

### **Use Authorization**

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Idaho State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further state that permission to download and/or print my dissertation for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of my academic division, or by the University Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this dissertation for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

CITIZEN ENTREPRENEUR:  
SOCIAL GOOD AND THE GOOD CITIZEN

by

Kacee A. Garner

A dissertation  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Arts in the Department of Political Science  
Idaho State University  
Spring 2016

Copyright 2015 Kacee A. Garner

## Committee Approval

To the Graduate Faculty:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the dissertation of  
KACEE A. GARNER find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

---

MARK MCBETH,  
Major Advisor

---

DONNA LYBECKER,  
Committee Member

---

ELIZABETH CARTWRIGHT,  
Graduate Faculty Representative



# Idaho State UNIVERSITY

Office for Research Integrity  
921 South 8th Avenue, Stop 8046 • Pocatello, Idaho 83209-8046

October 7, 2015

Kacee Garner  
Political Science

RE: regarding study number IRB-FY2016-94: Citizenship Attitudes Among Social Entrepreneurs

Dear Ms Garner:

I agree that this study qualifies as exempt from review under the following guideline: Category 2: Anonymous educational tests, surveys, interviews, or observations. This letter is your approval, please, keep this document in a safe place.

Notify the HSC of any adverse events. Serious, unexpected adverse events must be reported in writing within 10 business days.

You are granted permission to conduct your study effective immediately. The study is not subject to renewal.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. Contact Tom Bailey (208-282-2179; fax 208-282-4723; email: humsubj@isu.edu) if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely

Ralph Baergen, PhD, MPH, CJP  
Human Subjects Chair

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is gratefully dedicated to  
my always and forever husband, Graham Garner,  
and my can-do spirit mother, Kris Hiatt,  
who both never stopped believing I could finish.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables .....	ix
Abstract .....	x
Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
Research Question .....	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
Citizenship .....	11
Social Entrepreneurship .....	32
Chapter Three: Methodology .....	53
Chapter Four: Results .....	88
Chapter Five: Discussion and Analysis .....	104
Chapter Six: Conclusion .....	123
References .....	127
Appendix 1-3 .....	147

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 .....	62
Figure 3.2 .....	63
Figure 3.3 .....	67
Figure 3.4 .....	69
Figure 3.5 .....	71-72
Figure 3.6 .....	74
Figure 3.7 .....	76
Figure 3.8 .....	79
Figure 3.9 .....	82
Figure 3.10 .....	83
Figure 3.11 .....	84
Figure 3.12 .....	86

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 .....	89
Table 4.2 .....	90
Table 4.3 .....	91
Table 4.4 .....	91
Table 4.5 .....	92
Table 4.6 .....	93
Table 4.7 .....	94
Table 4.8 .....	95
Table 4.9 .....	96
Table 4.10 .....	97
Table 4.11 .....	98
Table 4.12 .....	100
Table 4.13 .....	100
Table 4.14 .....	101
Table 4.15 .....	102
Table 4.16 .....	103
Table 4.17 .....	104

## ABSTRACT

In contrast to those sounding the death knoll of American citizenship and political involvement, many have noted the rise of a new kind of citizenship in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. They argue citizenship is no longer simply defined by legal status and voting habits. Instead, they take a more holistic approach to citizenship including an interest in global civil society and varied forms of political participation. A parallel movement in the private sector has resulted in the rise of social entrepreneurship or capitalistic activities intended to address social and environmental problems. In this study, social entrepreneurship includes a continuum of activities ranging from corporate social responsibility among for-profit businesses to the proliferation of non-governmental organizations and non-profit entities. Utilizing a survey administered to a sample of individuals involved in social entrepreneurship ventures or scholarship, this quantitative study posits and demonstrates a correlational relationship between engaged citizenship and social entrepreneurship.

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

*[W]ithout other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withall. In such condition, there is no place for Industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving, and removing such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short.*  
 —Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*

Writing in the context of the English Civil War, Hobbes seminal work *Leviathan* posited that absent the power of an absolute sovereign, humans necessarily exist in a state of nature, wherein they are driven by fierce competition and the need for self-preservation. He argued that without a strong ruling force to provide protection, people had no incentive to cooperate to develop economic markets, civil society or promote the common good (Hobbes, 1904).

Through the development of modern representative democratic government changed the nature of the sovereign described by Hobbes, adherence to his evaluation of a selfish human nature persisted. In their quest to create a stable political system that promoted the rights of individual freedom and private property acquisition (Rimmerman, 1997), the framers of the constitution took a Hobbesian view. In The Federalist Papers No. 6, Alexander Hamilton called men “ambitious, vindictive and rapacious.” In Federalist 51, James Madison wrote “But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary... In framing a government which is to be

administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.” Hobbes doesn’t tell the whole story, though.

The *Zeitgeist*’s understanding of the works of Charles Darwin and Adam Smith reinforced and justified the notion of competition as the overarching motivation for human decision-making, both biological and economic. “A fundamental assumption of traditional economics is that competitiveness creates prosperity. This view ... weds the invisible hand of the market to the natural selection of nature” (Liu and Hanauer, 2011). Liu and Hanauer go on to argue, however, that this assumption is based on a misunderstanding of Darwin and Smith, and therefore a misunderstanding of Hobbesian human nature. They argue instead that an evaluation of human behavior must include both self-interest and mutual-interest or cooperation, writing, “Reciprocity makes compassion not a form of weakness but a model of strength; it makes pro-social morality not just moral but natural and smart (p. 36) ... reflect[ing] a deep recognition of

Cooperation among humans is based on the biological principle of altruism. Altruism is behavior performed that benefits the actor less than the recipient (Piliavin, 1990) and, according to unpublished research conducted by this author in 2007, can include all sorts of behaviors including the sharing of objects, cooperation, helping and empathetic or comforting behavior. Altruistic behaviors can be observed in children before the second year of life and continues to play an enormous role in human social interaction. Altruism seems to be a universal positive value in forms the foundation of most of the world’s religions and social reforms. In fact, J. Phillippe



Rushton (2001) argues altruism is essential for the existence of human society. The development of altruistic behavior mirrors the ability to feel empathy which is causally related to prosocial behavior.

How can altruism, which by definition stresses the well-being of others over the well-being of one's self (reducing personal fitness) possibly evolve via natural selection which, by definition, is based on the idea of a competitive environment? "More specifically, if individuals have been selected to behave in their own reproductive interests, how could a behavior evolve which entails helping others to increase their reproductive success at the expense of one's own" (Barrett, 2002). Altruistic behavior must have a property that makes it an evolutionary positive, something which increases fitness. Simply put, being prosocial must make survival more likely. As Rushton puts it, the "tremendous survival value of being social makes innate prosocial motives as likely as self-centered, egoistic ones" (Rushton, 29). A wholly Hobbesian view of human behavior does not account for this biologically-based altruism.

Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin tried to reconcile the idea of Darwinian self-preservation with observed unselfish behavior, both in the animal kingdom and among humans, which he termed, "the law of mutual aid." He wrote in 1902, "We may safely say that mutual aid is as much a law of animal life as mutual struggle, but that, as a factor of evolution, it most probably has a far greater importance, inasmuch as it favours the development of such habits and characters as insure the maintenance and further development of the species, together with the greatest amount of welfare and enjoyment of life for the individual, with the least waste of energy (p.6). This

insight grounded Kropotkin's pacifism and call for cooperative anarchism squarely in biology (Masters, 1982).

A similar argument can be made in the realm of economics to reconcile the inherent conflict between self-serving rational choices and altruistic philanthropy or profit-sharing. Nobel Peace Prize winner and microfinance pioneer Muhammad Yunus wrote in 2010:

If the profit motive alone controlled all of human behavior, the only existing institutions would be ones designated to generate maximum individual wealth. There would be no churches or mosques or synagogues, no schools, no art museums, no public parks, or health clinics or community centers. After all, institutions like these don't make anyone into a tycoon! There would be no charities, foundations, or non-profit organizations. This distorted view of human nature is the fatal flaw that makes our economic thinking incomplete and inaccurate.

Liu and Hanover agree, noting that cooperation creates “sybiotic, nonzero outcomes,” (p. 37) which can lead to better economic growth. However, traditional neoclassical economic theory assumes actors act rationally and self-interestedly. The recursive loops formed by their individualistic behaviors create patterns, which can be analyzed via economic equilibrium a “world of order, stasis, knowableness, and perfection” (Arthur, 2013). For decades, capitalistic macroeconomics was based on the idea that the singular goal of business was the maximization of profits and competition for market share. Any other pursuit was at best a disservice to shareholders, at worst, illegal. Public good was deemed the responsibility of government (Eggers, 2013). This view of economics has no room for addressing

social problems. In fact, quite the opposite is true--the unregulated pursuit of profit maximization tends to create social and environmental problems (Yunus, 2010).

An emerging view in macroeconomics is complexity economics that allows for the materialization of nonequilibrium in the economy resulting from uncertainty, non-rational actors, and disruption via technological change (Arthur, 2013). Markets are not perfectly efficient in the real world and people are not wholly selfish. Under the framework of complexity economics, money is no longer the sole measure of wealth; instead, ideas are the new currency of the economy (Liu and Hanauer, 2011)—an “economy that is not dead, static, timeless, and perfect, but one that is alive, ever-changing, organic, and full of messy vitality” (Arthur, 2013). Beyond failing to measure social good, classical economic thought also fails to account for external public costs not generally borne by the producer—for example polluted air or water or child labor (Keohane, 2013). Complexity economics allows for altruism and the service of social good in an effort toward long-term value creation, not just profit-maximization.

What can be found at the nexus of altruism and complexity economics? Social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is altruism functioning within a capitalistic economic model. “The currency of social entrepreneurship, and its ‘profit’ so to speak, is social change. To social entrepreneurs, change means a fundamental shift in how society deals with an issue” (Cusano, 2010).

From clean water to malaria eradication to radical recycling to building toilets for the one out of seven people on the planet who don’t have access to them, entrepreneurs are focusing in on tackling the world’s most pressing environmental

and social problems—problems that governments, religious organizations, and strictly for-profit enterprise have failed to adequately address. Increasingly, over the last few decades, the line between traditional public and private sectors is blurring (Schwartz, 2012) as humanity faces widespread ecological and environmental degradation, substantial gaps between rich and poor and increased awareness of inequality, injustice and intolerance. According to one leading researcher of social entrepreneurship, David Bornstein (2007), “Everywhere you look, conceptual firewalls that once divided the world into social and economic realms are coming down and people are engaging the world with their whole brains.” He refers to this shift as the forging of a new citizen sector.

The citizen sector’s great contribution to society is its ability to translate particular ethical values into concrete action. If government exists and serves society as a way to organize people to live together and business serves society as a way to manage resources and productivity, then the citizen sector’s role is to ensure that the social systems in which we live reflect certain universal values—the desire for justice, dignity, respect, security, peace, well-being, and the fulfillment of human potential. (Cusano, 2010).

Consider the following scenarios:

After a vacation to Argentina, a drivers’ education entrepreneur and reality TV star launches a shoe company out of his southern California apartment. He plans to sell shoes to his friends and use the profits to give shoes away to kids in rural Argentina. Within a few years, the company has sold millions of pairs of shoes to the middle and upper-middle class online and at stores like Nordstrom and has “shoe-dropped” in impoverished locales all over the globe providing children protection

from debilitating injuries and infections and allowing for them to attend school with all parts of the required uniform intact.

A young woman from Afghanistan, with the help of two African college mates, designs and secures funding to build a biogas digester in a refugee camp in Swaziland. The biogas digester processes human, animal and food wastes into usable natural gas to provide an ongoing source of fuel for people living there while vastly improving sanitation by providing a repository for waste. The biogas digester is built during the summer and the team oversees progress and process implementation on the ground before returning to the United State for their next school term.

A young man from Ghana, devastated by the high maternal mortality rate in his home country, curates a team of undergraduate college students with a variety of skills to address the issue. They launch a mobile healthcare platform for expectant mothers and rural care providers from his dorm room in rural Iowa. The project moves forward in the MIT Global Startup Challenge and the young man finds himself on stage in Marrakesh, Morocco pitching (after one-on-one coaching and mentorship from a vice president at Apple) his idea for the chance to win \$20,000 in start-up capital.

These individuals are just a few representatives of fundamental shifts in the social sector including the emergence of a global civil society, the fusion of the social and enterprise sectors (Cheng, 2010), and rapid changes in technology which allow for innovation. Bornstein posits that previous barriers to these social and economic shifts have come down, “with stunning speed” (2007). He points to increasing democracy, prosperity, longer life expectancy, basic education systems, women’s

equality movements, increased racial tolerance and instantaneous communication via the internet in the last few decades as drivers of change. Further, global citizens are increasingly aware of the issues facing humanity across the world. “Citizens have become acutely conscious of environmental destruction, entrenched poverty, health catastrophes, human rights abuses, failing education systems, and escalating violence” (ibid).

David Gershon (2009) points out that the current generation of young people, the Millennials, are perfectly primed to form the preponderance of the new citizen sector. He describes their values as hopeful, self-aware, wired to the world, socially responsible, socially tolerant, progressive, entrepreneurial and committed to sustainability. He writes, “The Millennials...are a ways down the path to being able to transform the paradigm...because their unitize consciousness is so antithetical to the belief system of intolerance, and because they are so passionately united in a generational mission to heal our planet.” Gershon is just one of many researchers who have noted a potential resurgence in prosocial behaviors and good citizenship among young people (Rimmerman, 1997; Zhukin et.al., 2006; Dalton, 2008; Khazei, 2010; Meyers, 2010). Millennials are primed to be engaged as changemakers in the world and are increasingly turning to social entrepreneurship to make their mark.

This determination contrasts markedly with other researchers who have noted declines in social capital and reciprocal pro-social behaviors (one aspect of altruism) and political and civic participation among young people. The most well-known of these is Robert Putnam, who in his landmark 2000 book, *Bowling Alone*, documented declining voter turnout, low political knowledge and interest in issues, and the dearth

of young people in once-thriving civic, service and recreational groups and clubs. Putnam was cited frequently by educators, politicians and the media, decrying the depreciation of civil society, making him a Hobbes for the 21st Century.

How then do we reconcile these two conflicting points of view? What are the prevailing views of citizenship and civic responsibility among young people in the context of the growing influence of social entrepreneurship? How do young social entrepreneurs conceive their place in civil society? Do their motivations for involvement in social justice and environmental causes fit more within a traditional framework of citizen duty and or is a new engaged and democratic altruism coming into play? If social entrepreneurship is a valid and promising avenue to solve global problems and create a new citizen sector, can it be cultivated and encouraged among young people to create a new class of civic entrepreneurs? The goal of this paper is to begin to answer these questions.

### RESEARCH QUESTION

Do social entrepreneurs tend to be more engaged citizens or duty-based citizens when compared to a control group?



## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

### Civil Society and Citizenship

*"I have no country to fight for: my country is the earth, and I am a citizen of the world."*

—Eugene V. Debs

### Social Capital

As social science's understanding of fundamental human and market behaviors evolves, our conceptions of identity, priorities and motivations also necessarily shift. For millennia an individual's identity was based primarily on inputs from a geographically-bound community—his or her family, neighbors, local religious and political leaders, local education, economics and culture--that together comprised civil society. Civil society can be described as "a sphere of our communal life in which we answer together the most important questions: what is our purpose, what is the right way to act, and what is the common good" (Eikenberry and Kluver, 2004). Social capital was based on reciprocity with the people someone saw and interacted with on a daily basis and an interest in the public good reflected a mutual interest in success of the local community as a citizen.

Print and Coleman (2003) point out that social capital is an indicator of the effectiveness of civil society and a citizen's resultant quality of life. Essentially, poor or negative social capital equals less trust, engagement, and cooperation, that in turn equals lesser quality of life. Economic sociologist, Nan Lin writes that "the notion of social capital contains three ingredients: resources embedded in a social structure; accessibility to such social resources by individuals; and use or mobilization of such

social resources by individuals for purposive actions” (2001, p. 12). These structures, resources and actions were limited by technology, geography and other social variables such as religion, education and class.

### Imagined Communities and Global Civil Society

Populations grew, political structures became more complex, and the notions of community and citizenship followed. Benedict Anderson, (1991) argues that all communities larger than “primordial villages of face-to-face contact” (p. 6) are “imagined.” He further explains that groups become imagined when “the members . . . will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (ibid). Anthropologist Arjun Appadurai (1996) builds on Anderson’s idea of the imagined community. “The world we live in today is characterized by a new role for the imagination in social life . . . The imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order” (p. 31).

While Anderson and Appadurai were referring to large communities formed by allegiance to one’s nation-state in a modern context, the same concept can be applied to imagined communities in a global context. As citizens use technology and media to meet, form relationships, and coalesce around mutually-shared interests or issues, an imagined community is formed irrespective of the limitations of geography, education, class, wealth etc. Wellman (2001) seconds this idea. He writes, “I define ‘community’ as networks of interpersonal ties that provide sociability, support, information, a sense of belonging and social identity. I do not limit my thinking about

community to neighborhoods and villages. This is good advice for any epoch and especially pertinent for the twenty-first century” (p. 228).

It is this proliferation of imagined communities that, in this author’s opinion, has driven the so-called NGO revolution and the more nascent field of social entrepreneurship. People have more opportunity than ever to create positive social capital and desire social good for others whom they have never, and will likely never meet, in real life. Consequently, they have an interest in creating a greater quality of life for people around the world and are looking for ways to accomplish those aims. A sense of global community and citizenship has led to a broadening of a greater awareness of social problems and the idea of what constitutes social good and ultimately, a remaking of civil society.

No longer is the social good confined to one’s one family, town, region or even nation. Social good has been expanded to humanity worldwide as we look to tackle problems like poverty, hunger, sanitation, women’s rights, freedom of speech and opportunities for democratic participation as well as deal with political and business scandals, economic challenges and global terrorism (Henton et al. 2004). As the complexity of the world’s problems and the definition of social good has grown more expansive, so has the understanding of what is required of citizens to achieve that social good (Blossom, 2011). Kumi Naidoo, executive director of Greenpeace International (2010) summarizes well the current state of global civil society:

Over the years, global civil society has become a rich amalgam of causes and motivations. It started with anti-colonialism and self-determination in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. From the 1970s, its campaigning dimension became more prominent as issues of feminism, peace and human rights took hold. With the post Cold-War euphoria of the 1990s, humanitarian support rose to the fore. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, many groups have risen to tackle the negative side effects of globalization. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, new waves of globalization-related issues (migrant, terrorism, fair trade, etc.) are rising. The work of global civil society is far from done (p. 329).

While Putnam (2000) sees the pervasiveness of mediated as opposed to face-to-face interaction as marking a decline in social capital, other researchers have claimed that technology improves social capital (Rimmerman, 1997; Lin, 2001; Wellman, 2001; Kraut et al, 2001 found Internet use “associated with greater participation in community activities and more trust” (DiMaggio et. al. 2001, p. 318).

Willie Cheng (2010) credits technology change with the rise of the global civic society overall. Dourish and Satchell (2011) argue that social media in particular provides an opportunity for users world-wide to explore their “moral economy...the moral and ethical considerations that underwrite and surround economic activity” (p. 23). They point out that social media creates 1. reciprocity, connecting people through their engagements; 2. responsiveness which allows social media users to engage in real (or near-real) time; and 3. responsibility, which shifts users accountability toward one another unlike traditional media. Referencing civic participation as one crucial example, they write, “Participation in online activism

creates pressures to respond; arguably it is more visible and more persistent than participation in a public meeting and more firmly entwined in everyday life” (p. 32).

### Good Citizenship

Political thinkers have long debated the behaviors and attitudes that can accurately be described as good citizenship as the concept of citizenship in a democracy has shifted. In colonial times, citizenship was primarily based on one’s ability to vote, which, of course, was then limited to white, land-owning males. Voters were expected to make their choices based on valuations of the virtue and character of a candidate as opposed to policy issues or political parties (Schudson, 2004). ...[T]he whole of their civic obligation was to recognize virtue well enough to be able to know and defeat its counterfeit. Citizens would turn back the ambitious and self-seeking at the polls. But they were not to evaluate public issues themselves. That was what representatives were for. Not parties, not interest groups, not newspapers, not citizens in the streets, but elected representatives alone would deliberate and decide” (p. 51). George Washington famously warned against what he termed combinations and associations in his farewell address.

([http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/washing.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp))

By the time French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States in 1831, the emphasis of good citizenship had shifted to one’s associations and the importance of collective action (Klein, 1999) in order to counteract human tendencies toward excessive individualism. He wrote, “Individualism ... disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellows and to draw apart with his family and friends so that ... he willingly leaves society at large to

itself (1945, p. 104). Klein (1999) argues that associations reinforce democracy by stimulating and informing the citizenry, and by decentralizing political power from state institutions. Again, we see the philosophical argument about the reality of human nature and citizenship revealed—is it selfish and atomistic or altruistic and communal?

Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* was an argument about citizenship — citizens recognizing the desirability of postponing the immediate gratification of their desires. They did so in the expectation of more certain or greater degrees of satisfaction at a later time. It was this ability that enabled Americans to reconcile their personal well-being with the common welfare of the people. In the final analysis, de Tocqueville believed that the delicate balance between freedom, equality and social order must be weighted by enlightened self-interest, public morality and patriotism. He believed that long-term self-interest and compassion would override short-term gratification and excesses of materialism. Individuals would learn that what is right is also useful. (Gregorian, 2012, para 15-16).

Post-de Tocqueville America became rife with party politics with an extreme emphasis on affiliations and political parties, not personal virtue or public policy.

“Party was related more to comradeship than to policy...Voting was not a matter of assent but a statement of affiliation. Drink, dollars, and drama brought people to the polls, and more than that, social connection, rarely anything more elevated”

(Schudson, 2004). Voter turnout routinely reached 80 percent or more. Reforms of the late 19th and early 20th century put the focus on the individual citizen voter, not party politics. Model citizens were educated and rational and media outlets claimed a great impartiality. Even as voting rights were expanded to minorities and women, voter participation fell drastically to under 50 percent in the 1920s and continued to hover between 50 and 65 percent throughout the rest of the 1900s (Valelly, 2000).

During the second half of the 20th Century, the focus of good citizenship shifted away from voting toward activism particularly in regards to the Vietnam War and to the question of individual and civil rights. “The civil rights movement opened the door to a widening web of both constitutionally guaranteed citizen rights and statutory acts based on an expanded understanding of citizens’ entitlements, state obligations, and the character of due process” (Schudson, 2004).

Increasing cultural emphases on multiculturalism, diversity, and minority rights laid the groundwork for citizenship to include an aspect of tolerance of those unlike oneself. However, voting rates continued to stay generally low. Studies also indicated that this period was marked by a decline in trust between citizens and their government, particularly the federal government (Rimmerman, 1997). People reported feeling that their participation in conventional politics has little to no consequence so they experience alienation from voting and elections and other traditional means of demonstrating citizenship.

Many researchers have noted that we seem to be entering a new phase of re-oriented and re-defined good citizenship and have attempted to create frameworks to make sense of the rapid and widespread technology and ecology shifts the world is currently experiencing. These theories of 21st Century citizenship assume that the concept has moved far beyond legal status, party affiliation, voting, rational policy priorities and even individual rights particularly in an era of globalization. It refers to more than “simply one’s relationship to a nation-state or national identity” (Meyers, 2010). “It has grown to encompass our relationship to others, to society, and to ourselves” (Caldwell et. al., 2012, p.509) Lister (2007) writes of the increasing

tendency of citizenship theory to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Liu and Hanauer (2011) point out why it is important to continue researching the shifting ideals, facets and norms of citizenship. They write:

Citizenship matters because it delivers for society what neither the market nor the state can or should. Citizenship isn't just voting. Nor is it just Good Samaritanism. A 21st century perspective forces us to acknowledge that citizenship is quite simply, the work of being in public. It encompasses behaviors like courtesy and civility, the "etiquette of freedom" to use poet Gary Snyder's phrase. It encompasses small acts like teaching your children to be honest in their dealings with others. It includes serving on community councils and as soccer coaches. It means leaving a place in better shape than you found it. It means helping others during hard times and being able to ask for help. It means resisting the temptation to call a problem someone else's. (p. 51)

If citizenship is a desirable activity and is intimately linked to community attachment (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994) it would follow that the imagined communities formed by Internet interactions would change citizenship norms, a process that Plummer (2003) calls "globalizing intimate citizenship." Goldsmith et. al. (2010) call this phenomenon the citizen-centered agenda and point out, "to thrive in these times of rapid change, we need the time and talents of all citizens. We need to create more pathways for their engagement" (p. 152). Bornstein (2007) points out that the current worldwide mobilization of citizens is unprecedented in its scale, dispersion, diversity, systemic approaches to problem solving, autonomy from church and state, an ability to exert meaningful pressures on governments. He writes, "For the time being, citizens, uninspired by political leaders, may be voting less, but they are fulfilling many needs in direct ways. Today individuals seeking meaningful work frequently opt to build, join, advocate for, or support organizations that are more



innovative, more responsive, and operationally superior to the traditional social structures.” (p. 9).

