



Theses and Dissertations

2015-12-01

The Role of Documentary Film in the Emerging Social Entrepreneurial Culture

KaRyn Elizabeth Daley
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Daley, KaRyn Elizabeth, "The Role of Documentary Film in the Emerging Social Entrepreneurial Culture" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5663.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5663>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Role of Documentary Film in the Emerging
Social Entrepreneurial Culture

KaRyn Daley Lay

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Robert I. Wakefield, Chair
Dean Duncan
Steven R. Thomsen

School of Communications
Brigham Young University
December 2015

Copyright © 2015 KaRyn Daley Lay

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Role of Documentary Film in the Emerging Social Entrepreneurial Culture

KaRyn Daley Lay
Department of Communications, BYU
Master of Arts

Considering the current skepticism surrounding the impact and efficacy of nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations, some believe that a unique category of innovator known as the social entrepreneur may be society's best hope for bringing innovative, scalable, and systemic solutions to bear on the world's most intractable problems. Social entrepreneurs, as defined by Ashoka, have a unique set of characteristics that determine not only how they move within the world of social change-making but also how they communicate their ideas and mission to the public.

This exploratory study reviewed how social entrepreneurs currently use documentary film and visual media in their communications strategy and public relations practice, what that tells us about the emerging culture of social entrepreneurs, and whether documentary, as defined by John Grierson, is an appropriate tool for these organizations. The author interviewed three founders, three communications professionals, and three filmmakers associated with social entrepreneurial organizations and observed a course for student filmmakers learning to make documentaries for social entrepreneurs. The findings of this study suggested that social entrepreneurs used documentary film as a communications tool when it aligned with their stated missions and goals but that cost, time, and control were significant barriers to implementation. Additionally, social entrepreneurs in all phases of development exhibited a unique set of cultural characteristics that interacted with the intent, content, and effect of their films in both positive and negative ways. The author also noted three distinct levels of filmmaker involvement with social entrepreneurial organizations that impacted the intent, content, and effect of their respective films. These levels of involvement are described as collaborative, independent, and interdependent.

While the author offers some provocative observations about the role of documentary in social entrepreneurial organizations, this study remains exploratory in nature. She suggests several additional avenues of research that may further the scholarly conversation and continue to shed light on documentary film as communication for and by social entrepreneurs.

Keywords: social entrepreneur, social innovation, NGO, Ashoka, documentary film, documentary content, documentary effect, documentary intent, visual media, public relations, communications, communications strategy, communications tactics, Ashoka, Grierson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have offered their kind assistance to make this thesis a possibility. First, I'd like to thank my long-suffering committee who offered support in unusual academic circumstances, again and again. Dr. Wakefield, Dr. Duncan, and Dr. Thomsen: thank you for your flexibility, kindness, and excellent long-term memory. I have taken your words of encouragement and counsel to heart and will put them to use in future academic and professional pursuits. I also offer my sincere appreciation to Debby Jackson, Claire DeWitt, and Rebecca Ott for their help in navigating the forms and logistics that are inevitably part of such a process.

Thank you to my employer, Deseret Book Company, and the many people there who made sure I had the time, space, and resources to finish this research: Chrislyn Woolston, Laurel Day, Sheri Dew, Jeff Simpson, Macy Robison, Laura Korth and everyone on the TOFW team. I truly couldn't have done it without you and your generous spirit.

Of course, I couldn't have completed this research without the social innovators and talented filmmakers who are working so hard to make a dent in some of the biggest problems of our day. Thank you for taking the time to talk with me about your work and your dreams; it was an honor and I hope this research helps you in some small way to do your work the way you want to. Your work is the inspiration for my work and I am so grateful.

