**Coming Clean: How a Transnational Social Movement Coalition Shapes National Clean Cookstove and Fuel Markets**

Diana Jue-Rajasingh

University of Michigan

May 11, 2018

I study the effect of a transnational social movement coalition organization on entrepreneurship in an emerging field. The Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC) is a coalition of organizations that operate across countries. In select countries, the GACC operates as a "network weaver" for member organizations that operate there. As a network weaver in a given country, the GACC creates a network of member organizations. This network becomes a mobilizing structure for collective action that promotes entrepreneurial entry into an emerging field. Through acquiring experiential knowledge of being network weaved and engaging in collective action, member organizations in countries with network weaving apply this knowledge to other countries to affect entrepreneurship in those places. The strength of cross-border knowledge transfer depends on cultural and political similarities, and this knowledge can mitigate the effects of countries not possessing other groups or networks that would otherwise promote entrepreneurship in the emerging field.

## INTRODUCTION

In September 2015, world leaders of the United Nations adopted 17 Sustainable Development Goals that aspire to solve social problems of global significance, including health and

education, jobs and economic growth, and poverty alleviation (UN Sustainable Development, 2017). Since there has been an increase in the pragmatic, moral, and cognitive legitimacy for market-based approaches to address social issues (Dart, 2004; McMullen, 2011), the creation of new products, services, and markets is considered a legitimate means to tackle the social problems outlined by the Sustainable Development Goals (Miller et al., 2012). Because these social problems are global in scale and too complex for any single entity to solve, one increasingly popular strategic action is to tackle them through transnational social movement coalitions. Social movement coalitions are formal organizations with memberships composed of other social movement organizations (SMOs), and transnational coalitions consist of member organizations that have a presence in multiple countries (Smith, 1997; Smith, Pagnucco, and Romeril, 1994). Examples of transnational social movement coalitions include the Climate Action Network, which operates as a forum for nongovernmental advocacy organizations to share ideas, strategy, and information on climate change, and the World Social Forum, a transnational coalition of protest groups engaged in mobilizations for global justice (Vicari, 2014). In pursuit of global development goals, transnational social movement coalitions spearhead efforts to establish new markets for products and services that can address social problems.

In this research, I ask: How does a transnational social movement coalition affect entrepreneurship in an emerging field? How do the activities of a transnational social movement coalition explain why entrepreneurial entry is more prevalent in some countries but not in others? I first argue that a transnational social movement coalition organization can proactively create a country-level network among SMOs operating there. This network then serves as a mobilizing structure for collective action that encourages entrepreneurial entry into an emerging field in that country. I then argue that coalition member organizations experientially learn from the process of being drawn into this network and from engaging in collective action through it. SMOs can apply

this knowledge in other countries where the transnational social movement coalition organization is not locally present and not network weaving, thus affecting entrepreneurship in that country. I hypothesize that the application of this knowledge is more effective in countries that are culturally and politically similar to the countries where the member organizations acquire their knowledge. I additionally theorize that experience gained from being drawn into the network and engaging in collective action can mitigate the negative effects of there not being mobilizing structures that would promote entrepreneurship in the emerging field.

I highlight the "network weaving" activities of transnational social movement coalitions. According to Ingram and Torfason (2010: 577), network weaving "consists of encouraging communication, facilitating shared understanding, and providing an institutional framework for maintaining ties" among similar entities, such as countries or, in this study, social movement organizations. Network weaving is a general term that includes both forming a network of member organizations and helping member organizations maintain, organize, and interpret the information related to their interactions (Ingram and Torfason, 2016). I argue that transnational social movement coalitions engage in network weaving for the explicit purpose of creating and maintaining a network of SMOs that can be used to facilitate collective action. Many of the activities associated with social movement coalitions are also functions of network weaving, such as constructing and maintaining a collective identity for member organizations (Cornelissen et al., 2007), articulating high-level plans of action (Moyes and Nash, 2011), and telling stories for growth (Wry, Lounsbury, and Glynn, 2011). Network weaving is especially important in emerging fields, where organizational actors are less likely to form collaboration networks because they may be unaware of each other, may disagree on the field's future direction, or lack the know-how to cooperate with other actors.

This study contributes to research that explores how organizations cause new organizations to emerge. In his seminal 1965 essay, Stinchcombe observes that "certain kinds of organizations are

themselves crucial aspects of the social structure determining the rate of formation of new organizations" (153). For Stinchcombe, organizations like large industrial corporations are themselves "organization-creating mechanisms" that "[give] birth at frequent intervals to new corporate units with new purposes, new social structures, and new markets" (Stinchcombe, 1965: 153). Rao, Morrill, and Zald (2000) argue that the formation of new organizations can be a political project involving collective action, which is a broad range of purposeful behavior that is organized by social movements. Social movement organizations often provide the mobilizing structures that are needed to facilitate collective action. For example, environmental SMOs like the Sierra Club constructed and propagated frameworks, norms, values, and regulatory structures that encouraged entrepreneurs to enter the early wind-energy sector (Sine and Lee, 2009). Though this and similar studies excel at describing the influence of social movements on entrepreneurship in new fields, they leave much space for further inquiry. First, these studies measure the strength of collective action by the number of individual actors within a single SMO. Collective action among organizations, and the ways in which collective action is supported by an umbrella coalition organization, are unaccounted for. Second, these studies take for granted the network of actors that facilitates collective action. Cooperation and collaboration may not readily occur among cross-sector or potentially competing organizations. Third, these studies only examine a movement and an emerging field in a single institutional context. They do not explain how actors can acquire knowledge and apply this knowledge to other settings.

I extend upon prior work by studying the effect of a transnational social movement coalition' on entrepreneurship across national contexts using insights from field theory, network approaches, and the international business literature. The transnational coalition of interest in this research is the Global Alliance for Clean cookstoves (henceforth known as the GACC), which operates in the emerging field of clean cookstoves and fuels. Clean cookstoves and fuels are

technologies that reduce the harmful effects of cooking on open fires, all while addressing 10 of the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. The primary goal of the GACC is the "development of a thriving global clean cookstoves and fuels industry" (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2011). As a transnational coalition, the GACC has over 1,900 member organizations as of April 2018, and these member organizations operate in one, two, or multiple countries. Although the GACC provides resources to organizations at the global level, as a strategy, the transnational coalition has committed to placing more focus on eight specific countries. These countries are where the GACC network weaves. I study the effect of the GACC's network weaving in these countries on the number of new small and medium enterprises that join the coalition from the beginning of 2013 to the end of 2017. The new membership of a small or medium enterprise signals entrepreneurship because it represents the entry of an existing business or the emergence of a new business into an emerging field. I theorize about how member organizations gain experiential knowledge from being network weaved and engaging in collective action. This knowledge can them be applied across national borders, in other national institutional contexts to encourage entrepreneurship. I theorize that cultural and political similarity aids the application of knowledge and that this knowledge can substitute of a lack of appropriate mobilizing structures in an institutional environment.

