Nonprofits.
				For profits with a social mission

In this chart, the mixture of objects of study is evident. As it was pointed out in the introduction of this work, authors developed typologies and classifications mixing different kinds of organizations.

Most of the types exposed, are based on the study of a wide variety of organizational structures, including in the same typology organizations ranging from social groups without commercial activities to for profit organizations with social activities as secondary activities and even alliances between different organizations. This implies totally different organizational structures between typologies, what hinders typological unification.

Considering typologies using the SE terminology, it can be observed that the organizational spectrum studied, although it includes for and nonprofit organizations, extends its social side including social groups without commercial activities and nonprofits with commercial activities as secondary ones. As for the economic side of the spectrum, it only extends to for profit organizations with social activities as principal one.

Considering typologies using the HO/HE terminology, the organizational spectrum studied includes from nonprofits with commercial activities (as secondary or principal) to for profits with social activities as secondary. Comparing with SE types, the social side of the spectrum it is shortened and the economic side is extended.

Cooperatives and alliances between organizations are named in different typologies across main terms, and big corporations with a social mission are only mentioned by HO's types.

In sum, the typological unification is threatened by 2 main factors:

- **Dimension's purposes:** the dimensions used by authors to develop typologies have diverse purposes, resulting in different typologies that could not be compared with each other,
- **Wide variety of organizational structures:** authors developed typologies mixing different kinds of organizations. This implies totally different organizational structures between typologies.

However, it was discovered that some typologies, without necessarily being the author's objective, position organizations along an organizational spectrum that shows the level of economic and social/environmental integration reached. This way, ideal types emerge, representing those organizations that reach the highest levels of economic and social/environmental integration, regardless of whether they are different kinds of organizations, with different organizational attributes.

For example, **Alter K. typology** (Alter 2007):

**Kind of organizations studied:** nonprofits organizations, alliances between for and nonprofits and for profits companies.

**Dimensions:** organizational purpose, profit distribution and main activity.

**Resulting types:** Nonprofit with Income- Generating Activities, Social Enterprise (mission centric, related or unrelated), Socially Responsible Business, and Corporation Practicing Social Responsibility.

Considering this types in the mentioned spectrum, the position of the corporation practicing social responsibility is not the same of the nonprofits with income- generating activities, the first one is nearer to the economic side of the spectrum and the second one, nearer to the social side. Nevertheless, all these different organizations are considered HO.

The ideal type in this typology will be the “Mission-Centric Social Enterprise”, because business activities are fully integrated to the organization's social mission, financial and social benefits are achieved simultaneously and the clients are the beneficiaries. This type is in the middle of the spectrum.

Other author´s types are placed in the middle of the spectrum and could be considered ideal types, like Market Hybrid (Santos, et. al., 2015), Hybrid Ideal (Battilana et. al., 2012), Full-Scale Commercialization (Dees, 1998), Social and Inclusive Business Model (Michelini and Fiorentino 2012), Social Business owned by the poor (Yunus 2007), For profit companies with social mission (Haigh, et. al. 2015). They all reach high integration of economic and social/environmental organizational attributes.

Since typologies cannot be unified by organizational structures, not by main terms or by dimensions, it was found pertinent to unify them by the level of integration reached (economic and social/environmental).

Considering ideal type´s organizational attributes, was detected that are mainly nonprofits with commercial activities as principal one or for profits with a clear social mission. Also, could be joint ventures between each other. Their main feature is integration in different fields (legal, financial, cultural, etc) in order to balance social and economic value.

