



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Pan, N. D., Gruber, M. & Binder, J. (2019). Painting with All the Colors: The Value of Social Identity Theory for Understanding Social Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(1), pp. 213-215. doi: 10.5465/amr.2017.0504

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/25053/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0504>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



Review

Painting with all the Colors: The Value of Social Identity Theory for Understanding Social Entrepreneurship

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AMR-2017-0504-Dialogue.R2
Manuscript Type:	Dialogue
Theoretical Perspectives:	Social cognitive theory, Social identity theory, Microfoundations of strategy
Topic Areas:	Entrepreneurial cognition (General) < Entrepreneurial Cognition < Entrepreneurship, Identity < Founder < Entrepreneurship, Founder (General) < Founder < Entrepreneurship
Abstract:	Dialogue - for Wry & York, 2017

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Painting with all the Colors: The Value of Social Identity Theory for Understanding Social Entrepreneurship

Building on the emerging body of research on founder identity, Wry and York (2017) elaborate how an identity-based approach has the potential to extend our knowledge of opportunity identification in social entrepreneurship. In particular, the authors draw on *role identity* theory (Stryker & Burke, 2000) and research on *personal identity* (Hitlin, 2003) to study hybrid identities within single individuals. While role and personal identity are useful constructs for studying entrepreneurial behavior, we are concerned about the foregone opportunity to use *social identity* theory for advancing our knowledge of social entrepreneurs as enterprising individuals, social venture creation processes, and related outcomes. Indeed, in this commentary, we argue that social identity theory holds more potential – than either role or personal identity theory – for analyzing the rich “other-oriented” behavior that is at the heart of social entrepreneurship.

The Identity “Toolbox” – Identity Theories & Entrepreneurial Behavior

In traditional conceptualizations of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial behavior tends to be equated with economic rationality and utility maximization. However, given the increasing popularity of social entrepreneurship – entrepreneurial activities primarily aimed at improving the welfare of others (e.g., by addressing social or environmental problems) – theories traditionally used to explain entrepreneurial phenomena have fallen short (Gruber & MacMillan, 2017). Therefore, an increasing number of scholars have turned to *identity* theories, explaining that some entrepreneurs engage primarily in “other-oriented” activities because they strive to act and behave in ways that are consistent with their identity and sense of self (e.g., Fauchart & Gruber, 2011; Powell & Baker, 2017).

Because no theory is perfectly complete, researchers may feel compelled to combine different theories to study their phenomenon of interest. In this case, scholars interested in social

1
2 entrepreneurship might examine past work on *personal identity*, *role identity*, and *social identity*,
3
4 and try to combine selected works which offer the greatest explanatory potential without
5
6 violating key theoretical assumptions or compromising parsimony (Whetten, 1989). When we
7
8 did this, we found these three areas of identity research to be related: *Personal identity* relates to
9
10 individual, *intrapersonal* behavior (shaped by idiosyncratic individual attributes). *Social identity*
11
12 captures social, *interpersonal* behavior (driven by identification with a collective). *Role identity*,
13
14 focused on an individual's role-based relationships, combines elements of the intrapersonal and
15
16 the interpersonal (Tajfel, 1982; Terry, Hogg, & White, 1999). Thus, the main concern we raise
17
18 relates to Wry and York's choice to combine *role identity theory* with research on *personal*
19
20 *identity*. We argue that this pairing of theoretical lenses is, at best, very limited, and at worst,
21
22 misleading, distracting us from the most valuable insights related to social entrepreneurship.
23
24
25
26

27
28 Role identity theory, one of two major theories of identity, focuses on role-related views
29
30 of the self, attributing differences in self-categorization to salient, repeated interactions between
31
32 individuals embedded in groups (Stryker & Burke, 2000). We support Wry and York's use of
33
34 role identity theory in this context, particularly due to copious evidence of the ability of role
35
36 identity to explain important phenomena inside and outside (emerging) organizations (Ashforth,
37
38 Schinoff, & Rogers, 2016; Cardon, Wincent, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2009; Gruber & MacMillan,
39
40 2017; Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995; Powell & Baker, 2017). However, we are surprised that Wry
41
42 and York have chosen not to complement their analysis of role identity with social identity
43
44 theory. Since they do not provide any justification¹ for their decision to exclude it, any rationale
45
46 for this fundamental decision remains speculative. The choice, however, is particularly surprising
47
48 since Wry and York's phenomenon of interest is the entrepreneur in relation to others, and given
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹ The authors simply state that they are *not* using social identity theory in their article (Wry & York, 2017: 438).
59
60