## CONTEXT: THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR CLEAN COOKSTOVES

The Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves is a public-private partnership hosted by the United Nations Foundation that was created to address the health and environmental issues associated with cooking over open fires with traditional cookstoves and unclean fuels. The World Health Organization estimates that household air pollution from cooking kills over 4.3 million people every year (World Health Organization, 2017). The GACC recognizes that clean, safe, and

affordable cooking solutions exist and that these solutions can drastically reduce harmful smoke and fuel consumption, thereby having significant health and environmental impacts.

The transnational coalition's mission is to "save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions" (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2016b). Note that the means through which the GACC aims to achieve its massive social goals involves the creation of a "thriving global market" for existing clean cookstove and fuel solutions. This is a marked departure from the charity and foreign aid-based means utilized by earlier initiatives to address global social problems. The following paragraph indicates the ethos behind utilizing market mechanisms to address grand challenges related to indoor air pollution, cooking, and deforestation.

> "The development of a thriving global clean cookstoves and fuels industry that is constantly innovating to improve design and performance, while lowering the cost of cookstoves and fuels, is the most sustainable way to bring modern cooking solutions to hundreds of millions of families in developing countries. While reducing costs for clean cookstoves, designing products that people will buy, addressing cultural preferences, and reaching greater scale in the manufacturing and distribution of clean cookstoves are challenges, success will literally mean life-saving and life-changing improvements in the lives of billions of people." (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2011)

Although there had been earlier efforts to promote clean cookstoves and fuels, these initiatives were operating independently of one another, were developed without an integrated plan or shared prioritization of activities, and were typically dependent on donor funding. As a result, the

clean cookstoves and fuels industry lacked legitimacy, could not attract sufficient investment for private sector development, and could not affect the broader environment to encourage entrepreneurial entry into the emerging field. The few clean cookstove companies that did exist struggled to achieve profitability and growth. To encourage the growth of clean cookstoves and fuels markets around the world, the GACC established "three strategic pillars of engagement" that focused on enhancing demand, strengthening supply, and fostering an enabling environment (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2011). Enhancing demand included "understanding and motivating potential users, developing better technologies, and providing consumer finance." Strengthening supply involved "creating innovative distribution models to reach a wide variety of consumers, attracting more finance and investment, increasing access to carbon finance, enhancing market intelligence and creating inclusive value-chains." Finally, fostering an enabling environment meant "engaging national and local stakeholders, building the evidence base for the benefits of clean stoves and fuels, promoting international standards and rigorous testing protocols, enhancing monitoring and evaluation, and championing the sector" (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2013).

These descriptions of the GACC's activities indicate that the transnational coalition works at both the international and national levels. The GACC's headquarters in Washington D.C. spearheads the global-level efforts, such as mobilizing resources for investment and research, setting international technology standards, and garnering support from institutions like the World Health Organization and the Environmental Protection Agency. However, although the transnational coalition's activities began at the international level, the GACC has become increasingly focused on engagement at the national level. At the national level, collective efforts to encourage the growth of clean cookstoves and fuels markets are deployed through the GACC's network of public, private, and non-profit member organizations. The emerging field is continuously experiencing new entries,

either through the diversification of existing organizations or the emergence of new organizations that specifically address the issue of clean cooking. For its member organizations, the GACC offers the strength of a coalition to undertake what no single organization can accomplish alone, such as championing for the sector at the national and international levels, promoting national and international technology standards, and brokering partnerships between international funders, non-profit organizations, and small startups.

Although its member organizations implement activities, the GACC has chosen eight "focus countries" for "deeper in-country engagement," or network weaving. These eight countries are Bangladesh, China, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda. In these countries, the GACC network weaves through the local presence of a Market Manager who oversees member organizations' in-country efforts. The Market Manager's responsibilities include the following: convening the partner organizations that are working in the country, working with member organizations to create a Country Action Plan for the clean cookstoves and fuel sector, acting as a clearinghouse for information that comes from the Washington D.C. headquarters, and ensuring that member organizations' implementation of agreed upon activities is on track. In non-focus countries, the GACC does not have a local presence in the form of a Market Manager, even though the transnational coalition may still transfer knowledge from countries where it network weaves to countries where it does not network weave through regional workshops, online platforms that are accessible by all members, and the creation and dissemination of best practices and toolkits (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2014).

When the GACC network weaves in a country, it engages in different activities. The Market Manager may enable organizations to coordinate activities that make consumers aware of clean cookstoves, support cookstove producers through financial and technical support, and organize an effort to advocate the national government for policies that support the growth of the national clean

cookstove industry. The following are examples of interventions that describe the GACC's network weaving efforts.

**The Household Energy Platform in Bangladesh**

The Household Energy Platform is Bangladesh's clean cookstove sector coordinator, and it has the primary objective of achieving the nation's clean cookstove adoption goals. In Bangladesh's Country Action Plan, the GACC and the Sustainable and Renewable Energy Development Authority (SREDA) designed the Household Energy Platform to disseminate information and bring together a number of key stakeholders from the clean cookstove industry. The HEP annually hosts four meetings consisting of a minimum of 20 GACC member organizations, and it collaborates with major national and international organizations like the World Bank. Although the GACC initially provided support for the Household Energy Platform, SREDA soon became the organization's primary controller. Currently, the Household Energy Platform serves the nation as a vital tool in encouraging engagement and interaction among previously isolated member organizations. Functioning under the guiding principles put forth in Bangladesh's Country Action Plan, the Household Energy Platform works nationally much like the GACC works internationally, sharing best practices between member organizations and motivating both public and private organizations to work together toward the common goal of disseminating 30 million cookstoves by 2030. The Household Energy Platform also supports the formation of sub-committees that organize members into particular areas, such as testing and standards, demand creation, fuel, and policy advocacy. The Household Energy Platform's close link to Bangaldesh's national government allows it to request country-level support.

**Obaatan Boafo in Ghana**

One of the primary goals of the GACC is to enhance demand for cookstoves. For this reason, the GACC, in partnership with the Ghana Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GhACCO), began a three-month long campaign in Ghana in 2016. The campaign, named Obaatan Boafo, or "Mother's Helper" in the local language, was developed by the GACC in an attempt to appeal to local women, as research indicated that, "women are seen as 'in charge' when it comes to the kitchen," in Ghana. The Obaatan Boafo consisted of three primary components: women's advocacy, market activation, and radio awareness. Obaatan Boafo enabled Ghanaian key stakeholders and member organizations to work together for the initial launch event. These stakeholders included the Energy Commission, Ministry of Power, developmental partners SNV (a development organization based in the Netherlands), KfW (the German government-owned development bank), local cookstove manufacturers and importers, and the Women's Advocacy Network. The Women's Advocacy Network, for example, participated in door-to-door activation to encourage family and friends to the market event, where the clean cookstove manufacturers demonstrated in sold clean cookstoves. As Obaatan Boafo continued, radio advertisements were placed on 10 local station and played for three months, further encouraging potential consumers to the attend the 11 market events in Accra and Kumasi.