**Chart VII: Ideal Types detected**

Main Term	Author	Dimensions	Ideal Type
SE	Dees, J. G.	1. Main activity 2. Clients-beneficiary	<b>Full-Scale Commercialization SE:</b> When an organization (nonprofit) is fully commercial, revenue covers all costs at market rates, including the market cost of capital, without a hint of philanthropic subsidy even for startup expenses. Because nonprofits cannot accept equity investments and it is difficult to be financed totally with debt, such organizations often are structured as, or convert to, for profit enterprises.
SE and HO	Alter, K.	1. Purpose 2. Profit 3. Main Activity	<b>Mission-Centric Social Enterprise:</b> is motivated by the mission, focused in stakeholder accountability and the income is reinvested in the mission. Business activities are fully integrated to the organization's social mission. Financial and social benefits are achieved simultaneously, the clients are the beneficiaries
SE and HE	Haigh, et. Al.	Legal Structure	<b>For profit companies with social mission:</b> in US (Low-Profit Limited Liability Company -L3C-, Benefit LLC, Benefit Corporation and Flexible Purpose Corporation); in UK (Community Interest Company -CIC-)
HO	Battilana, et. Al.	1. Clients-Benef. 2. Value	<b>Hybrid Ideal:</b> This hypothetical organization is fully integrated, everything it does produces both social value and commercial revenue.
HE	Michellini L Fiorentino D	Profit	<p><b>1. Social Business Model:</b> Based on the Yunus model, where the enterprises arise as an alliance between a for profit and a nonprofit organization (eg. Danone and Grameen), the enterprise has commercial activities that generates surpluses, but they are reinvested (not distributed among shareholders) and don't depends on donations, grants or subsidies</p> <p><b>2. Inclusive Business Model:</b> Model associated with UN and WBCSD definitions, where a big company sells products or services to the base of the pyramid (BOP), generates profits and they are distributed between shareholders (p. 563)</p>
SOCIAL BUSINESS HYBRIDS	Santos, et. Al.	1. Clients-Benef. 2. Value	<b>Market Hybrid:</b> the client is the beneficiary and the value spill over is automatic, the social impact happens at the same time as the economic value (profit) is captured. Both values are spilled in the same transaction, this indicates that the more products or services they sell, the more people are benefited. Are commercial business models that do not require additional efforts and are easily scalable.
SOCIAL BUSINESS	Yunus, M.	1. Purpose 2. Profit	<b>Social Business:</b> Companies that focus on providing a social benefit by the nature of their products, services, or operating systems. These companies are owned by the poor or disadvantaged, so the more profit they reach and distribute, the more impact they produce. E.g. Grameen Bank (pp. 32.)

## 5. BUSINESS STRUCTURES AND MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Throughout this work it was advanced that lack of clarity in the object of study's delimitation could affect the understanding of business structures and management challenges faced by different kinds of organizations acting in the SESHIP field.

Different business structures between typologies were detected, as showed in Chart VI. Only ideal types business structures could be analyzed in order to find common patterns, nevertheless, the small number of authors who specify this point in their work, makes the available information unrepresentative.

Regarding management challenges, 8 papers, between the 11 typologies found, pronounce about this topic. Challenges mentioned were coded and the results are shown in order of importance, according to the number of mentions:

- **Organizational - Legal structure:** each organization should decide very well which organizational and legal structure will have in order to better balance their financial and social goals.  
Being just commercial, integrated with social activities or build different organizations for each mission, choosing a for profit legal figure or a nonprofit one, all of these subjects are important to determine the subsequent strategies that positions the HO in a better way in front of the demands of the market and the social sector.  
Nevertheless, HO must remain flexible and willing to change their structure as a way to find solutions to those demands in different moments. Although the structure is important, the mission is what it commands and, if it requires new structures, new alternatives that better maintain the balance should be sought.  
Changing their legal structure it is common among SE or HO for different reasons: facilitate the mission, need to raise capital, diversify income, fit with founder values, perceived expedience, etc. (Haigh, et. al. 2015, pp.66).
- **Culture:** the organizational culture depends on the people that compose it, their workers, managers, board. Conflicting cultures challenge HO, due to they often need human resources with social expertise on one side, and with commercial expertise in the other side. Finding the right balance between them is not always easy.  
Some HO prefer to hire personnel without experience, to train them from scratch in a hybrid culture, without ties to previous paradigms (Battilana and Dorado 2010, pp. 1432).
- **Financial sustainability:** the current funding pathway is not so clear for hybrids, as it is for nonprofits and for profits. Finding mechanisms for scaling-up HO it is a real challenge. A bigger impact investment market is needed, with investors ready to wait for social and financial returns (Battilana et al. 2012; Santos, et. al., 2015).
- **Mission drift:** risk level of disintegration between social and economic mission. Searching new sources of revenue can pull an organization away from its original mission; and being blinded by the mission could threatened the financial sustainability.  
HO are always in risk of committing trade-offs, prioritizing serving one at the expense of the other, that's why they should design very good their organizational structure, in order to establish control mechanisms that diminish this risk (Dees 1998 a.; Santos, et. al., 2015).
- **Governance:** right definition of board and management's responsibilities and expertise and which stakeholders may be included in the main decisions is crucial for HO, due to they are complex organizations trying to unify social and economic goals that should be balanced from organizational authorities onwards.  
Mixed HO (two organizations working for a common goal) have a double challenge, balancing social and economic goals and coordinating activities between

organizations (Spear, et. al. 2009; Michelini and Fiorentino 2012; Santos, et. al., 2015).

It is remarkable that the main challenge mentioned regards organizational structure, due to several times in this paper it was mentioned that a wide variety of organizational structures could be a serious problem to understand the real management challenges of HO or SE.

This also implies that, unlike traditional organizations, HOs have a wide range of organizations structures to choose where to position themselves based on their mission and financial needs. This could be a great advantage on the one hand, and a great dilemma, for another.