And finally, thank you to my friends and family for the years of support and optimism. Mom, Dad, Krisanne Knudsen, Brooke Pohlman, Jetmira Karanxha, Vauna Davis, Natalie Pickett, and Aliah Hall, you invite me to think deeply about the world around me and I'm grateful for your examples. Of course, I owe the deepest debt of gratitude to my husband Justin and our children, Kai and Keala, for their patience and constant cheerleading. We think big.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Communications models: Prosocial marketing vs. public relations	4
The roots of documentary film and social activism.....	10
In practice: NGOs' current use of documentaries.....	18
A new old wave of change: Social entrepreneurs.....	19
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	23
METHODOLOGY	24
Observation.....	25
In-depth Interviews	28
Sample Selection.....	30
Data Collection	40
Data Analysis.....	42
Establishing Trustworthiness	44
FINDINGS AND RESULTS.....	47
RQ1: How do SE orgs in different stages of development currently use visual media in their communications?	47
Intended Audience Use.....	47
Distribution	53
Barriers to Use	54
RQ2: How do SE organizations differ in their communication needs from traditional models of business and NGOs?	57
RQ3: How does the practical communications culture of SE organizations interact with the intent, content and effects of documentary?	63
SE Character & Documentary.....	64
The Role of the Filmmaker in the SE Organization.....	78
OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION.....	90

Documentary's usefulness to social entrepreneurs is conditional.....	90
Documentary filmmakers bring much more than footage to the table.....	95
Paradox is present	96
LIMITATIONS.....	101
CONCLUSION.....	103
REFERENCES	106
APPENDIX A: Interview Questions.....	111
For social entrepreneurial organization.....	111
For filmmaker	111

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the number of active nonprofits seeking media publicity and donor support has increased exponentially (Clarke & Mount, 2001). Old ideas of marketing and public relations built to service the communication and publicity needs of corporate entities are now lending themselves to new theories of public relations for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and advocacy groups intent on increasing exposure to and public support for important societal issues. The concurrent rise of alternative frameworks for nongovernmental aid organizations defined by the ability to combine large-scale social change with traditional capitalist business models has also made a redefinition of prosocial communication practices necessary (Bornstein & Davis, 2010; Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009). The field is ripe for reinvention and redefinition.

There is plenty of evidence that film, and specifically documentary film, has been perceived by advocacy groups and NGOs as a powerful tool in this new cause-related marketing and public relations practice. Both the Ogoni tribe of Nigeria, a group seeking redress for human rights violations, and the Lost Boys of Sudan, an advocacy group attempting to bring publicity to the plight of child soldiers, used documentaries in the publicity of their causes (Bob, 2005; Mullman, 2008). Many mainstream documentaries, such as *Food, Inc.* use their popularity to introduce a persuasive platform for social causes (Lindenfeld, 2010). This symbiotic relationship makes sense. Within media effects literature, there is evidence that documentary films are perceived by audiences to be more realistic than their fiction film counterparts. This “perceived realism” leads to higher levels of personal involvement in the issue portrayed by the film (Pouliot & Cowen, 2007). Additionally, in a society increasingly primed by television toward emotional decision-making (Deluca & Peebles, 2002), some evidence suggests that

documentaries increase emotional engagement in audiences more than other kinds of film (LaMarre & Landreville, 2009). Engagement and issue involvement are variables that have been shown to act as important mediators in the persuasive power of a message (Bae, 2008; LaMarre & Landreville, 2009). If an issue needs persuasive power to move publics to action, documentary may be the right tool for the job.

Many NGOs and advocacy groups understand these connections intuitively and make use of documentary visual media in their public relations and communications strategies, but there is still relatively little scholarly research on the impacts and implications of that usage (Nisbet & Aufderheide, 2009). Additionally, most of the literature on documentaries and their use in advocacy focuses on the mobilization of community activists and the attainment of political objectives using traditional means of distribution (Whiteman, 2004, 2009; Christensen, 2007; Schiller, 2009; Aguayo, 2013). There is great need to academically study and discuss the use of documentary film by nonpolitical entities in public relations efforts toward other publics such as donors, volunteers, clients and mass media. This discussion becomes even broader when we consider the breadth of the nonpolitical aid organization field.

Within the past few years the international community has become increasingly skeptical of the effectiveness of large non-governmental organizations (NGO) in achieving their missions (Fowler, 2000; Jayasinghe, 2011). This well-documented skepticism has been instrumental in the seemingly meteoric rise of alternative systems and frameworks for international social change embodied in recent years by the term social entrepreneur. Though its interdisciplinary structure makes an unambiguous definition of social entrepreneurship difficult, the contrast to traditional NGO structure is may be identified as “linking the morality and objective of public benefit to characteristics commonly attributed to entrepreneurs in the private sector: vision of a new ‘value-

added', contextual insight, awareness of opportunities, risk-taking, self-confidence, self-motivation, determination and viability, with keen attention to an economic bottom-line” (Fowler, 2000, p 645). Though this framework is far from new, the increasing popularity of the term and positioning as the next best thing in social innovation could mean the introduction of new cultural attitudes that influence the academy's answers to the question, “What does prosocial communication look like?”