There is a wide spectrum of ideas about what good citizenship is and what good citizens do in the 21st Century (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). Meyers (2010) describes citizenship as heterogeneous, complex, flexible and a personal construction. This is particularly true for young people who Meyers describes a “likely to feel a strong moral responsibility to address global problems through political participation in social movements that are global and separate from formal political parties...especially concerning global issues like human rights and the environment” (p. 487) Walter Parker (1996) calls for the teaching of multidimensional citizenship (personal, social, spatial and temporal aspects) in order to meet the unique challenges of the early 21st century. He describes the personal dimension as one’s commitment to develop and hone a civic identity, including responsible and ethical habits. The social dimension is the ability to work with other diverse citizens to solve problems respectfully. For the spatial dimension, modern citizens must be willing to expand their traditional definition of community and see their potential role in flexible regional, national, global (or even imagined) communities. The temporal dimension means that modern citizens can “mount simultaneously a past-present-and-future outlook” (p. 127) without losing perspective to address the problems at hand. Parker acknowledges this is a tall order.

## Big Citizenship

Alan Khazei (2010), founder of City Year, calls this new kind of 21st Century citizenship “Big Citizenship.” and refers to “citizen” as the highest office in the land (p. 5). Khazei defines Big Citizenship as moving beyond self-interest and to become involved in politics, service, change movements and to take personal responsibility. He also stresses the importance of entrepreneurship and innovation in the public, private and nonprofit sectors while monitoring return on investment and looking beyond wholly traditional capitalist market solutions. He blames partisan gridlock for a lost sense of “common purpose” (p. 6). He believes that while previously, Big Citizens have been household names--political and business leaders at the top of their fields, the role of Big Citizenship can be expanded to anyone who is willing, and in particular the rising generation. He writes, “We cannot solve a damaged economy individually any more than we can create a safe environment individually ... the more widely we draw our inspiration, and the more broadly we encourage participation, the greater our chance of transformative success.” (ibid). Khazei has developed a list of key aspects of Big Citizenship and social entrepreneurship that he includes as an appendix of his book including:

- Turn on your justice nerve by identifying a need or injustice that is the motivation behind your work.
- Develop a powerful “one-day” vision statement that clearly communicates the world you are trying to achieve.
- Become an expert in your field--both from a programmatic and policy perspective.
- Propose an innovative solution based on an entrepreneurial insight.
- Demonstrate, improve, and promote the solution as part of a larger vision.

- Develop a comprehensive policy agenda for achieving the “one day” vision.
- Leverage your organization for institutional development, policy advances, and movement building.
- Change tactics, program design and goals in response to the changing environment and as necessary to confront obstacles and leverage progress towards achieving the “one day” vision.
- Seek a fundamental shift in the public policy arena--a tipping point--through large-scale demonstrations and bolder public policy proposals. (p. 255-256).

### New Citizenship

Craig Rimmerman (1997) terms the shift in citizenship definition and principles “New Citizenship” and emphasizes the role of participation beyond voting and civic efforts beyond volunteerism. New Citizens focus carefully on thoroughly understanding a societal problem, and carefully defining or, if necessary, re-defining it before jumping to solutions. Further, rather than relying on political leaders to provide solutions, New Citizenship calls on citizens to “claim their own responsibility and become solutions themselves” (p. 23). This process creates better engagement and a fuller democracy while increasing tolerance, reciprocity and social capital. New Citizenship also emphasizes grassroots mobilization, alliance formation and self-help to solve social problems. Rimmerman claims that the historical roots of New Citizenship can be found in the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 60s and that the decline in traditional political participation is a result of a decline in political efficacy. However, New Citizenship goes beyond traditional definitions of political participation (voting, contributing to a candidate, or running for office) to “shape a

culture of civic engagement, one where they are central participants in promoting political and social change.” (p. 28).

#### Gardenbrain Pro-social Citizenship

Liu and Hanuer (2011) term the modern citizenship phenomenon “Gardenbrain” or “pro-social citizenship.” Gardenbrain takes into account complexity economics and the role of civil society, forcing citizens to view democracy as a garden that needs tending to. It is contrasted with “Machinebrain” thinking which is more focused on mechanisms--classical economics with rational, self-serving actors, political machines with votes to collect and businesses with the sole goal of plugging in employee cogs and outputting profit. They argue that previous Machinebrain thinking allowed people to rationalize atomistic selfishness and accept social problems like poverty and pollution as unavoidable byproducts of the marketplace. Gardenbrain, on the other hand, recognizes those ills as the result of human priorities that can evolve for the better, and that one person’s choices necessarily affect others well being. They lay out six rules for pro-social, gardenbrain citizenship: 1. Small acts of leadership compound; 2. Infect the supercarriers (the network nodes who have influence in communities); 3. Bridge more than bond (a reference to Putnam’s social capital types); 4. Create Dunbar units (communities of around 150 individuals for maximum effectiveness and coherence as postulated by social scientist Robin Dunbar which can then be linked to each other); 5. Make courtesy count in order to “subordinate the self, even if momentarily; and, 6. Trust in trust which they say forms the basis of all other acts of pro-social citizenship. By following these steps, citizens can become more pro-social and come to contribute more meaningfully to their

communities. “We ... argue that understanding the world in these new ways raises the standard for citizenship, by making clearer the ways in which our individual behavior inescapably creates feedback loops that contagiously shape society. Our new understanding of citizenship forces us to acknowledge that we are individually both more powerful within, and more responsible to, the communities and networks that surround us.” (p. 15)

### A New Engagement

In their book *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life and the Changing American Citizen*, Zukin et. al. (2006) outline the different citizenship attitudes between the Baby Boom generation, Generation X and what they term the newly engaged DotNets, more commonly known now as the Millennials. They argue that technology and globalism have made DotNets more aware of social justice issues worldwide and given them the political tools to start to address them. They also argue that the citizenship of DotNets is much more influenced by business and commerce than by government as compared to past generations. This is yet more evidence that the lines between the public and private sectors and between political and civic engagement are blurring. They write, “In such an environment, where the locus of power shifts from government and elected officials to the private sector and nongovernmental organizations, citizens may see the need to achieve public goals through cooperative work that engages or targets institutions other than the government” (p. 53). Using a mixed method approach, they also posit that claims that today’s youth are poor citizens and unengaged compared to previous generations simply is not true. Young people are more involved in volunteerism and charitable

activities than are older people. They are, however, less likely to identify traditional political activities, like voting or joining a political party, with the ideals of good citizenship. In fact, many DotNets find politics distasteful, “dominated by negative images of partisan bickering, corruption, lying and a sense that politics is boring, confusing, and a realm that is for people (such as the rich and powerful) other than themselves” (p. 190). They tend to resist conventional descriptions of Democrat or Republican altogether. Paradoxically, their trust in government is generally high with young people reporting that government does a better job than it gets credit for and that government should do more to address social issues. Perhaps it is this inconsistency that leads Putnam and others to demonstrate concern over the citizenship readiness of next generation.

### Global Citizenship

Another conception of citizenship in the modern era is that of global citizenship. Lynn Davies (2006) succinctly defines a global citizen as “someone who knows how the world works, is outraged by injustice and who is both willing and enabled to take action to meet this global challenge” (p. 5). Davies argues that global citizenship is concerned with social justice, rights, cultural tolerance, and reducing conflict. Falk (1993) argues for the definition of citizenship to be extended beyond traditional boundaries of nation or state into the realm of global citizenship. He writes, “This spirit of global citizenship is almost completely deterritorialized, and is associated with an extension of citizenship as an expression of an affirmation of human unity. It is not a matter of being a formal member and loyal participant in a particular political community, whether city or state. Instead, it is feeling, thinking

and acting for the sake of the human species, and above all for those most vulnerable and disadvantaged” (p. 42).

Global citizens tend to think more broadly about the whole of the human experience and creating a better world with the ideals of peace, justice and environmental sustainability via pragmatic solutions. He argues these attitudes are a natural response to global integration, particularly economical globalization, that require reform. They are also a response to the idea that change is necessary for the survival of the human race in the face of ecological vulnerabilities. Finally, global citizens are not just satisfied by what they see to be likely or comfortable outcomes, but are motivated by achieving the “impossible” through dedicated action. Like Parker, Falk invokes the temporal aspect of citizenship arguing that a global citizen is constantly reaching out to an aspirational world, yet-to-be-actualized, more congruent with his or her ideals. These ideals generally include protection of human rights, greater democracy, nonviolence, multiculturalism and environmental preservation.

#### Differentiating Types of Citizenship

Other researchers have found it useful to differentiate between different types of citizens who embody different roles and values in the 21st Century.

Parker, for example, (1996) categorizes citizenship three ways: traditionalists who emphasize objective knowledge about government processes and embrace core values like freedom and liberty; progressives who place a greater emphasis on civic participation and a strong democracy; and advanced citizens who view citizenship in a more nuanced way paying “careful attention to inherent tensions between pluralism

and assimilation” and the “politics of recognition” (Taylor, 1994) or multiculturalism to incorporate feminist or racial minority perspectives.

Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne (2004) also place citizen types under three headings: personally-responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented. Personally-responsible citizens, they claim, see good citizenship as acting responsibly in their communities by recycling, volunteering, giving blood or voting. They see this as the most conservative and individualistic conception of citizenship. Participatory citizens see good citizenship as actively committing themselves to the civic affairs of the community to foster social capital. “Such commitments were ... prevalent in the education writings of nation’s founders. Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others viewed informed participation in civic life as a fundamental support for a democratic society and saw education as a chief means for furthering this goal” (p. 351). Finally, Westheimer and Kahne define justice-oriented citizens as those who share with the participatory citizens the significance of collective action but to the end of addressing social issues, correct injustices and to stimulate social systemic change. They characterize the three types helpfully:

In other words, if participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice-oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover. That today’s citizens are ‘bowling alone’ would worry those focused on civic participation. Those who emphasize social justice, however, would worry more that when citizens do get together, they often fail to focus on or to critically analyze the social, economic, and political structures that generate problems. (p. 352).



Similar to Zukin et. al., and most salient to this author's research, Russell Dalton picks up on the word "engagement" to describe emerging trends in 21st-Century citizenship norms in his 2015 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) book *The Good Citizen: how a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics*. Dalton begins his discussion of citizenship by outlining norms of good citizenship as established by a 2004 General Social survey and a 2005 Center for Democracy and Civil Society survey: Participation, Autonomy, Social Order and Solidarity. Participation involves being active in political or voluntary organizations, ethical purchasing attitudes and voting. Autonomy refers to having enough knowledge to form independent opinions on issues and keeping an eye on governmental action. The social order dimension includes obeying laws, serving in the military if necessary, and assisting law enforcement or the judicial process. Solidarity is the idea that good citizens are interested in helping those worse off than themselves.

From these categories, Dalton develops two citizen types: Duty-based and Engaged. Duty-based citizens score high in the Participation category, particularly with regards to voting, and also place high importance on the Social Order category. Dalton writes, "Citizen duty thus reflects traditional notions of citizenship as the responsibilities of a citizen-subject. The good citizen pays taxes, follows the legitimate laws of government, and contributes to the national need such as service in the military. In addition ...feelings of citizen duty are a strong stimulus of voting" (p. 28). Engaged citizens tend to place more importance instead, on the Autonomy and Solidarity categories and their Participation interest shifts from voting to non-electoral activities and organizations. Dalton summarizes, "This suggests a pattern of the

socially-engaged citizen: one who is aware of others, is willing to act on his or her principles, and is willing to challenge political elites” (p. 29).

Besides the aforementioned changes in technology, Dalton points to several other societal changes that have influenced these shifting conceptions of citizenship in the 21st Century. The first change he examines is generational. The younger generations have grown up in a time of relative economic stability, after the expansive social change of the 1960s and with unprecedented access to politically-relevant information. Next, he examines the role of education in citizenship, noting that today’s public is more educated than any time in American history, contributing to a higher level of political sophistication and engagement. Dalton also looks at changing gender roles, particularly in the last quarter of the 20th century as the number of women in the workforce increased dramatically and the number of families who followed the traditional man=breadwinner, woman=homemaker model plummeted. This shift has given women the opportunity to form their own political identities, including running for and holding office. Race is also a factor in citizenship change. By the year 2000, voting frequency among African Americans finally reached or exceeded that of white Americans--a full 130 years after the passage of the 15th Amendment. The population growth of other minority groups including Latinos and Asian-Americans are shaping the political landscape. Finally, Dalton points to additional citizenship changes stemming from mobility (physical and social), urbanization and suburbanization, and higher standards of living. He writes, “None of these trends are surprising to analysts of American society, but too often we overlook the size of these changes and their cumulative impact over more than fifty years. In

fact, these trends are altering the norms of citizenship and, in turn, the nature of American politics. They have taken place in a slow and relatively silent process over several decades, but they now reflect the new reality of political life” (p. 17).

Based on data presented in Dalton’s book, generalized characteristics of engaged citizens and duty-based citizens emerge. Older generations born prior to WWII and Baby Boomers tend to be more duty-based, while younger generations (Generation X and Millennials) tend to be more engaged. African Americans and other racial minority groups tend to be more engaged while white Americans tend to be more duty driven. Republicans identify more as duty-based citizens, while Democrats tend to be more engaged. However, other variables are not so clear cut. There is not a substantial difference between the number of females or males who identify as either duty or engaged citizens. Increased education increases both aspects of citizenship, but engaged outpaced duty-based slightly. Religiosity increases citizen duty overall but both non-religious and very strongly religious people tend to be highly engaged citizens with a dip in engagement among somewhat-strong and not-very-strong religious people.

Dalton, like the other researchers noted in this review, finds cause for optimism regarding the citizenship norms among young people today. Whether it is called big citizenship, new citizenship, pro-social citizenship, justice-oriented citizenship, or engaged citizenship, clear trends are emerging. Even Putnam’s concern over low voter turnout among young people was rebutted, somewhat, in Dalton’s epilogue incorporating data from the 2008 presidential election. Then Senator Barack Obama utilized a youth-oriented strategy that many pundits and strategists thought

would fail to result in actual votes. However, Obama won the important Iowa Democratic caucuses in the face of Hillary Clinton's machine and money, when the caucus turnout surged--90,000 people more than expected--with one in five participates falling in the unlikely 17-29 year-old category. Voters who could be described as engaged citizens favored Obama by a rate of nearly 2 to 1. They were younger, tolerant and diverse, less religious, highly educated, less militarily-oriented, more global, environmentally-conscious, and highly technologically savvy. Dalton summarizes Obama's appeal to this group:

...the Obama organization ran a different type of campaign in the Democratic primaries in relation to young. The campaign consciously mobilized young people as no other had previously done. It expressed the issues and political style that appealed to youthful engaged citizens. By including the issues of interest to young people and connecting to them on their own terms, the Obama campaign also showed that past electoral disinterest among the young at least partially reflected the nature of past campaigns rather than an intrinsic feature of a generation raised on television and a pop culture mass media. Perhaps most important, the Obama campaign recognized that young Americans are interested in their nation and would participate if politics changed to reflect their views. (Epilogue to 1<sup>st</sup> edition, revised, p.13)

Throughout the general election, Obama's strategy of youth engagement continued to pay off. Dalton reports that an aggressive voter registration program and unprecedented uses of technology for voter communication and fundraising contributed to his 2 to 1 lead among voters under age 30. General election turnout was the highest in 40 years with some indications that up to two-thirds of this increase was a result of higher turnout among young people, particularly Millennials. Dalton takes this as a sign that engaged citizens want a political process that is more inclusive,

based in social capital bridge building. Engaged citizens are out to change the world--of politics, of business, in their communities and abroad--remaking it into one that is more just, socially responsible, and environmentally sustainable.

## Social Entrepreneurship

***While we do our good works let us not forget that the real solution lies in a world in which charity will have become unnecessary.***

**-Chinua Achebe**

## Social Justice

Paralleling the rise of a new kind of citizenship in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries is the rise of social entrepreneurship, based in a commitment to altruistic social justice through the lens of complexity economics and capitalism. What, in modern times, is generally referred to as the social justice movement is not a new concept. Improving the lives of others has been tied to conceptions of good citizenship throughout the history of Western thought. In *The Republic*, Plato pointed to matters of (not legalistic) justice and injustice as having “their origins in the mutual needs of the city’s inhabitants.” Aristotle referred to social justice as “giving every man his due.” Both philosophers pointed out that the practice of social justice was crucial for the stability of the community or the state (Corning, 2003). Economic and moral philosopher Adam Smith wrote in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (written before *Wealth of Nations*) (Henton, 2004) “He is certainly not a good citizen who does not wish to promote, by every means in his power, the welfare of the whole of his fellow citizens.” Darwin called the human tendency toward social justice “social coherence” while Durkheim referred to it as “solidarity” (Corning, 2003). John Rawls took up the mantle of social justice philosophy in the 20th Century with his “justice as fairness” theory. Corning sees Rawls’ work as a middle road between self-interested free-market capitalism and egalitarian socialism or pure altruism. In this way, social

entrepreneurship (at the junction of altruism and capitalism) can be seen as one way of putting social justice theory to work in the real world.

Throughout history, the work of social entrepreneurship and social justice was often relegated to the purview of religious organizations or churches. Causes like the eradication of poverty, hunger or disease were often coupled with the zeal of missionary work, funded by charitable donations of church members. However, in the 20th century, social justice causes expanded beyond the scope of organized religion as the foundations of the global civil sector were laid. Kumi Naidoo (2010) points to the anti-colonialism, feminism, peace and human rights movements of the post-World War II era as a “rich amalgam of causes and motivations.” (p. 329). Many researchers have noted the

striking rise in international nongovernmental organizations, alliances, and networks that support social movements and pressure for policy change. Important among these groups have been environmental, human rights, women's, and indigenous movements that have joined forces across state borders to reshape international norms, affect policy changes at home and abroad, and mobilize new kinds of social consciousness. In this sense, these movements and organizations are internationalized forms of collective action (Yasher, 2002, p. 356).

### Millennium Goals

In an increasingly interconnected world the young people of the 21st Century are exposed to a wide variety of issues related to these causes and the negative side effects of globalization (including migrant and displaced people crises, fair trade, terrorism) and climate change. This coincides with a well-documented decline in organized religious affiliation, particularly among the Millennial generation (Cone

Millennial Cause Study, 2006). Young people today are accustomed to their social media feeds including not just status updates from friends but news from the Half the Sky movement, Water.org, or countless other social issue awareness campaigns.

In 2000, the United Nations hosted the Millennium Summit with 189 world leaders to outline policy recommendations to address social justice issues world-wide. Participants pledged to work to achieve eight Millennium Development goals based on the values freedom, equality, tolerance and solidarity (Kabeer, 2010) to alleviate poverty and hunger and ensure better gender parity, education and health outcomes for humans across the globe. Specifically, the goals were to 1. eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; 2. achieve universal primary education; 3. promote gender equality and empower women; 4. reduce child mortality; 5. improve maternal health; 6. combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; 7. ensure environmental sustainability; and 8. develop a global partnership for development.

([http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/millennium\\_summit.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/millennium_summit.shtml) para. 10).

Work on these goals continued through 2015 with followup forums, events and summits. A 2013 outcome document adopted by UN General Assembly reiterated the commitment to the MDGs and affirmed “remarkable progress” with “significant and substantial advances ... made in meeting several of the targets” (p. 1). The Millennial generation has grown up with these broad goals as a major focus of global civil society. These priorities and the social justice causes they represent have significantly informed their worldview. Even with the UN’s claim of progress, they see there is much work yet to do particularly as governments have turned their focus to addressing threats of terrorism and away from human development in the ensuing



years. Schwarz (2012) argues that “the challenges we face--worsening gaps between rich and poor, destruction of critical ecological support systems, failing core institutions from finance to education--are simply beyond the scope of governments to deal with alone” (p. 18). Muhammad Yunus (2010) blames these failures on corruption, special interests and political parties.

### Sector Blending

If religion and governments are failing to achieve the systemic change necessary for improving the human condition, then who can? David Bornstein (2008) writes that individual people today are far more aware of social problems than ever before and feel more power and responsibility to address them as they witness the failure of governments and traditional charitable efforts. He writes:

There are also major historical forces that have, for the first time in history, made social entrepreneurship feasible for many people in recent years. The growth of an educated middle class, the extension of basic rights to women and minorities and the spread of information technology have made it possible for hundreds of millions of people around the world to unleash their creativity in new directions. In recent decades, more than 80 countries that were formerly dictatorships, totalitarian societies or apartheid regimes have moved toward democracy. People today are better informed about social problems and they have both the desire and the ability to solve them. (FAQ, para. 2)

The increased blurring of public and private sectors (Schwartz, 2012; Khazei, 2010) has created a new economic borderland (Eggers and MacMillan, 2013) to address market failures via collaborative effort. Intractable social problems, or so-called wicked problems (Kolko, 2012) are less likely to be described as either public or private, political or economic, social or commercial. Instead the new and growing citizen sector has adopted responsibility for these problems, (Bornstein, 2007;

Goldsmith et.al., 2010; Eggers and Macmillan, 2013; Keohane, 2013 ) taking a multi-disciplinary, innovation-rich approach to solving them.

Willie Cheng (2010) has also noted the increased leverage for social good in the 21st century. He attributes this to innovation and technology and a crossover from traditional business leaders into the realm of social entrepreneurship. Further making the case for social entrepreneurship, Stephen Ute and Lorrain Uhlaner (2010) found that “cooperation and social support (vs. competitive aggressiveness) may be the key levers to stimulate entrepreneurship rates worldwide” (p. 1360). Entrepreneurship based in altruism makes for higher-quality, more nimble entrepreneurship and better societal outcomes.

### Defining Social Entrepreneurship

The academic study of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship is relatively recent, though the practice of it is not. “We have always had social entrepreneurs, even if we did not call them that (Dees, 2001, p.1). The term “social entrepreneurship” was coined by Bill Drayton, Founder and CEO of the Ashoka: Innovators for the Public, in the early 1980s. Ashoka was named for a political leader around 300 BCE who unified the Indian subcontinent and dedicated his life to improving the lives of the Indian people through social welfare and economic development ([www.ashoka.org/facts](http://www.ashoka.org/facts)) The Ashoka website defines a social entrepreneurship as bringing “innovative solutions to society’s most pressing social problems” ([www.ashoka.org/social\\_entrepreneur](http://www.ashoka.org/social_entrepreneur)) such as disease, poverty and hunger. Social entrepreneurship was defined by researcher Paul Light (2006) as “an individual, group, network, organization or alliance of organizations that seeks

sustainable, large-scale change through pattern-breaking ideas in what or how governments, nonprofits, and businesses do to address significant social problems. Roger Martin and Sally Osberg (2007) write that social entrepreneurship has three components: 1. identifying an unjust equilibrium negatively affecting a population of people who don't have the tools to change their situation; 2. challenging said equilibrium via creativity and action; 3. attaining a new equilibrium with better outcomes for the population and society at large. Alvord et. al. (2002) write that the best social entrepreneurship produces small short-term changes which then “reverberate through existing systems to catalyze large changes in the longer term” (p. 4). J. Gregory Dees (2001) writes that social entrepreneurship “combines the passion of a social mission with [a]... business-like discipline and implies a “blurring of sector boundaries” (p. 1). David Bornstein calls a social entrepreneur “a person who has both a powerful idea to cause a positive social change and the creativity, skills, determination and drive to transform that idea into reality” (<https://davidbornstein.wordpress.com/faq>). In an effort to explain the concept succinctly to students, one professor of social entrepreneurship calls it “using business skills to solve social problems” (Ewest, 2011).