The mission drift risk it's another challenge that distinguishes HO and SE from traditional organizations. This is a characteristic of those ideal types that try to reach the highest social-economic integration, nevertheless remains under investigated in management research.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDA**

The organizational level of SEship it is a very young research topic, and that is one of the reasons why terminology is still in construction.

SEship is used as general term that contemplates the other terms, such as SE, HO, HE and PDC.

Comparing organizational attributes of SE and HO/HE, we concluded that SE term is more associated with nonprofit organizations that have a social/environmental mission and try to adopt business logics, while HO/HE refer to organizations which main feature is balancing economic and social/environmental objectives and activities, independently if they are for or nonprofits, if they reinvest or distribute surpluses, if they are hierarchical or collective decision making or if they have or haven't owners.

Purpose-driven companies' term is not often used in the literature, but could be considered a HO or HE.

Detecting and analyzing PDC typologies was the main objective in this work, accomplished in section 4. Central conclusions were that typologies are constructed from diverse dimensions and include, under the same analysis, totally different organizational structures. These findings confirmed the previous assumption regarding the mix of objects of study in SE literature.

However, a first approximation to typologies unification could be done, considering the integration level reached by organizations regarding their social/environmental and economic objectives and activities.

It was discovered that most of typologies, position organizations along a social-economic spectrum that shows the level of integration reached by each organization. In this process, ideal types were found: organizations placed in the middle of the spectrum, reaching the maximum level of integration of social/environmental and economic goals or activities.

Some authors already talked about the level of integration as a fundamental characteristic of this new organizational era, considering a fundamental convergence and reconfiguration of the social and commercial sectors, from completely separate fields to a common space. They named it “hybridization movement” (Battilana et al. 2012, pp. 54; Hockerts 2015, pp. 83).

As the hybridization comes from nonprofits assuming business and managerial skills on one side, from for profit organizations taking on social missions related with their core business, on the other side and from HO that were born with the express mission of finding the social and economic balance, the mixture in the objects of study in literature is understandable.

Nevertheless, future research should be undertaken considering this risk and trying to delimit the study to one type of organization among the ideal types. This will help to better identify and understand business structures and management challenges for each kind of organization going through this hybridization process.

## 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

### CITED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramovay, RICARDO, M. E. Correa, S. Gatica, and BERNHARDUS Van Hoof. 2013. “Nuevas Empresas, Nuevas Economías: Empresas B En Sur América.” São Paulo.
- Alter, Kim. 2007. “Social Enterprise Typology.” *Virtue Ventures LLC*, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-013-0234-y>.
- Austin, James, Howard Stevenson, and Jane Wei-Skillern. 2006. “Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 30 (1): 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x>.
- Battilana, Julie, and Silvia Dorado. 2010. “Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations.” *Academy of Management Journal* 53 (6): 1419–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.57318391>.
- Battilana, Julie, Matthew Lee, John Walker, and Cheryl Dorsey. 2012. “In Search of the Hybrid Ideal.” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 10 (3 (Summer)): 51–55. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/in\\_search\\_of\\_the\\_hybrid\\_ideal](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/in_search_of_the_hybrid_ideal).
- BID. 2016. “Economía Colaborativa En América Latina.” *IE Business School* Abril: 21.
- Buckland, H, and D Murillo. 2014. *La Innovación Social En América Latina*. Madrid: FOMIN e Instituto de Innovación Social ESADE. <http://www.gestionsocial.org/archivos/00000902/ISLatin.pdf>.
- Carper, William B, and William E. Snizek. 1980. “The Nature and Types of Organizational Taxonomies: An Overview.” *Academy of Management Review* 5 (1): 65–75. <https://bd.austral.edu.ar:2117/docview/229993392?pq-origsite=summon>.
- Dees, J Gregory. 1998. “The Meaning of ‘Social Entrepreneurship.’” <http://www.redalmarza.cl/ing/pdf/TheMeaningofsocialEntrepreneurship.pdf>.
- Doherty, Bob, Helen Haugh, and Fergus Lyon. 2014. “Social Enterprises as Hybrid Organizations: A Review and Research Agenda.” *International Journal of Management Reviews* 16 (4): 417–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028>.
- Doty, D. H., and W. H Glick. 1994. “Typologies as a Unique Form of Theory Building:

- Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling.” *Academy of Management Review* 19 (2): 230–51.  
<https://bd.austral.edu.ar:2117/docview/210942854/fulltextPDF/41281B249CD74316PQ/1?accountid=40137>.
- FOMIN & Sistema B. 2012. “El Fenómeno de Las Empresas B En América Latina. . Redefiniendo El Éxito Empresarial.” New York, EEUU. [https://www.sistemab.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/MIF2014\\_EmpresasB-America-Latina.pdf](https://www.sistemab.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/MIF2014_EmpresasB-America-Latina.pdf).
- Granthon, R., and M.E. Correa. 2015. “Ejemplos de Buenas Prácticas de Empresas B En LATAM.”
- Grassi, Wolfgang. 2011. “Hybrid Forms of Business: The Logic of Gift in the Commercial World.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 100 (1): 109–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-01>.
- Groppa, Octavio;, and María Laura Sluga. 2015. “Empresas y Bien Común. Caracterización de Las Empresas de Economía de Comunión y Empresas B En La Argentina.” *Revista Cultura Económica* 33 (89): 8–24.
- Grupo de Trabajo de Inversión de Impacto en Argentina. 2017. “Inversión de Impacto En Argentina 2017. Oportunidades y Desafíos.” Buenos Aires. <http://inversiondeimpacto.net/contenidos/>.
- Haigh, Nardia, Elena Dowin Kennedy, and John Walker. 2015. “Hybrid Organizations as Shape-Shifters: Altering Legal Structure for Strategic Gain.” *California Management Review* 57 (3): 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.59>.
- Hernández Sampieri, Roberto, C. Fernandez, and P. Baptizta. 2006. *Metodología de La Investigación. Mc Graw Hill*.
- Hockerts, Kai. 2015. “How Hybrid Organizations Turn Antagonistic Assets into Complementarities.” *California Management Review* 57 (3): 83–106.
- Jackson, Kevin T. 2016. “Economy of Mutuality: Merging Financial and Social Sustainability.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 133 (3): 499–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2408-0>.
- Jaramillo Martínez, P (Ed.). 2010. *Negocios Inclusivos : Creando Valor En América Latina*. Edited by P Jaramillo Martínez. Alianza para los Negocios Inclusivos SNV y WBCSD.
- Mair, Johanna, and Ignasi Martí. 2006. “Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight.” *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>.
- Mair, Johanna, and Ernesto Noboa. 2003. “The Emergence of Social Enterprises and Their Place in the New Organizational Landscape.” The emergence of social enterprises and their place in the new organizational landscape. Barcelona. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6536275.pdf>.
- Mair, Johanna, Jeffrey Robinson, and Kai Hockerts. 2006. *Social Entrepreneurship*. Edited by Johanna Mair, Jeffrey Robinson, and Kai Hockerts. *Social Entrepreneurship*. 2006th ed. New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625655>.
- Márquez, Patricia, E. Reficco, and Gabriel Berger. 2010. *Negocios Inclusivos: Iniciativas de Mercado Con Los Pobres de Iberoamérica*. Edited by SEKN. David Rockefeller Center of Latin American Studies, Harvard University.
- Michelini, Laura, and Daniela Fiorentino. 2012. “New Business Models for Creating Shared Value.” *Social Responsibility Journal* 8 (4): 561–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17471111211272129>.
- Musso, N., & Ulla, L. 2009. “Negocios Inclusivos–Casos de Buenas Prácticas Nacionales.”

Córdoba, Argentina.

- Pels, J., and M.J. Sucarrat. 2013. "Primer Relevamiento de Actores de Los Negocios Inclusivos En Argentina. Primera Parte: Emprendimientos y Pequeñas Empresas." Buenos Aires.
- Peredo, Ana María, and Murdith McLean. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept." *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007>.
- Rüdiger, Hahn, and Ince Inan. 2016. "Constituents and Characteristics of Hybrid Businesses: A Qualitative, Empirical Framework." *Journal of Small Business Management* 54 (S1): 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12295>.
- Santos, Filipe, Anne-Claire Pache, and Christoph Birkholz. 2015. "Making Hybrids Work: Aligning Business Models and Organizational Design for Social Enterprises." *California Management Review* 57 (3): 36–59. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.36>.
- Spear, R, C Cornforth, and M Aiken. 2009. "The Governance Challenges of Social Enterprises: Evidence from a UK Empirical Study." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 80 (2): 247–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00386.x>.
- Sun, Jiazhe, Shunan Wu, and Kaizhong Yang. 2017. "An Eco-Systemic Framework for Business Sustainability." *Business Horizons* 61 (1): 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.09.006>.
- Teasdale, Simon. 2010. "How Can Social Enterprise Address Disadvantage? Evidence from an Inner City Community." *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing* 22 (2): 89–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495141003601278>.
- Yunus, M. 2007. *Creating a World without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism*. 2007th ed. New York: Public Affairs. [www.globalurban.org/GUDMag08Vol4Iss2/MagHome.htm](http://www.globalurban.org/GUDMag08Vol4Iss2/MagHome.htm).