The scope of this exploratory study seeks to understand how the additional category of social entrepreneur interacts with documentary film in prosocial public relations and communications strategies. How are social entrepreneurs currently using documentary film in practice and does that use align with their communications goals and organizational mission? Considering what we already know of NGO use of documentary film, is there something new or different about the way social entrepreneurs are implementing it in their work? Are the filmmakers currently involved in making films for social entrepreneurs doing anything differently because of the unique positioning of this group of change-makers? Perhaps most importantly, the purpose of this study is to survey the communications and media landscape of a possibly emerging phenomenon and give the academy a place to begin more scholarly inquiry.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Communications models: Prosocial marketing vs. public relations

For many years, the creation of theory to delineate and shape communications practices for social causes and the organizations that advocate for them has been decidedly cross disciplinary and amorphous. As early as 1971, Kotler and other business marketing scholars were attempting to define what they called the “selling of brotherhood” as “social marketing” or

...the design, implementation, and control of programs calculated to influence the acceptability of social ideas and involving considerations of product planning, pricing, communications and marketing research. (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971, p. 4)

These early theories treated causes and social issues as products and focused communication efforts from the perspective of social advertising (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971; Fox & Kotler, 1980; Rothschild, 1979). We can still see the NGO-communication-as-marketing idea prevalently within the new and emerging literature on cause-related communications. Increasingly, humanitarian NGOs discuss the importance of creating and protecting a “brand” to compete and distinguish themselves in a globally saturated cause-related marketplace.

Cottle and Nolan (2007) argue that this desire to protect brand image and engage in corporate-style marketing negatively affects the NGO’s strategic use of communications by encouraging the employment of a passive “media logic” approach.

This media logic, we argue, proves at once indispensable and inimical to NGO aims and ideas of global humanitarianism. NGOs need the media to bring public attention to humanitarian emergencies to mobilize support for vital assistance, but

in order to attract the media spotlight, they deploy communication strategies which practically detract from their principal remit of humanitarian provisions and symbolically fragment the historically founded ethic of universal humanitarianism. (pp. 863-864)

Cottle and Nolan note that while the media is an imperative ally to the communication of causes to the public, the dysfunctional aspects of accepting media logic, in which NGOs frame their messages to garner media attention by making use of celebrity endorsement and regionalizing news stories, sometimes misses the meat of their cause's message. They argue that this media logic is detrimental to the fundamental design and missions of humanitarian NGOs and detracts from the trust and sincerity of the cause itself.

Media logic...has the capacity to empty out the impulse and message of global humanitarianism and to deny the life and death relationship between media and humanitarian disasters, replacing it with something far too trivial. (Cottle & Nolan, 2007, p. 876)

Cottle and Nolan are not alone in recognizing the inherent problems of treating social causes from a marketing-driven perspective. In an increasingly competitive funding environment, marketing strategies are often employed as a means to give an NGO a financial edge. However, scholars have long noted that the success of an NGO is dependent upon the maintenance of long-term relationships with key stakeholders, namely donors, volunteers, clients, and the media (Pope, Sterrett Isley, & Asamoah-Tutu, 2009). In fact, some studies have shown that the level of trust, satisfaction, commitment, and shared power with an NGO, all empirical measures of the strength of relationships, are predictors of a public's willingness to

donate at different levels (O'Neil, 2006, 2008). If the media logic approach does indeed call into question the sincerity of an organization and by association the validity of its truth claims about a specific issue, potential and current stakeholders may be less likely to donate. Authenticity, then, is of particular concern to maintaining those long term relationships to potential and current stakeholders.