However, Dees (2001) and Light (2009) acknowledge the term can be confusing and means different things to different people. In many ways, trying to define social entrepreneurship is similar to Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's definition of pornography: “I know it when I see it” (oyez.com). This author finds it most helpful view social entrepreneurship as a continuum moving from the profit-maximizing to the wholly nonprofit. Aleica Plerhoples (2013) explains helpfully:

closer to the profit-maximizing side of the social enterprise spectrum, one might find corporate philanthropy or corporate social responsibility initiatives. On nonprofit side of the spectrum, one might find nonprofit organizations using an earned income strategy to sustain a set of social services, as opposed to a nonprofit that relies exclusively on donations. (pp. 223-224)

This continuum may include:

1. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) measures and corporate philanthropy
2. Benefit corporations
3. One for one models
4. Impact Investing
5. Microfinance
6. Human Centered Design and technology innovation
7. Social Business
8. Non-profits and Non-governmental organizations

with the general public being most familiar with either extreme of the spectrum. Tan et. al (2005) also use a continuum of altruism to define the different aspects of social entrepreneurship but lump them into four main groups: 1) community-based enterprises; 2) socially-responsible enterprises 3) social service industry professionals; and, 4) socio-economic or dualistic enterprises.

### Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate philanthropy has its roots in the scientific charity of the late 19th century when mega-rich elites like John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie “sought more systematic, strategic, and enduring solutions to social problems, rather than simply giving alms away to the poor” (Keohane, 2013, p. 29). Carnegie, in particular believed that philanthropy was most effective when targeted at the root causes of inequality, not at trying to decide between worthy and unworthy social projects (Hall, 2013). This behavior is highlighted today with high-dollar donors giving large sums

worldwide to a variety of social justice causes like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation or former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg (Bishop, 2013). Often they embrace tackling problems that are not being addressed by governments or the free market. This ongoing culture of “problem-solving philanthropy” (Martin, 2010) coupled with movements in 1980s and ‘90s among MBA students committed to social responsibility (e.g. Students for Responsible Business, Social Venture Network, Businesses for Social Responsibility, Net Impact, MBA Oath) has led to far-reaching efforts in corporate social responsibility. Prieto-Carron et. al. define CSR as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (2007, p. 978). Those stakeholders include society, company, and employee and companies behave ethically by contributing to economic development and the well-being of the workforce and community. (McGlone et. al, 2011).

Uzoechi Nwagbara and Patrick Reid (2013) outline important characteristics for effective CSR such as a recognition that companies impact people and the environment in ways that political regulations may now address, and companies have a responsibility for not only their own behavior, but those with whom they do business. Morten Hansen and Julian Birkinshaw argue for CSR via value creation, particularly through innovation and improved supply chain management (2007). CSR is most often demonstrated via a charity or foundation funded with corporate profits tasked with doing good in a local community (Yunus, 2010) and this work improves the company’s image as a good citizen. However, to be most effective, these charitable efforts must be adapted to the place in which they are implemented, taking

into account local cultural norms and attitudes (Prieto-Carron et. al., 2007).

Increasingly, consumers are also driving CSR behavior as they are more informed about the social and environmental impacts of companies and make their purchasing decisions accordingly. (Perhoples, 2013). McGlone et.al. (2011) demonstrate that phenomenon is especially true for the Millennial generation. Damini Partridge (2011) refers to this movement as “activist capitalism” and “supply-chain citizenship” which, in Rawlsian fashion, he describes as “neither pure free-market rationality nor more open democracy but a negotiated rationality based on local and global economic and social relations” (p. 599)

Another increasingly popular avenue of CSR is cause branding. This term, originally coined by Cone Communication, implies something deeper and more integrated than cause marketing. Cone defines cause branding as, “ a business strategy that helps an organization stand for a social issue(s) to gain significant bottom line and social impacts while making an emotional and relevant connection to stakeholders” (What is Cause Branding?, 2007). Cause branding provides an opportunity for a business to stand out in a crowded marketplace and put their company values on display for consumers as well as benefit the community (Thapar, 2015). Millennial consumers, in particular, are attracted to cause branding (Millennial Cause Study, 2006).

### One-for-one

While the one-for-one model was not invented by social entrepreneur Blake Mycoskie, his story and subsequent brand surely propelled this innovative sales model into the limelight. After a stint as a traditional entrepreneur developing an online driving school in California, Mycoskie took a much-needed vacation to Argentina. There he met some students who were participating in a shoe drive for poor children in the rural part of the country. He participated in the drive and was overwhelmed by the great need he saw for something as simple as shoes. Children without shoes to match the required uniform were not allowed to attend school and in some cases multiple siblings shared a single pair of oversized shoes and took turns alternating school days. Children were also at risk for fungal and parasite infections introduced through wounds in the unprotected foot. He returned to California with a new passion. After selling his business, Mycoskie had approximately \$1 million in capital and considered spending it all on shoes he could give away to needy children. But then he re-thought the model. If he gave away \$1 million worth of shoes, his capital would be gone and the next year, those same children would have worn through or outgrown the shoes. (Mycoskie, 2011). Instead he checked with a group of friends and family members and asked if they would be willing to buy traditional Argentinian *ropa* shoes and then he could use the profits from the shoe sales to fund giving away more shoes. He returned to Argentina to work with a local artisan to create the shoes to sell in southern California and the TOMS--TOMorrow Shoes--brand was born (Mycoskie, 2010). A feature in the *L.A. Times* and then *Vogue* magazine brought a contract with Nordstrom and thousands of orders poured in

(Krasny, 2014). Since 2006, TOMS has given away over 45 million pairs of culturally-and-climate appropriate shoes in more than 70 countries around the world. (toms.com). One million pairs have been donated in the United States in places like the Lakota Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota and poor neighborhoods in New York City. They have expanded to local production, building factories in places like Haiti and Kenya, and sales of other one-for-one products. (Mycoskie, 2013).

Companies that embrace the one-for-one model include BoGo solar flashlights, Baby Theresa infant clothing, and Warby Parker eyeglasses among many others. These companies take advantage of the buying power of middle-and-upper income people in the developed world and use a portion of the profits to provide necessary goods and services to people in the developing world—a financially-sustainable model.

### Benefit Corporations

The creation of the legal designation of benefit corporation (b-corp) is another way in which companies are expanding stakeholders and evaluating social and environmental impact. For many years, business leaders adhered to Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman’s postulation that the sole goal of business was to increase profits. “Thinking beyond the bottom line was viewed as unfocused or even worse, a disservice to shareholders” (Eggers and MacMillan, 2013, p. 3) and “any distraction from making money as quickly as possible must be avoided” (Herman and Skylar, 2010, p. xiii). Common interpretations of ambiguous legal codification for modern corporations reflect this thinking of shareholder primacy and prevents corporations from pursuing both profit and social good. (Chu, 2013;



Cummings, 2012). After the 2008 economic collapse, corporate obsession with the bottom line was brought into question (as illustrated by the Occupy Wall Street Movement and state legislatures passed laws to establish benefit corporations (Chu, 2013; Grant, 2013). The benefit corporation is a hybrid, having both characteristics of a non-profit and a for-profit entity. (Blount and Offei-Danso, 2013). This new legal designation requires businesses to take into account their social and environmental impact and create social benefit as they make money. This is called a triple bottom line, easily remembered with the 3 Ps--people, planet, profits. Additionally, benefit-corporations are required to publish annual reports about their performance in these areas.

Chu (2013) outlines to three main positive outcomes for triple-bottom-line businesses that use the benefit-corporation designation: 1. Legal protection for business leaders who publicly state that they take into account other issues besides profit; 2. Increased transparency leads to greater accountability for shareholders; and 3. Market differentiation for consumers looking for socially conscious purchasing options. According to information cited by Joseph Grant (2013) 90% of American consumers want companies to tell them the ways they are supporting causes and 80% of consumers are likely to switch brands based on social cause support. Effective January 2016, 30 states and the District of Columbia had passed b-corp legislation. Nine other states had introduced but not passed legislation. However, not all researchers are lauding the move toward b-corp designation. In 2013, Justin Blount and Kwabena Offei-Danso made the case that the legislation was unnecessary and “inherent problems with its corporate governance structure ... make it unwieldy and

ineffective (p. 669). In particular, they write that the social benefit requirement to b-corps is far too vague and cannot be accurately measured, thus making it an impractical and inappropriate corporate aim.

### Impact Investing

Impact investors, particularly younger investors, don't just want an ROI (return on investment), but desire an SROI (social return on investment, a FROI (financial return on investment) and an EROI (emotional return on investment) (Eikenberry and Kluver, 2004). Impact investors, a term coined in 2007, reject the view that social good is the purview of government and charity and financial return is the role of business. Antony Bugg-Levine, Board chair of the Global Impact Investing Network, says of impact investors: "We recognize that for-profit investment can be both a morally legitimate and economically effective way to address social and environmental challenges" (Kanani, 2012, para. 5). He also points out that traditional approaches to corporate profit-making are not working for all societies across the globe. R. Paul Herman, author of *The HIP (Human Impact + Profit) Investor: Make Bigger Profits by Building a Better World*, agrees. He wrote, "The majority of investors have focused on a capitalist approach and short-term financial gain. However, this traditional approach has accelerated the number and intensity of societal problems, creating a larger gap between a better world and the world of today. (2010, pg. xiii).

Herman uses a proprietary method to score and rate companies based on their social and environmental impacts. His hypothesis was that investing companies that took into account a triple bottom line would, over the long-term, result in higher

returns over traditional investment strategies. According to a white paper summary on the HIP Investor website, Herman shows that over both a one-year and a three-year period, an impact investment portfolio out-performed a Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT) managed portfolio. (<http://hipinvestor.com/how-high-impact-portfolios-can-outperform-traditional-portfolios/>)

Daniel Pink, in his 2009 book *Drive: The Surprising Truth about What Motivates Us*, makes a similar point. Companies who focus narrowly on performance over the next three months as opposed to implementing sustainable long-term practices end up threatening the health of the company when judged over a multi-year period.

Herman also notes that impact investing is particularly appealing to Millennials who “realize problems are multi-sector and the solutions are multi-disciplinary” because this approach “blend[s] the best of the old capitalist and do-gooder investment approaches” (xxiii).

### Microfinance

Microfinance can be considered a sub-sector of impact investing. However, instead of amassing portfolios worth thousands or millions of dollars, the amounts of money invested in microfinance deals is small amounts of money aimed at the bottom 2.8 billion—people living in extreme poverty or less than \$2 per day. Microfinance can make financial instruments like retirement savings, mortgages and credit capital available to individuals shut out of the traditional lending and finance market (Khavul, 2010). Microlending or microcredit is small-dollar loans to individuals or groups with an entrepreneurial goal—either starting or expanding a business

operation. (ibid). Mohammed Yunus is one of the best well-known proponents of microlending after establishing a program in Bangladesh. He started by lending just \$37 from his own pocket (Yunus, 2010) and his founding institution, Grameen Bank, has disbursed over \$9.1 billion in more than 35 countries. Previously, efforts for poverty alleviation have stemmed from government or World Bank action with a top-down approach to the tune of several trillion dollars over the last 50 years. Results have been mixed but generally poor with programs poorly designed, administered and plagued by corruption. In contrast, microfinance uses “direct engagement with the poor, and looks to the individual and her immediate community to generate economic growth through market-driven business initiatives” (Khavul, 2010, p. 58).

Microfinance lending is done by non-profit or NGO organizations, by for-profit organizations and by traditional banks, with this last category responsible for only 10 percent of overall loans (Khavul, 2010).

Many microfinance models take advantage of existing social networks as loans are made to small groups who share liability or village banks are established to cross-guarantee loans. (ibid). This prevents lenders from taking advantage of payees through exorbitant interest rates or unrealistic repayment schedules. It also encourages higher repayment rates as individuals want to improve their reputation with their microfinance peers. Microlending also focuses on boosting the economic power and entrepreneurial spirit of women in developing countries. Some research has shown that extending microfinance capital to women can result other forms of collective action taken by women in a community to address issues (Sanyal, 2009) and even a reduction in intimate partner violence. (Pronyk et. al, 2006).

Kiva is one example of a microfinance lending interface that harnesses the power of the internet, social media and middle-and-upper-income people to finance the loans. Partnering with on-the-ground lending, entrepreneurial, and social support organizations, Kiva disperses loans around the globe. Borrower stories and brief business plans in a variety of sectors are featured on the website [kiva.org](http://kiva.org) and lenders choose a borrower to help fund with a loan as small as \$25. Lenders get periodic e-mail updates on entrepreneur progress and loan repayment. As soon as the loan is repaid in full, lenders can choose to get their initial investment returned to them or can reinvest in another entrepreneur ([kiva.org](http://kiva.org)).

### Social Business

Social Business is an idea developed by Muhammed Yunus (2010) after his pioneering work in microfinance. He argues that today's world economy demands a new type of business not motivated by profits, but by cause alone. These businesses would be non-loss, non-dividend with the goal of addressing a social problem. All profit from the enterprise would be immediately reinvested in the enterprise itself, not dispersed to shareholders. In this way, social businesses are different from traditional CSR. Yunus envisions social businesses as a type of social entrepreneurship but does not see the terms as interchangeable due to the unique legal structure of the business. Though not profit driven, social businesses must be financially sustainable. Culturally-appropriate, environmentally-sound products and services should be sold at a fair price to populations who desire them. Yunus believes this approach is superior to charity not only in its ability to "endlessly recycle money" (p. 6) unlike a

charity that must be constantly looking for new donors, but in the “personal dignity and autonomy” (ibid.) it grants to its beneficiaries. He writes:

Even well-meaning, well-designed charity programs have the inevitable effect of taking away the initiative of those who receive the benefits. Poor people who become dependent on charity do not feel encouraged to stand on their own feet. By contrast people who pay a fair price for the goods and services they receive are taking a giant step toward self-reliance. Rather than passively accepting gifts, they are actively participating in the economic system, becoming players in their own right in our free-market economy. This is enormously empowering and leads much more directly to genuine, long-term solutions to such problems as poverty, inequality, and oppression. (ibid).

The social business model is also uniquely situated to take advantage of technology innovation and creative problem-solving through Human Centered Design. The goal of HCD is to create empathy between a product’s designer and the end user in order to most efficiently and effectively solve a social problem. Most HCD concepts are targeted at the bottom billion and address basic needs like water and sanitation, agriculture, power production, financial services, gender equality etc. (ideo.org). One excellent example of this synergy is the IDEO.org’s Clean Team project in Kumasi, Ghana, where only 28 percent of people have access to sanitation at home. The majority of people use chamber pots (emptied into garbage piles or waterways), open defecation, or poorly maintained public pay toilet facilities, subjecting them to disease and potential violence. Even private pit latrines are out of reach of most families with an upfront cost of approximately \$700. IDEO worked with families in Ghana understand their sanitation needs and prototype a variety of toilet facilities in their home. Ultimately, the team and the families struck upon the idea of stand-alone toilets that families could lease at an affordable rate. The rental

also comes with interchangeable waste cartridges (or a lower cost bag collection option) and a cleaning service to maintain the toilet and high standards of hygiene for users. A social business entrepreneur can sell the service and employ others as cleaning and delivery people, creating economic opportunity for the community (<http://www.ideo.org/projects/clean-team/completed>).

Yunus argues that because social businesses are nimble, flexible, and geographically and resource tailored, they have a better chance at solving wicked problems than traditional business models. Social business also “fits neatly into the capitalist system, offering the hope of millions of new customers into the marketplace” (p. 29). He sees unlimited growth potential for social business and can even envision social businesses eventually comprising the whole world economy.

#### NGOs and Nonprofits

In the last three decades, nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations have proliferated massively in an effort to address a wide array of social problems in all corners of globe. NGOs and NPOs address issues relating to the environment, public health, human rights, peace and democracy, development, poverty, education and every other conceivable area of social justice. According to 2009 unpublished research by this author, NGO expert and visionary Paul Hawken (2007) traces the roots of this transformation to the genesis of the abolition movement when in 1780s London a small handful of people determined to bring the global slave trade to an end. With grassroots organization and effective lobbying led to the passage of the 1807 slave trade abolition with the complete outlawing of slavery altogether in Britain in 1833. Fueled by the new democratic idea of individual action over government

domination and Henry David Thoreau's concept of civil disobedience, this kind of social justice organization began to spring up across the world. With recent changes in technology, the potential for social networking and non-geographically-based social capital NGOs are now numbered at more than 3 million (Naidoo, 2010).

In his book, *Building the Next Ark*, Michael M. Gunter points to other recent changes that have contributed to the rise of NGOs. The first is the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. He writes, "The sudden conceptual vacuum allowed nonmilitary, security issues to receive greater attention. This attention, in turn, exposed the dangerous cognitive dissonance" (p. 181) regarding social justice, human rights and sustainable development. People were moved to action even as governments and traditional state actors seemed unable or unwilling to adequately address these issues.

Gunter argues that NGOs are uniquely equipped because they "operate both above and below state governments" (180). Often they can accomplish more than any state or group of states could on their own. As new generations of problems crop up, new generations of solutions also arise and NGOs are a crucial factor in creating and implementing these solutions. Gunter further argues that NGOs are unique in their abilities to challenge state power, enhance communication and provide opportunities for participation and action in ways that traditional state actors are unable to do (9). Hawken agrees that NGOs and NPOs are built to disperse power, not aggregate it, and often aim to empower formerly disenfranchised populations. NGOs do not have a central headquarters, but exist and flourish all over the world, each according to the norms, values and cultures of their individual locales. The NGO movement is also



leaderless. That is, while individual NGOs have directors and decision makers, there is not a single leader or hierarchy which speaks for all

NGOs are also not ideological in the traditional sense. They are highly diverse with varying values, norms, missions, goals and actions. One cannot simply file NGOs under a simple heading such as “social justice” or “development.” Even terrorist groups can fit the broad definition of a nongovernmental organization working for social or political change (Abdukadirov, 2010; Hawken, 2007).

Regarding the new territory being forged by NGOs and NPOs, Hawken stated:

...[Y]ou go back in history ... and you cannot find any movement that arose with this characteristic [lacking ideology]. It has never happened. What’s happened is the opposite, which is movements have begun with a very clear set of ideals, principles, and then they began to divide and spilt up and split up. Every ‘ism’ has become a schism. And that’s what’s so great about this movement is that it can’t be divided. It started that way” (The Great New Transformation).

The biggest issue with NGOs and NPOs, however, is the funding models under which they generally operate which are highly dependent on ongoing philanthropic donations or annual government allocations. Many function as charities. Yunus (2010) argues that this is not a sustainable model as it forces NGO leaders to spend far too much time and effort raising funds instead of actually delivering services. Even successful NGOs often do not have enough sustainable capital to scale or replicate programs that work (Fairbanks, 2009). Finally, Yunus argues that charities create dependency. He writes, “Even well-meaning, well-designed charity programs have the inevitable effect of taking away the initiative of those who receive the benefits. Poor people who become dependent on charity do not feel encouraged to

stand on their own feet” (p. 6). However, many traditional charities are trying to change their funding approach, making themselves more entrepreneurial and financially sustainable while continuing to deliver on mission. (Huggett, 2010; Horst and Greer, 2014). They are also starting to look beyond the delivery of social services, going “upstream to fix the root cause” of social problems (Herman and Skylar, 2010, p. xiii). Though some social entrepreneurship organizations may indeed have a 501c3 or equivalent tax status, they seek not only to do good, but also fundamental pattern change within the system. (Cheng, 2010). To create this lasting change, social entrepreneurs seek to “alter the social system that creates and sustains the problems in the first place” (Schwartz, 2012, p. 10). The ultimate goal of social entrepreneurship would be to eliminate the need for charity altogether.

Ashoka’s Bill Drayton argues that social entrepreneurship is “no passing fad” and that the citizen sector is growing faster than either the private or public sectors. He warns, “we are on the cusp of a new world and any individual or institution that ignores this reality is making a grave mistake.” (Malinsky, 2012, para. 6).

Bornstein and Davis (2010) draw a clear connection between citizenship and social entrepreneurship. They argue that social entrepreneurs strengthen democracies through experimentation and the creation of new institutions to meet shifting needs, both in the developing world and more developed nations. They call for a “vision of robust citizenship” via social entrepreneurship with “hands-on institution building and problem solving emerging as a more common expression of citizenship” (p. 47).

### CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

*Being an intellectual creates a lot of questions and no answers.*

—Janis Joplin

The purpose of this study is to undertake a preliminary, quantitative evaluation of citizenship attitudes among social entrepreneurs, using the lens of Dalton's engaged versus duty-based citizenship scale. Many recent writers in the fields of both social entrepreneurship and citizenship have described what they see to significant social shifts in the development of a new global civil society. The social entrepreneurship writers are noting the importance of citizens who are engaged beyond just voting. Citizenship writers are noting the influence wicked problems are having on the thoughts and feelings of young people around the world as they develop their civic roles and priorities. However, to this researcher's knowledge, no previous systematic or quantitative study has been undertaken to measure or classify the citizenship attitudes of social entrepreneurs or to bridge these two fields of study. The intent of this research is to begin to fill that gap.

There are multiple types of quantitative research one may choose to undertake. ([https://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/researchcourse/develop\\_writing\\_method\\_quantitative.html](https://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/researchcourse/develop_writing_method_quantitative.html).) This survey is intended to be a correlational-descriptive attempt to determine a relationship between social entrepreneurship thinking and engaged citizenship behaviors. This study is not intended to be experimental or causal. While a cause and effect relationship may indeed exist between social entrepreneurship exposure and engaged citizenship that determination falls outside the parameters of this current study and should be considered at a future time.

This researcher developed an online survey that was administered to social entrepreneurs to determine whether they tend to be more duty-based citizens or engaged citizens. For the purposes of this research a social entrepreneur was defined as an individual who self-selects a social entrepreneurship course of academic study at an institution of higher education, who teaches social entrepreneurship at an institution of higher education or who self-selects involvement in a social entrepreneurship venture in either a volunteer or professional setting. Respondents included students currently studying social entrepreneurship, professors teaching social entrepreneurship or individuals involved who are now working in a social entrepreneurship venture.

For the purposes of this study, social entrepreneurship refers broadly to the continuum of activities established in Chapter Two of this work in the pursuit of addressing a social or environmental problem, including corporate social responsibility, impact investing and the non-profit sector. A course of study in social entrepreneurship refers to a class or series of classes at the higher education level that teach about continuum of activities established in Chapter Two and how they are applied to social or environmental problems. Courses in this field can be traditional classroom or experiential learning and may include internship hours spent at a social entrepreneurship venture.

Populations for this the social entrepreneurship study group were drawn from a various colleges and social entrepreneurship ventures. Respondents were recruited from social media networks, academics colleagues at several institutions of higher education, in-person at the 2015 Net Impact Conference (Net Impact is an

international 501c3 non profit organization for the promotion of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship) (netimpact.org and in-person at Wartburg College (a small liberal arts college in the Midwestern United States) (wartburg.edu). All potential respondents were vetted by the researcher to ensure they fit the parameters established above for the social entrepreneurship response group. They were then provided with a standardized e-mail invitation (Appendix 1) and a unique Google Forms link to the human subjects notification. Upon agreeing to the human subjects notification, respondents were directed to the survey. The original Google Forms original was password protected and accessible only to this researcher. Responses were recorded automatically into a Google Sheets spreadsheet for social entrepreneurship responses only. The response goal for the social entrepreneurship study group was between 50 and 75 respondents; 82 responses were collected.

An identical (with the exception of necessary minor changes to the Human Subjects notification outlining who was eligible to take the survey) Google Forms survey was created with a separate link and was distributed to a second group of non-social entrepreneurship students, professors and professionals working in other fields to establish a control group for this study. Respondents were recruited from social media networks, academic colleagues and in person at Wartburg College among students not pursuing a course of study in social entrepreneurship and among professors not teaching social entrepreneurship. Again, all potential respondents were vetted to ensure they fit the parameters outlined above and then were e-mailed a standardized invitation (Appendix 1) and the unique Google Forms link to the control group survey. Upon agreeing to the human subjects notification, respondents were

directed to the survey. The original Google Forms document was password protected and accessible only to this researcher. Responses were recorded automatically into a Google Sheets spreadsheet for control group responses only. The response goal for the control group was between 50 and 75 respondents; 57 responses were collected.