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY CORRESPONDING TO DOCUMENTS REVISED BUT NOT CITED IN THE TEXT**

- Agafonow, Alejandro. "Toward A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship. On Maximizing Versus Satisficing Value Capture." *Journal of Business Ethics* 125, no. 4 (2014): 709–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1948-z>.
- Billis, David. "Towards a Theory of Hybrid Organizations." In *Hybrid Organizations and the Third Sector. Challenges for Practice, Theory and Policy*, edited by D. Billis, 46–69. Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, (2010). <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/55260/>.
- Bull, Mike, and Rory Ridley-Duff. "Towards an Appreciation of Ethics in Social Enterprise Business Models." *Journal of Business Ethics*, (2018), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3794-5>.
- Campbell, Sandy. "Social Entrepreneurship: How to Develop New Social-Purpose Business Ventures." *Health Care Strategic Management* 16, no. 5 (1998): 17–18. <https://bd.austral.edu.ar:2117/docview/226906466/fulltextPDF/883572421BDB48BAPQ/1?accountid=40137>.

Chell, Elizabeth. "Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship: Towards a Convergent Theory of the Entrepreneurial Process." *International Small Business Journal* 25, no. 1 (2007): 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607071779>.

Cooney, Kate. "Examining the Labor Market Presence of US WISEs." *Social Enterprise Journal* 9, no. 2 (2013): 147–63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-01-2013-0006>.

Dees, J. G., and B. B Anderson. "Sector-Bending: Blurring the Lines between Nonprofit and for-Profit." *Society* 40, no. 4 (2003): 16–27. [https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Article\\_Deese\\_SectorBending\\_2003.pdf](https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Article_Deese_SectorBending_2003.pdf).

Dees, J Gregory, and Jaan Elias. "The Challenges of Combining Social and Commercial Enterprise." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 8, no. 1 (1998): 165–78. <https://bd.austral.edu.ar:2110/stable/pdf/3857527.pdf?refregid=excelsior%3A56b48611a97ae78ccac83a6d17ab455a>.

Diochon, Monica, and Alistair R Anderson. "Social Enterprise and Effectiveness: A Process Typology." *Social Enterprise Journal* 5, no. 1 (2009): 7–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508610910956381>.

El Ebrashi, R. "Social Entrepreneurship Theory and Sustainable Social Impact." *Social Responsibility Journal* 9, no. 2 (2013): 188–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-07-2011-0013>.

Fowler, Elizabeth A R, Betty S Coffey, and Heather R Dixon-fowler. "Transforming Good Intentions into Social Impact: A Case on the Creation and Evolution of a Social Enterprise." *Journal of Business Ethics* dec 2017 (2017): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3754-5>.

Galvin, Michael D, and Lora Iannotti. "Social Enterprise and Development: The KickStart Model." *Voluntas* 26, no. 2 (2015): 421–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9424-z>.

Gilligan, Colin and Linda Golden. "Re-Branding Social Good: Social Profit as a New Conceptual Framework." *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal* 13, no. 2 (2009): 97–117. <https://bd.austral.edu.ar:2117/docview/214844994/fulltextPDF/188766A3A15481BPQ/1?accountid=40137>.

Harding, R. "Social Enterprise: The New Economic Engine." *Business Strategy Review* 15, no. 4 (2004): 39–43.

Lasprogata, Gail A, and Marya N Cotten. "Contemplating 'Enterprise': The Business and Legal Challenges of Social Entrepreneurship." *American Business Law Journal*; Fall 41, no. 1 (2003): 67–113.

Low, Chris. "A Framework for the Governance of Social Enterprise." *International Journal of Social Economics* 33, no. 5/6 (2006): 376–85.

Mair, Johanna, and Oliver Schoen. "Successful Social Entrepreneurial Business Models in the Context of Developing Economies. An Explorative Study." *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 2, no. 1 (2007): 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468800710718895>.

Moizer, Jonathan, and Paul Tracey. "Strategy Making in Social Enterprise: The Role of Resource Allocation and Its Effects on Organizational Sustainability." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 27, no. 3 (May 2010): 252–66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.1006>.

Peattie, Ken, and Adrian Morley. "Eight Paradoxes of the Social Enterprise Research Agenda." *Social Enterprise Journal* 4, no. 2 (2008): 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508610810901995>.

Pless, Nicola M, and Jenny Appel. "In Pursuit of Dignity and Social Justice: Changing Lives Through 100 % Inclusion—How Gram Vikas Fosters Sustainable Rural Development." *Journal of Business Ethics* 111, no. 3 (2012): 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s>.

Reid, Kristen;, and Jon Griffith. "Social Enterprise Mythology: Critiquing Some Assumptions." *Social Enterprise Journal* 2, no. 1 (2006): 1–10.

Seanor, Pam, Mike Bull, Sue Baines, and Rory Ridley-Duff. "Narratives of Transition from Social to Enterprise: You Can't Get There from Here!" *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 19, no. 3 (2013): 324–43. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552551311330200>.