Though most scholars use the terms “marketing” and “public relations” somewhat interchangeably with regard to NGO communications, Cottle and Nolan’s (2007) argument about the ethical inconsistencies inherent in applying marketing constructs to NGOs can be seen in the current scholarly effort to clearly distinguish between the two disciplines. In recent years, more attention has been paid to the way mass communications and public relations fit into ideas of social cause communication and how it is different from social marketing, leading to a new strain of prosocial public relations (Wakefield, Burnett & Van Dusen, 2010). Though the finer points of what constitutes public relations have been widely debated since the phrase was coined by Ed Bernays in the 1920’s, the idea of public relations as a tool to facilitate communication between organizations and publics has remained central. In its normative form, the public relations model assumes a two-way flow of information which is imperative in the maintenance of a relationship between publics and organizations (Grunig & Hunt, 1984). It is this focus on relationships that distinguishes public relations from marketing and requires a new model for how to aid communication and advocacy among NGO’s.

Scholars are now defining and redefining questions of nonprofit communications with regard to audience, NGO type, and media interaction through the lens of public relations (Cottle & Nolan, 2007; Dimitrov, 2007; Wakefield, Burnett & Van Dusen, 2010). Though steeped in concepts of relationship building, literature focusing on prosocial public relations is still in the

nascent stages of theory building. In some cases, the language of social marketing is still present as scholars examine what already exists and what should be in their theory building. For example, Dimitrov's (2007) public relations model for NGO communication highlights the successful communication strategy of the small Australian human rights advocacy group ChilOut. In it Dimitrov recognizes four public relations tactics that increase connection to the issue among publics and increase communication efficacy. Within these four strategies, he discusses branding and framing which are traditional marketing strategies, but he looks at them from the lens of relationship building.

First, Dimitrov (2007) refutes the validity of current NGO marketing practices which brand the organization and suggests that successful campaigns brand the issue or cause instead.

Publics do not like activists; they like causes. Important here is the distinction between 'interest groups' and 'issue groups'. While interest groups, for example unions and business associations, represent the self-interest of their members, issue groups such as environmental and human rights agencies are formed around problems and values- at times even against the self-interest of their members...Businesses brand their own names. Issue groups brand the issue, not the group. (p.137)

Dimitrov appropriates branding as a means of building a relationship with the public by advocating for this traditional marketing tactic to be used to connect publics to the cause. This corroborates Cottle and Nolan's (2007) observation that most NGOs use organizational branding to justify a passive following of media logic and gives further proof that it can be detrimental to NGO public relations success.

Secondly, Dimitrov (2007) notes that successful NGO communication campaigns capitalize on the wealth of what he calls human capital, or skilled volunteers, to carry the message to the media independently of the organization leadership. In the case of ChilOut, volunteers with a background in journalism were able to increase positive media attention to the issue of human rights (Dimitrov, 2007).

The third element of a successful campaign is characterized as “the public relations bonus of non-instrumental integrity” (Dimitrov, 2007, p. 138) or the authentic care advocates show for those for whom they advocate that can naturally lead to publicity. This authenticity and sincerity in action is imperative to the building of trust between an NGO and publics and directly challenges notions of the superior effectiveness of staged media events and succumbing to the precepts of media logic (Cottle & Nolan, 2007; DeLuca & Peeples, 2002).

Despite these seeming departures from a marketing influence, Dimitrov’s (2007) fourth tactic of reframing the issue for relevant publics is decidedly in keeping with social marketing culture of “packaging” the issue in order to appeal to a specific market (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971).

Strategists have to be familiar with the current state of issue preferences. Top national values and issues underpin choices about what is newsworthy...if the issue of concern for the organization has not high priority for the larger public, reframing should take place...ChilOut is a good example of reframing the issue of mandatory detention of “boat people” from the low importance context of human rights to the high priority area of “statutory” child abuse. (Dimitrov, 2007, p.139)

Bob (2005) cites issue reframing as a major element in the success of the embattled Ogoni's campaign for worldwide issue recognition. Specifically, he notes the ability of the Ogoni to reframe a human rights struggle with the ballast of environmental protection as the key to garnering attention and support from overseas NGOs. For Cottle and Nolan (2007) the act of reframing an issue in order to gain media attention is problematic for humanitarian NGO's especially when that reframing is geopolitical and "underplays and marginalizes the active agency of indigenous aid workers (and victims) and thereby symbolically reinforces a highly Westernized and Western-centric view" (p. 871). It is, therefore, not surprising that Bob (2005) also makes mention of the "price" of framing:

