

Sample Abstract #1

Regulatory Environments and NGO Sustainability: The Case of Uganda

This paper asks how restrictive regulatory environments influence presence of U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and how management responses increase or decrease organizational performance in the case of Uganda. In addition, it explores how the adoption of restrictive regulations affects the total number of U.S.-based NGOs in neighboring countries. An upward trend in restrictive legislation aimed at NGOs has been noted as the presence and capacity of NGOs expands (Christensen and Weinstein 2015). In 2015, Uganda introduced legislation allowing the government to blacklist organizations deemed to threaten the security, dignity, or interests of the Ugandan people. NGOs advocating against the elimination of presidential age limits were further targeted in 2017. Such vague and restrictive regulations represent unpredictable environments that encumber NGO performance, yet how management responds may mitigate negative outcomes. Previous scholarship shows that in some cases, organizations adapt to restrictive environments to survive (Appe and Barragán 2015; Tweets 2017; del Valle and Healy 2013) while other findings suggest restrictive regulations lead to fewer NGOs (Dupuy et al. 2014, 2016; Poppe and Wolff 2017). This juxtaposition highlights the importance of context (O'Toole and Meier 2017) while the latter point emphasizes the grave implications for advocacy, service delivery, and government-nonprofit relations in low-capacity states. Consequently, there is an opportunity to test the generalizability findings as well as how and when context matters for organization performance in response to restrictive regulatory environments.

Using an original dataset that includes political, demographic, and economic country measures between 2008 and 2012, this paper expands the dataset to include an NGO Regulation Index modeled after Bloodgood et al. (2014) to conduct an event history of NGO location in Uganda related to the regulatory environment. In addition, it incorporates interviews conducted in Kampala with 23 country directors of U.S.-based NGOs. The Ugandan case allows us to test the theory of context and explore NGO responses empirically before and after the adoption of legislation. For scholars, it serves as an opportunity to comparatively test the generalizability of previous studies and to expand the scope of the literature. For practitioners, it is an opportunity to better understand the context of restrictive legislation and strategies to survive and flourish.

Sample Abstract #2

Inter-sectoral and multi-purpose. Two different kinds of hybridity

Beyond the sphere of academic research, the notion of “hybridity” has reached some popularity in the debate on social enterprises and social entrepreneurship. And it is much in this context that one has moved from an earlier conceptual stage to contributions that move on to procedural and organisational questions (see e.g. Battilana et. al. 2012).

My paper, based on a thoroughly reading of the hybridity debate in the last fifteen years, will however focus on conceptual issues. Its thesis is, that the conceptual debate about hybrids has pushed aside some dimensions of hybridity that could allow for a broader perspective including concerns with

democracy and legitimacy. It will be argued that there are two very different concepts of hybridity that exist separate from each other,

The paper will sketch out these two concepts in its first part. The first one is often seen as the only interpretation of hybridity. Here hybrids represent a kind of inner-organisational intertwining of usually separated institutional logics and organisational fields (see e.g. Brandsen et. Al. 2005; Skelcher / Rathgeb Smith 2014). Besides this concept of 'inter-sectoral' hybridity, however, there is another stream in the debate which has got far less attention. Here hybrids appear as organisational forms that combine distinct purposes, such as service provision and advocacy, mutual help and value change (see e.g. Minkoff 2002; Hasenfeld / Gidron 2005). This kind of 'multi-purpose' hybridity is seen as essential for the vitality of a third sector and of many organisations therein.

Both approaches are pointing in different direction for research and practice. E. g. the attention given to goals and tasks of multi-purpose hybrids such as advocacy and identity-building might be lost sight of once the focus is on better, somehow 'more social', products and services. Nevertheless, both approaches must not be seen as mutually exclusive.

With respect to the question, how 'inter-sectoral' and 'multi-purpose' hybridity might interact, the second part of the paper will suggest a different orientation in research. Rather than relating hybridity above all to kind of rivalling 'eternal' institutional logics, e.g. of 'the state' and 'the market', it recommends looking at the impact of history, contexts and discourses and the different ways in which they have and actually do shape and conceive the intertwining of such sector logics.

Sample Abstract #3

Social Innovation Ecosystems, Living Labs and Public Inquiry: The Case of Florianópolis City in Brazil

The aim of this chapter is to put forward the debate about Social Innovation Ecosystem -SIE and the dynamics of development of the cities, focusing in SIEs as vectors of "collective learning" and social transformation in public arenas (Cefai, 2017). Cities are positioned as the main locus where, in time and space, complex relations can be produced between economic, social, technological and ecological dynamics that accelerate or hinder forms of more sustainable development. In this sense, cities are spaces of multiple "regimes", "configurations" or "public arenas" (Cefai, 2002) in which is possible to build the future. As highlighted by Cefai (2002) and Chateauraynaud (2011), public arenas can be seen as "political laboratories" formed by individual, organizational and institutional actors who commit themselves (or not) to a collective effort to identify and manage public problems.

Therefore, social innovation diffusion and impact in the public arenas of the city is linked with collective and collaborative learning process. Based on a pragmatist approach to social innovation (Andion et al., 2017), we postulate that the collective learning in SIE can be increased by "public inquiry" processes. Such processes, as Zask (2004; 6) highlights, may be able to transform a situation of interdependence into a situation of sharing, being an important vehicle for democratic strengthening. For the author, only public inquiry "that considers the point of view of the publics [...] developed in forms of cooperation and a co-production of research objects and take in account diverse political positions is compatible with the demands of a democratic life ". Public inquiry can thus be an important vector for promoting and disseminating dynamics of social innovations in cities, understood as processes of co-definition and co-

dominium of problematic situations in public arenas (Andion et al, 2017a). The public inquiry perspective, can be inspiring to foster new "living labs" experiences that could be a locus of problematization, publicity and debate, as well as co-construction of solutions to the city's problems.

To illustrate these arguments and materialize the proposed approach, we will describe and analyze an experience that is being put into practice in Florianópolis, through a partnership between professors and researchers from the State University of Santa Catarina and the actors that compose the city's EIS (both organizations that support social innovation, and organization that promotes social innovation). This experience, which articulates teaching, research and extension, consists of the creation and implementation of the Social Innovation Observatory of Florianópolis (OBISF) and the Education Laboratory for Sustainability and Social Innovation (LEdS).

Thus, from the description and analysis of the experience of co-creation and implementation of the OBISF and the LEDs this chapter seeks to explore the perspective and limits of the use of the concept of "public inquiry" as an approach to think and put into practice "living labs". Those laboratories are seen as spaces for reflection and action in a sense to strength democracy and promote sustainability in the context of cities.