Sisodia, R., D. Wolfe, and J Sheth. *Firms of Endearment: How World-Class Companies Profit from Passion and Purpose*. Wharton School Publishing, 2007.

Stecker, Michelle J. "Revolutionizing the Nonprofit Sector Through Social Entrepreneurship." *Journal of Economic Issues* 48, no. 2 (2014): 349–57. <https://doi.org/10.2753/JEI0021-3624480208>.

SZYMANSKA, A. and JEGERS M. "MODELLING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 87, no. 4 (2016): 501–27.

Thomas, Antonio. "The Rise of Social Cooperatives in Italy." *Voluntas* 15, no. 3 (2004): 243–63.

WADDOCK, SANDRA, and MALCOLM MCINTOSH. "Business Unusual: Corporate Responsibility in a 2.0 World." *Business and Society Review* 116, no. 3 (September 2011): 303–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8594.2011.00387.x>.

Wilburn, Kathleen, and Ralph Wilburn. "Evaluating CSR Accomplishments of Founding Certified B Corps." *Journal of Global Responsibility* 6, no. 2 (2015): 262–80. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-07-2015-0010>.

Wilson, Fiona, and James E Post. "Business Models for People, Planet (& Profits): Exploring the Phenomena of Social Business, a Market-Based Approach to Social Value Creation." *Small Business Economics* 40, no. 3 (2013): 715–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9401-0>.

Young, Dennis R, Jesse D Lecy, D R Young, and Á J D Lecy. "Defining the Universe of Social Enterprise: Competing Metaphors." *Voluntas* 25, no. 5 (2014): 1307–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9396-z>.

Zahra, Shaker, Eric Gedajlovic, Donald Neubaum, and Joel Shulman. "A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges." *Journal of Business Venturing* 24 (2009): 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>.

## 8. APPENDIX

Chart VIII: Main Term's definitions

Term	Definitions	Author	Year
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	Organizations trading for a social purpose or business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholders and owners (pp. 90)	Teasdale, Simon	2010
	Business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholders and owners. Organizations whose governance and ownership structures are normally based on participation by stakeholder groups and accountable to their stakeholders and the wider community for their social, environmental and economic impact (pp. 248-250. Assumes the UK government's Social Enterprise Unit (SEU) and Social Enterprise Coalition)	Spear, R. et. Al.	2009
	SE are between nonprofit sector (USA) and Social Economy (Europe), in the third sector. Inside the social enterprise, there are social cooperatives, mutuals, foundations, associations (pp 245-260)	Thomas, Antonio	2004
	A business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners (UK Government's SE definition). Their main characteristics are the primacy of social aims and trading goods and services as primary activity (pp. 96)	Peattie, K. and Morley, A.	2008
	SE are different organizations such as social purpose enterprises that trade like any other commercial establishment but return the profits to a social organisation (Wallace, 1999), business ventures operated by non-profits, but also may include privately owned ventures that have a very strong blended financial and socially responsible return on investment (Canadian Social Entrepreneurship Foundation, 2008). This organizations can be within or across the non-profit, government or business sectors (Austin et al., 2006) and not all SE will adopt an entrepreneurial strategy. pursuing their social agenda	Diochon M Anderson A	2009
	Affirms that SE are organizations blurring boundaries between nonprofit and for profit. Nevertheless, the author identifies them more with the non-profit sector (pp. 380)	Low C	2006
	Any business venture created for a social purpose and to generate social value while operating with the financial discipline, innovation and determination of a private sector business. the author consider SE as nonprofit organizations only. Nevertheless, SE are part of the Hybrid Organizations, wich include in their spectrum a wider range of organizations (also for profit). Not all HO are SE (pp.18).	Alter, S. K.	2007
	Hybrid/Social enterprise is a private undertaking committed to achieve a social purpose, one that incorporates traditional resources of nonprofit organizations (donations and voluntary participation), commercial revenue and business activity. They take democratic decisions and include representatives of most stakeholder groups in their governing body. Nevertheless, they are not necessarily forced to reinvest the surplus (as a traditional nonprofit), but can distribute only in the way	Mair, J., & Noboa, E	2003
	Considers as SE only nonprofit organizations, and recomend them to be more commercially like, to operates as a business in how they acquire their resources and distribute their goods and services, in order to be more efficient and effective in their mission's achievement. (pp. 59)	Dees, J. G.	1998
	Those not for profit organizations that has dual objectives, depth and breadth of social impact to be realized, and amount of money to be earned. Business models are basically needed to 1. Reduce the need of donated funds 2. having a diversified funding base and 3. adopting market discipline (effectiveness and efficiency) (pp. 206).	Alter, S. K.	2006
	Those commercially viable business that have social and environmental objectives. Takes into account GEM UK survey's criterion of definition (pp. 42)	Harding, R.	2004
	SE are those social organizations (nonprofit, NGOs,) trying to find new funding sources to sustain their social missions and being more effective in their duties, and because of that, they develop commercial/business-like models. (pp. 166)	Dees, G. and Elias, J.	1998
	nonprofit organizations that apply entrepreneurial strategies to sustain themselves financially while having a greater impact on their social mision (pp. 69) Recognizes that SEship adopt a broader definition (for profit entities and hybrids mix in non and for profit elements), but for the purpose of the paper they assume the exposed earlier	Lasprogata, G.A. and Cotton, M.N	2003
Non-profit organizations that seek to achieve social goals through commercial activity (pp. 252). SE differ from other social purpose organizations such as charities and non- governmental organizations: 1) They have a strong commercial ethos and generate a substantial part of their revenue through business activity, 2) have democratic structures which allow the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the governance of the enterprise (pp. 254)	Moizer, J. and Tracey, P.	2010	

