

Higher School of Economics, Moscow Centre for social entrepreneurship and social innovations studies

"Dependent" and "Independent" Social Enterprises:

some results of a comparative survey

Oleg OBEREMKO, Alexandra MOSKOVSKAYA, Marina CHERNYSHEVA

Content

- 1. What we planned
- 2. (Lost in) Sampling
- 3. Rejected hypotheses
- 4. Exploratory results

1. What we mean talking on in\dependence

Independence – vulnerability to imposing standards of conduct on a social enterprise by the "big" state.

1. What we mean talking on in\dependence

the "big" state influences strongly on SE in

- Establishing (legally and financially),
- Supporting paid-up demand
- (other aspects are hardly catchable in a survey)

The state is not the only danger...

1. What we planned to do

Meaningfully:

- Distinguish in/dependent SE
- □ Find out the spheres and patterns for "independent" activities (further qualitative step)

Methodologically

Have experience, how to make an international online survey

1. What we planned to find out

Research question:

- To what extent social enterprises in different countries (macro-regions) are oriented to different forms of partnerships (especially with the governments)?
- What factors play the main role in the character of a partnership (interactions with stakeholders)?
- ☐ Is the SE "independence" connected with its market orientation?

1. What we've got

Methodologically

Invaluable experience on how to make an international online survey

Meaty:

- ☐ All the hypotheses were failed to test (only 5% recognised to be dependent)
- □ Some exploratory results

2. Sampling:

The sampling base:

- open lists of the fellows of a prominent NPO globally supporting *leaders* in SE
- The sampling frame:
- □ 60 countries randomly selected 12 in each of 5 continents (save Australia)

Shifts in sampling:

- 2 languages: English y Espanol
- Differences in availability

2. Sampling: (unexplained) differences in availability

Countries	N in the list	N of the answers
Czech Republic	27	2
Germany	46	1
Lithuania	8	2
Netherlands	2	2
Spain	24	7

2. Sampling: gains

9% completed questionnaires from the "established contacts"

	N = 124
Asia and Africa	32.3
Europe and Northern America (USA and Canada)	28,0
Latin America	38.7

2. Sampling losses:

Inner limitations

- ? establishing contacts
- ? questionnaire
- ? researcher's brand

Outer limitations

? - open lists as a base for sampling

3. Rejecting the hypos

□ 93%: independent

□ 5%: dependent

□ 2%: NA

3. Rejecting the hypos

Ratio of government subsidies in SE income	SE,%
0 %	74
1-30 %	19
50-95 %	7
In total	100

- Please evaluate the importance of each of the 14 characteristics for the establishment of your organization.
- // successful operation ...
- □ 5-points scale, «5» - "the very important",

. . .

<1≫ - "not important at all".

- **Both**: 5 factors models
- Main components;
- □ Varimax + Kaiser's normalization;
- number of factors stone scree;
- □ Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling adequacy = 0.707 / 0.697;
- Bartlett's sphericity at 0.000;
- explained variance 76 % / 80%

4. Factors favorable

to be established

- 1. Patronage 20¹
- 2. Prof. experience 15
- 3. Shared actions 12
- 4. Shared values 11

to operate

- 1. Patronage 19
- 2. Shared values 17
- 3. Prof. experience 14
- 4. Shared actions 13
- 5. Informal circles 11 5. Informal circles 10

1 % of the dispersion explained after rotation

1/1. Patronage: personal contacts with VIPs

While operating donors move from "values sharers" to "patrons", strategic investors – vice versa.

	Estab.	Oper.
13 Support by government officials	,849	,808
14 Support by celebrities	,816	,819
12 Support by prominent businesspeople	,765	,830
03 Strategic investor	,596	values
11 Support by donor organizations	values	,656

2/3. Professional experience and entrepreneurial skills are equally important.

	Estab.	Oper.
1 Professional experience of the leader	,847	,715
7 Professional experience of the team members	,765	,850
2 Business savvy of the leaders	,740	,621

3/4. Shared actions

While operating "partnership" means rather keeping stable connections then getting new ones online.

	Estab.	Oper.
6 Partnership with NPO	,803	,917
10 Use of the Internet social networks	,544	
5 Partnership with profit-making organizations	,540	,832

4/2. Shared values

	Estab.	Oper.
11 Support by donor organizations	,762	
9 Support by individuals who share the values	,731	,799
of organization		
8 Support of informal social groups interested		,753
in your organization's activities		
3 Strategic investors		,652

5/5. Informal circles:

While operating

	Estab.	Oper.
8 Support by informal groups interested in	,798	
your organization's activities		
4 Free help of family members, friends,	,654	,814
colleagues, neighbours of the team members		

Thank you!