Respondents were notified of the optional nature of the survey both in the e-mail, after following the survey link, and when appropriate, in person. Respondents were provided with an informed consent statement prior to the survey and were under no obligation to complete the survey once started. Respondents were notified they could quit the survey at any time by closing the browser window and none of their responses would be recorded or included in the statistics. All survey questions were required to complete the survey with the exception of an optional field for the respondent to include his or her e-mail address at the end of the survey for potential follow-up questions. All survey responses from both the study group and the control group were randomized and anonymized according to the conventions of research ethics. The only potential identifier, the optional e-mail address, was immediately separated from the remainder of the responses in the data set prior to any analysis or statistics. These e-mail responses are stored in a separate Google Sheets spreadsheet available only to this researcher. No respondent was paid or otherwise compensated for his or her response. No drawings, prizes or benefits were awarded to any respondent either before or after completion of the survey. This research study was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Committee at Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho. This researcher has completed the appropriate ethical research

training modules and certifications as required by Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho. (Appendix 2)

The survey administered to both the social entrepreneurship study group and the control group comprises a total of 57 questions (Appendix 3), some of which require the respondent to use a Likert scale, some of which require the respondent to choose from among several possible responses and the majority of which require the respondent to choose one of two possible responses. The final questions on the survey are demographic and included open-ended potential responses in the case of age and legal citizenship/country of origin.

The point of the survey was to measure the four citizenship dimensions outlined by Dalton in *The Good Citizen* (Participation, Autonomy, Social Order and Solidarity) to see if the respondent follows the engaged or duty-based descriptions predicted by Dalton. Thus, many of the questions are similar in nature to the survey questions reported by Dalton in *The Good Citizen* and this researcher is indebted to his work for the inspiration for this research project. Additionally, the survey measured adherence to social entrepreneurship principles and premises, including the roles of business and government. The survey also measured technology usage among respondents, primarily that of various social media platforms. Statistically significant differences in these topical areas between the social entrepreneurship study group and the control group demonstrate differences between citizenship tendencies between the two groups an attempt to answer the overall research question as stated in chapter one: Do social entrepreneurs tend to be more engaged citizens or duty-based citizens when compared to a control group?

To this end, several sub-research questions (RQ<sub>x</sub>) and corresponding hypotheses (H<sub>x</sub>) were developed to more clearly analyze the data presented by survey responses. These questions and hypotheses are detailed below.

RQ<sub>1</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of and attitudes toward political participation between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>1-A</sub>: The SE group will have higher levels of political participation.

Survey Questions 1, 2 and 3 were analyzed to address this question.

H<sub>1-B</sub>: Political participation activities among the SE group will tend toward engaged citizen behaviors when compared with the control group.

Survey Questions 3 and 4 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>2</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in the sense of political autonomy between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>2-A</sub>: The SE group will report higher levels of, and place a higher value upon, political knowledge than the control group.

Survey Questions 5,7, 9,11, 13 and 15 were analyzed to address this question.

H<sub>2-B</sub>: The SE group will report more engaged citizen attitudes in other aspects of autonomy besides political knowledge.

Survey Questions 8, 12, and 18-22 were analyzed to address this question.



RQ<sub>3</sub>: Is there a difference in of political issues most frequently noted as important by the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>3</sub>: The SE group and the control group will emphasize the importance of different political issues

Survey Questions 16 and 17 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>4</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference between the SE group's and the control group's commitment to social order?

H<sub>4</sub>: The SE group will be less committed to social order than the control group.

Survey Questions 24-31 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>5</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in commitment to solidarity between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>5</sub>: The SE group will be more committed to solidarity then the control group.

Survey Questions 32-37 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>6</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in how the SE group and the control group view the roles of government and business?

H<sub>6-A</sub>: The SE group will favor government intervention to help people and regulate business when compared to the control group.

Survey Question 23 was analyzed to address this question.

H<sub>6-B</sub>: The SE group will favor socially responsible business practices when compared to the control group.

Survey Questions 38-46 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>7</sub>: Is there a difference in online resource and social media usage between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>7</sub>: Online resource usage in general and for political purposes will be higher among the SE group.

Questions 48 and 49 were analyzed to address this question.

RQ<sub>8</sub>: Taking into consideration Dalton's four dimensions of citizenship, does the SE group tend to be more engaged citizen than the control group?

H<sub>8</sub>: The SE group will tend to be engaged citizens.

The results of RQ<sub>1</sub>, RQ<sub>2</sub>, RQ<sub>4</sub> and RQ<sub>5</sub> were analyzed to address this question.

Survey Questions 1 and 2 (Figure 3.1) introduce the idea of political activity and good citizenship and use a Likert scale, with a 1 being not at all active and a 5 being extremely active. Respondents are asked to rank their personal level of political activity and make a value judgment as to the political activity level of a hypothetical "good citizen." Political activity falls under Dalton's dimension of participation. He notes that "Participation is a prime criterion for defining the democratic citizen and his or her role within the political process" (p.26). These questions were not coded separately for statistical analysis; the Likert scale numbers were used.

Survey Questions 3 and 4 (Figure 3.2) establish both levels of political activity and kinds of political activities that the respondent has completed and theoretically prioritizes for a hypothetical good citizen.

**1. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all politically active and 5 being extremely politically active, how politically active are you personally? \***

1 2 3 4 5

---

Not at all active ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely active

---

**2. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being completely disagree and 5 being completely agree, how much do you agree with the following statement? A person must be politically active to be a "good citizen." \***

1 2 3 4 5

---

Disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Agree

---

*Figure 3.1*

**3. There are many ways in which citizens choose to participate or take political action. Please mark ALL forms of participation which you have personally done. If you have not done any, mark "I have participated in NONE of these actions." For actions not listed, mark "Other" and briefly describe the action you took. \***

☐ Attended a protest, march or demonstration  
☐ Voted in a local election  
☐ Voted in a presidential election  
☐ Signed or started a petition calling for a public policy change at any level  
☐ Contacted a local government office (e.g. city, county, state) via any technology or face to face  
☐ Contacted a national government office (e.g. U.S. Congress, President, federal agency) via any technology or face to face  
☐ Visited a website sponsored by a political candidate, party, or public policy group  
☐ Displayed swag (button, bumper sticker or t-shirt etc.) advocating a political candidate, party, or public policy.  
☐ Attended a speech, rally or other event sponsored by a political candidate, campaign or party  
☐ Posted or shared a message on social media advocating a public policy or political candidate  
☐ Boycotted or specifically purchased a product for political or social reasons  
☐ Boycotted or specially patronized a store or business for political or social reasons  
☐ Volunteered for a political candidate or party at any level  
☐ Contributed money to a political candidate or party at any level  
☐ Volunteered for a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue  
☐ Contributed money to a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue  
☐ I have participated in NONE of these actions  
☐ Other:

**4. In considering the following list of political actions, which do you think are the MOST IMPORTANT to be a good citizen REGARDLESS OF WHETHER YOU PERSONALLY HAVE DONE THEM. Select THREE. \***

☐ Attend a protest, march or demonstration  
☐ Vote in local elections  
☐ Vote in presidential elections  
☐ Sign or start a petition calling for a public policy change at any level  
☐ Contact a local government office (e.g. city, county, state) via any technology or face to face  
☐ Contact a national government office (e.g. U.S. Congress, President, federal agency) via any technology or face to face  
☐ Visit a website sponsored by a political candidate, party, or public policy group  
☐ Display swag (button, bumper sticker or t-shirt etc.) advocating a political candidate, party, or public policy.  
☐ Attend a speech, rally or other event sponsored by a political candidate, campaign or party  
☐ Post or share messages on social media advocating a public policy or political candidate  
☐ Boycott or specifically purchase products for political or social reasons  
☐ Boycott or specially patronized stores or businesses for political or social reasons  
☐ Volunteer for a political candidate or party at any level  
☐ Contribute money to a political candidate or party at any level  
☐ Volunteer for a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue  
☐ Contribute money to a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue

Figure 3.2

Because both duty-based and engaged citizens generally value political participation, it was important to determine the types of participation the respondent has completed to determine if those actions generally fall more toward engaged citizen or duty-based citizen.

In coding the responses to Questions 3 for statistical analysis both a count of the political activities and a citizen duty vs. an engaged citizen code were used. For the count, each response, including “Other” marked was counted as a 1, with the exception of a response of “NONE” which was counted as a 0. A respondent could potentially have a maximum count score of 17 if they had completed all of the activities listed for Question 3. This would indicate a highly politically active respondent for the purposes of this study, which would contribute to a high participation level in Dalton’s citizenship dimension.

To measure citizen duty and engaged citizen tendencies in Questions 3, responses were coded with a 1 (denoting an engaged citizen action), a -1 (denoting a duty-based action), or a 0 (denoting a neutral action), based on evidence presented in *The Good Citizen*. “Attended a protest, march or demonstration” was coded as a 1, as it corresponds to more engaged citizen behavior (p. 70). “Voted in a local election” was coded as a -1, as it corresponds to more duty-based citizen behavior (p. 64). “Voted in a presidential election was coded as a 0, as it corresponds to both engaged citizen and duty-based citizen behavior. Though voting in general tends to be a duty-based behavior (p.64) Dalton provides ample evidence that engaged citizens were highly motivated to vote for President Obama in 2008 (p. 124) demonstrating that this participation activity can be important to both citizen types. “Signed or started a

petition calling for a public policy change at any level” was coded as 1 (p. 72).

“Contacted a local government office (e.g. city, county, state) via any technology or face to face” was coded as 1 (p. 68). “Contacted a national government office (e.g. U.S. Congress, President, federal agency) via any technology or face to face was coded as 1 (ibid). “Visited a website sponsored by a political candidate, party or public policy group was coded as 1 (p. 72) because the activity happens online.

“Displayed swag (button, bumper sticker or t-shirt etc.) advocating a political candidate, party or public policy” was coded as 0 because physical yard signs and virtual Facebook button are both legitimate forms of campaign swag in the modern era. (p. 68). “Attended a speech, rally or other event sponsored by a political candidate, campaign or party” was coded as -1. This activity is different from attending a protest march or demonstration as it is defined as a strictly party-based activity, which Dalton posits tends to be more duty-based (p. 86). “Posted or shared a message on social media advocating a public policy or political candidate” was coded as a 1. Social media usage was determined to be a more engaged citizen action (p. 68). “Boycotted or specifically purchased a product for political or social reasons” was coded as a 1, as was “Boycotted or specifically patronized a store or business or political or social reasons.” Dalton determined that boycotting behavior fell more to the engaged citizen category (pp.71-72). “Volunteered for a political candidate or party at any level” and “Contributed money to a political candidate or party at any level” were both coded with a -1 as again, Dalton considers party-motivated behaviors to be duty-based. (p. 82). “Volunteered for a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue” and “Contributed money to a group advocating for or

against a public policy issue” were both coded with a 1 as Dalton considers policy advocacy to be more engaged citizen behavior (p. 69). Responses marked “Other” on Question 3 were coded with a 0. Responses were added together to give each respondent a political activity score. A lower score, resulting primarily from codes of -1 indicated more citizen duty political participation. A higher score resulting primarily from codes of 1 indicated more engaged citizen political participation. Neutral activities, coded with a 0 did not affect the citizen duty or engaged citizen score.

For Survey Question 4, each response was counted and totaled to determine the three most frequent responses among each group.

Survey Questions 5-22 begin the section of the survey which attempts to measure Dalton’s citizenship dimension of Autonomy, or a person’s ability to make form political opinions for themselves, having enough political knowledge, and ability to listen to the ideas of others. Questions 5-8 specifically address knowledge of and opinion toward political processes (Figure 3.3). Questions 5 and 7 use a Likert scale from 1 to 5 and were statistically analyzed using the respondent’s selected number. Question 8 was coded using the engaged citizen, 1, duty-based citizen, -1, scale with a response of “Political processes in America are fair and should not be changed” scoring a -1 and “Political Processes in America are not fair and should be changed” score a 1 (p.137). Responses were collected for Question 6, but were not coded or analyzed for the purpose of this research study.

**5. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you on American POLITICAL PROCESSES (e.g. elections, branches of government, how a bill becomes a law etc.) \***

1 2 3 4 5

---

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

---

**6. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of POLITICAL PROCESSES? Select ONE. \***

☐ High school course(s)

☐ College course(s)

☐ Parents or relatives

☐ Personal reading or study

☐ Peers or friends

☐ Television or Radio

☐ Internet including social media

☐ Other:

**7. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about POLITICAL PROCESSES to be a "good citizen?" \***

1 2 3 4 5

---

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

---

**8. Political Process Fairness \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes your opinion:

☐ Political processes in America are fair and should not be changed

☐ Political processes in America are not fair and should be changed

*Figure 3.3*



Survey Questions 9-12 specifically address knowledge of and opinion toward political people (Figure 3.4). Questions 9 and 11 use a Likert scale from 1 to 5 and were statistically analyzed using the respondent's selected number. Question 12 was coded using the engaged citizen, 1, duty-based citizen, -1, scale with a response of "Most people involved in politics or government are honest and look out for the interests of citizens" scoring a -1 and "Most people involved in politics or government are dishonest and are looking out for their own interests" scoring a 1. This corresponds with Dalton's determination that distrust of government and political cynicism tend to be more engaged citizen traits (p. 137). Responses were collected for Question 10, but were not coded or analyzed for the purpose of this research study.

**9. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you about notable PEOPLE in American politics (e.g. local or national office holders, candidates etc.) \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

**10. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of notable POLITICAL PEOPLE? Select ONE. \***

- ☐ High school course(s)
- ☐ College course(s)
- ☐ Parents or relatives
- ☐ Personal reading or study
- ☐ Peers or friends
- ☐ Television or Radio
- ☐ Internet including social media
- ☐ Other:

**11. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about notable POLITICAL PEOPLE to be a "good citizen?" \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

**12. Honesty in Government \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes your opinion:

- ☐ Most people involved in politics or government are honest and look out for the interests of citizens
- ☐ Most people involved in politics or government are dishonest and are looking out for their own interests

*Figure 3.4*

Survey Questions 13-18 (Figure 3.5) specifically address knowledge and opinion of political issues and gauge the political issues most important to the respondent personally and which the respondent deems most important to a hypothetical good citizen. Survey Questions 13 and 15 utilize a Likert scale from 1 to 5 and were statistically analyzed using the respondent's selected number. Questions 16 and 17 were analyzed according to the most frequent responses given by each respondent. Question 18 was coded using the engaged citizen, 1, duty-based citizen, -1, scale with "I generally HAVE adequate political knowledge to form opinions on important political issues" scoring a 1 and "I generally DO NOT HAVE adequate knowledge to form opinions on important political issues scoring a -1. This corresponds to Dalton's assertion that placing a higher value on political autonomy tends to be a more engaged citizen behavior (p. 35). Responses were collected for Question 14, but were not coded or analyzed for the purpose of this research study.

**13. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you about CURRENT ISSUES in American politics \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

**14. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES? Select ONE. \***

- ☐ High school course(s)  
☐ College course(s)  
☐ Parents or relatives  
☐ Personal reading or study  
☐ Peers or friends  
☐ Television or Radio  
☐ Internet including social media  
☐ Other:

**15. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES to be a "good citizen?" \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

**16. Which political issues are most urgent to you personally right now? Select THREE \***

- ☐ Immigration  
☐ Education  
☐ Strong Military  
☐ Health Care  
☐ Lower taxes  
☐ Environment  
☐ Clean Energy  
☐ Jobs  
☐ Infrastructure  
☐ Civil Rights  
☐ Terrorism Threats  
☐ Campaign Finance  
☐ Free Speech  
☐ Religious Protections  
☐ Race Relations  
☐ Right to Privacy  
☐ Foreign Aid  
☐ Other:

<p><b>17. Which issues do you think are most urgent to a "good citizen"? Select THREE *</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Immigration</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Education</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Strong Military</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Health Care</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Lower taxes</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Environment</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Clean Energy</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Jobs</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Civil Rights</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Terrorism Threats</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Finance</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Free Speech</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Religious Protections</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Race Relations</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Right to Privacy</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Aid</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></li></ul>
<p><b>18. Knowledge of Political Issues *</b></p> <p>Select the statement from the following that best describes you</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="radio"/> I generally HAVE adequate political knowledge to form opinions on important political issues</li><li><input type="radio"/> I generally DO NOT HAVE adequate knowledge to form opinions on important political issues</li></ul>

*Figure 3.5*

Survey Questions 19-22 (Figure 3. 6) measure other aspects of political autonomy and were coded using the engaged citizen, 1, duty-based citizen, -1, scale. A response of “My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by my own research and conclusions” scored a 1. For Question 19, responses of “My opinions are primarily formed by the opinions of other people I know” and “My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by public figures, celebrities or media personalities” scored a -1. Again this corresponds to a stronger desire for political autonomy among engaged citizens (p. 35). Similarly, on Question 20, a response of “Once I form an opinion about a political issue, my mind is made up and rarely changes” scored a -1, while a response of “Once I form an opinion about a political issue, I sometimes change my mind based on new information” scored a 1. (p. 26). For Question 21, a response of “I HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government scored a 1 (Dalton, p. \*\*) while a response of “I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government scored a -1. (p. 35). For Question 22 a response of “I HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me” scored a 1 while a response of “I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me” scored a -1 (p. 29).

**19. Political Opinions Formation \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by my own research and conclusions
- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by the opinions of other people I know
- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by public figures, celebrities or media personalities

**20. Changing Mind on Issues \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Once I form an opinion about a political issue, my mind is made up and rarely changes
- ☐ Once I form an opinion about a political issue, I sometimes change my mind based on new information

**21. Keeping Watch on Government \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government
- ☐ I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government

**22. Understanding Others \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me.
- ☐ I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me.

**Figure 3.6**

Question 23 of the survey will be discussed later in this chapter.

The next section of the survey, Questions 24-31 inclusive, (Figure 3.7) are intended to measure the respondent's commitment to Dalton's citizenship dimension of Social Order. i.e. obeying the law, reporting crimes and feeling a duty to the government to serve in the military. All were coded using the -1, 1 scale, with responses corresponding to a commitment to social order being determined to be more duty-based than engaged citizen. (p. 35). Survey Questions 24 and 25 test a respondent's enthusiasm for obeying the law regardless of consequences. A response of "If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone" on Question 24 scored a 1, while a response of "If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD NOT drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone" scored a -1. One question 25 a response of "If I knew I wouldn't get caught I WOULD report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25" scored a 1, while a response of "If I knew I wouldn't get caught I WOULD NOT report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25" scored a -1.



**24. Speed Limits \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone
- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD NOT drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone.

**25. Paying Taxes \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25.
- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD NOT report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25.

**26. Jury Service \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD serve on a jury even if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job
- ☐ I WOULD NOT serve on a jury if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job

**27. Military Service \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I WOULD join the military to fight for my country
- ☐ Imagine a hostile has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I WOULD NOT join the military to fight for my country

**28. War Declaration \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I would publicly SUPPORT the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight.
- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I would publicly OPPOSE the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight.

**29. Reporting a Drug Crime \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age selling an illegal substance, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age selling an illegal substance, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

★

**30. Reporting a Theft**

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age shoplifting t-shirt, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age shoplifting t-shirt, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

**31. Reporting a Vandalism \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age vandalizing a school building, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age vandalizing a school building, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

**Figure 3.7**

Survey Questions 26, 27, and 28 test a respondent's propensity for government service and support for political leaders decision-making (p. 125, 144, 152). A response of "I WOULD serve on a jury even if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job" on Question 26 was coded as a -1, while a response of "I WOULD NOT serve on a jury if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job" was coded as a 1. For Question 27, a response of "...I WOULD join the military to fight for my country" was given a -1 but a response of "...I WOULD NOT join the military to fight for my country" was given a 1. In coding Question 28, a response of "...I would publicly SUPPORT the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight" scored a -1 while "...I would publicly OPPOSE the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight" scored a 1.

The final three questions of this section explore a respondent's willingness to report a drug crime (29), a theft (30) and a vandalism (31). For all three questions a response of "...I WOULD report it to authorities" was recorded as a -1 while a response of "...I WOULD NOT report it to authorities" was recorded as a 1.

Survey Questions 33-37 (Figure 3.8) were administered to test the respondents' citizenship dimension of Solidarity, (p. 127). or willingness to help other people worse off than oneself, both in the respondent's own country and in other countries around the world. For Questions 32 and 33, a response of "I WOULD be willing to pay 5% higher taxes..." resulted in a score of 1, reflecting a more engaged citizen mindset, while a response of "I WOULD NOT be willing to pay 5% higher taxes..." resulted in a score of -1, reflecting a more citizen-duty mindset (p. 119). Similarly, for Questions 34 and 35, a response of "I WOULD shop at a store with

10% higher prices than a competitor...” was coded as a 1, while a response of “I WOULD NOT shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor” was coded as a -1. For Question 36, if the respondent selected “I WOULD join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem” they were given a 1; however, if they selected “I WOULD NOT join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem” they were given a -1.

**32. Taxes-Domestic**

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem (e.g alleviating poverty, improving the environment, reducing sickness) IN MY COUNTRY. (Ex. If you currently owed \$100 a year in federal taxes, you would be willing to pay \$105).
- ☐ I WOULD NOT be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN MY COUNTRY.

**33. Taxes-International \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.

**34. Shopping-Domestic \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN MY COUNTRY. (Ex. An item that cost \$10 at another store would cost \$11).
- ☐ I WOULD NOT shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN MY COUNTRY.

**35. Shopping-International \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.

**36. Volunteer \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.

**37. Donate \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD donate money to a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT donate money to a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.

**Figure 3.8**

The next section of the survey, Questions 38-46, (Figure 3.9) test the respondents' to social entrepreneurship principles, including corporate social responsibility and charitable giving, the role of business in society and supply chain ethics. These questions were also scored with a 1, -1 system; however, these correspond to a social entrepreneurship orientation versus a non-social entrepreneurship orientation and do not correspond with Dalton's engaged or duty-based citizenship dimensions. For Question 38 a response of "I believe the first responsibility of a business is to increase revenues for its owners and shareholders" was coded as a -1, representing a non-social entrepreneurship orientation. Conversely, a response of "I believe that the first responsibility of a business is to improve people's lives" was coded as a 1, representing a social entrepreneurship orientation. For Question 39, a response of "I believe that a business's owners and shareholders have earned 100% of its profits" was coded as a -1, while a response of "I believe that a portion of a business's profits should be directed toward charitable efforts" was coded as a 1. Questions 40-43 test a respondent's commitment to ethical supply chains with regard to both the treatment of human capital and environmental considerations. Responses of "I WOULD take a high-paying job at a company..." in Questions 40 and 42 resulted in a code of -1, while responses of "I WOULD NOT take a high-paying job at a company..." resulted in a code of 1. Similarly for Questions 41 and 42, a response of "I WOULD purchase a product from a company..." was given a score of -1, while a response of "I WOULD NOT purchase a product from a company..." was given a score of 1.

Survey Question 44 assumes a pro-social entrepreneurship answer of "I WOULD prefer to start a non-governmental organization or non-profit to help people

even if meant making less money than I would starting a for-profit business” and was scored accordingly with a 1. However, the non-social entrepreneurship answer of “I WOULD prefer to start a for-profit business where I would make more money as opposed to a non-governmental organization or a non-profit” was scored with a -1.

The desire for change in the global economy was addressed by Question 45 where an answer of “I believe the current global economy is generally fair for a majority of people and should not be changed” was coded as a -1 while an answer of “I believe the current global economy is generally unfair for a majority of people and should be changed” was scored with a 1. Finally, optimism toward addressing social and environmental problems was testing in Question 46. A response of “I believe social problems like poverty, pollution, discrimination etc. will always be a part of human life” was scored as a -1, but a response of “I believe social problems can be eliminated through technological advances and/or new ways of thinking” was scored as a 1, demonstrating a social entrepreneurship orientation.