Term	Definitions	Author	Year
SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	SE are those organizations that have an economic and social dimension, they are between cooperatives and nonprofit spheres (mutual, associations, foundations, NGO's). They have limited profit distribution, may distribute profits, but only to a limited extent, thus avoiding profit-maximizing behaviour. (pp. 5. Takes the EMES-European Research Network-definition)	Nyssens, M. & Defourny, J.	2006
	Private organizations dedicated to solving social problems, are businesses that trade for a social purpose. They combine innovation, entrepreneurship and social purpose and seek to be financially sustainable by generating revenue from trading. Their social mission prioritizes social benefit above financial profit, and if and when a surplus is made, this is used to further the social aims of the beneficiary group or community, and not distributed to those with a controlling interest in the enterprise.	Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006).	2006
	Organizations that create wealth that may be reinvested in the business to assure its sustainability, and social value. It commonly associates SE to nonprofit organizations (pp. 13)	Chell, E.	2007
	Organization that trades, not for private gain, but to generate positive social and environmental externalities. Two defining characteristics of SE: 1) the adoption of some form of commercial activity to generate revenue; and 2) the pursuit of social goals. (pp.420). Considers the SE as a form of Hybrid Organization (pp. 431).	Doherty, Bob; et Al.	2014
	Defines Social/Hybrid Enterprise as synonymous, businesses with social and financial objectives and a strong efficiency in its management covering operational costs and realizing some form of added value, surplus or profit. They have different business structures: on one hand as Yunus Social Enterprises (reinvestment), on the other hand as Kramer and Porter Shared Value proposal (distribution among stakeholders). (pp. 502-504)	Jackson K	2016
	They use the term hybrid organization (or hybrid) as synonymous of SE, they are enterprises that mix aspects of for-profit and nonprofit realms to solve specific social or environmental issues while striving to remain economically sustainable. (pp. 60)	Haigh, N., et Al.	2015
	nonprofits supplementing their donated income with earned revenue strategies (pp. 716).	Wilson, F. and Post, J.E.	2013
SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP	Social entrepreneurship : opportunities and activities that leverage economic activity to pursue a social objective and implement social change. The change in the social system is not a by-product, but the very essence of their endeavors, this distinguishes SE from "entrepreneurship with a conscience". The focus on economic activity is important to differentiate social entrepreneurship from pure forms of social movements as well as from charitable and philanthropic initiatives. (pp. 353-354)	Mair, J; et Al.	2012
	SEship is an innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors. The authors focus mainly in nonprofit type of SE (pp. 2).	Austin, J; et Al.	2006
	Is innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, and public sectors. Generating social value is the explicit, central driving purpose and force for SE (pp. 22)	Austin, J. E.	2006
	Is a process that includes the identification of a specific social problem and a specific solution (or set of solutions) to address it; the evaluation of the social impact, the business model and the sustainability of the venture; and the creation of a social mission-oriented for-profit or a business-oriented nonprofit entity that pursues the double (or triple) bottom line	Jeffrey Robinson	2006
	SEship are those enterprises led by social entrepreneurs who have the following characteristics: 1. Are change agents in the social sector 2. Adopt a mission to create and sustain social value, this social mission is explicit and central, this is what distinguishes social entrepreneurs from business entrepreneurs, even from socially responsible businesses. (this conflicts with Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M, 2006 that affirm that social entrepreneurship creates social value, either exclusively or at least in some prominent way) 3. Exhibit a heightened sense of accountability, take steps to assure they are	Dees, J. G. b)	1998
	SEship is exercised where some person or group: 1. aim(s) at creating social value, either exclusively or at least in some prominent way (this marks the divide between social and other forms of entrepreneur); 2. show(s) a capacity to recognize and take advantage of opportunities to create that value ("envison"); 3. employ(s) innovation, ranging from outright invention to adapting someone else's novelty, in creating and/or distributing social value; 4. is/are willing to accept an above-average degree of risk in creating and disseminating social value; and 5. is/are unusually resourceful in being relatively undaunted by scarce assets in pursuing their social venture (pp. 64)	Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M.	2006
	SEship provides products and services that cater directly to unsatisfied basic human needs. Social value creation is the primary objective, while economic value creation is often a by-product that allows the organization to achieve sustainability and self-sufficiency. For SE economic value capture is often limited (pp. 243-244).	Seelos, C. and Mair, J.	2005
	The activity of those entrepreneurs that build social ventures in order to pursue economic and social goals. Organizations pursuing profits as their sole objective or for-profit firms engaged in philanthropic endeavors or socially responsible activities often fall outside the domain of social entrepreneurship. Likewise, nonprofit organizations, social service organizations or NGO's ignoring the economic implications of their operations would generally lie outside the boundaries of social entrepreneurship (pp. 521).	Zahra, S.A., et Al	2009
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Organizations with mixed motives (philanthropic and commercial) that create social and economic value and reinvest their income in mission activities or operational expenses, and/or retained for business growth and development (for-profits may redistribute a portion) (pp. 14-20).	Kim Alter	2007
	Organizations pursuing an explicit social mission through business-inspired earned-income strategies, with the express goal of creating market disequilibria. They are a new breed resulting from the mixing of two distinct organizational species, a result of conscious cross-breeding between charities and for-profit businesses. (pp. 83-84)	Hockerts, K.	2015
	Organization that combines different institutional logics in unprecedented ways, development and commercial logics. (pp. 1419)	Battilana J. and Dorado S.	2010