1
2 that social identity theory is the other widely used theory of the situated human self, explicitly
3
4 considering the self in relation to others in the social space (Stets & Burke, 2000).
5
6

7 While we acknowledge that personal identity *does* affect role and social identity, this
8
9 perspective provides little added value (to role identity theory) in explaining entrepreneurial
10
11 behavior. First of all, research on personal identity relies on idiosyncratic personal identifiers.²
12
13 At the core of this theory lies the assumption that individuals are driven by their own subjective
14
15 goals and desires rather than those of a group or external others (Stets & Burke, 2000).
16
17 Consequently, past theorists are uncertain about the degree of impact a personal identity can
18
19 have once a role identity is established. As Stets and Burke posit, “once a role or group identity
20
21 becomes established, [...] personal identities may have little impact” (2000: 229). Finally, while
22
23 it may be argued that personal identity could offer some insights into explaining profit-oriented
24
25 entrepreneurial behavior, it certainly falls short in capturing the “other-oriented” motivations and
26
27 activities of social entrepreneurs.
28
29
30
31

32 Given these observations, we believe that the pairing chosen by Wry and York (2017)
33
34 and, by implication, the neglect of social identity theory, is not simply a lost opportunity. We are
35
36 concerned that this pairing of theories may also be misleading. Personal identity research and
37
38 role identity theory do not appear capable of systematically capturing the “other-oriented”
39
40 dimension that is at the very core of social entrepreneurship. As a result, researchers are likely to
41
42 overlook fundamental aspects of the phenomenon, focusing their energy on inferior research
43
44 questions, and potentially also misinterpreting their findings. In the next section, we share a few
45
46 ways social identity theory has guided *our* thinking on social entrepreneurship, and why it
47
48 presents a better alternative.
49
50
51
52

53 ***The “Self”, “Known Others” and “Unknown Others” as Beneficiaries in Entrepreneurship***

55 ² Specifically, Hitlin (2003: 122) indicates: “Values are the most important, but not the only, phenomenon
56 constituting personal identity. Other aspects of personal identity theoretically include (but are not limited to) traits,
57 abilities, bodily self-perception, other perceived unique personal characteristics, and personality.”
58

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Social identity research indicates that due to differences in self-categorization, entrepreneurs diverge in key ways in terms of their “other-orientation,” or, in their desire to act in the benefit of others. Work by Fauchart and Gruber (2011) shows that entrepreneurs may have three main types of social identities: entrepreneurs with the “closest” level of self-categorization in the social space are oriented towards helping themselves (“Darwinians”); entrepreneurs with a broader degree of self-categorization may be oriented towards helping personal, *known* others in their community (“Communitarians”); finally, entrepreneurs with the broadest degree of self-categorization will be oriented towards helping impersonal, *unknown* others (“Missionaries”). While prior work has identified three primary types of social identities, a combination of each may exist to varying degrees in a single individual, thus representing the possibility of hybrid social identities.³ Just like all palette colors combine the three primary colors yellow, red, and blue, one may think of all entrepreneurs as being characterized by smaller or larger concentrations of the three primary social identities (Gruber & MacMillan, 2017: 7).

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

What makes these social identity-based distinctions so important is the fact that they provide scholars with a clear and systematic way to account for entrepreneurial activities that span the spectrum of inclusiveness in one’s self-definition, from the “I” to the “Personal We”, to the “Impersonal We” (see also: Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Harb & Smith, 2008). In other words, by applying social identity theory to social entrepreneurship we have, in our hands, a compelling framework that allows us to better understand hybrid and non-hybrid entrepreneurs who act (purely) out of economic self-interest, and/or with the (additional) aim to support *known* others (e.g., addressing hunger or environmental challenges in a local community), and/or *unknown* others (e.g., fighting hunger or environmental degradation for society-at-large) in the social

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

³ In Fauchart and Gruber’s (2011) sample over 20% of founders were hybrid entrepreneurs, in the sense that the entrepreneurs exhibited traits of at least two primary social identities (and thus received pressure from at least two distinct logics). Sieger and colleagues (2016) find evidence that the frequency of different social identity “blends” vary across industry and geographic contexts.