## NETWORK-WEAVING COALITIONS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Interorganizational networks are important to consider when thinking about entrepreneurship in emerging fields. Organizational actors are influenced by the social contexts in which they are embedded (Granovetter, 1985). Through interorganizational networks, organizations receive information that can lead to strategic decision making (Haunschild, 1993; Gulati, 1998), and cooperation between organizations can lead to innovation (Shan, Walker, and Kogut, 1994) and knowledge spillovers (Owen-Smith and Powell, 2004). Interorganizational networks have been

shown to diffuse specific practices among network members (Davis and Greve, 1997) and provide an opportunity for businesses to meet and "scan" their environments (Useem, 1984). Networks not only directly affect their members but can also transform their broader environments. Established social networks, such as those found in friendship circles, neighborhoods, churches, and social movement organizations, are catalytic to the origin of movements because they can be used to facilitate collective action (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1996). Similarly, small businesses join industry and regional groups, and through these "webs of direct and indirect relationships" (Abrahamson and Fobrun, 1992), they can maintain and alter components in their institutional contexts (Astley and Fombrun, 1983; Hirsch, 1975).

If a social movement coalition wants to encourage entrepreneurs to enter an emerging field, then one strategy is to alter the broader institutional environment through collective action. New businesses suffer from a "liability of newness" and often fail (Stinchcombe, 1965). To survive, organizational structures and activities must align with the "cultural-cognitive belief systems and regulatory and normative structures that prevail in a given organizational community" (Baum and Rao, 2004). When the field itself is emerging, the liability of newness is even more severe because there is no cognitive and sociopolitical legitimacy for the new market (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994). To encourage entrepreneurs' entry into an emerging field, the members of a social movement coalition can act collectively to alter the broader institutional environment so that the entrepreneurial activities would be viewed as favorable. The entry of new organizations due to these favorable conditions, in turn, continues legitimating the market. That is, existing organizations can collectively act as institutional entrepreneurs to "deinstitutionalize existing beliefs, norms, and values embodied in extant social structures and establish new structures that instantiate new beliefs, norms, and values" (Rao, Morrill, and Zald, 2000). The market legitimation process involves regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive work (Scott, 2001), such as using "broad culture codes" to

motivate new entrepreneurs to enter and persist in the emerging market (Weber et al., 2008), constructing and propagating cognitive frameworks, norms and values, and regulatory structures (Hiatt, Sine, and Tolbert, 2009), campaigning to politicize issues that mobilize consumers (Balsiger, 2010), and advocating for legislation that creates a favorable regulatory environment for new businesses (Schneiberg and Bartley, 2001).

Even if there are many actors in an emerging field, it cannot be assumed that they will act collectively to promote the interests of the field. An emerging field is defined as a social space occupied by two or more actors where rules do not yet exist (Fligstein and McAdam, 2011). Actors in the space do not readily act in concert for the promotion of the field because they may not be aware of each other, may only want to promote their interests, may be jockeying for power to set the field's rules, or may not know how to work with each other because they come from different sectors (e.g., public, private, or non-profit). When a skilled social actor (Fligstein, 2001) is able to get actors to become aware of, communicate with, align with, and cooperate with each other over time through the process of network weaving, the collective action as described in the previous paragraph is more likely to occur. As mentioned, network weaving "consists of encouraging communication, facilitating shared understanding, and providing an institutional framework for maintaining ties" among organizations (Ingram and Torfason, 2010)[1]. As a mobilizing structure, the national-level network of social movement organizations that is created through network weaving decreases the cost of collective action (McCarthy and Zald, 1987). Collective action increases the likelihood that entrepreneurs become aware of new market opportunities, believe that such opportunities are

[1] The concept of network weaving is drawn from the work on intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) conducted by Paul Ingram and colleagues (e.g., Ingram, Robinson, and Busch, 2005; Ingram and Torfason, 2010; Torfason and Ingram, 2010; Alcacer and Ingram, 2013). IGOs, such as the International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization, provide network relations for countries that affect national-level outcomes. Torfason and Ingram (2010), for example, find that democracy diffuses through the IGO network and that the influence of democratic countries is stronger than undemocratic countries. Building upon this work, Jandhyala and Phene (2015) argue that membership in an IGO raises the level of innovation within member states and trace this to the way in which IGOs support the development of international ties and partnerships. In this research, I take network weaving down a level, focusing on a coalition organization's network-weaving efforts within countries.

attractive, and enter the emerging field. Therefore, social movement coalitions engage in network weaving to create networks that would be used as mobilizing structures to facilitate collection action, which results in higher levels of entrepreneurship.

I argue that through network weaving, transnational social movement coalition organizations create networks of member organizations (Ingram and Torfason, 2010). These country-level networks serve as mobilizing structures for collective action (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1996), which encourages entrepreneurs to enter an emerging field (Sine and Lee, 2009). In the context of this research, the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves network weaves to create country-level networks of member organizations that engage in collective action. In its first published report, the GACC wrote that "the lack of a cohesive vision for the sector has led to a failure to build the enabling environment necessary to foster a robust market for clean cookstoves," which is a statement that applied to all national contexts. Moreover, the GACC wrote: "in many countries a patchwork of cookstove manufacturers, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders often exists with little coordination among themselves or with the host government. This situation has resulted in missed opportunities and a failure to achieve the economies of scale that come with a more cohesive and strategic approach" (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2011). Prior to the GACC's presence in a country, organizational actors within the clean cookstoves and fuels field were operating without regard of each other, assuming that they were aware of other actors. For example, cookstove distributors attempted to sell stoves without considering the production rates suppliers. Donors provided capacity building for manufacturers without considering whether customers were buying these products.

When the GACC enters a country, it conducts an assessment of the organizations already working there. Then, the GACC convenes the country's existing stakeholders at an in-person meeting. The act of bringing together people who are working in the same field but have not yet met

or communicated is useful for all actors to become aware of who is operating in the field, what is occurring in the field, and what the potential tensions may be among existing actors. The Market Manager facilitates the meeting and provides input based on information garnered from the GACC's headquarters. The outcome of this initial stakeholder meeting is a document called the Country Action Plan (CAP). The CAP identifies three to four main problem areas and strategies that member organizations have agreed upon. CAPs provide guidance to the GACC, member organizations, and potential cookstove donors and investors who want to channel funds into the country for clean cooking purposes. CAPs also aid the coordination of tasks that no single organization would risk working on independently, such as lobbying for policies like favorable tax treatment and the removal of subsidies for competing fuels and products. After bringing together the different partner organizations, the Market Manager's job is to see that the member organizations are implementing activities as outlined by the CAP and to continue acting as a clearinghouse of information (e.g., new research findings concerning public health and gender outcomes) and convener for member organizations. By network weaving, the GACC creates a local network that enables guided collective action that alters the broader institutional environment and encourages entrepreneurial entry into the emerging clean cookstoves and fuels field. The number of organizations in a field affects the emergence of new organizations in the field (Hannan and Freeman, 1989); I argue that network weaving provides a positive moderator to this main effect.