**38. Role of Business \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I believe the first responsibility of a business is to increase revenues for its owners and shareholders
- ☐ I believe that the first responsibility of a business is to improve people's lives.

**39. Business Profits \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I believe that a business's owners and shareholders have earned 100% of its profits.
- ☐ I believe that a portion of a business's profits should be directed toward charitable efforts.

**40. Business-Environment \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.

**41. Consumer-Environment \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.

**42. Business-Workers \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.

**43. Consumer-Workers \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.

**44. Entrepreneurship-NGO \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD prefer to start a non-governmental organization or non-profit to help people even if it meant making less money than I would starting a for-profit business.
- ☐ I WOULD prefer to start a for-profit business where I would make more money as opposed to a non-governmental organization or a non-profit.

**45. Global Economy \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you.

- ☐ I believe the current global economy is generally fair for a majority of people and should not be changed.
- ☐ I believe the current global economy is generally unfair for a majority of people and should be changed.

**46. Social Problems \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you.

- ☐ I believe social problems like poverty, pollution, discrimination etc. will always be a part of human life.
- ☐ I believe social problems can be eliminated through technological advances and/or new ways of thinking.

**Figure 3.9**

Returning to Question 23, (Figure 3.10) the respondents' attitudes towards the role of government are tested. A response of "I think the role of government is to help people and regulate business" represents a pro-social entrepreneurship mindset and a code of 1, while a response of "I think the role of government is to protect people from terrorism and leave business alone" represents a non-social entrepreneurship mindset and a code of -1 (p. 113).

**23. Government Roles\***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

☐ I think the role of government is to help people and regulate business

☐ I think the role of government is to protect people from terrorism and leave business alone

*Figure 3.10*



Questions 48-49 (Figure 3.11) of the survey required respondents to mark the online resources they use frequently and report which of those media they utilize in a political manner. These were analyzed with a count of each potential response to determine if there was a difference in online media usage between the social entrepreneurship study group and the control group (p. 81, 89).

**48. Which of the following online resources do you use at least once a week? \***

☐ Facebook

☐ Twitter

☐ Instagram

☐ BuzzFeed

☐ YikYak

☐ Snapchat

☐ Pinterest

☐ Online news sites (e.g. Slate, New York Times etc.)

☐ I use none of these online resources.

☐ Other:

**49. Which of the following online resources do you use to learn about or share political news or messages? \***

☐ Facebook

☐ Twitter

☐ Instagram

☐ BuzzFeed

☐ YikYak

☐ Snapchat

☐ Pinterest

☐ Online news sites (e.g. Slate, New York Times etc.)

☐ I use none of these online resources.

☐ Other:

**Figure 3.11**

The final section of the survey, Questions 47, and 50-56 (Figure 3.12) asks general demographic questions of the respondents including age, race, citizenship and political party as well determines if the respondent is a student, teacher or professional. Question 57, (Figure 3.12) the only optional question on the survey, provides an opportunity for respondents to input their e-mail address to make themselves available for followup activities with this researcher. Questions 47-54 were analyzed for distribution. Question 47 was additionally coded using the above-explained duty-based citizen and engaged citizen scale. Responses of “Democrat” were coded with a 1, while responses of “Republican” were coded with a -1. While party identification in and of itself is not a predictor of citizenship type, Dalton has claimed that generally speaking, conservatives tend to be more duty-based and liberals tend to be more engaged citizens (p. 126). Questions 55 and 56 were not coded or analyzed for the purposes of this research study.

**47. With which American political party do you tend to identify? \***

- ☐ Republican
- ☐ Democrat
- ☐ Green
- ☐ Libertarian
- ☐ Other:

**50. What is your age? \***

**51. What is your gender? \***

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ prefer not to say
- ☐ Other:

**52. What is your legal citizenship or country of origin? \***

**53. If you are from the United States, what state do you identify as your home state? (If you are not a US citizen, skip this question)**

**54. What is your race? \***

- ☐ White/caucasian
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Pacific Islander
- ☐ American Indian/Alaska Native
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Other:

**55. Which of the following best describes you?**

- ☐ Undergraduate Student
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☐ Professor/instructor
- ☐ Non-teaching professional
- ☐ Other:

**56. If you marked student or professor in question 55, please share which college or university you attend/are affiliated with. (If you not a current student or professor, skip this question.)**

**57. If you are willing to be contacted by the researcher about this survey to answer any followup questions, please enter your preferred e-mail address in the field below.**

E-mail addresses are optional and are not required to complete the survey. Followup action is not guaranteed. E-mail addresses will remain private and will be used for the sole purpose of a potential survey followup. Emails will not be used for any commercial purposes.

**Figure 3.12**

After coding, various question types and groups were saved as .csv files and imported into R for statistical analysis. Once statistical means were calculated, two-tailed T-tests were the primary method of determining statistically significant differences between responses of the social entrepreneurship study group and the control group at a 95 percent confidence level. This process is explained further in Chapter 4 of this study, which details the results of this research.

Limitations to this study include a definite skew toward a younger average respondent age. As the field of social entrepreneurship is rather new, curriculums and practitioners tend to be younger. Students undertaking courses of study in social entrepreneurship, primarily those at the Bachelor's degree level will also tend to be younger. Further limitation must be accounted for since a bulk of respondents from both the social entrepreneurship and the control group are from a single geographic region and institution (Wartburg College). Even though the survey is written to work for respondents from any country as many social entrepreneurs studying and working in the United States are from other countries. However, since Dalton's work, as well as the majority of literature reviewed on the topic of citizenship, is focused on conceptions of American citizenship, a small number of responses from non-Americans in both the study group and the control group may have affected outcomes. The social entrepreneurship study group population was heavily dominated by female respondents as opposed to having the expected equitable mix of female and male respondents.

It is important to remember this research is preliminary and tries to establish correlation, not causation between a sample of social entrepreneurs when compared to

a sample control group. Additionally many measures used by Dalton in *The Good Citizen* to determine citizenship typology and accompanying behavior patterns were not modeled in this research.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

*A black cat crossing your path signifies that the animal is going somewhere.*

—Groucho Marx

The results from the survey administered to the social entrepreneurship study group (N=82) and the control group (N=57) are detailed below. The results are categorized by demographics and the eight sub-research questions and hypotheses listed in the previous chapter. The statistical analyses used to address each research question are detailed and results are described and presented in table format.

#### Demographics

Several demographic indicators were collected by the survey administered to both the social entrepreneurship group (heretofore known as SE) and the control group. As noted in Chapter Three, because the survey was administered to college students, the **age** (Figures 4.1) of both samples tends to be younger than the general population in which people aged 35-45 represented the highest percentage ([http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart\\_age.html](http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart_age.html)).

Age	Under 25	25-35	36-45	46-55	Over 55	Total
Control N	32	10	7	2	6	57
Control %	56.14	17.54	12.28	3.51	10.53	100
SE N	38	16	19	5	4	82
SE %	46.34	19.51	23.17	6.1	4.88	100

**Table 4.1**

Among the SE group, 46.34 percent of respondents were under the age of 25, while 56.15 percent of the control group were under age 25. For the age group 25-35, the percentages were 17.54 and 19.51 respectively. The SE group had 23.17 percent of respondents between the ages of 36 and 45 while the control had 12.28. The

smallest percentages were in the populations over age 45 with the SE group at 10.98 percent and the control at 14.04. The youngest age reported by a survey respondent was 17 while the oldest was 72.

The statistical average age of the SE group was 30.90 and the average age of the control group was a nearly-identical 30.23. The median age of the SE group was 29.5 but the control group was only 22. Both skew substantially younger than the general U.S. population with a median age of 37.5 (<http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/us-population/>).

While the control group was more comparable to the general U.S. population in terms of **gender** breakdown, the SE group was skewed heavily toward female respondents. (Figure 4.2) For the control group, nearly 46 percent of respondents were male while nearly 53 percent of respondents were female. For the SE group, only approximately 26 percent of respondents were male, while nearly 72 percent were female. The general population of the United States in 2014 was 49 percent male and 51 percent female (<http://kff.org/other/state-indicator/distribution-by-gender/>).

<b>Gender</b>	Male	Female	Prefer not to say/Other	Total
Control N	26	30	1	57
Control %	45.61	52.63	1.75	99.99*
SE N	21	59	2	82
SE %	25.61	71.95	2.44	100

**Table 4.2**

\*due to rounding percentage does not equal 100%

The SE respondent group proved to be slightly more **racially** diverse (Figure 4.3) than the control group with 79.27 percent white, 2.44 percent Asian, 2.44

Hispanic and 13.41 percent black. In contrast, the control group was 84.21 percent white with 8.77 percent other races. Both groups were less diverse than the United States as a whole which, in 2014, was 62 percent white, 18 percent Hispanic, 6 percent Asian, 12 percent black and 1 percent Alaska native or American Indian. Hispanic people, in particular, were underrepresented among all survey respondents.

<b>Race</b>	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Prefer Not to Say/Other	Total
Control N	1	4	0	48	4	57
Control %	1.75	7.02	0	84.21	7.02	100
SE N	2	11	2	65	2	82
SE %	2.44	13.41	2.44	79.27	2.44	100

**Table 4.3**

<b>Citizenship</b>	US Citizen	Non US Citizen	Total
Control N	54	3	57
Control %	94.74	5.26	100
SE N	70	12	82
SE %	85.37	14.63	100

**Table 4.4**

As anticipated, the SE study group had a higher percentage of respondents who were not United States **citizens** (Figure 4.4). U.S. citizen respondents in the control group reportedly hailed from 11 different US states—Arkansas, Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah and Washington. The SE group included respondents from Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Texas, Utah, Virginia and Washington. Iowa



was the most common home state for respondents in both groups. Non-citizen respondents included individuals from the United Kingdom, Burundi, Nigeria, Barbados, Malawi, Canada, Kenya, Angola, Germany, Mongolia, Burma, Uganda and Ghana.

Survey respondents were also asked which American political party they identified with. (Figure 4.5) The control group had an excellent normal distribution with 35 percent Democrats, 35 percent Republicans, 12 percent Independents, and 3.5 percent Libertarians. However, the SE group had a far higher percentage of Democrats at nearly 54 percent, with Republicans at nearly 21 percent, Independents at 8.5 percent, and Libertarians and Greens at around 3.5 and 2.5 percent respectively.

<b>Political Party</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent	Libertarian	Green	Other/None	Total
Control N	20	20	7	2	0	8	57
Control %	35.09	35.09	12.28	3.51	0	14.04	100.01*
SE N	44	17	7	3	2	9	82
SE %	53.66	20.73	8.54	3.66	2.44	10.98	100.01*

**Table 4.5**

\*due to rounding percentages do not equal 100%

## **Research Questions (RQ<sub>x</sub>) and Hypotheses (H<sub>x</sub>)**

### Participation Dimension

RQ<sub>1</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of and attitudes toward political participation between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>1-A</sub>: The SE group will have higher levels of political participation.

Results: The SE study group did self-report higher levels of political activity (participation) both on a Likert scale (Q1) and using a count of specific political activities completed (Q3). (Figure 4.6) The statistical mean of the responses for Q1 for the SE resulted in a group score of 3.138537 while the mean for the control group was 2.701754. Applying a two-tailed T-test at a 95 percent confidence to those values established a statistically significant difference with a resulting P-value of 0.01212. When a count of the total activities marked by the respondents was averaged for Question 3, the mean for the SE group was 8.243902 activities completed, while the count for the control group was 6.245614. This also represents a statistically significant difference between the two groups with a P-value of 0.0273. However, the two groups did not report a statistically significant difference between the value they placed on participation with regards to a hypothetical “good citizen” (Q2).

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q1	3.158537	2.701754	0.01212
Q2	2.987805	2.684211	0.1178
Q3 count	8.243902	6.245614	0.0273

**Table 4.6**

H<sub>1-B</sub>: Political participation activities among the SE group will tend toward engaged citizen behaviors when compared with the control group.

Results: When Q3 was re-analyzed using the 1, -1 engaged citizen and duty citizen scale, the SE group had a mean score of 3.256098 while the control group had a mean score of 1.78947. With this scoring method, a larger number is correlated with a greater engaged citizen tendency. After a two-tailed T-test the difference between

the two groups was determined to be statistically significant with a P-value of 0.0006992. (Figure 4.7) These results will be applied toward determining the results of  $H_8$  later in this chapter.

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q3	3.256098	1.789474	0.0006992

**Table 4.7**

After determining a frequency count for each response for Q4, (Figure 4.8) the political action most valued by respondents for a hypothetical good citizen in both groups was voting in a local election. Nearly 86 percent of the control group reported local voting as one of their top three choices, while a slightly lower 80 percent of respondents in the SE group selected it. Similarly, voting in a presidential election was the second most frequently-selected response for both groups with 84 percent and 73 percent respectively. However, the two groups diverged in their third most-frequent response. The control group selected attending a partisan speech or rally, while the SE group selected contacting local government officials third-most frequently with approximately 28 percent and 29 percent respectively.



### Autonomy Dimension

RQ<sub>2</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in the sense of political autonomy between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>2-A</sub>: The SE group will report higher levels of, and place a higher value upon, political knowledge than the control group.

Results: Questions 5, 9 and 13 collected data about the knowledge of political processes, people and issues using a Likert scale of 1-5. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in their levels self-reported knowledge in these three areas. (Figure 4.8) Questions 7, 11, and 15 asked respondents to judge the level of knowledge in these three areas for a hypothetical good citizen. The results of Q7 and Q11 showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups; however, Q15, which asked specifically about a good citizen's knowledge of political issues did result in a statistically significant difference. The SE group scored a mean of 3.902439 while the control scored a 3.45614. A two-tailed T-test at a 95 percent confidence resulted in a P-value of 0.007231.

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q5	3.670732	3.438596	0.1997
Q7	3.5	3.333333	0.3656
Q9	3.353659	3.140351	0.2152
Q11	3.146341	3.175439	0.8663
Q13	3.621951	3.421053	0.2322
Q15	3.902439	3.45614	0.007231

**Table 4.9**

H<sub>2-B</sub>: The SE group will report more engaged citizen attitudes in other aspects of autonomy besides political knowledge.

Results: After applying the 1,-1 engaged citizen/duty-based citizen scoring to Q8, Q12 and Q18-22, the responses were added together, with a higher number corresponding to more typically engaged citizen attitudes (Figure 4.10)

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q8, 12, 18-22	3.341463	2.964912	0.4595

**Table 4.10**

The totals for the SE group and the control group were averaged resulting in mean scores of 3.341463 and 2.964912 respectively. The SE group did in fact score as more engaged with a higher number, but with P-value of 0.4595, the results were not statistically significant to a 95 percent confidence after a two-tailed T-test. These results will be applied toward determining the results of  $H_8$  later in this chapter.

RQ<sub>3</sub>: Is there a difference in of political issues most frequently noted as important by the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>3</sub>: The SE group and the control group will emphasize the importance of different political issues.

A frequency count on the responses to Questions 16 and 17 were used to determine the issues most important to the two groups. (Figure 4.11) Question 16 asked for respondents to mark the issues most important to them personally; Question 17 asked regarding a hypothetical good citizen. “Education” was the most frequently-cited issue of importance for both the control group and the SE group for both questions. “Health care” was the second-most-frequently cited issue of importance for both groups for both questions, though the percentage of respondents decreased by approximately 11 percent for the Control group between Q16 and Q17 while the

16. Which political issues are most urgent to you personally right now? Select THREE	16a-immigration	16b-education	16c-strong military	16d-health care	16e-lower taxes	16f-environment	16g-clean energy	16h-jobs	16i-infrastructure	16j-civil rights	16k-terrorism	16l-campaign finance	16m-free speech	16n-religious protection	16o-race relations	16p-privacy	16q-foreign aid	16r-other
	Control N	14	33	8	28	10	8	21	2	10	4	3	4	9	3	2	0	6
	Control %	24.56	57.89	14.04	49.12	17.54	14.04	36.84	3.51	17.54	7.02	5.26	7.02	15.79	5.26	3.51	0.00	10.53
	SE N	18	54	4	31	6	30	23	7	15	2	8	2	4	18	2	1	8
	SE %	21.95	65.85	4.88	37.8	7.31	36.59	28.05	8.54	18.29	2.44	9.76	2.44	4.88	21.95	2.44	1.22	9.76
17. Which issues do you think are most urgent to a "good citizen"? Select THREE	Top	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth													
	17a-immigration	17b-education	17c-strong military	17d-health care	17e-lower taxes	17f-environment	17g-clean energy	17h-jobs	17i-infrastructure	17j-civil rights	17k-terrorism	17l-campaign finance	17m-free speech	17n-religious protection	17o-race relations	17p-privacy	17q-foreign aid	17r-other
	Control N	14	33	8	22	10	14	22	1	15	5	1	10	8	0	1	2	2
	Control %	24.56	57.89	14.04	38.6	17.54	24.56	38.6	1.75	26.32	8.77	1.75	17.54	14.04	0	1.75	3.5	3.5
	SE N	15	57	6	40	5	22	34	4	26	3	8	9	0	11	1	2	2
	SE %	18.29	69.51	7.31	48.78	6.1	26.83	41.46	4.88	31.71	3.66	9.76	10.98	0	13.41	1.22	2.44	2.44
	Top	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth													

Table 4.11

Some of the less-frequently selected responses show the largest discrepancies between the control group and the SE group. For example “race relations” was the fifth-most frequent response for the SE group on Q16 (tied with immigration) at almost 22 percent. Only 5 percent of the control group cited “race relations” as one of their three most important issues however. Similarly, “race relations” came it at 13 percent among the SE group on Q17 but was not selected by any respondents in the control group. “Religious protections” was selected by around 14 percent of control group respondents on Q17, but was not selected by any respondents in the SE group. “Foreign aid” scored as the least-frequent response for both groups in Q16 and scored quite low for both groups in Q17. The “other” category prompted a wide array of responses from both groups including income inequality, gun rights and gun control, national debt, entitlements, affordable childcare and abortion.

#### Social Order Dimension

RQ<sub>4</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference between the SE group’s and the control group’s commitment to social order?

H<sub>4</sub>: The SE group will be less committed to social order.

Results: Questions 24-31 (Figure 4.12) tested respondents commitment to social order including military service, obeying the law, jury service and reporting crimes. The questions were coded using the 1, -1 engaged citizen/duty-based citizen scale and added together, giving an overall social order score for each respondent. The mean of these scores for the SE group was -1.54878 while the mean for the control group was -2.491228. A two-tailed T-test at 95 percent confidence resulted in a 0.1012 P-value. While the SE group did indeed lean more toward an engaged citizen



behavior type, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant at a 95 percent confidence. These results will be applied toward determining the results of  $H_8$  later in this chapter.

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q24-31	-1.54878	-2.491228	0.1012

**Table 4.12**

#### Solidarity Dimension

RQ<sub>5</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in commitment to solidarity between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>5</sub>: The SE group will be more committed to solidarity then the control group.

Results: Questions 32-37 (Figure 4.13) measured respondents' willingness to help others. Responses were scored with the same 1, -1 citizen scale referenced previously and the scores for this section were added together and averaged. The mean of the SE group was 3.585366 and the mean of the control group was 1.789474, with a higher number corresponding to a more engaged citizen outlook. When a two-tailed T-test was applied to a confidence of 95 percent, the p-value was 0.0003412, demonstrating a statistically significant difference in solidarity between the two groups. These results will be applied toward determining the results of  $H_8$  later in this chapter.

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q 32-37	3.585366	1.789474	0.0003412

**Table 4.13**

#### Roles of Government and Business

RQ<sub>6</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in how the SE group and the control group view the roles of government and business?

H<sub>6-A</sub>: The SE group will favor government intervention to help people and regulate business when compared to the control group.

The results of Q23 show that while the SE group was slightly more likely than the control group to favor government intervention and business regulation; however with a P-value of 0.05155 the difference was approximately statistically significant to a 95 percent confidence. (Figure 4.14)

	SE group mean	Control group mean	P-value
Q23	0.5121951	0.1929825	0.05155
Q38-46	3.756098	0.9298246	0.003417

**Table 4.14**

H<sub>6-B</sub>: The SE group will favor socially responsible business practices when compared to the control group.

Results: Questions 38-46 (Figure 4.14) tested respondents' affinity for socially responsible and ethical business practices for both human capital and environmental resources. Responses were scored with the 1, -1 scale with a 1 being a social entrepreneurship outlook and a -1 being a non-social entrepreneurship outlook. The scores were added, giving each respondent a score for the section. A higher number positively correlates with a more social entrepreneurship outlook. Not surprisingly, the SE group had a much higher mean score of 3.756098 than did the control group at 0.9298246. A two-tailed T-test at a 95 percent confidence resulted in a p-value of 0.0003417, showing that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant.

### Online Resources

RQ<sub>7</sub>: Is there a difference in online resource and social media usage between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>7</sub>: Online resource usage in general and for political purposes will be higher among the SE group.

Results: A count of the number of online resources used by survey respondents on a weekly basis showed a similar result both the control group (an average of approximately 3.58) and the SE group (an average of approximately 3.4). (Figure 4.15)

	Online resources used weekly	Online resources used for political purposes
Control mean	3.578947368	1.666666667
SE mean	3.402439024	1.817073171

**Table 4.15**

When asked how many online resources they use to learn about or share political information, the control group mean was approximately 1.67 while the SE group mean was slightly higher at around 1.82. Facebook was the most popular online resource for both groups. It was used on a weekly basis by nearly 93 percent of the control group and nearly 87 percent of the SE group. (Figure 4.16) The SE group reported using online news sites and Twitter somewhat more frequently than the control group. The control group reported using Snapchat more frequently than the SE group. Everyone in both groups indicated they used at least one of the online resources listed on a weekly basis. Again, Facebook was the most popular online avenue for respondents to share or learn about political stories or messages with

nearly 65 percent of the control group and approximately 62 percent of the SE group using it in this manner. Political usage was similar between the two groups for online news sites, and Snapchat, though the SE group reported slightly higher political usage of Twitter, Instagram and BuzzFeed. No respondents in either group reported using YikYak for political purposes. Overall, Instagram showed the biggest difference between weekly usage and political usage with an average of 52 percent of respondents using it weekly but only an average of 4 percent of respondents using it politically.

48. Which of the following online resources do you use at least once a week?	48a- Facebook	48-b- Twitter	48-c- Instagram	48-d- BuzzFeed	48-e- YikYak	48-f- Snapchat	48-g- Pinterest	48-h- Online news	48-i- None	48-j- Other
Control N	53	25	30	10	11	30	14	30	0	1
Control %	92.98	43.86	52.63	17.54	19.3	52.63	24.56	52.63	0	1.75
SE N	71	42	42	10	12	29	25	47	0	1
SE %	86.59	51.22	51.22	12.19	14.63	35.37	30.49	57.32	0	1.22
49. Which of the following online resources do you use to learn about or share political news or messages?	49-a- Facebook	49-b- Twitter	49-c- Instagram	49-d- BuzzFeed	49-e- YikYak	49-f- Snapchat	49-g- Pinterest	49-h- Online news	49-i- None	49-j- Other
Control N	37	17	1	4	0	2	0	30	3	1
Control %	64.91	29.82	1.75	7.01	0	3.51	0	52.63	5.26	1.75
SE N	51	28	5	9	0	3	3	42	6	2
SE %	62.2	34.14	6.1	10.98	0	3.66	3.66	51.22	7.32	2.44

**Table 4.16**

### Citizenship Types

RQ<sub>8</sub>: Taking into consideration Dalton's four dimensions of citizenship, does the SE group tend to be more engaged than the control group?

H<sub>8</sub>: The SE group will tend to be engaged citizens.

Results: (Figure 4.17)

When the four dimensions of citizenship are taken as a whole, the mean for the SE group was 8.6343147 while the mean for the control group was 4.052632, with a larger number corresponding to more engaged citizenship. After a two-tailed T-test, these two scores had a P-value of 0.00001806, which indicates high statistical significance. Even though there was not statistical significance in the areas of Autonomy and Social Order when analyzed in isolation, the SE group did score higher in those areas, in line with an engaged citizenship prediction. Statistical significance was achieved in the areas of Participation and Solidarity when analyzed in isolation with the SE group testing as more engaged in those areas as well. Looking at an overall measure of engaged citizenship in aggregate additionally confirms the engaged citizen hypothesis for the SE group.