Notwithstanding the many benefits it bestowed, NGO intervention came at the price of MOSOPs downplaying its core minority agenda. The association between repression and international activism also suggest the need for caution both by local movements and NGOs. (p. 115)

It is important to note that within the scope of Dimitrov's (2007) work, reframing is the last resort to be employed only if simplifying issues (reinforcing) is not sufficient and the reframing aligns with the ethos of the organizational goals. It is acknowledged as an effective marketing tool, but remains problematic in the transparent, trustworthy world of public relations best practices.

The role of framing in public relations is a complex one that requires more thought. Though not explicitly discussed in the aforementioned literature, framing as a tactic does not belong explicitly to the discipline of marketing. In their content analysis study of framing and public relations research on several research data bases, Lim and Jones (2010) found that of

thirty-nine relevant studies since 1990, 95% looked at ways in which public relations practitioners construct reality in their communications through framing. However, the same study also revealed that the main focuses of these analyses did not include NGO communications (Lim & Jones, 2010). We can conclude that while public relations literature does include framing as a relevant tactic for practitioners, there is little or no discussion of it as a tool in NGO communications.

The roots of documentary film and social activism

To successfully explore the power of documentary in relation to social entrepreneurs, it is first important to understand the ways in which documentary may be naturally suited to the task. However, the notable dearth of communication scholarship on the forms, functions, and impacts of documentaries (Nisbet & Aufderheide, 2009) as well as the lack of information about documentaries in practice with social entrepreneurial (SE) organizations requires a review of the small amount of scholarship on the applications of documentaries in NGOs. NGO practitioners are already using documentary film in myriad ways to mobilize group members, influence government leaders, and attract the media (Bob, 2005; Lindenfeld, 2010; Whiteman, 2003, 2004, 2009). The literature indicates that documentary film may be a natural fit for the communications and public relations efforts of NGOs and advocacy groups for three reasons: *intent, content and effect*.

Intent. Though the definition of a documentary has been highly contested by theorists throughout the decades since its inception, scholars in film generally concede that Grierson's idea of documentary as "the creative treatment of actuality" is one of the most serviceable (Eitzen, 1995; Plantinga, 2005). For Grierson, the intent of documentaries has always been far

from art for art's sake. He argues that documentary filmmakers have a civic duty to attend to in their pursuit of beauty:

The documentary film was conceived and developed as an instrument of public use. It was conceived, moreover, as an instrument to be used systematically in all fields of public instruction and enlightenment. It is true that we hoped that individual artists would have every opportunity within the framework of the public service; but the other half of our socialized or public concept of art was that we could only secure this larger hope by tying our effort to the organized forces of social growth under whatever form they came. (Grierson, 1971, pp.340-341)

Grierson and his contemporaries recognized that art in general and documentaries in particular could only truly be successful in encouraging social change through a connection to “the organized forces of social growth” which he broadly defines as governments, corporations, unions, or “even the Boy Scouts or the Y.M.C.A.” (Grierson, 1971, p. 341). Though NGOs come almost as an afterthought to his target collaborators, Grierson could not have foreseen the rise of the NGO in the latter part of the twentieth century as a major force in the global economy and subsequently in social reform. Regardless, it appears that the mission of documentaries and the mission of NGOs in the broadest sense are aligned.

Documentary and communications scholars have since built upon Grierson's definition and theory of civil duty to form exciting new models of interactive filmmaking with an eye toward advocacy. *The coalition model* as proposed by Whiteman (2004) encourages filmmakers to work with NGOs, advocacy groups, issue groups, and other stakeholders from the beginning

of the filmmaking process to create films with decided political impact. Whiteman (2004) notes that “once produced, organizers and other supportive groups can use a film to create a space within which citizens can encounter, discuss, and decide to act on the issues raised in the film” (p.55). In this way, documentary films become a potent tool in public relations to reach key stakeholders and decision makers associated with NGOs and advocacy groups.