*Hypothesis 1: In a country where there is network weaving, the effect of the number of existing field organizations on the entry of new small and medium enterprises will be more positive.*

## ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

In the international business literature, it is widely held that a firm's accumulation of experience in a new host country or a similar country enables it to withstand the risk and uncertainty of investing and operating in that country. Researchers have examined how specific profiles of experience affect different outcomes related to international expansion. For example, experience in a host country provides information about the national business environment (Luostarinen, 1980) and policy environment, which can lower subsidiary exit rates (Henisz and Delios, 2001). Experience acquired in culturally similar countries affects the longevity of acquisitions in a host country (Barkema, Bell, and Pennings, 1996), and experience gained in a specific industry affects the relationship between a country's public expropriation hazards and a firm's level of subsidiary equity ownership (Delios and Henisz, 2000). Similarly, experience gained in politically hazardous countries affects the relationship of a country's political hazards on rates of foreign direct investment into that country (Delios and Henisz, 2003). Even other foreign firms' experiences of entering into a target industry can affect the survival of a focal firm's foreign direct investment (Shaver, Mitchell, and Yeung, 1997). In short, experience in a country can affect a firm's performance in that country or a different country.

The accumulation of experience is a process of organizational learning (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990), which has its foundation in the behavioral theory of the firm (Cyert and March, 1963). According to theories of organizational learning, distinct types of knowledge (e.g., codified information and tacit know-how) can be transferred both within and between firms (Kogut and Zander, 1992). Moreover, prior learning facilitates the learning and application of new, related knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Organizational learning drives the stages model of internationalization (Johanson and Vahlne, 1977), which argues that firms increase their international involvement in incremental steps, expanding from countries that are closer to home countries in terms of culture and politics to countries that are more distant. As firms spend more

time operating in a country, they gain "experiential knowledge" and skills that can be used to manage the uncertainty present in other countries (Barkema, Bell, and Pennings, 1996).

Multiple literatures highlight the importance of experience acquired through collaborating with other organizations. The strategic alliance literature demonstrates that alliance performance outcomes depend on how well organizations learn to cooperate (Doz, 1996). General collaborative experience from prior joint ventures increases the value creation of a firm's new joint ventures (Anand and Khanna, 2000). Partner-specific experience also matters, as partners develop a set of interorganizational routines that smoothen their interaction patterns over time (Zollo, Reuer, Singh, 2002) and develop trust, which reduces the likelihood of malfeasance (Gulati, 1995). The social movements literature explains that routine exposure to ideologies of collaborating organizations can lead to "frame transformation," in which an organization's ideologies widen to include a broader conception of social problems, their causes, and their solutions (Obach, 2004). Increased collaboration with other social movement organizations is related to a social movement's organization's propensity to both transmit and adopt specific tactics of collective action (Wang and Soule, 2012). The international business literature shows that a firm's domestic joint venture experience can increase the longevity of international joint ventures, indicating that a firm's experience with collaboration at home can affect its collaboration abroad (Barkema et al., 1997).

I argue that social movement organizations acquire experiential knowledge from being network weaved and from engaging in collective action. Both processes are supported, if not initiated, by the transnational social movement coalition. Both processes involve learning information through collaboration (e.g., information, strategies, and tactics) and learning the know-how of collaboration (e.g., how to start and continue working together across sectors). The process of organizational learning from collaboration in this setting differs from those described in the alliance literature because of the interventions of the network-weaving organization. The alliance

literature emphasizes how a firm's dedicated "alliance function," which a distinct organizational unit that is charged with there responsibility to capture prior experience from being in an alliance (Kale, Dyer, and Singh, 2002), greatly affects a firm's alliance learning process (Kale and Singh, 2007). Network-weaving organizations, such as transnational social movement coalitions, play the role of an external alliance function for member organizations. The network-weaving organization's activities affect the process of learning to collaborate, which involves articulation, codification, sharing, and the internalization of collaboration management know-how (Kale and Singh, 2007). In the case of the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, the transnational social movement coalition articulates the shared mission of member organizations to engage a broad number of stakeholders, codifies its efforts and the collective efforts of its member organizations, shares this information and know-how through reports, in-person meetings, and the presence of a Market Manager. These aid with the internalization of information and collaboration management know-how, which SMOs can apply in other countries where the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves does not have a local presence.

Consider the conceptualization of the GACC as a network of two node types (member organizations and countries). Each tie between a member organization and a country indicates that the organization operates there. Two countries can be indirectly tied if an organization works in both locations. I argue that countries without network weaving that have more indirect ties to countries with network weaving will experience increased entrepreneurial entry into the emerging field because the organizations tying them together can transfer knowledge from one country to the other.

*Hypothesis 2: In a country without network weaving, indirect ties to countries with network weaving will increase entrepreneurial entry.*

## CULTURAL AND POLITICAL DISTANCE

Research in international business demonstrates differences between home and host countries affects international investment and expansion (e.g., Siegel, Licht, and Schwartz, 2011). In the stages model of internationalization, firms accumulate different profiles of experiential knowledge from operating in a host country. This knowledge enables them to move into markets of similar cultural and political environments more easily than into markets of very different cultural and political environments (Barkema, Bell, and Pennings, 1996; Delios and Henisz, 2003). If uncertainty about a culture and a policy environment are high in a potential host country, then a firm requires a substantial amount of learning along these dimensions before attempting to invest in it. The applicability of specific types of experience depend, then, on the similarity between where an organization acquires its experiential knowledge and where an organization applies it. For example, Barkema, Bell, and Pennings (1996) demonstrate that cultural distance between a firm's home country and a firm's host country negatively affects the longevity of foreign ventures. This occurs because there are cultural barriers in a host country that experience gained in a distant home country cannot surmount. Firms can, however, eventually surmount these cultural barriers as they experientially learn from their other international investments. Delios and Henisz (2003) show that Japanese manufacturing firms' experience in politically hazardous countries (that is, countries in which policy changes are easy to achieve) positively moderates the negative relationship between a host country's level of political hazards on firms' rates of entry into that country. As with learning about culture, experience acquired in politically hazardous countries most profoundly affects uncertainty reduction when it is gained in settings that are similar to the one that is being considered for investment.