	SE group	Control group	P-value
Participation	3.256098	1.789474	
Autonomy	3.341463	2.964912	
Social Order	-1.54878	-2.491228	
Solidarity	3.585366	1.789474	
<b>Total</b>	8.634147	4.052632	0.00001806

**Table 4.17**

## CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

*Citizenship is a tough occupation which obliges the citizen to make his own informed opinion and stand by it.*

—Martha Gellhorn

Based on the results detailed in the previous chapter, various conclusions can be drawn about the engaged vs. duty-based citizenship behaviors and attitudes of the SE group when compared to the control group. A discussion and analysis of the demographics, each of the sub-research questions, corresponding hypotheses and the results follows.

### Demographics

The demographic breakdown of the SE group and the control group were largely what this researcher expected with the exception of the large number of female respondents in the SE group. The literature review in Chapter Two of this work and anecdotal evidence observed by this researcher do not reveal a gender differential in individuals who pursue a study of or careers in social entrepreneurship versus other fields, so there is not a ready explanation for why the SE group was dominated by female respondents. The effect this gender imbalance may have had on other results is unknown and may require further review. This potential skew is noted in Chapter Three as a limitation of this research project.

Though both groups of respondents tended to be younger than the general population, the mean age of both groups was very similar. It was noted in the limitations that large numbers of college student respondents under age 25 and the fact that social entrepreneurship tends to be a young field, both in practice and scholarship, would likely trend the age of the sample downward.

Increased racial and citizenship diversity among the SE group was an expected outcome of the demographic breakdown as the field addresses social and environmental problems that may be more evident to those who grow up in developing countries or who themselves are minorities. Further study is needed to see to what extent these factors influence the choice of persons to study or pursue a career in social entrepreneurship, including, perhaps, a study of Global Citizenship, as referenced in Chapter Two, and social entrepreneurs.

The fact that social entrepreneurs self-identified as more Democrat (54 percent versus 35 percent in the control group) is also not particularly surprising. Social and environmental issues are traditionally considered to be the purview of the Democrat party in United States politics and individuals motivated to study how to create and implement innovative solutions to these problems would more likely align themselves with Democrats on this issue. Additionally, since Dalton reports that Democrat party-identification has a correlation with engaged citizenship (p. 52) this result lends evidence to the conclusion that the SE group does indeed tend toward engagedness, rather than duty-based citizenship.

Additional demographic information not collected in the survey that may be useful for further analysis includes religious activity and preference, income levels, urban vs. rural living, international travel experience and education levels achieved.

#### Participation Dimension

RQ<sub>1</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of and attitudes toward political participation between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>1-A</sub>: The SE group will have higher levels of political participation.

The evidence gleaned from the results does indicate that the SE group has higher levels of political participation than the control group. Although Dalton does indicate that participation is important to both engaged and duty-based citizens (p. 28-29) a wider variety of potential engaged citizen participation activities are outlined in the book. The survey questions and analysis attempt to capture this with a count of activities completed which provides one facet of participation. However, the survey did not capture the frequency or intensity with which a respondent completed a single participatory activity. For example even if a respondent has voted in a local election 10 times, demonstrating a high level of participation, the response “voted in a local election” was only counted one time. More study is required to provide a multi-faceted and complete view of political participation among social entrepreneurs. Perhaps a more accurate way to describe these results would be that the SE group participates in a wider variety of political activities, rather than simply being more politically active.

The fact that disproportionate number of respondents in both the SE group and the control group either grew up in or currently live in Iowa lends a unique tenor to this question. Because of Iowa’s first-in-the-nation status in presidential elections, citizens in the state have far more opportunities to contact national-level candidates and officials face-to-face, attend rallies and speeches made by national-level candidates and participate in party-building and presidential campaign volunteer activities. Wartburg College, for example, has hosted four presidential candidates on campus for speeches or town hall events during the 2015 calendar year and many



other candidates have visited the community or surrounding communities.

Presidential candidates hold events at libraries and local restaurants—intimate affairs generally open to the public. Thus, even younger respondents who may not go out of their way to engage with candidates in other states have had far more opportunity to complete participation activities by virtue of living in Iowa.

H<sub>1-B</sub>: Political participation activities among the SE group will tend toward engaged citizen behaviors when compared with the control group.

The results from the engaged versus duty-based scoring of political activities completed in Q3 does indeed support the hypothesis that the SE group tends toward engaged citizenship. The citizenship score for the SE group was 3.26 compared to a score of 1.79 for the control group, with a larger number corresponding with engaged citizenship and a smaller number corresponding with engaged citizenship. A p-value of approximately 0.0007 lends credence to the interpretation that the difference between the two groups is highly statistically significant. However, a more extensive study of this phenomenon may be necessary to extrapolate the conclusion to a wider sample or draw any conclusions beyond correlation.

Survey Question 4 results are somewhat helpful in capturing attitudes toward types of political activities most important for a hypothetical good citizen. By a strong majority, both the SE group and the control picked voting in local elections and voting in presidential elections as their top-two most-frequent responses for good citizen political actions. It is not surprising that respondents to a citizenship survey would select voting as important, but this result does not correspond with actual

recorded voting rates. Data from 2014 estimates the municipal voter turnout rate in the United States to be around 20 percent, down from nearly 27 percent in 2001 (<http://www.governing.com/topics/politics/gov-voter-turnout-municipal-elections.html>). However, 69 percent of the control group and 67 percent of the SE group reported personally voting in a local election (data from Q3)—far higher than expected. Voter turnout for presidential elections in the United States averages around 60 percent—much lower than other developed democracies around the world (<http://www.fairvote.org/research-and-analysis/voter-turnout/>). Both groups had 59 percent (data from Q3) of respondents indicate they had voted in a presidential election, in line with the national average. However, responses from younger individuals in the sample are likely skewing that result lower as they have not yet had the opportunity to cast a ballot in a presidential election since they've been of age to vote. It is possible this study over-sampled actual local voters or respondents were not entirely honest about their voting behaviors. Additionally some respondents may have voted in a small number of local elections but may not vote in them habitually.

In considering additional conclusions that may be drawn from data resulting from Q4, the same three political actions rounded out the third, fourth and fifth-most frequent responses for both groups; however they are in a slightly different order in the control group and the SE group. The control group prioritized attending a partisan speech or rally at approximately twice the rate of the SE group, a duty-based citizen behavior as explained in Chapter Three. The SE group prioritized volunteering for a public policy organization at approximately twice the rate of the control group, an engaged citizen behavior as explained in Chapter Three. Both groups prioritized

contacting local government officials with approximately 23 percent from the control group selecting this engaged citizen action and a slightly higher 29 percent of the SE group selecting this action. These results are in line with the assertion that in looking beyond voting activities the SE group tends to value engaged citizenship activities beyond more than the control group.

### Autonomy Dimension

RQ<sub>2</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in the sense of political autonomy between the SE study group and the control group?

H<sub>2-A</sub>: The SE group will report higher levels of, and place a higher value upon, political knowledge than the control group.

Overall, the Likert questions designed to explore respondents' knowledge of political processes, people and issues did not yield particularly fruitful results. Neither did their responses to political knowledge levels ideal for a hypothetical good citizen. The sole exception was Q15, which asked about a good citizen's knowledge of political issues. The SE group had a mean of 3.9 on the 1-5 Likert scale, while the control group had a mean of just under 3.5 with a statistically significant P-value of approximately 0.007 between the two. This difference makes sense in the context of learning about and trying to solve social and environmental problems, which could also be viewed, in general, as political issues. If one is intimately involved with a nonprofit intended to combat homelessness, for example, the political issues of poverty alleviation, mental health care access, veterans' benefits, nutritional deserts, substance abuse rehabilitation etc. will likely be a priority in contrast to a person who does not see the effects of these issues first-hand. Thus, it is possible that the SE

group values knowledge of a variety of political issues more highly for the hypothetical good citizen because knowledge of the issues is seen as the first step in addressing them—the primary point of social entrepreneurship. Moreover, since the survey asked respondents to judge their own political knowledge and that of a hypothetical good citizen but did not objectively test political knowledge of processes, people or issues, it is possible that the SE group is understating their actual knowledge or the control group was overstating their knowledge. Further study with objective, rather than subjective, self-selection measures of political processes, processes and people is necessary to determine actual levels of knowledge for the respondents.

H<sub>2-B</sub>: The SE group will report more engaged citizen attitudes in other aspects of autonomy besides political knowledge.

Though the SE group did in fact score slightly higher in engaged citizenship attitudes on measures of political autonomy, the result was not statistically significant. Further study is needed to determine if isolating various aspects of autonomy such as opinion formation or responsibility to keep watch on the government would yield more nuanced results with a statistically significant difference between the groups. The lack of significant results in this area could also be a result of demographic quirks in the sample responses.

RQ<sub>3</sub>: Is there a difference in of political issues most frequently noted as important by the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>3</sub>: The SE group and the control group will emphasize the importance of different political issues.

In addressing the data from Q16 and Q17 regarding political issues, this researcher expected to see a greater disparity between the two groups than was actually evident. Both groups selected education as a most-important issue for the respondents personally and for a hypothetical good citizen at nearly identical rates—58 percent in the control group and between 66 and 69 percent for the SE group. Health care was the next-most frequent response, though the response rates between the two groups are more or less flip-flopped between Q16 and Q17. More of the control group cared about health care personally (49 percent vs. 38 percent), while more of the SE group thought a good citizen should care about health care (49 percent vs. 38 percent). The SE group did report caring more personally about environmental issues (37 percent vs. the control group's 14 percent) but the control group picked the environment at a higher frequency when judging issue importance for a hypothetical good citizen. In other words, the environment was not important to them, but they thought it should be. Several respondents input “climate change” in the “other” category as either an issue personally important or important to a good citizen. This indicates that some respondents saw climate change as somehow separate from the categorical option of “environment,” though other respondents likely grouped them together.

The issue of race relations provided an interesting contrast between the two groups with only 5 percent of the control identifying it as personally important, but nearly 22 percent of the SE group identifying it as personally important. This could be a result of the greater racial diversity of the SE group, a function of geographical distribution of respondents including urban vs. rural dwellers or a higher sensitivity to

social justice issues comes from a study of or work in social entrepreneurship fields. It could also be a result of increased exposure to messages like Black Lives Matter in the media. Similarly, the issue of religious protections was cited as important issue for a good citizen by 14 percent of the control group but 0 percent of the SE group. This disparity could also be a function of geographical distribution, religious activity rate differences not tested for or captured between the control group and the SE group or sampling error.

Another surprising result is the dearth of responses from the SE group on the issue of foreign aid in either Q16 or Q17. In fact, slightly more respondents in the control group than the SE group selected foreign aid as important to a good citizen (3.5 vs. 2.4 percent). This researcher would have assumed that individuals studying or working in social entrepreneurship—a major focus of which is international development—would be more likely to demonstrate an interest in the issue of foreign aid. Perhaps this is an illustration of the rejection of traditional government efforts, like foreign aid, toward addressing wicked problems. As Muhammad Yunus points out (as referenced in Chapter Two of this work) government failures have exacerbated the social and environmental problems social entrepreneurs are now attempting to solve through more market-driven means. However, further study is required to elucidate this phenomenon with any degree of reliability.

Unfortunately, the ambiguous nature of many of the issues listed for Q16 and Q17 of the survey do not provide an accurate picture of how respondents feel about an issue—just that they think it is important. For example, a respondent who selected health care as an important issue may strongly desire the development of a single-

payer system in the United States. Another who also selected health care may want to see a dismantling and defunding of the Affordable Care Act/Obamacare. Others may have selected health care because they are concerned about Medicare funding, prescription drug costs, or research and testing of new treatments. Similarly, a respondent who marked immigration as a priority issue may want to see efforts to stop to illegal immigration or desire deportations of undocumented people living in the United States. Another may have marked immigration because he or she was particularly concerned about the plight of Syrian refugees and wants to ensure people wishing to coming to America have an opportunity to do so. Other respondents may be concerned about their own personal immigration status and their ability to remain in the United States for graduate school or work after they complete undergraduate educations. This ambiguity made it impossible to code the current data and test the responses for greater context and understanding. Further study on political issues is required to determine why respondents in the SE group or the control group selected an issue as important, how they actually feel about that issue, and if those feelings can be correlated with party identification or other demographic information or involvement in social entrepreneurship activities.

#### Social Order Dimension

RQ<sub>4</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference between the SE group's and the control group's commitment to social order?

H<sub>4</sub>: The SE group will be less committed to social order, in line with engaged citizenship behavior.

With a higher overall score of approximately -1.5 for the SE group versus -2.5 for the control group, the SE group did in fact demonstrate a lesser commitment to social order, in line with engaged citizen tendencies. However, a 0.1 P-value did not indicate that the difference was statistically significant to a 95 percent confidence. Further study is needed to determine if isolating various aspects of social order such as reporting criminal activity, military service or government criticism would yield more nuanced results with a statistically significant difference between the groups. The lack of significant results in this area could also be a result of demographic sampling anomalies.

#### Solidarity Dimension

RQ<sub>5</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in commitment to solidarity between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>5</sub>: The SE group will be more committed to solidarity than the control group, in line with engaged citizenship behavior.

Given the stated goal of social entrepreneurship to solve social and environmental problems, the results that the SE group was more committed to solidarity or helping others than the control group come as no surprise. The SE group mean score for this section was around 3.6 while the control group mean was only 1.8. The difference resulted in a P-value of 0.003412, highly statistically significant. It also gives support to the idea that the SE group will tend toward engaged citizenship. More study of existing data would be useful to capture if the SE group is more amenable to sacrifice in order to help fellow people at different rates



domestically or internationally or if they would be more likely to volunteer time or money to help others.

Further, this survey only establishes correlation between solidarity and social entrepreneurship. Additional scholarship into the motivations of respondents and any existing causal relationship between solidarity and social entrepreneurship are needed to truly understand the phenomenon. Do respondents become more likely to want to help others as a result of their study or practice of social entrepreneurship or are individuals who are already predisposed (by nature or nurture) toward altruism drawn to the study and practice of social entrepreneurship? Or do these factors work in conjunction to reinforce each other? Additionally, demographic factors such as religiosity, income, political party identification and education levels may affect a respondent's reported desire to help others.

#### Roles of Government and Business

RQ<sub>6</sub>: Is there a statistically significant difference in how the SE group and the control group view the roles of government and business?

H<sub>6-A</sub>: The SE group will favor government intervention to help people and regulate business when compared to the control group.

Though the SE group did tend toward this way of thinking with a mean score of 0.51 as compared to the control group with a mean score of 0.19, with a larger number corresponding to governmental intervention. However the difference was approximately statistically significant to a 95 percent confidence. The survey only utilized a single question to attempt to capture attitudes toward the role of government and perhaps a series of questions would have captured a more complete or statistically

significant picture. Additionally, a larger sample may have may yield results with a lower p-value and a stronger significance.

H<sub>6-B</sub>: The SE group will favor socially responsible business practices as compared to the control group.

This section provided a good check on the survey sample to test social entrepreneurship values and new ways of thinking about the role of business. As expected, the SE group indicated a strong preference for corporate social responsibility and ethical supply chain management both as potential employees and consumers with a mean score of approximately 3.76 when compared with the control group's mean of only 0.93. A P-value of 0.0003 demonstrates that the difference in attitudes about socially and environmentally responsible business practice between the two groups was statistically significant.

This section highlights the growing consumer demand for corporate transparency in both environmental policies and human capital. If consumers increasingly are willing to avoid products or companies who pollute or have questionable labor practices, companies will need to do more than greenwash their products to remain competitive. Athletic brand Nike is an excellent example of this trend. Nike was recently named a favorite brand among millennial and has 60 percent of US athletic footwear marketshare, quadruple the value of Asics, Adidas and Skechers combined. (Lutz, 2015) However, in the mid-1990s the company came under fire when its unethical labor practices came to light with overseas workers enduring long hours, shockingly low wages and unsafe factory conditions. Sales declined and layoffs loomed. Nike's turnaround started with a 108-page report

detailing the widespread issues, acknowledging responsibility and outlining a plan to raise wages, improve safety and re-earn consumers trust. Eventually Nike recovered as HIP Investor Paul Herman predicted they would have. As outlined in Chapter Two of this work, he posits that companies who pay attention to improving the lives of their human capital and minimizing their negative environmental impacts will have long term growth and financial success over companies who do not.

However, most consumers do not know where to obtain or review these kinds of reports for most companies, if such a report even exists. Many consumers remain ignorant until issues are picked up by mainstream American media. Even media reports do not necessarily change purchasing habits. For example, fully 53 percent of survey respondents indicated they would not purchase a product whose production resulted in pollution or unethical labor practices elsewhere in the world. This researcher wonders how many of these individuals own a smart phone—made in a factory in Guangdong Province, China, with a suicide net on the outside to keep workers from jumping from the windows (Chmielewski, 2015) with mineral components mined by Congolese children (Poulsen, 2012) whose bosses may be using profits to finance rebel attacks in a country plagued by unrest for decades (Essick, 2001, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13286306>). A stated commitment to socially-responsible business practices does not mean consumers will faithfully adhere to socially-responsible purchasing.

### Online Resources

RQ<sub>7</sub>: Is there a difference in online resource and social media usage between the SE group and the control group?

H<sub>7</sub>: Online resource usage in general and for political purposes will be higher among the SE group.

The results for Q48 and 49 did not support the hypothesis of increased usage of online resources for the SE group. In fact, just the opposite was true. For most media, the control group reported increased weekly usage, with the exception of online news sites like The New York Times or Slate and the microblogging platform Twitter. The SE group used Facebook and online news sites less than the control group to learn about or share political messages, but used Twitter, Buzzfeed and Instagram somewhat more. An average of 6 percent of all respondents didn't learn about political news or share any political messages online at all.

Survey results show an average of 90 percent of respondents using Facebook at least weekly comparable to a 91 percent at least weekly usage rate for all American adults who have a Facebook profile, which comprises 72 percent of all American adult internet users. (<http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/19/the-demographics-of-social-media-users/>). Twitter usage among the sample was higher at an average of 47.5%, while only 23 percent of adult Internet users tweet. Instagram use was also high nearly 52 percent of survey respondents reporting weekly use as compared to only 28 percent of adult internet users. These higher rates of online social media usage could be linked to the lower median age of the sample. Platforms like YikYak, Snapchat and Buzzfeed are primarily marketed to and used by people under age 25.

Citizenship Types

RQ<sub>8</sub>: Taking into consideration Dalton's four dimensions of citizenship, does the SE group tend to be more engaged than the control group?

H<sub>8</sub>: The SE group will tend to be engaged citizens.

Aggregated results do indicate, that at least for this survey sample, social entrepreneurs tend to be more engaged citizens when compared to a control group. Differences were observed between the two groups in all four of Dalton's citizenship dimensions and while these differences were not statistically significant in each individual dimension, when taken together they were highly statistically significant. The average score for the SE group was 8.6 but the control group had an average score of only 4.1, with a larger number corresponding to engaged citizen tendencies.

However, since this research was primarily focused on determining what differences existed, if any, between the citizenship attitudes of the two groups in the sample, more research needs to be completed to understand where this sample fits in an overall scale of American citizenship attitudes and if social entrepreneurs are strongly or slightly engaged citizens when compared to the general public. It is entirely possible that these two samples tend toward engaged citizenship, with the SE group leaning more that way than the control group. Conversely, it is possible that even the SE group tends toward duty-based citizenship compared with general public. Based on the data collected by this project, it is impossible to determine where precisely the two groups fall on the scale of citizenship types. Comparing these results to Dalton's extensive databases of citizenship attitudes would be one way to attempt to situate this sample more definitely on the engaged/duty-based citizenship continuum.

In addition, as the above research was intended to be a preliminary step in quantifying a relationship between social entrepreneurs and citizenship typology,

many aspects of citizenship were simply not addressed. *The Good Citizen* includes several measures of citizenship not included in this research including survey questions and analysis exploring tolerance, free speech, religiosity, budget priorities, national pride and how the opinions of American citizens compare to individuals from other countries. Future work on these fronts is necessary to continue to build the case for a correlation between social entrepreneurship and citizenship typology. Much work has yet to be done to establish strong evidence for a positive correlation between social entrepreneurship and engaged citizen classification.

The research presented above only establishes a preliminary correlational relationship between social entrepreneurship scholarship or work and engaged citizen attitudes. Further research would be required to establish any causality between social entrepreneurship and engaged citizenship. It is possible that engaged citizens are drawn to courses of study or careers that fall under the social entrepreneurship umbrella of activities. Conversely, it is possible that exposure to social and environmental problems and potential innovative solutions to them push people to display more engaged citizenship behaviors than they would otherwise. Perhaps both of these effects are coming into play. One way to test for causality would be to administer citizen-type tests to students before and after they are presented with course work in social entrepreneurship to see if the introduction of social entrepreneurship problems and practices changes their citizenship attitudes, making them more or less engaged than they were before. Evidence to this effect could lead to calls for expanding Social Entrepreneurship programming at the higher education level and an impetus to entice more people to choose careers in a social

entrepreneurship field or venture. This may mean making salaries and benefits more equitable between the for-profit and non-profit sectors (Dan Pallotta, 2013) and providing government incentives for socially-oriented startups and organizations in a manner similar to that provided to strictly for-profit businesses. It may also mean revamping K-12 civics education curriculum to include social entrepreneurship learning so the United States is truly creating citizens with the skills to tackle 21<sup>st</sup> Century problems.

Finally, the citizen duty/engaged citizenship scale is simply one of a large number of descriptions for recent developments and changes in American citizenship norms. More research is necessary to determine what, if any, correlations may exist between social entrepreneurship and, say Big Citizenship (Khazei 2010), or Global Citizenship (Davies 2006, Falk 1993), as reviewed in Chapter Two of this work. Are social entrepreneurs personally-responsible citizens, participatory citizens, or justice-oriented citizens (Westheimer and Kahne 2004) or an as-of-yet identified mixture of all three?

The definitions and demands of citizenship in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century are a rapidly-evolving reflection of an increasingly complex global society. With an expansion of traditional citizenship beyond national legal status and voter turnout, young people deserved to be equipped with the tools to express their citizenship in a greater variety of ways. As Chapter Two of this work demonstrates, the paths to good citizenship are divers, with as many descriptions and definitions as there are researchers. The young people of today are already primed for global engagement. Unprecedented access to technology leads them to intrinsically grasp the power of communities and social

capital beyond geographical boundaries. They have already demonstrated an interest in and commitment to solving problems and saving the world (Millennial Cause Study The Millennial Generation: Pro-Social and Empowered to Change the World, 2006). As Adam Braun (2014) put it, “Every person has a revolution beating within his or her chest” (p. 3). Citizenship goes beyond values, beliefs and political opinions; it is action as a expression of those values, beliefs and opinions with the goal of achieving a particular political aim—electing a candidate, changing a public policy, or addressing a perceived issue. Similarly, social entrepreneurship can be considered values in action with the goal of addressing a perceived problem (Banks, 2013). Or as Bill Shore (2010) puts it, “compassion ... hitched to the power of imagination” (p.281). This study provides an initial foundation for a linkage between engaged citizenship and social entrepreneurship and this relationship warrants further investigation. It is possible that training in social entrepreneurship could not only grant young people the skills to solve social and environmental problems, but could make them better citizens in the process.



## CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

***“Walk with the dreamers, the believers, the courageous, the cheerful, the planners, the doers, the successful people with their heads in the clouds and their feet on the ground. Let their spirit ignite a fire within you to leave this world better than when you found it.”***

**—Wilferd A. Peterson**

Entrepreneurship is a daunting road to travel and many entrepreneurs are plagued by repeated failure. A few succeed; a very few hit it big. Social entrepreneurship is likely no different. Just as not every for-profit businessperson becomes Steve Jobs or Warren Buffet, not every social entrepreneur will become Bill Drayton or Alan Khazei. It is too early to call modern social entrepreneurship a panacea for international development, ending environmental degradation or achieving social justice. Fixing these problems will take an all-of-the-above, all-hands-on-deck approach. But the evidence is mounting that social entrepreneurship is a viable avenue for both personal success as a career choice and in fixing social and environmental issues.