Content. Scholars interested in documentary have understood that the structure and content of the documentary form give it undoubted persuasive possibility. Grierson spoke of documentary as

...capable of direct description, simple analysis and commanding conclusion, and may by its tempo'd and imagistic powers, be made easily persuasive. It lends itself to rhetoric, for no form of description can add nobility to a simple observation as readily as a camera set low, or a sequence cut to a time-beat. But principally, there is this thought that a single say-so can be repeated a thousand times a night to a million eyes, and, over the years, if it is good enough to live, to millions of eyes. That seven-leagued fact opens a new perspective, a new hope, to public persuasion. (J. Grierson as quoted in Hardy, 1979, p.)

Persuasion is therefore inherent in the structure of the art form. To Grierson, the factual narratives and documentation of reality combined with artistic execution found in the technique of film was the key. Recently, scholars have been working to quantify the persuasive elements of documentary and use it as positive evidence that content is well suited to the aims and goals of the NGO communication campaign. As mentioned previously, sincerity and authenticity are highly valued constructs among NGOs who are ever careful to protect the organizational

transparency in efforts to engage key stakeholders (Dimitrov, 2007; Pope, et al., 2009). Rabiger (1998) notes that a well-crafted documentary creates a contract of trust with its audience and subjects which are some of the film's stakeholders. He discusses the documentary *Best Boy* (Wohl, 1979) in this way:

At the higher level is a discourse...that aims not at conditioning or diverting but at sharing something in all its complexity...A film such as this (*Best Boy*) does not set out to sell or convert, but rather to expand one's mind and emotions by drawing us through a series of events fraught with meaning and ambiguity. It invites us to make difficult judgments about motive and responsibility, and it makes us accomplices during an honest, painful quest for goodness and truth. A good film, like a good friend, engages us actively, and never patronizes or manipulates either its subjects or its audience.

(Rabinger, 1998, p. 9)

Rabiger's (1998) understanding of the trust relationship between filmmakers and audience combined with Grierson's hope for public persuasion through the specific visual elements of documentary are not without scientific support. Studies have shown that the visual structure of documentaries which differentiates it from fiction films leads audiences to perceive them as more factual. That perceived factuality may increase the audience's interest in the topic or issue when compared to fictional films (Pouliot & Cowen, 2007). Additional studies conclude that higher perceptions of reality and factuality positively affect issue concern, learning and engagement among publics (LaMarre & Landreville, 2009). Issue concern, learning, and engagement are the building blocks of attitude change. As organizations use documentaries in their advocacy campaigns, the higher levels of perceived realism in representing causes may be a boon to relationship building strategies related to authenticity.

Additionally, as discussed in previous sections of this paper, issue framing has been shown to be a valuable and necessary tool for public relations and marketing of NGOs and advocacy groups. The role of documentaries as a tool in the framing of issues has been ably discussed in two recent studies (Dow, 2004; Schiller; 2009). Schiller (2009) discusses the way activists, filmmakers, and distributors helped to reinforce the message of a documentary that elicits questions about the way the media originally framed the coup d'état in Venezuela and its supposed fully supported resolution to oust Chavez. Schiller (2009) argues that the film, *The Revolution Will Not Be Televised* (Bartley & O'Briain, 2002), already controversial and specific in its counter-framing of the political leanings of the Venezuelan people, was made even more potent in its ability to recast the conflict and create a public awareness of the other side of the story by the active involvement of stakeholders who helped to create context and believability. Dow's (2004) study of the television documentary, *Women's Liberation* (Sanders, 1970), and its impacts as a reframing tool for the women's liberation movement of the 1970's recognizes the rhetorical elements of documentary film structure that made it an effective tool for showing the more moderate side of the movement. Dow (2004) explains the well matched relationship between documentary form and framing:

More than any other aspect of the program, Sanders' overt interpretations and explanations of what the viewer is seeing and hearing signal her embrace of the greater rhetorical license offered by the documentary form, and she uses that license to construct a powerful, yet problematic, analogy between feminism and Black civil rights. (p. 59)

The filmmaker used the function and form of documentary to reframe women's liberation
 "as a natural outgrowth of the questioning of social and political inequality that had

become visible in the 1960's, particularly in connection to the civil rights of African Americans" (Dow, 2004, p.62). It was successful in its great persuasive impact on the more mainstream acceptance of the movement.