In the case of the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, social movement organizations' experiential knowledge from collaboration in countries with network weaving is likely to be more effective in countries that are similar to countries with network weaving. Cultural differences affect the applicability of the tangible information and tacit know-how learned through interorganizational collaboration. The strategies and tactics that SMOs learn through collective action are differentially effective across cultural contexts. The strategic frames that SMOs use to mobilize collective action to promote clean cooking technologies are culturally-specific and tend to be based on cultural idiosyncrasies in cooking methods. For example, the biomass fuels that Kenyans use for cooking are different from the biomass fuels that Sri Lankans use for cooking. Who traditionally cooks, where traditional cooking occurs, and the types of traditional stoves that are used also differ from country to country, even though some countries may share similarities (e.g., India, Nepal, and Bangladesh). The most effective strategies of collective action to influence households' cooking and purchasing behaviors are therefore likely to differ across national cultures. Moreover, the processes of interorganizational cooperation and collaborate also differ across countries because organizational cultures (and, therefore, the organizational routines that are developed through ongoing interorganizational interactions) vary across countries (Hofstede, 2001). How organizations cooperate in Kenya may differ from how organizations cooperate in Sri Lanka, so experiential knowledge gained in Kenya regarding best practices of collaboration may not be very applicable in Sri Lanka.

Differences in political environments also affect the cross-border applicability of the tangible knowledge and tacit know-how learned through interorganizational collaboration. One role of social movement coalitions is to disseminate a particular analysis of the political environment (Meyer and Whittier, 1994: 290). With a shared analysis of political threats and opportunities, member organizations can determine which tactics of collective action work best to advocate for policy

change or stability that, for example, permits the low-cost importation of clean cookstoves or taxes unclean cooking fuels like kerosene. The most effective strategies to promote advantageous policies likely differ by countries' degree of political hazards. Additionally, the most effective processes of interorganizational collaboration likely differ by countries' degree of political hazards. For example, if policies are particularly volatile to exogenous shocks, then the cooperation agreements between potential competitors must be stronger and more formalized. If cooperation is less formalized in politically hazardous contexts, there is a high likelihood that organizations would not continue to collaborate because they can singlehandedly change policies in ways that solely benefit them. In politically hazardous contexts, organizations may not believe that the benefits of interorganizational collaboration outweigh the costs, since policy changes pushed by a social movement coalition can easily become undone. Different incentives and processes of collaboration are more effective in politically hazardous environments compared to politically stable environments. Hence, the effectiveness of experiential knowledge that is acquired in countries with network weaving on entrepreneurial entry in countries without network weaving is negatively affected by cultural and political distance.

*Hypothesis 3: In a country without network weaving, cultural distance negatively affects the relationship between indirect ties to countries with network weaving and entrepreneurial entry.*

*Hypothesis 4: In a country without network weaving, political distance negatively affects the relationship between indirect ties to countries with network weaving and entrepreneurial entry.*

## NETWORKS, MOBILIZING STRUCTURES, AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Specific types of experiential knowledge can mitigate the effect of specific characteristics of a country's institutional context. For example, Delios and Henisz (2003) demonstrate that experience in politically hazardous environments specifically mitigates the relationship between political hazards and the likelihood of investment in a country. Similarly, experiential knowledge gained from collaborating through being network weaved and engaging in collective action can mitigate the relationship between aspects of an institutional context and entrepreneurship in an emerging field. The entrepreneurship literature emphasizes the role of networks in entrepreneurship (for a review, see Hoang and Antoncic, 2003). For example, interpersonal and interorganizational relationships provide information, advice, and access to resources (Johannisson et al., 1994). Relationships with well-regarded organizations signal high status to potential investors and enable startups to develop legitimacy and have better performance outcomes (Stuart, Hoang, and Hybels, 1999). The trust that undergirds networks enables startups to rely on implicit and open-ended contracts rather than legal enforcement, creating cost advantages (Jones, Hesterly, and Borgatti, 1997). The networks of entrepreneurs predict emergence and potential for success.

In an emerging field, there may not exist networks of organizations from which a potential entrepreneur can learn about market opportunities, garner resources, receive advice, or develop supplier, consumer, or collaborative relationships. As discussed, this may be because actors operating in an emerging field may not know each other or may be jockeying for power. Moreover, in some institutional contexts, there may not exist mobilizing structures that can facilitate collective action to promote the emerging field (McCarthy, 1997). These mobilizing structures may be social movement coalitions or organizations that represent movements related to the emerging field and have a high likelihood of ideological congruence (McCammon and Campbell, 2002). For example, Lighting Africa is a coalition that promotes off-grid energy and lighting solutions in Sub-Saharan Africa. Its network of member organizations generally cares about environmental issues and,

therefore, may also care about the adoption of clean cookstoves. If Lighting Africa is present in countries where the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves is not present, Lighting Africa's network of member organizations can still be utilized as a mobilization structure for collective action that promotes entrepreneurship in the clean cookstoves and fuels sector. For example, cookstoves can be promoted alongside solar home lighting systems during events held by Lighting Africa's member organizations.

If many like-minded mobilizing structures exist in a country, then social movement organizations promoting an emerging field can coopt them to diffuse information, strategies, tactics, and frames without creating a separate network. Hence, the number of ideologically-congruent mobilizing structures in a country would have a positive effect on entrepreneurial entry into the emerging field. On the flip side, a country's dearth of ideologically-congruent mobilizing structures would have a negative effect on entrepreneurial entry into the emerging field. SMOs with experiential collaborative knowledge of being network weaved and engaging in collective action to promote entrepreneurial entry, however, can mitigate this negative effect. These SMOs have learned how to network weave, which creates a mobilizing structure for collective action and an interorganizational network for potential entrepreneurs to utilize. In essence, SMOs with experiential knowledge in network weaving countries become network weavers in other countries, creating effective networks where there are none.

*Hypothesis 5: In a country without network weaving, indirect ties to countries with network weavings mitigates the negative relationship between a lack of relevant mobilizing structures and entrepreneurial entry.*

## PRELIMINARY DATA AND ANALYSIS

## Data

The primary dataset for this study is the publicly available GACC online partner directory, which as of April 2018 contained over 1,900 distinct organizations. This directory includes information such as: organization name, country where the organization is based, country or countries where the organization is operating, organization type (e.g., carbon asset/project developer, consultant, foundation, government, investor, multilateral organization, national or multinational enterprise, non-governmental organization, research, and small or medium enterprise), and website. Using R, I scraped this member organization directory and, using 60 webpages announcing new coalition members, I determined in which years organizations joined the GACC. I created country-organization observations based on where organizations operate, and I used these observations to create country-year counts of organizations from 2013 to 2017. I then culled the dataset to include only countries in which over 5 percent of its population uses solid fuels with information from the GACC (Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, 2016a) and/or the United Nations Development Programme considered its 2010 human development level as medium or lower based on GDP per capita (UN Development Programme, 2014). The final dataset, prior to adding any covariates that may contain missing data, had 600 country-year observations.