Social entrepreneurial thinking is also making inroads into the public sector with the new field of civic entrepreneurship. In their book, *The Power of Social Innovation: How Civic Entrepreneurs Ignite Community Networks for Good* (2010), Stephen Goldsmith, Gigi Georges and Tim Glynn Burke describe civic entrepreneurship as a way to breakthrough traditional iron-triangles of bureaucrats, politicians, agency heads and funders who “believe more of the same will make a difference. This iron triangle produces barriers to entry for new actors. Indeed, many of the obstacles civic entrepreneurs face are inadvertent, caused by good people with good intentions trying within a narrow jurisdiction, to solve problems created by

matters outside their control (p. 7). They argue that civic entrepreneurs from a wide variety of backgrounds including politics, philanthropists, faith leaders, business owners, grassroots organizers, and yes, “engaged citizens,” are breaking these triangles, changing thinking, filling niches and finding new ways to help people in trouble (pp.15-16).

Civic entrepreneurship, combining as it does our communal ideals with the efficiency and technological know-how of business, represents hope for effective community change...energetic and passionate citizens can close the widening gap between social problems and solutions and ... communities, funders, and government can indeed create an environment for social change. (p. 24)

Civic entrepreneurship is an attempt to utilize the time and talents of all citizens drive a citizen-centered agenda in order to meet the massive challenges of the modern world. Zukin et.al. (2006) argue that the most effective citizen is one who can combine both political and civic engagement, one who is “comfortable and active in both worlds” (p. 199).

Let us return to the three young individuals profiled in Chapter One of this work. The shoe company in question is, of course, TOMS, which within the last two years has launched TOMS marketplace, a platform for other one-for-one entrepreneurs to market goods to an expansive existing customer base. TOMS has also opened several sustainable practice shoe factories in-country to provide living-wage jobs with safe working conditions to the very people who were previously simply recipients of free shoes once a year. TOMS has also started other one-for-one products with sales of handbags for maternal supplies, sunglasses for eye care, fair trade coffee for clean water and backpacks for anti-bullying efforts (toms.com) The

company has approximately 70 employees and an estimated worth of \$600 million, making founder Blake Mycoskie a millionaire at least three hundred times over (O'Connor, 2014).

As for the young Afghani woman, within a year of the biogas digester project, she had secured funding to build another biogas digester in the Kabul region of her home country, demonstrating her model to be replicable and scalable. She pursued the project even though her family back in Afghanistan had received threats because she appeared in online press releases without a customary religious headscarf. This second project idea and implementation won her a full-ride scholarship to one of the premier sustainability schools in the country, Presidio Graduate School ([www.presidio.edu](http://www.presidio.edu)) in San Francisco, California (<https://www.presidio.edu/blog/clean-tech/power-play-is-smart-energy-possible-in-afghanistan>). She is currently pursuing a double master's degree (MBA/MPA) there and was recently featured in the school's magazine *The Presidian* as one of the women of PSG to watch (<http://issuu.com/presidiograd/docs/presidian-fall2014>).

The young man from Ghana won the MIT Global Startup Challenge (<http://mitgsw.org/2014/>) and on top of the \$20,000 prize, he and his team spent a summer at MIT refining their software application and business plan and networking with health care providers and government officials both in the United States and in Ghana. The group, now called ObaaHealth also secured additional funding, purchased land and constructed a two-room health clinic outside Accra, Ghana. Within one year of launching, the company had 200 subscribers in Ghana and the

United States with plans to add 500 more (obaahealth.com). Profits from subscribers in the developed world will subsidize more users in the developing world.

Just a few hours ago, Facebook founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg announced he would give away 99 percent of his Facebook holdings currently valued at \$45 billion to charitable and social enterprises. He and his wife, Priscilla Chan, stated they would initially focus on “personalized learning, curing disease, connecting people and building strong communities” (Goel and Wingfield, 2015). He has already teamed with other billionaires to fund clean energy innovation and funded multiple education ventures. It seems the practice of using business skills to fix the world’s social and environmental problems is here to stay.

Even if they aren’t Blake Mycoskie or Mark Zuckerberg, these individuals still deserve to be called changemakers or social innovators—“people who create, develop or build an organization or a business based on a value proposition that delivers actions on behalf of others in exchange for huge self-satisfaction, with [often] limited personal financial gain” (Schwarz 2012, p. 7) Still others “work with social entrepreneurs and help them spread their innovations and impact to other places, people and sectors. Be they individuals, corporations or donors, they keep the work alive, vibrant, and meaningful” (ibid) From shoes to maternal health to sanitation and everything in between, a vast and growing cadre of worldwide do-gooders are working to make the lives of their fellow humans less “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.” Good citizens, indeed.

## REFERENCES

- Abdukadirov, S. (2010). Terrorism: The Dark Side of Social Entrepreneurship. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 33, 603-617.  
doi:10.1080/1057610X.2010.484011
- Alvord, S., Brown, D., & Letts, C. (2002). Social entrepreneurship and social transformation: An exploratory study. Retrieved February 12, 2014, from <http://community-wealth.org/content/social-entrepreneurship-and-social-transformation-exploratory-study>
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. and extended ed.). London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arthur, W. (2013). Complexity economics: A different framework for economic thought. *SFI Working Paper*. Retrieved May 27, 2015, from <http://www2.econ.iastate.edu/tesfatsi/ComplexityEconomics.WBrianArthur.SFIWP2013.pdf>
- Banks, K. (2013). *The Rise of the Reluctant Innovator*. London, England: London Publishing Partnership.
- Barrett, L., & Dunbar, R. (2002). *Human evolutionary psychology*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Bernier, L., & Hafsi, T. (2007). The Changing Nature of Public Entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 67(3), 488-503. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.

- Bishop, M. (2013). Philanthrocapitalism: Solving Public Problems through Private Means. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 80(2), 473-490.  
Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOHOST.
- Bloomberg, L., & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A roadmap from beginning to end*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blossom, E. (2011). *Material change: Design thinking and the social entrepreneurship movement*. New York, NY: Metropolis Books.
- Blount, J., & Offei-Danso, K. (2013). The Benefit Corporation: A questionable solution to a non-existent problem. *St. Mary's Law Journal*, 44(3), 617-670.  
Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOHOST.
- Bornstein, D. (2008, December 3). F.A.Q. Retrieved June 10, 2015.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas* (Updated ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship what everyone needs to know*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Braun, A., & Adler, C. (2014). *The promise of a pencil: How an ordinary person can create extraordinary change*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Burnett, L., & Spelman, A. (2011). Creative citizenship: Building connection, knowledge, belonging and leadership in young people. *Aplis*, 24(1), 23-31.  
Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.

- Caldwell, K., Harris, S., & Renko, M. (2012). The Potential of Social Entrepreneurship: Conceptual Tools for Applying Citizenship Theory to Policy and Practice. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 50(6), 505-518. doi:10.1352/1934-9556-50.06.505
- CensusScope -- Population Pyramid and Age Distribution Statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved November 30, 2015, from [http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart\\_age.html](http://www.censusscope.org/us/chart_age.html)
- Chambliss, D., & Schutt, R. (2006). *Making sense of the social world: Methods of investigation* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Cheng, W., & Mohamed, S. (Eds.). (2010). *The world that changes the world: How philanthropy, innovation and entrepreneurship are transforming the social system*. Singapore: Wiley.
- Chmielewski, D. (2015, April 6). Where Apple Products Are Born: A Rare Glimpse Inside Foxconn's Factory Gates. Retrieved December 2, 2015, from <http://recode.net/2015/04/06/where-apple-products-are-born-a-rare-glimpse-inside-foxconns-factory-gates/>
- Chu, J. (2012). Filling a Nonexistent Gap: Benefit Corporations and the Myth of Shareholder Wealth Maximization. *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal*, 22(1), 155-191. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOHOST.
- Clean Team. (n.d.). Retrieved September 10, 2015, from <http://www.ideo.org/projects/clean-team/completed>
- Cook, B., Dodds, C., & Mitchell, W. (2003). Social entrepreneurship—false premises and dangerous forebodings. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 38(1), 57-72. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.

- Corning, P. (2003). "Fair Shares" Beyond capitalism and socialism, or the biological basis of social justice. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 22(2), 12-32. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Cummings, B. (2012). Benefit Corporations: How to Enforce a Mandate to Promote the Public Interest. *Columbia Law Review*, 112(3), 578-627. Retrieved June 25, 2015, from <http://columbialawreview.org/benefit-corporations/>
- Cusano, C. (2010). Of Pattern Changers and Changemakers. In *The world that changes the world: How philanthropy, innovation, and entrepreneurship are transforming the social ecosystem*. (1st ed., pp. 105-122). Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dalton, R. (2015). The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks, California: CQ Press.
- Davie, G. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Call for Collective Action. *OD Practitioner*, 43(1), 17-23. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25. doi:10.1080/00131910500352523
- Dees, J. (2001, May 30). The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship" Retrieved February 21, 2014, from [http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees\\_sedef.pdf](http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf)
- Democratic Republic of Congo profile - Timeline - BBC News. (2015, August 15). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13286306>



- Developing the Field of Social Entrepreneurship. (2008, June 8). Retrieved February 21, 2014, from [http://www.ub.edu/emprenedoriasocial/sites/default/files/Developing the field of Social Entrepreneurship.pdf](http://www.ub.edu/emprenedoriasocial/sites/default/files/Developing%20the%20field%20of%20Social%20Entrepreneurship.pdf)
- DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W., & Robinson, J. (2001). Social Implications of the Internet. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 307-336. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Dourish, P., & Satchell, C. (2011). The Moral Economy of Social Media. In *From social butterfly to engaged citizen urban informatics, social media, ubiquitous computing, and mobile technology to support citizen engagement* (pp. 21-38). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Eggers, W., & Macmillan, P. (2013). *The solution revolution: How business, government, and social enterprises are teaming up to solve society's toughest problems*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Eikenberry, A., & Drapal Kluver, J. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 132-140. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Eikenberry, A., & Kluver, J. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 132-140. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00355.x
- Essick, K. (2011, June 10). Guns, Money and Cell Phones. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.globalissues.org/article/442/guns-money-and-cell-phones>

- Ewest, T. (2011, January 1). *Social Entrepreneurship*. Lecture presented in Classroom, Waverly, IA.
- FairVote.org | Voter Turnout. (2014). Retrieved November 28, 2015, from <http://www.fairvote.org/research-and-analysis/voter-turnout/>
- Fairbanks, M. (2009). *In the river they swim: Essays from around the world on enterprise solutions to poverty*. West Conshohocken, Pa.: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Falk, R. (1993). The Making of Global Citizenship. In *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 39-50). Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Garner, K. (2009). Bringing the Great Transformation to the Classroom.
- Gergen, C., & Rego, L. (2014, February 19). Educating a New Generation of Entrepreneurial Leaders (SSIR). Retrieved February 21, 2014.
- Gershon, D. (2009). *Social change 2.0: A blueprint for reinventing our world*. West Hurley, NY: High Point.
- Godwyn, M. (2009). Can the liberal arts and entrepreneurship work together? *Academe*, 95(1). Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- Goel, V., & Singer, N. (2015, December 1). Mark Zuckerberg and Wife Pledge 99% of Their Facebook Shares to Charity. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/02/technology/mark-zuckerberg-facebook-charity.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/02/technology/mark-zuckerberg-facebook-charity.html?_r=0)
- Goldsmith, S., & Georges, G. (2010). *The power of social innovation: How civic entrepreneurs ignite community networks for good*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Grant, J. (2013). When Making Money and Making a Sustainable and Societal Difference Collide: Will Benefit Corporations Succeed or Fail? *Indiana Law Review*, 46(3), 581-602. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from Social Science Research Network.
- Greer, P., & Horst, C. (2014). *Entrepreneurship for Human Flourishing*. Lanham, MD: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Gregorian, V. (2012, May 27). Individualism and Civility: 2012 Reflections on de Tocqueville's 1831 America. Retrieved August 5, 2015, from <http://www.theglobalist.com/individualism-and-civility-2012-reflections-on-de-tocquevilles-1831-america/>
- Gunter, M. (2004). *Building the next ark: How NGOs work to protect biodiversity*. Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Press.
- Hall, P. (2013). Philanthropy and the Social Enterprise Spectrum. In *Social Entrepreneurship: How Business Can Transform Society* (pp. 23-69). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger/ABC-Clio.
- Hamilton, A. (1787, November 14). The Federalist Papers No. 6. Retrieved May 27, 2015.
- Hansen, M., & Birkinshaw, J. (2012). The Innovation Value Chain. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <https://hbr.org/2007/06/the-innovation-value-chain>
- Hawken, P. (2007, June 8). *The Great New Transformation*. Lecture presented in The Long Now Foundation, San Francisco, CA.

- Henton, D., Melville, J., & Walesh, K. (2004). *Civic revolutionaries: Igniting the passion for change in America's communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Herman, R., & Skylar, J. (2010). *The HIP investor: Make bigger profits by building a better world*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley.
- Hobbes, T. (1904). *Leviathan, Or, The Matter, Forme & Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiasticall and Civill*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Horst, C., & Greer, P. (2014). *Entrepreneurship for human flourishing*. Washington D.C.: AEI Press.
- How Kiva Works. (n.d.). Retrieved June 27, 2015, from <http://www.kiva.org/about/how>
- Human Centered Design. (n.d.). Retrieved September 10, 2015, from <http://www.ideo.org/hcd>
- Improving Lives. (n.d.). Retrieved June 28, 2015, from <http://www.toms.com/improving-lives>
- Jacqueline, H. (2006). Negotiating social membership in the contemporary world. *Social Forces*, 85(2), 631-642. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Jill, K. (2014, October 8). The Hilarious Story of How Toms Shoes Got Into Nordstrom. *Inc*.
- Kabeer, N. (2010). Can the MDGs provide a pathway to social justice? The challenge of intersecting inequalities. Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <https://www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/MDGreportwebsiteu2WC.pdf>

- Kanani, R. (2012, February 23). The State and Future of Impact Investing. *Forbes*.
- Keohane, G. (2013). *Social entrepreneurship for the 21st century: Innovation across the nonprofit, private, and public sectors*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Khavul, S. (2010). Microfinance: Creating Opportunities for the Poor? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 58-72. Retrieved June 27, 2015, from [http://www.neeley.tcu.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic\\_Departments/Management/zol003102949p.pdf](http://www.neeley.tcu.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic_Departments/Management/zol003102949p.pdf)
- Khazei, A. (2010). *Big citizenship: How pragmatic idealism can bring out the best in America*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Klein, H. (2006). Tocqueville in Cyberspace: Using the Internet for Citizen Associations. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, 15(4), 123-220. doi:10.1080/019722499128376
- Kolko, J. (2012). *Wicked problems: Problems worth solving : A handbook and call to action*. Austin, TX: Austin Center for Design.
- Korosec, R., & Berman, E. (2006). Municipal Support for Social Entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 448-462. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2001). Internet Paradox Revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 49-74. Retrieved August 5, 2015, from <http://kraut.hciresearch.org/sites/kraut.hciresearch.org/files/articles/kraut02-paradox-revisited-16-20-2.pdf>

- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return Of The Citizen: A Survey Of Recent Work On Citizenship Theory. *Ethics*, 352-381. Retrieved August 5, 2015, from JSTOR.
- Light, P. (2006). Reshaping Social Entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, Fall 2006*. Retrieved June 10, 2015, from [www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/reshaping\\_social\\_entrepreneurship](http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/reshaping_social_entrepreneurship)
- Light, P. (2009). Social Entrepreneurship Revisited. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, Summer 2009*. Retrieved June 10, 2015, from [www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/social\\_entrepreneurship\\_revisited](http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/social_entrepreneurship_revisited)
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital a theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lister, R. (2007). [https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/2524/3/citstudies06\[1\].pdf](https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/2524/3/citstudies06[1].pdf). *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 49-61. Retrieved August 5, 2015, from [https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/2524/3/citstudies06\[1\].pdf](https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/2524/3/citstudies06[1].pdf)
- Liu, E., & Hanauer, N. (2011). *The gardens of democracy: A new American story of citizenship, the economy, and the role of government*. Seattle, WA: Sasquatch Books.
- Llewellyn, K., Cook, S., & Molina, A. (2010). Civic learning: Moving from the apolitical to the socially just. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 791-812. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- Lutz, A. (2015, June 6). How Nike shed its sweatshop image to dominate the shoe industry. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from

- <http://www.businessinsider.com/how-nike-fixed-its-sweatshop-image-2015-6>
- MIT Global Startup Workshop. (2013). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://mitgsw.org/2014/>
- Maciag, M. (2014, October 1). Voter Turnout Plummeting in Local Elections. Retrieved November 27, 2015, from <http://www.governing.com/topics/politics/gov-voter-turnout-municipal-elections.html>
- Madison, J. (1788, February 6). Federalist No 51. Retrieved May 27, 2015.
- Malani, A., & Posner, E. (2007). The Case for For-Profit Charities. *Virginia Law Review*, 93(8), 2017-2067. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Malinsky, E. (2012, December 12). Bill Drayton's Five Trends For Social Entrepreneurs. *Forbes*.
- Mars, M., & Rhoades, G. (2003). Socially Oriented Student Entrepreneurship: A Study of Student Change Agency in the Academic Capitalism Context. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 435-459. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- Martin, M. (2010). Transformative Leaders Wanted. In *The World that Changed The World: How Philanthropy, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship are Transforming the Social Ecosystem* (pp. 279-288). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Martin, R., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition (SSIR). Retrieved February 21, 2014.

- Masters, R. (1982). Is Sociobiology Reactionary? The Political Implications of Inclusive-Fitness Theory. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 57(3), 275-292. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Mayhew, M., Simonoff, J., Baumol, W., Wiesenfeld, B., & Klein, M. (2012). Exploring Innovative Entrepreneurship and Its Ties to Higher Educational Experiences. *Res High Educ Research in Higher Education*, 53, 831-859. doi:DOI 10.1007/s11162-012-9258-3
- McGlone, T., Spain, J., & McGlone, V. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility and the Millennials. *Journal of Education for Business*, 86, 195-200. doi:10.1080/08832323.2010.502912
- Meyers, J. (2010). To benefit the world by whatever means possible: Adolescents' constructed meanings for global citizenship. *British Education Research Journal*, 36, 483-502. doi:10.1080/01411920902989219
- Millennial Cause Study The Millennial Generation: Pro-Social and Empowered to Change the World. (2006). Retrieved September 9, 2015.
- Millennium Summit (6-8 September 2000). (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015.
- Mindry, D. (2001). Nongovernmental Organizations, "Grassroots," and the Politics of Virtue. *Globalization and Gender*, 26(4), 1187-1211. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Moore McBride, A., & Mlyn, E. (2015, February 2). Innovation Alone Won't Fix Social Problems. Retrieved February 2, 2015, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Innovation-Alone-Won-t-Fix/151551/>



- Mycoskie, B. (2010, October 1). *TOMS Shoes*. Lecture presented at South Dakota International Business Conference in Mt. Rushmore National Park, Rapid City, SD.
- Mycoskie, B. (2013, October 26). *Something Bigger Than Us*. Lecture presented at Net Impact 2013 in San Jose Convention Center, San Jose, CA.
- Mycoskie, B. (2011). *Start something that matters*. New York, NY: Spiegel & Grau.
- Naidoo, K. (2010). Rallying for Real Change. In *The World That Changed The World: How Philanthropy, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship Are Transforming the Social Ecosystem*. (pp. 327-340). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Net Impact. (2015). Retrieved December 2, 2015, from <https://netimpact.org/>
- New Evidence: How High Impact Portfolios Can Outperform Traditional Portfolios. (n.d.). Retrieved July 13, 2015, from <http://hipinvestor.com/how-high-impact-portfolios-can-outperform-traditional-portfolios/>
- Nwagbara, U., & Reid, P. (2013). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and management trends: Changing times and changing strategies. *Economic Insights—Trends and Challenges*, 2(2), 12-19. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- O'Connell, B., & Gardner, J. (1999). *Civil society: The underpinnings of American democracy*. Hanover,, NH: University Press of New England.

- O'Connor, C. (2014, August 20). Bain Deal Makes TOMS Shoes Founder Blake Mycoskie A \$300 Million Man. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/clareoconnor/2014/08/20/bain-deal-makes-toms-shoes-founder-blake-mycoskie-a-300-million-man/>
- Obaa Inc - Remote Specialist Care Through Primary Care ... (2015). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://obaahealth.com/>
- Pallotta, D. (2013, March 1). *The way we think about charity is dead wrong*. Lecture presented at TED 2013 in TED Conference, Long Beach, California.
- Parker, W. (1999). Educating World Citizens: Toward Multinational Curriculum Development. *American Education Research Association*, 36(2), 117-145. Retrieved August 12, 2015, from JSTOR.
- Partridge, D. (2011). Activist Capitalism and Supply-Chain Citizenship: Producing Ethical Regimes and Ready-to- Wear Clothes: With CA comment by Bená Burda. *Current Anthropology*, 52(S3), S97-111. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Perlmutter, F., & Cnaan, R. (1995). Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector: The Horns of a Dilemma. *Public Administration Review*, 55(1), 29-36. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Piliavin, J., & Charng, H. (1990). Altruism: A Review Of Recent Theory And Research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27-65.
- Pink, D. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

- Plerhoples, A. (2013). Representing Social Enterprise, Teaching (Sustainable) Corporate Governance. *Clinical Law Review*, 20, 215-265. Retrieved February 14, 2014, from EBSCOhost.
- Plummer, K. (2003). *Intimate citizenship private decisions and public dialogues*. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press.
- Population Distribution by Gender. (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2015, from <http://kff.org/other/state-indicator/distribution-by-gender/>
- Potter Stewart. (n.d.). Retrieved June 10, 2015, from [http://www.oyez.org/justices/potter\\_stewart](http://www.oyez.org/justices/potter_stewart)
- Poulsen, J. (2012, December 7). Children of the Congo who risk their lives to supply our mobile phones. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/blog/congo-child-labour-mobile-minerals>
- Presidian Fall 2014. (2014). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://issuu.com/presidiograd/docs/presidian-fall2014>
- Presidio Graduate School - MBA & MPA San Francisco. (n.d.). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.presidio.edu/>
- Prieto-Carron, M., Lund-Thomsen, P., Chan, A., & Muro, A. (2006). Critical Perspectives on CSR and Development: What We Know, What We Don't Know, and What We Need to Know. *International Affairs*, 82(5), 977-987. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.