A discussion of the persuasive power of documentary film and its perceived authenticity would not be complete without a frank conversation about the role of interpretation inherent to the act of film making. Bill Nichols (2010) reminds us that documentary is more than merely raw evidence with a highly indexical relationship between the image and the thing that image represents. It is a construction or piecing together of evidences or what are sometimes called the "pro-filmic events". According to Nichols, "documentaries marshal evidence and then use it to construct their own perspective or proposal about the world. We expect this process to take place. We are disappointed if it does not" (p. 36). This marshalling and construction occurs within the technical choices of documentary content: How the piece is edited; What lighting is used; Whether there is a narrator and, if so, who that narrator represents. The very act of "crafting" evidence forces us to acknowledge the lack of objectivity in documentary filmmaking that precludes it from ever being a neutral reality.

Nichols (2010) argues that the audience is expecting this subjectivity and, in fact, requires it:

As an audience we expect to be able both to trust the indexical linkage between what we see and what occurred before the camera *and* to assess the poetic or rhetorical transformation of this linkage into a commentary of perspective on the world we occupy. We anticipate an oscillation between the recognition of

historical reality and the recognition of a representation about it. This expectation distinguishes our involvement with documentary from our involvement with other film genres. (p.36)

Rather than implying insincerity or lack of trustworthiness, this unique dual audience involvement with documentary actually renders the genre more powerful as a tool for leading audiences to act and do. The very nature of the crafted documentary content forces the viewer to disregard notions of fantasy and requires them to constantly question the validity of the perspective that is being presented. Nichols (2010) calls this interaction “a discourse of sobriety” which, he argues, is the space in which maieutic learning and subsequent action occurs.

Effect. Beyond quantitative media effects studies examining content, the documentation of successful and effective use of documentary in NGO public relations campaigns is beginning to take shape. The case study of *Yes, In My Backyard* (Huling, 1998), a documentary about the political and social implications of prisons located in rural towns, showed that documentaries can be effectively used to jump start scholarly inquiry and create a community around an unknown issue (Whiteman, 2009). By showing documentaries to targeted groups of people, NGOs have also been able to secure government reallocations of funding toward their respective issues and influence important structural directives among government officials (Whiteman, 2003). In his case study of the Ogoni, Bob (2005) notes that the television documentary, *Heat of the Moment*, about the exploitation of the Ogoni by Shell Oil, was instrumental in activating additional media attention. These very tangible results are some evidence that documentary film can effectively be used to meet the communications and public relations goals of NGOs.

From a media effects perspective, the effectiveness of visual media to elicit emotional response is well documented. A recent experimental study of fictional television violence and real disaster footage showed that subjects in the real disaster condition felt more compassion than those viewing fictional violence. While the study was not conclusive about the effect of the increased compassion on greater giving behavior, it does suggest that exposure to realistic graphic visual representations can have a strong affective result (Popova, 2009). Visual realism like that espoused in documentary, has the potential to make disaster situations more engaging, more intense, and more involving. In media appeals trying to persuade donors to give, involvement is key to successful effect (Bae, 2008; Tsiotsou, 2004).

Some scholars note that lack of context present in visual images of disaster as reported in the media may actually lead to negative affective responses. In her theoretical essay on viewing images of catastrophe, Kaplan (2008) discusses the possibility of empathic responses leading to vicarious trauma and what she calls “empty empathy” or empathy that does not lead to prosocial behavior. She suggests that empty empathy can be triggered when images of suffering are fragmented without any context or background knowledge. In these cases, the viewer focuses on the pain of individuals seen at a distance and who are strange to us eliciting only a short lived feeling of pity. Fragmentation is, in essence, a mechanical problem of photographs that do not help the viewer to identify enough to evoke lasting altruistic empathy that motivates to action.

The concept of empty empathy illuminates how a certain kind of media reporting encourages sentimentality by presenting TV viewers or newspaper readers with a daily barrage of images of individual pain. In this kind of media reporting, spectators are asked to peek in on an individual’s life in war rather than to think about the ethics of the

war, human rights and other related issues. We are encouraged to identify with specific people – to enter their personal lives – and not to go beyond this. (Kaplan, 2008, p.11)

Documentary film, in its normative form, offers relief from this sort of sentimentality and lack of context. Given enough time with the subject, context is established and viewers are given the opportunity to experience empathy that may lead to sustainable behavioral change.