## Variables

### *Dependent Variable*

The *number of entrepreneurial entries* in a country in $year_t$ is my dependent variable. From the GACC directory, I counted the number of organizations that listed themselves as a Small of Medium Enterprise in the GACC directory. Using data on when they joined the GACC (which is interpreted as when they begin entrepreneurial activities in the clean cookstoves and fuels industry,

as they may be de novo companies or existing companies that diversify into the industry), I determine how many entrepreneurial entries occurred each year between 2013 and 2017 for each country.

*Independent and Moderator Variables*

For Hypothesis 1, my independent variable is *total number of organizations* in a country in $year_{t-1}$. This is simply counted as the number of GACC member organizations that list the country of interest as a country that they operate in. My moderating variable is a dummy variable taking on 0 or 1 that indicates if the country has a *network weaver* in $year_{t-1}$. This is defined by the GACC, which chose Bangladesh, China, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda as "focus countries." These are the countries in which the GACC has a local presence and engages in network weaving activities.

For Hypothesis 2, my independent variable is the *total number of indirect ties* to countries where there is a network weaver in $year_{t-1}$. Indirect ties to countries where there is a network weaver are calculated as the sum of the number of ties to countries with a network weaver that a country without a network weaver has across all organizations working in the country without a network weaver. For example, if a country without a network weaver is served by a member organization that serves four countries with a network weaver, four is added to the number of indirect ties possessed by the country without a network weaver. I choose not to only count experience in the immediately prior year and not accumulated experience because the emerging field is changing quickly. Only the most recent experiential knowledge may be applicable in other contexts.

For Hypothesis 3, I include a moderator variable for the *average culture block distance* between the focal country and indirectly tied countries with network weaving. I use the method following Delios and Henisz (2003) and Barkema, Bell, and Pennings (1996): coding countries into Ronen and

Shenkar's (1985) cultural blocks and then making an ordinal ranking of these blocks in terms of their comparative distance from the focal country. I produce an average of the difference between ordinal rankings based on the number of indirect ties between the focal country and the countries with network weaving.

For Hypothesis 4, I include a moderator variable for the *average political hazard distance* between the focal country and indirectly tied countries with network weaving in $year_{t-1}$. This data is based on the Political Constraint Index (POLCON) Dataset, which is available online (The Wharton School, 2018). The most recent data release is 2017, and it includes country-year observations from 2013 to 2016. Since there is not yet data for 2017, I use 2016 data for 2017. Similar to the previous variable, I calculate the average political hazard distance as the weighted average of the difference between POLCON index value of the focal country and the countries with network weaving. The weights are based on the number of indirect ties between the focal country and each country with network weaving.

For Hypothesis 5, my independent variable is the number of *international coalition organizations* in the environmental sector that are operating in the focal country in each year. This data is from the Yearbook of International Organizations.

*Control Variables*

Because there may be competitive population ecology effects that encourage or deter the entry of entrepreneurs into an emerging field, I include as a covariate the *number of companies* in $year_{t-1}$ that are members of the coalition. I also include the quadratic term for this this variable, *number of companies squared* in $year_{t-1}$, to account for an inverse U relationship that may be present. The *number of funders* in $year_{t-1}$ is also included, as entrepreneurs may be more likely to enter if they know that funding is available in their country.

To coordinate activities, organizations require the freedom to assemble. Hence, a country's civil liberties and political rights can affect how effective organizations – especially those that promote a societal cause – will be in a country. Hence, I include measures for a country's civil liberties and political rights, which will be based on data from annual Freedom in the World reports. These reports assess civil liberties (e.g., freedom of assembly) and political rights (e.g., free elections). Like prior research, I include a measure of a country's *civil liberties and political rights* in $year_{t-1}$ (e.g., Tsutsui and Wotipka, 2004; Marquis et al., 2016).

Potential entrepreneurs in a country may learn about the clean cooking sector through other international means that are not the GACC network. Hence, how well a country is integrated with other countries can affect company foundings. I therefore include a country's *globalization index* in $year_{t-1}$, which measures how much a country is exposed to global norms. I use the KOF Index of Globalization (Dreher, 2006; Dreher et al., 2008), which is annually calculated for 208 countries and incorporates how much a country is integrated with other countries.

The effect of a transnational coalition's activities on entrepreneurship is influenced by how much the media covers the efforts of the coalition and its member organizations. Hence, I include a measure for *press freedom in 2013*, which is based on the World Press Freedom Index that is produced by Reporters without Borders (Faccio, 2006). There is no data prior to 2013, which also happens to be in the middle of our period of study. Even though it is a post-treatment measure for some of the country-year observations, I argue that clean cookstove organizations do not affect this measure.

Transparency can also affect the effectiveness of a transnational coalition's activities. Hence, I include a measure for each country's *corruption level* in $year_{t-1}$, which based on Transparency International's annual Corruption Perceptions Index. I additionally include variables indicating levels of national economic development, which includes *gross domestic product per capita* in $year_{t-1}$ (purchasing

power parity in constant 2011 international dollars), *population* in year$_{t-1}$, and *percentage of rural population* in year$_{t-1}$. These data are from the World Bank database.

**Analysis**

For Hypotheses 1 through 5, I run ordinary least squares regressions with panel data of country-year observations. The dependent variable for all hypotheses is the number of entrepreneurial entries in a country in year$_t$. I include time-lagged independent variables and control variables. All models are run with country and year fixed effects.

## PRELIMINARY RESULTS

For the current version of this paper, I have results for Hypothesis 1 and 2, which are listed in Table 1. The hypotheses are generally supported, although for Hypothesis 1, my hypothesis is supported only when I include the control variables. The competitive dynamics among companies in the emerging field of clean cookstoves and fuels significantly affects entrepreneurial entry, and the inverted U can be evidenced in Model 4.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| total number of organizations in year$_{t-1}$ | -0.024 **<br>(0.0081) | 0.205 ***<br>(0.018) | -0.132 ***<br>(0.011) | 0.075 ***<br>(0.022) |
| total number of organizations in year$_{t-1}$ * network weaver | -0.032 **<br>(0.011) | 0.029*<br>(0.01) | | |
| indirect ties in year$_{t-1}$ | | | 0.027 ***<br>(0.003) | 0.031 ***<br>(0.003) |
| number of companies in year$_{t-1}$ | | -0.803 ***<br>(0.062) | | -0.832 ***<br>(0.055) |
| number of companies squared in year$_{t-1}$ | | 0.000<br>(0.000) | | 0.002 ***<br>(0.000) |
| funders in year$_{t-1}$ | | 0.523 *<br>(0.210) | | 0.900 ***<br>(0.193) |
| civil liberties and political rights in year$_{t-1}$ | | 0.429<br>(0.307) | | 0.460<br>(0.279) |
| globalization index in year$_{t-1}$ | | -0.028<br>(0.044) | | -0.055<br>(0.039) |
| corruption level in year$_{t-1}$ | | 0.090<br>(0.048) | | 0.075<br>(0.043) |
| GDP per capita in year$_{t-1}$ | | 0.000<br>(0.000) | | -0.001 ***<br>(0.000) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| population in $year_{t-1}$ | | -0.137 **<br>(0.041) | | -0.063<br>(0.037) |
| percentage of rural population in $year_{t-1}$ | | 0.000<br>(0.000) | | 0.000<br>(0.000) |
| Country fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Year fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 600 | 484 | 600 | 484 |
| $R^2$ | 0.14 | 0.57 | 0.25 | 0.64 |