Term	Definitions	Author	Year
HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS	Organizations that primarily pursue a social mission but rely significantly on commercial revenue to sustain operations. The ideal of HO is fully integrate everything it does produces both, social value and commercial revenue. (pp. 51)	Battilana J. et. Al.	2012
	Organizations blending mission and market logics. They are named as "businesses with social purpose" or "in business for good" (pp. 4)	Bull M Ridley-Duff R	2018
	Formal organizations, networks or umbrella groups that have both forprofit and nonprofit components. Forprofit organizations may create nonprofit affiliates, and nonprofits sometimes establish for-profit subsidiaries. It doesn't speak about Hybrid enterprise that born with both characteristics, always one type of organization assuming the characteristics of the other. (pp.18).	Dees, J. G.& Anderson, B. B	2003
	Hybrids are the offspring of two different species, organizations that span institutional boundaries and draw on at least two different sectoral paradigms, logics and value systems (private, public, nonprofit sector). The SE are a form of HO (pp. 418-419)	Doherty, B. et. Al. a)	2014
HYBRID ENTERPRISES	Organizations that combine different domains (market, civil society and state). SE are a form of HO (p. 11)	Wolfgang Grassi	2011
	Hybrid Business pursue a social mission while engaging in commercial activities that sustain their operations. Sustainability is part of their business models. SE are a form of HO (pp. 33)	Rüdiger, Hahn; Inan, Ince	2016
	Defines Social/Hybrid Enterprise as synonymous, businesses with social and financial objectives and a strong efficiency in its management: covering operational costs and realizing some form of added value, surplus or profit. They have different business structures: on one hand as Yunus Social Enterprises (reinvestment), on the other hand as Kramer and Porter Shared Value proposal (distribution among stakeholders). (pp. 502-504)	Jackson K	2016
	Private undertaking committed to achieve a social purpose, incorporating traditional resources of nonprofit organizations (donations and voluntary participation), commercial revenue and business activity. Although the authors recognize hybrid organizational forms can develop within and between all three sectors (private, public, nonprofit), they particularly focus on the development of hybrids in the context of the nonprofit sector, that's why they use SE and HE as synonymous (pp. 2-3)	Mair, J., & Noboa, E	2003
	For profit business from the outset (a corporation),but its specific mission is to drive transformational social and/or environmental changes (pp. 563)	Michelini L Fiorentino D	2012
	They use the term HO (or hybrid) as synonymous of SE, they are enterprises that mix aspects of for-profit and nonprofit realms to solve specific social or environmental issues while striving to remain economically sustainable. (pp. 60)	Haigh, N., Dowin Kennedy, E., Walker J.	2015
PURPOSE-DRIVEN COMPANY	Are business driven by goals beyond profit, considering a triple-bottom line approach. They have financial goals in addition to meeting social and environmental standards of performance, accountability, and transparency. Based in an eco-systemic framework to foster innovation for business sustainability, where the business operates as a system similar to a living organism (pp. 1-5)	Sun J, Wu S and Yang K	2017