- Print, M., & Coleman, D. (2003). Towards Understanding of Social Capital and Citizenship Education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(1), 123-149.  
doi:DOI:10.1080/0305764032000047522
- Pronyk, P., Kim, J., Watts, C., Ndhlovu, L., Phetla, G., Morison, L., & Porter, J. (2007). Understanding the Impact of a Microfinance-Based Intervention on Women's Empowerment and the Reduction of Intimate Partner Violence in South Africa. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(10), 1794-1802.  
doi:10.2105/AJPH.2006.095521
- Pronyk, P., Kim, J., Watts, C., Ndhlovu, L., Phetla, G., Morison, L., & Porter, J. (2007). Understanding the Impact of a Microfinance-Based Intervention on Women's Empowerment and the Reduction of Intimate Partner Violence in South Africa. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(10), 1794-1802.  
doi:10.2105/AJPH.2006.095521
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rimmerman, C. (2011). *The new citizenship unconventional politics, activism, and service* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rushton, P. (2001). Evolution, Altruism and Genetic Similarity Theory. *The Mankind Quarterly*.
- Sandler, M. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship in education: Private ventures for the public good*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Sanyal, P. (2009). From Credit to Collective Action: The Role of Microfinance in Promoting Women's Social Capital and Normative Influence. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 529-550. Retrieved June 27, 2015, from [http://www.soc.cornell.edu/faculty/sanyal/From Credit to Collective Action.pdf](http://www.soc.cornell.edu/faculty/sanyal/From%20Credit%20to%20Collective%20Action.pdf)
- Schudson, M. (2004). Click Here for Democracy: A history and critique of information based model of citizenship. In *Democracy and New Media: Media in Transition* (pp. 49-59). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Schwartz, B. (2012). *Rippling how social entrepreneurs spread innovation throughout the world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shore, W. (2010). *The imaginations of unreasonable men: Inspiration, vision, and purpose in the quest to end malaria*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.
- Smith, S. (2008). The Challenge of Strengthening Nonprofits and Civil Society. *Public Administration Review*, 68(Supplement to Volume 68), S132-S145. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- State by State Legislative Status. (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from <http://www.benefitcorp.net/state-by-state-legislative-status>
- TOMS Shoes & Eyewear Official Store - With Every Pair You ... (2015). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from <http://www.toms.com/>
- Tan, W., Williams, J., & Tan, T. (2005). Defining the 'Social' in 'Social Entrepreneurship': Altruism and Entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(3), 353-365.  
doi:10.1007/s11365-005-2600-x

- Taylor, C., & Gutmann, A. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Thapar, N. (2015). What is Cause Branding? Retrieved September 10, 2015, from <http://www.nidhithapar.com/736/what-is-cause-branding/>
- The Demographics of Social Media Users. (2015, August 19). Retrieved December 2, 2015, from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/19/the-demographics-of-social-media-users/>
- Thornton, P. (1999). The Sociology of Entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 19-46. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Tocqueville, A. (1999). *Democracy In America*. Champaign, Ill.: Project Gutenberg.
- U.S. Population (LIVE). (n.d.). Retrieved November 28, 2015, from <http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/us-population/>
- United Nations Official Document. (2013, October 1). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/68/L.4](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/68/L.4)
- Ute, S., & Uhlaner, L. (2010). Performance-based vs socially supportive culture: A cross-national study of descriptive norms and entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(8), 1347-1364. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Valelly, R. (2000, December 4). Vanishing Voters. *The American Prospect*.
- Vasan, N., & Przybylo, J. (2013). *Do good well: Your guide to leadership, action, and social innovation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, a Wiley Imprint.
- Wartburg College | Waverly, Iowa. (n.d.). Retrieved December 2, 2015, from <http://www.wartburg.edu/>

- Washington, G. (1796). Washington's Farewell Address. Retrieved August 12, 2015, from [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/washing.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp)
- Wellman, B. (2001). Physical Place and Cyberplace: The Rise of Personalized Networking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25(2), 227-252. doi:q
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind Of Citizen? The Politics Of Educating For Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. Retrieved August 5, 2015, from JSTOR.
- What is Cause Branding? (2007, September 21). Retrieved September 11, 2015, from <http://www.conecomm.com/what-is-cause-branding>
- What is a Social Entrepreneur? | Ashoka - Innovators for the ... (n.d.). Retrieved June 24, 2015, from [https://www.ashoka.org/social\\_entrepreneur](https://www.ashoka.org/social_entrepreneur)
- Writing the Methodology - Quantitative Approach. (n.d.). Retrieved September 10, 2015, from [https://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/researchcourse/develop\\_writing\\_method\\_quantitative.html](https://www.bcps.org/offices/lis/researchcourse/develop_writing_method_quantitative.html)
- Yashar, D. (2002). Globalization and Collective Action. *Comparative Politics*, 34(3), 355-375. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from JSTOR.
- Yunus, M., & Weber, K. (2010). *Building social business: The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. (2006). *A new engagement? political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix 1

### Social Entrepreneurship study group standardized e-mail invitation.

You are sincerely invited to participate in an academic survey measuring citizenship attitudes among social entrepreneurs. This anonymous survey can be completed entirely online and will take about 10-15 minutes. The data collected from this survey will help to fulfill the requirements for a Doctor of Arts in Political Science degree for myself, Kacee A. Garner. Your time, attention and assistance is greatly appreciated. If you have colleagues or students who are also studying or teaching social entrepreneurship, please feel free to forward this request on to them. This survey has been reviewed and approved by the Idaho State University Human Subjects Committee.

Please click on the following link to review the informed consent form and survey.

<http://goo.gl/forms/BX1Y034sxs>

Thank you!  
Kacee A. Garner

### Control group standardized email invitation.

You are sincerely invited to participate in an academic survey measuring citizenship attitudes. This anonymous survey can be completed entirely online and will take about 10-15 minutes. The data collected from this survey will help to fulfill the requirements for a Doctor of Arts in Political Science degree for myself, Kacee A. Garner. Your time, attention and assistance is greatly appreciated. If you have colleagues or students who are also studying or teaching social entrepreneurship, please feel free to forward this request on to them. This survey has been reviewed and approved by the Idaho State University Human Subjects Committee. Please click on the following link to review the informed consent form and survey.

<http://goo.gl/forms/33Gc89Co1u>

Thank you!  
Kacee A. Garner



## Appendix 2

### Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative certifications.

#### **COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)**

##### **COURSEWORK REQUIREMENTS REPORT\***

\* NOTE: Scores on this Requirements Report reflect quiz completions at the time all requirements for the course were met. See list below for details. See separate Transcript Report for more recent quiz scores, including those on optional (supplemental) course elements.

- **Name:** Kacey Garner (ID: 4841469)
- **Email:** gankace@isu.edu
- **Institution Affiliation:** Idaho State University (ID: 1264)
- **Institution Unit:** Political Science
- **Phone:** 208-406-9394
  
- **Curriculum Group:** Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research
- **Course Learner Group:** Same as Curriculum Group
- **Stage:** Stage 1 - RCR
- **Description:** This course is for investigators, staff and students with an interest or focus in **Social and Behavioral** research. This course contains text, embedded case studies AND quizzes.
  
- **Report ID:** 16085573
- **Completion Date:** 05/20/2015
- **Expiration Date:** N/A
- **Minimum Passing:** 80
- **Reported Score\*:** 100

REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE MODULES ONLY	DATE COMPLETED	SCORE
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Course Introduction (ID:1522)	05/20/15	No Quiz
Research Misconduct (RCR-Basic) (ID:16604)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Data Management (RCR-Basic) (ID:16600)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Authorship (RCR-Basic) (ID:16597)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Peer Review (RCR-Basic) (ID:16603)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Mentoring (RCR-Basic) (ID:16602)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Using Animal Subjects in Research (RCR-Basic) (ID:13301)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest (RCR-Basic) (ID:16599)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Collaborative Research (RCR-Basic) (ID:16598)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Research Involving Human Subjects (RCR-Basic) (ID:13566)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Course Conclusion (ID:1043)	05/20/15	No Quiz

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

**CITI Program**  
Email: [citisupport@miami.edu](mailto:citisupport@miami.edu)  
Phone: 305-243-7970  
Web: <https://www.citiprogram.org>

## COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)

### COURSEWORK TRANSCRIPT REPORT\*\*

\*\* NOTE: Scores on this Transcript Report reflect the most current quiz completions, including quizzes on optional (supplemental) elements of the course. See list below for details. See separate Requirements Report for the reported scores at the time all requirements for the course were met.

- **Name:** Kacey Garner (ID: 4841469)
- **Email:** gankace@isu.edu
- **Institution Affiliation:** Idaho State University (ID: 1264)
- **Institution Unit:** Political Science
- **Phone:** 208-406-9394
  
- **Curriculum Group:** Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research
- **Course Learner Group:** Same as Curriculum Group
- **Stage:** Stage 1 - RCR
- **Description:** This course is for investigators, staff and students with an interest or focus in **Social and Behavioral** research. This course contains text, embedded case studies AND quizzes.
  
- **Report ID:** 16085573
- **Report Date:** 05/20/2015
- **Current Score\*\*:** 100

#### REQUIRED, ELECTIVE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL MODULES

	MOST RECENT	SCORE
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Course Introduction (ID:1522)	05/20/15	No Quiz
Using Animal Subjects in Research (RCR-Basic) (ID:13301)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Research Involving Human Subjects (RCR-Basic) (ID:13566)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Authorship (RCR-Basic) (ID:16597)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Collaborative Research (RCR-Basic) (ID:16598)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest (RCR-Basic) (ID:16599)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Data Management (RCR-Basic) (ID:16600)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Mentoring (RCR-Basic) (ID:16602)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Peer Review (RCR-Basic) (ID:16603)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Research Misconduct (RCR-Basic) (ID:16604)	05/20/15	5/5 (100%)
Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Course Conclusion (ID:1043)	05/20/15	No Quiz

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing Institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

#### CITI Program

Email: [citisupport@miami.edu](mailto:citisupport@miami.edu)

Phone: 305-243-7970

Web: <https://www.citiprogram.org>

Collaborative Institutional  
Training Initiative  
at the University of Miami

## COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)

### COURSEWORK REQUIREMENTS REPORT\*

\* NOTE: Scores on this Requirements Report reflect quiz completions at the time all requirements for the course were met. See list below for details. See separate Transcript Report for more recent quiz scores, including those on optional (supplemental) course elements.

**Name:** Kacey Garner (ID: 4841469)  
**Email:** garkace@isu.edu  
**Institution Affiliation:** Idaho State University (ID: 1264)  
**Institution Unit:** Political Science  
**Phone:** 208-406-9394  
  
**Curriculum Group:** Basic/Refresher Course - Human Subjects Research  
**Course Learner Group:** Social/Behavioral Research Course  
**Stage:** Stage 1 - Basic Course  
  
**Report ID:** 16085572  
**Completion Date:** 05/27/2015  
**Expiration Date:** 05/25/2020  
**Minimum Passing:** 80  
**Reported Score\*:** 100

REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE MODULES ONLY	DATE COMPLETED	SCORE
Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction (ID:1127)	05/27/15	3/3 (100%)
Students in Research (ID:1321)	05/27/15	10/10 (100%)
History and Ethical Principles - SBE (ID:490)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE (ID:491)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
The Federal Regulations - SBE (ID:502)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Assessing Risk - SBE (ID:503)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Informed Consent - SBE (ID:504)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE (ID:505)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID:506)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research with Children - SBE (ID:507)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID:508)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
International Research - SBE (ID:509)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID:510)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections (ID:14)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees (ID:483)	05/27/15	4/4 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects (ID:488)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Idaho State University (ID:12693)	05/27/15	No Quiz

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

CITI Program  
 Email: [citisupport@miami.edu](mailto:citisupport@miami.edu)  
 Phone: 305-243-7970  
 Web: <https://www.citiprogram.org>

**COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)**  
**COURSEWORK TRANSCRIPT REPORT\*\***

\*\* NOTE: Scores on this Transcript Report reflect the most current quiz completions, including quizzes on optional (supplemental) elements of the course. See list below for details. See separate Requirements Report for the reported scores at the time all requirements for the course were met.

• **Name:** Kacey Gamer (ID: 4841469)  
 • **Email:** gkacey@isu.edu  
 • **Institution Affiliation:** Idaho State University (ID: 1264)  
 • **Institution Unit:** Political Science  
 • **Phone:** 208-406-9394

• **Curriculum Group:** Basic/Refresher Course - Human Subjects Research  
 • **Course Learner Group:** Social/Behavioral Research Course  
 • **Stage:** Stage 1 - Basic Course

• **Report ID:** 16085572  
 • **Report Date:** 05/27/2015  
 • **Current Score\*\*:** 100

REQUIRED, ELECTIVE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL MODULES	MOST RECENT	SCORE
Students in Research (ID:1321)	05/27/15	10/10 (100%)
History and Ethical Principles - SBE (ID:490)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE (ID:491)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction (ID:1127)	05/27/15	3/3 (100%)
The Federal Regulations - SBE (ID:502)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Assessing Risk - SBE (ID:503)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Informed Consent - SBE (ID:504)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE (ID:505)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID:506)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research with Children - SBE (ID:507)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID:508)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
International Research - SBE (ID:509)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID:510)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections (ID:14)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees (ID:483)	05/27/15	4/4 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects (ID:488)	05/27/15	5/5 (100%)
Idaho State University (ID:12693)	05/27/15	No Quiz

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

CITI Program  
 Email: [citisupport@miami.edu](mailto:citisupport@miami.edu)  
 Phone: 305-243-7970  
 Web: <https://www.citi-program.org>

# Social Entrepreneurship and Citizenship

\* Required

## Social Entrepreneurship and Citizenship Survey

Please complete the following questions.

**1. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all politically active and 5 being extremely politically active, how politically active are you personally? \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all active ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely active

**2. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being completely disagree and 5 being completely agree, how much do you agree with the following statement? A person must be politically active to be a "good citizen." \***

1 2 3 4 5

Disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Agree

**3. There are many ways in which citizens choose to participate or take political action. Please mark ALL forms of participation which you have personally done. If you have not done any, mark "I have participated in NONE of these actions." For actions not listed, mark "Other" and briefly describe the action you took. \***

- ☐ Attended a protest, march or demonstration
- ☐ Voted in a local election
- ☐ Voted in a presidential election
- ☐ Signed or started a petition calling for a public policy change at any level
- ☐ Contacted a local government office (e.g. city, county, state) via any technology or face to face
- ☐ Contacted a national government office (e.g. U.S. Congress, President, federal agency) via any technology or face to face
- ☐ Visited a website sponsored by a political candidate, party, or public policy group
- ☐ Displayed swag (button, bumper sticker or t-shirt etc.) advocating a political candidate, party, or public policy.
- ☐ Attended a speech, rally or other event sponsored by a political candidate, campaign or party
- ☐ Posted or shared a message on social media advocating a public policy or political candidate
- ☐ Boycotted or specifically purchased a product for political or social reasons
- ☐ Boycotted or specially patronized a store or business for political or social reasons
- ☐ Volunteered for a political candidate or party at any level

- ☐ Contributed money to a political candidate or party at any level
- ☐ Volunteered for a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue
- ☐ Contributed money to a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue
- ☐ I have participated in NONE of these actions
- ☐ Other:

**4. In considering the following list of political actions, which do you think are the MOST IMPORTANT to be a good citizen REGARDLESS OF WHETHER YOU PERSONALLY HAVE DONE THEM. Select THREE. \***

- ☐ Attend a protest, march or demonstration
- ☐ Vote in local elections
- ☐ Vote in presidential elections
- ☐ Sign or start a petition calling for a public policy change at any level
- ☐ Contact a local government office (e.g. city, county, state) via any technology or face to face
- ☐ Contact a national government office (e.g. U.S. Congress, President, federal agency) via any technology or face to face
- ☐ Visit a website sponsored by a political candidate, party, or public policy group
- ☐ Display swag (button, bumper sticker or t-shirt etc.) advocating a political candidate, party, or public policy.
- ☐ Attend a speech, rally or other event sponsored by a political candidate, campaign or party
- ☐ Post or share messages on social media advocating a public policy or political candidate
- ☐ Boycott or specifically purchase products for political or social reasons
- ☐ Boycott or specially patronized stores or businesses for political or social reasons
- ☐ Volunteer for a political candidate or party at any level
- ☐ Contribute money to a political candidate or party at any level
- ☐ Volunteer for a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue
- ☐ Contribute money to a group advocating for or against a public policy or issue

**5. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you on American POLITICAL PROCESSES (e.g. elections, branches of government, how a bill becomes a law etc.) \***

1   2   3   4   5

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

**6. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of POLITICAL PROCESSES? Select ONE. \***

- ☐ High school course(s)
- ☐ College course(s)
- ☐ Parents or relatives
- ☐ Personal reading or study
- ☐ Peers or friends

- ☐ Television or Radio
- ☐ Internet including social media
- ☐ Other:

**7. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about POLITICAL PROCESSES to be a "good citizen?" \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

**8. Political Process Fairness \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes your opinion:

- ☐ Political processes in America are fair and should not be changed
- ☐ Political processes in America are not fair and should be changed

**9. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you about notable PEOPLE in American politics (e.g. local or national office holders, candidates etc.) \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

**10. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of notable POLITICAL PEOPLE? Select ONE. \***

- ☐ High school course(s)
- ☐ College course(s)
- ☐ Parents or relatives
- ☐ Personal reading or study
- ☐ Peers or friends
- ☐ Television or Radio
- ☐ Internet including social media
- ☐ Other:

**11. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about notable POLITICAL PEOPLE to be a "good citizen?" \***

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

## 12. Honesty in Government \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes your opinion:

- ☐ Most people involved in politics or government are honest and look out for the interests of citizens
- ☐ Most people involved in politics or government are dishonest and are looking out for their own interests

## 13. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all knowledgeable and 5 being extremely knowledgeable, how knowledgeable are you about CURRENT ISSUES in American politics \*

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely knowledgeable

## 14. From what source did you primarily gain your knowledge of CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES? Select ONE. \*

- ☐ High school course(s)
- ☐ College course(s)
- ☐ Parents or relatives
- ☐ Personal reading or study
- ☐ Peers or friends
- ☐ Television or Radio
- ☐ Internet including social media
- ☐ Other:

## 15. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for a person to be knowledgeable about CURRENT POLITICAL ISSUES to be a "good citizen?" \*

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely important

## 16. Which political issues are most urgent to you personally right now? Select THREE \*

- ☐ Immigration
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Strong Military
- ☐ Health Care
- ☐ Lower taxes
- ☐ Environment
- ☐ Clean Energy
- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Infrastructure



- ☐ Civil Rights
- ☐ Terrorism Threats
- ☐ Campaign Finance
- ☐ Free Speech
- ☐ Religious Protections
- ☐ Race Relations
- ☐ Right to Privacy
- ☐ Foreign Aid
- ☐ Other:

**17. Which issues do you think are most urgent to a "good citizen"? Select THREE \***

- ☐ Immigration
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Strong Military
- ☐ Health Care
- ☐ Lower taxes
- ☐ Environment
- ☐ Clean Energy
- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Infrastructure
- ☐ Civil Rights
- ☐ Terrorism Threats
- ☐ Campaign Finance
- ☐ Free Speech
- ☐ Religious Protections
- ☐ Race Relations
- ☐ Right to Privacy
- ☐ Foreign Aid
- ☐ Other:

**18. Knowledge of Political Issues \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I generally HAVE adequate political knowledge to form opinions on important political issues
- ☐ I generally DO NOT HAVE adequate knowledge to form opinions on important political issues

**19. Political Opinions Formation \***

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by my own research and conclusions
- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by the opinions of other people I know
- ☐ My opinions on political issues are primarily formed by public figures, celebrities or media

personalities

## 20. Changing Mind on Issues \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Once I form an opinion about a political issue, my mind is made up and rarely changes
- ☐ Once I form an opinion about a political issue, I sometimes change my mind based on new information

## 21. Keeping Watch on Government \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government
- ☐ I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to keep watch on the government

## 22. Understanding Others \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me.
- ☐ I DO NOT HAVE a personal responsibility to understand the thinking of people who disagree with me.

## 23. Government Roles \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I think the role of government is to help people and regulate business
- ☐ I think the role of government is to protect people from terrorism and leave business alone

## 24. Speed Limits \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone
- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD NOT drive 70 mph in a 55 mph zone.

## 25. Paying Taxes \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25.
- ☐ If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I WOULD NOT report undocumented tax deductions in order to get a \$25 refund instead of owing \$25.

## 26. Jury Service \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD serve on a jury even if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job
- ☐ I WOULD NOT serve on a jury if it meant a paycheck reduction for lost hours at my job

## 27. Military Service \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I WOULD join the military to fight for my country
- ☐ Imagine a hostile has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I WOULD NOT join the military to fight for my country

### 28. War Declaration \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I would publicly SUPPORT the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight.
- ☐ Imagine a hostile nation has dropped a bomb on an American city. If the United States declared war on that nation today, I would publicly OPPOSE the decision of the President and Congress to send troops to fight.

### 29. Reporting a Drug Crime \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age selling an illegal substance, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age selling an illegal substance, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

### 30. Reporting a Theft

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age shoplifting t-shirt, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age shoplifting t-shirt, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

### 31. Reporting a Vandalism \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ If I saw someone my age vandalizing a school building, I WOULD report it to authorities.
- ☐ If I saw someone my age vandalizing a school building, I WOULD NOT report it to authorities.

### 32. Taxes-Domestic

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem (e.g alleviating poverty, improving the environment, reducing sickness) IN MY COUNTRY. (Ex. If you currently owed \$100 a year in federal taxes, you would be willing to pay \$105).
- ☐ I WOULD NOT be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN MY COUNTRY.

### 33. Taxes-International \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT be willing to pay 5% higher taxes to address a specific social problem IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.

### 34. Shopping-Domestic \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN MY COUNTRY. (Ex. An item that cost \$10 at another store would cost \$11).
- ☐ I WOULD NOT shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN MY COUNTRY.

### 35. Shopping-International \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT shop at a store with 10% higher prices than a competitor if I knew the extra money went to help poor people IN OTHER COUNTRIES around the world.

### 36. Volunteer \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT join a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.

### 37. Donate \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD donate money to a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT donate money to a volunteer organization with the primary goal of addressing a social problem.

### 38. Role of Business \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I believe the first responsibility of a business is to increase revenues for its owners and shareholders
- ☐ I believe that the first responsibility of a business is to improve people's lives.

### 39. Business Profits \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I believe that a business's owners and shareholders have earned 100% of its profits.
- ☐ I believe that a portion of a business's profits should be directed toward charitable efforts.

### 40. Business-Environment \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.

#### 41. Consumer-Environment \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory in another country that was polluting the environment.

#### 42. Business-Workers \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT take a high-paying job at a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.

#### 43. Consumer-Workers \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.
- ☐ I WOULD NOT purchase a product from a company if I knew it had a factory where workers were in danger or underpaid.

#### 44. Entrepreneurship-NGO \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you

- ☐ I WOULD prefer to start a non-governmental organization or non-profit to help people even if it meant making less money than I would starting a for-profit business.
- ☐ I WOULD prefer to start a for-profit business where I would make more money as opposed to a non-governmental organization or a non-profit.

#### 45. Global Economy \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you.

- ☐ I believe the current global economy is generally fair for a majority of people and should not be changed.
- ☐ I believe the current global economy is generally unfair for a majority of people and should be changed.

#### 46. Social Problems \*

Select the statement from the following that best describes you.

- ☐ I believe social problems like poverty, pollution, discrimination etc. will always be a part of human life.
- ☐ I believe social problems can be eliminated through technological advances and/or new ways of thinking.

#### 47. With which American political party do you tend to identify? \*

- ☐ Republican

- ☐ Democrat
- ☐ Green
- ☐ Libertarian
- ☐ Other:

**48. Which of the following online resources do you use at least once a week? \***

- ☐ Facebook
- ☐ Twitter
- ☐ Instagram
- ☐ BuzzFeed
- ☐ YikYak
- ☐ Snapchat
- ☐ Pinterest
- ☐ Online news sites (e.g. Slate, New York Times etc.)
- ☐ I use none of these online resources.
- ☐ Other:

**49. Which of the following online resources do you use to learn about or share political news or messages? \***

- ☐ Facebook
- ☐ Twitter
- ☐ Instagram
- ☐ BuzzFeed
- ☐ YikYak
- ☐ Snapchat
- ☐ Pinterest
- ☐ Online news sites (e.g. Slate, New York Times etc.)
- ☐ I use none of these online resources.
- ☐ Other:

**50. What is your age? \***

**51. What is your gender? \***

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ prefer not to say
- ☐ Other:

**52. What is your legal citizenship or country of origin? \***

**53. If you are from the United States, what state do you identify as your home state? (If you are not a US citizen, skip this question)**

**54. What is your race? \***

- ☐ White/caucasian
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Pacific Islander
- ☐ American Indian/Alaska Native
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Other:

**55. Which of the following best describes you?**

- ☐ Undergraduate Student
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☐ Professor/instructor
- ☐ Non-teaching professional
- ☐ Other:

**56. If you marked student or professor in question 55, please share which college or university you attend/are affiliated with. (If you not a current student or professor, skip this question.)**

**57. If you are willing to be contacted by the researcher about this survey to answer any followup questions, please enter your preferred e-mail address in the field below.**

E-mail addresses are optional and are not required to complete the survey. Followup action is not guaranteed. E-mail addresses will remain private and will be used for the sole purpose of a potential survey followup. Emails will not be used for any commercial purposes.

« Back

Submit

*Never submit passwords through Google Forms.*