*** p<0.001; ** p<0.01; * p<0.5

**Table 1: Effects on Entrepreneurial Entry in Yeart**

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, I explain how a transnational social movement can affect entrepreneurial entry into an emerging field through network weaving activities. These network weaving activities create a network of member organizations that can be used as a mobilizing structure for collective action that encourages entrepreneurship. I argue that member organizations experientially learn from the process of being drawn into a country-level network and from engaging in collective action with other coalition members. Social movement organizations can apply this knowledge in other countries where the transnational social movement coalition organization is not locally present and not network weaving, thus affecting entrepreneurship in that country. I hypothesize that the application of this knowledge is more effective in countries that are culturally and politically similar to the countries where the member organizations acquire their knowledge. I additionally theorize that experience gained from being network weaved and engaging in collective action can mitigate the negative effects of there not being mobilizing structures that would otherwise promote entrepreneurship in the emerging field.

This study emphasizes the role of network-weaving organizations and the experience that organizations acquire from being network weaved. I build on the international business literature to demonstrate that collaboration experience through being network weaved and engaging in collective action can also affect entrepreneurial entry in an emerging field. I additionally demonstrate how

network approaches can be applied to study transnational social movements, which will be important to consider as global social movements continue to emerge.

## REFERENCES


Abrahamson, E., & Fombrun, C., J. 1992. Forging the Iron Cage: Interorganizational Networks and the Production of Macro-Culture. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 29(2): 175–194.

Alcacer, J., & Ingram, P. 2013. Spanning the Institutional Abyss: The Intergovernmental Network and the Governance of Foreign Direct Investment. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 118(4): 1055–1098.

Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. 1994. Fools Rush in? The Institutional Context of Industry Creation. ***The Academy of Management Review***, 19(4): 645–670.

Anand, B. N., & Khanna, T. 2000. Do Firms Learn to Create Value? The Case of Alliances. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 21(3): 295–315.

Astley, W. G., & Fombrun, C. J. 1983. Collective Strategy: Social Ecology of Organizational Environments. ***Academy of Management Review***, 8(4): 576–587.

Balsiger, P. 2010. Making Political Consumers: The Tactical Action Repertoire of a Campaign for Clean Clothes. ***Social Movement Studies***, 9(3): 311–329.

Barkema, H. G., Bell, J. H. J., & Pennings, J. M. 1996. Foreign Entry, Cultural Barriers, and Learning. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 17(2): 151–166.

Barkema, H. G., Shenkar, O., Vermeulen, F., & Bell, J. H. J. 1997. Working Abroad, Working with Others: How Firms Learn to Operate International Joint Ventures. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 40(2): 426–442.

Baum, J. A. C., & Rao, H. 2004. Evolutionary dynamics of organizational populations and communities. In M. S. Poole & A. H. V. de Ven (Eds.), ***Handbook of Organizational Change and Innovation***: 212–258. Oxford University Press.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. 1990. Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 35(1): 128–152.

Cornelissen, J. P., Haslam, S. A., & Balmer, J. M. T. 2007. Social Identity, Organizational Identity and Corporate Identity: Towards an Integrated Understanding of Processes, Patternings and Products. ***British Journal of Management***, 18(s1): S1–S16.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. 1963. ***A Behavioral Theory of the Firm***. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dart, R. 2004. The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise. ***Nonprofit Management and Leadership***, 14(4): 411–424.

Davis, G. F., & Greve, H. R. 1997. Corporate Elite Networks and Governance Changes in the 1980s. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 103(1): 1–37.

Delios, A., & Henisz, W. I. 2000. Japanese Firms' Investment Strategies in Emerging Economies. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 43(3): 305–323.

Delios, A., & Henisz, W. J. 2003. Political hazards, experience, and sequential entry strategies: the international expansion of Japanese firms, 1980–1998. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 24(11): 1153–1164.

Doz, Y. L. 1996. The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: Initial conditions or learning processes? ***Strategic Management Journal***, 17(S1): 55–83.

Dreher, A. 2006. Does globalization affect growth? Evidence from a new index of globalization. ***Applied Economics***, 38(10): 1091–1110.

Dreher, A., Gaston, N., & Martens, P. 2008. ***Measuring Globalisation: Gauging Its Consequences***. Springer Science & Business Media.

Faccio, M. 2006. Politically connected firms. ***The American Economic Review***, 96(1): 369–386.

Fligstein, N. 2001. Social Skill and the Theory of Fields. ***Sociological Theory***, 19(2): 105–125.

Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. 2011. Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields. ***Sociological Theory***, 29(1): 1–26.

Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. 2011. ***Igniting Change: A Strategy for Universal Adoption of Clean Cookstoves and Fuels***. Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. http://cleancookstoves.org/binary-data/RESOURCE/file/000/000/272-1.pdf.

Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. 2013. ***Partner Country Toolkit***. Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. http://cleancookstoves.org/resources/205.html.

Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. 2014. ***Market Enabling Roadmap***. Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. http://cleancookstoves.org/about/news/11-20-2014-market-enabling-roadmap-phase-2-2015-2017.html.

Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. 2016a. ***All Countries***. http://cleancookstoves.org/country-profiles/all.html.

Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. 2016b. ***Our Mission***. http://cleancookstoves.org/about/our-mission/.

Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 91(3): 481–510.

Gulati, R. 1995. Social Structure and Alliance Formation Patterns: A Longitudinal Analysis. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 40(4): 619–652.

Gulati, R. 1998. Alliances and Networks. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 19(4): 293–317.

Haunschild, P. R. 1993. Interorganizational Imitation: The Impact of Interlocks on Corporate Acquisition Activity. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 38(4): 564–592.

Henisz, W. J., & Delios, A. 2001. Uncertainty, Imitation, and Plant Location: Japanese Multinational Corporations, 1990-1996. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 46(3): 443–475.

Hiatt, S. R., Sine, W. D., & Tolbert, P. S. 2009. From Pabst to Pepsi: The Deinstitutionalization of Social Practices and the Creation of Entrepreneurial Opportunities. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 54(4): 635–667.

Hirsch, P. M. 1975. Organizational Effectiveness and the Institutional Environment. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 20(3): 327–344.