1
2 space. These distinctions matter, as founders with different social identities do not just pursue
3
4 different goals; they also derive largely different types of benefits from new firm creation,
5
6 engage in distinct venture creation activities, and apply fundamentally different performance
7
8 criteria to their activities overall (see, e.g., Fauchart & Gruber, 2011: 947). Given their respective
9
10 theoretical emphases, neither role identity theory nor personal identity research alone allow
11
12 scholars to grasp the other-orientation(s) of social entrepreneurs in a systematic manner. This not
13
14 only leaves us blind to one of the defining features and source of differences in the phenomenon;
15
16 it also handicaps our understanding of hybrid identities and how entrepreneurs may mix
17
18 competing logics (e.g., a commercial and a social welfare logic) in their entrepreneurial
19
20 activities.
21
22
23
24

25 To conclude, if social entrepreneurship is about venturing in the service of others (Miller,
26
27 Grimes, McMullen, & Vogus, 2012), then it follows that we should use theoretical lenses that
28
29 allow us to examine the variance in how social entrepreneurs perceive and support others. Social
30
31 identity theory allows us to do exactly this, and thus, in our view, is *essential* to the study of
32
33 social entrepreneurship. Moreover, by combining social identity theory and role identity theory,
34
35 we can investigate interesting role identity-based variation in social entrepreneurship that exists
36
37 *within* the three primary social identities (see Gruber and MacMillan, 2017). It is our hope that
38
39 the suggestion to employ social identity theory in the study of social enterprises will encourage
40
41 research which embraces, and is thus guided by, the richness of this important entrepreneurial
42
43 phenomenon.
44
45
46
47

48 **References**

- 49
50 Ashforth, B. E., Schinoff, B. S., & Rogers, K. M. 2016. "I identify with her," "I identify with him":
51 Unpacking the dynamics of personal identification in organizations. *Academy of Management*
52 *Review*, 41(1): 28–60.
53
54 Bacharach, S. B. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management*
55 *Review*, 14(4): 496–515.
56
57 Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. 1996. Who is this "We"? Levels of collective identity and self
58 representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1): 83.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. 2009. The nature and experience of entrepreneurial
4 passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3): 511–532.
- 5 Fauchart, E., & Gruber, M. 2011. Darwinians, Communitarians, and Missionaries: The Role of Founder
6 Identity in Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, 54(5): 935–957.
- 7 Gruber, M., & MacMillan, I. C. 2017. Entrepreneurial Behavior: A Reconceptualization and Extension
8 based on Identity Theory. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*.
- 9 Harb, C., & Smith, P. B. 2008. Self-Construals Across Cultures: Beyond Independence—
10 Interdependence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(2): 178–197.
- 11 Hitlin, S. 2003. Values as the Core of Personal Identity: Drawing Links between Two Theories of Self.
12 *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66(2): 118–137.
- 13 Hogg, M. A., Terry, D., & White, K. 1995. A Tale of Two Theories. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4):
14 255–269.
- 15 Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. 2012. Venturing for others with heart and
16 head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*,
17 37(4): 616–640.
- 18 Powell, E. E., & Baker, T. 2017. In the beginning: Identity processes and organizing in multi-founder
19 nascent ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0175>.
- 20 Sieger, P., Gruber, M., Fauchart, E., & Zellweger, T. 2016. Measuring the social identity of
21 entrepreneurs: Scale development and international validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*,
22 31(5): 542–572.
- 23 Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. 2000. Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*,
24 224–237.
- 25 Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. 2000. The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology*
26 *Quarterly*, 284–297.
- 27 Tajfel, H. 1982. Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33(1): 1–39.
- 28 Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. 1999. The theory of planned behaviour: self-identity, social
29 identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(3): 225–244.
- 30 Whetten, D. A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*,
31 14(4): 490–495.
- 32 Wry, T., & York, J. G. 2017. An identity-based approach to social enterprise. *Academy of Management*
33 *Review*, 42(3): 437–460.
- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60