Hoang, H., & Antoncic, B. 2003. Network-based research in entrepreneurship: A critical review. ***Journal of Business Venturing***, 18(2): 165–187.

Ingram, P., Robinson, J., & Busch, M. L. 2005. The Intergovernmental Network of World Trade: IGO Connectedness, Governance, and Embeddedness. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 111(3): 824–858.

Ingram, P., & Torfason, M. T. 2010. Organizing the in-Between: The Population Dynamics of Network-Weaving Organizations in the Global Interstate Network. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 55(4): 577–605.

Ingram, P., & Torfason, M. T. 2016, August 17. Ingram & Torfason (2010). Organizing in the In-between: The Population Dynamics of Network-Weaving Organizations in the Global Intense Network. ***The ASQ Blog***. https://asqblog.com/2016/08/17/ingram-torfason-2010-organizing-in-the-in-between-the-population-dynamics-of-network-weaving-organizations-in-the-global-intense-network/.

Jandhyala, S., & Phene, A. 2015. The Role of Intergovernmental Organizations in Cross-border Knowledge Transfer and Innovation. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 60(4): 712–743.

Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J. E. 1977. The internationalization process of the firm: a model of knowledge devel opment and increasing foreign market commitments. ***Journal of International Business Studies***, 8(1): 23–32.

Jones, C., Hesterly, W. S., & Borgatti, S. P. 1997. A General Theory of Network Governance: Exchange Conditions and Social Mechanisms. ***Academy of Management Review***, 22(4): 911–945.

Kale, P., Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. 2002. Alliance capability, stock market response, and long-term alliance success: the role of the alliance function. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 23(8): 747–767.

Kale, P., & Singh, H. 2007. Building firm capabilities through learning: the role of the alliance learning process in alliance capability and firm-level alliance success. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 28(10): 981–1000.

Luostarinen, R. 1980. ***Internationalization of the Firm***. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki School of Economics.

Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., & Zhou, Y. 2016. Scrutiny, Norms, and Selective Disclosure: A Global Study of Greenwashing. ***Organization Science***, 27(2): 483–504.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. 1996. ***Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings***. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McCammon, H., & Campbell, K. 2002. Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. ***Mobilization: An International Quarterly***, 7(3): 231–251.

McCarthy, J. D. 1997. The Globalization of Social Movement Theory. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), ***Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State***: 243–259. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. 1987. Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. ***Social movements in an organizational society***: 15–42.

McMullen, J. S. 2011. Delineating the Domain of Development Entrepreneurship: A Market-Based Approach to Facilitating Inclusive Economic Growth. ***Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice***, 35(1): 185–193.

Meyer, D. S., & Whittier, N. 1994. Social Movement Spillover. ***Social Problems***, 41(2): 277–298.

Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. 2012. Venturing for Others with Heart and Head: How Compassion Encourages Social Entrepreneurship. ***Academy of Management Review***, 37(4): 616–640.

Moyes, R., & Nash, T. 2011. ***Global coalitions: An introduction to working in international civil society partnerships***. (A. Reeve-Crook, Ed.). Action on Armed Violence.

Obach, B. 2004. ***Labor and the Environmental Movement: The Quest for Common Ground***. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rao, H., Morrill, C., & Zald, M. N. 2000. Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. ***Research in Organizational Behaviour***, vol. 22: 237–281. Elsevier Science.

Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. 1985. Clustering Countries on Attitudinal Dimensions: A Review and Synthesis. ***The Academy of Management Review***, 10(3): 435–454.

Schneiberg, M., & Bartley, T. 2001. Regulating American Industries: Markets, Politics, and the Institutional Determinants of Fire Insurance Regulation. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 107(1): 101–146.

Scott, W. R. 2001. ***Institutions and Organizations***. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shan, W., Walker, G., & Kogut, B. 1994. Interfirm cooperation and startup innovation in the biotechnology industry. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 15(5): 387–394.

Shaver, J. M., Mitchell, W., & Yeung, B. 1997. The Effect of Own-Firm and Other-Firm Experience on Foreign Direct Investment Survival in the United States, 1987-92. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 18(10): 811–824.

Siegel, J. I., Licht, A. N., & Schwartz, S. H. 2011. Egalitarianism and international investment. ***Journal of Financial Economics***, 102(3): 621–642.

Sine, W. D., & Lee, B. H. 2009. Tilting at Windmills? The Environmental Movement and the Emergence of the U.S. Wind Energy Sector. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 54(1): 123–155.

Smith, J. 1997. Characteristics of the Modern Transnational Social Movement Sector. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), ***Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State***: 42–58. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Smith, J., Pagnucco, R., & Romeril, W. 1994. Transnational social movement organisations in the global political arena. ***Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations***, 5(2): 121–154.

Stinchcombe, A. L. 1965. Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), ***Handbook of Organizations***: 142–193. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Stuart, T. E., Hoang, H., & Hybels, R. C. 1999. Interorganizational Endorsements and the Performance of Entrepreneurial Ventures. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 44(2): 315–349.

The Wharton School. 2018. The Political Constraint Index (POLCON) Dataset. ***Management Department***. https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/faculty/heniszpolcon/polcondataset/.

Torfason, M. T., & Ingram, P. 2010. The Global Rise of Democracy: A Network Account. ***American Sociological Review***, 75(3): 355–377.

Tsutsui, K., & Wotipka, C. M. 2004. Global Civil Society and the International Human Rights Movement: Citizen Participation in Human Rights International Nongovernmental Organizations. ***Social Forces***, 83(2): 587–620.

UN Development Programme. 2014. ***Human Development Reports: GDP per capita (2011 PPP $)***. http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gdp-per-capita-2011-ppp.

UN Sustainable Development. 2017. ***United Nations sustainable development agenda***. http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/.

Useem, M. 1984. ***The Inner Circle: Large Corporations and the Rise of Business Political Activity in the U.S. and U.K.*** New York: Oxford University Press.

Vicari, S. 2014. Networks of Contention: The Shape of Online Transnationalism in Early Twenty-First Century Social Movement Coalitions. ***Social Movement Studies***, 13(1): 92–109.

Wang, D. J., & Soule, S. A. 2012. Social Movement Organizational Collaboration: Networks of Learning and the Diffusion of Protest Tactics, 1960–1995. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 117(6): 1674–1722.

Weber, K., Heinze, K. L., & DeSoucey, M. 2008. Forage for Thought: Mobilizing Codes in the Movement for Grass-fed Meat and Dairy Products. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 53(3): 529–567.

World Health Organization. 2017. Household (Indoor) Air Pollution. ***WHO***. http://www.who.int/indoorair/en/.

Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. 2011. Legitimating Nascent Collective Identities: Coordinating Cultural Entrepreneurship. ***Organization Science***, 22(2): 449–463.

Zollo, M., Reuer, J. J., & Singh, H. 2002. Interorganizational Routines and Performance in Strategic Alliances. ***Organization Science***, 13(6): 701–713.