In practice: NGOs' current use of documentaries

In attempting to understand how social entrepreneurial organizations are using documentaries within the framework of public relations theory, it becomes necessary to identify ways in which they are already in use by traditional prosocial organizations. Recent articles indicate that many nonprofits are becoming involved in promoting commercially released documentaries. From funding related publicity campaigns and contributing to a sponsored blog advertised at the end of the film to sharing views on camera and participating in after-screening panels, NGOs used the momentum of a critically acclaimed film, *Waiting for Superman* (Guggenheim, 2010) to increase visibility and issue awareness (Gose, 2009). Other traditional uses of documentaries by NGOs include holding private screenings hosted by an organization or in conjunction with the filmmaker or a third party (Brown, 2010; Whiteman, 2004, 2009) and becoming independent distributors of documentaries that bring attention to related issues (Christensen, 2007; Khorana, 2015).

Within the world of new media, there has been a recent boom in the study of NGOs and their use of social media platforms in concert with their communications strategies and public relations goals, with several authors noting varying degrees of success (McPherson, 2015; Thrall,

Stecula, & Sweet, 2014). However, there is relatively little data about how NGOs are using documentaries to increase public relations on these same social media platforms. Within the academy, it would seem that social media such as Twitter and Facebook seem to have limited application for the distribution of persuasive video content. An older study of how NGOs use Facebook revealed that only 24% of the sampled organizations uploaded video files to their Facebook profiles (Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009). However, this statistic is not particularly indicative of the perceived importance of visual media among NGOs. A survey of transnational NGOs found that websites are seen as the most important new media tool for NGOs, with video as the third most important tool (Seo, Kim, & Yang, 2009). In a comprehensive study of website use by NGOs, Yeon, Choi, and Kiouisis (2005) surveyed current websites of the *Nonprofit Times* top 100 NGOs to discover how NGO websites meet the needs of three specific stakeholders: donors, volunteers, and the media. This analysis did not take into consideration the presence of short documentaries or other visual media on these websites.

The limited scope of scholarly research about NGOs and their use of visual media, specifically documentaries in online campaigns, is not commensurate with the rate of practical employment. As previously discussed, documentaries are a powerful and appropriate persuasive tool for NGOs wishing to increase issue awareness and engagement among key publics. What we don't know is how and if this match extends beyond traditional NGOs to meet the communication needs of social entrepreneur groups.

A new old wave of change: Social entrepreneurs

In 2006, economist Muhammed Yunus won the Nobel Peace Prize for his pioneering work with microcredit (AP, 2006). Yunus' Grameen Bank set the gold standard for social

innovation by combining capitalistic economic principles with social responsibility in an effort to alleviate poverty in rural Bangladesh. His tried and tested formula worked and set the stage for a worldwide interest in what appeared to be a fresh way of looking at social transformation called social entrepreneurship (Auwal & Singhal, 1992).

A single definition of the term “social entrepreneur” is difficult to find partially because it has been appropriated and studied by a wide variety of disciplines each laying claim as the rightful heir to the definition. The term is itself a hybrid of two value laden terms each with different meanings to different groups of people (Zahra, et.al., 2009). However, some common thematic elements make their way into most definitions of social entrepreneurship which give us the basis for a working definition. Scholars agree that social entrepreneurs create systemic change to shift societal perceptions and behaviors, destroying old patterns and establishing society wide transformation (Bornstein, 2007). To some, the title of social entrepreneur can only be used honestly in conjunction with systemic change that also addresses economic sustainability, but other scholars note that “on the whole, most existing definitions imply that social entrepreneurship relates to exploiting opportunities for social change and improvement, rather than traditional profit maximization” (Zahra, et. al., 2009, p. 521).

Considering the breadth of possibilities for defining what a social entrepreneur is, it may be useful to examine what he or she is not. The term cannot be applied to traditional business models that simply use their profits for good. Nor can it be extended to traditional NGO’s because they incorporate a for- profit model in their business plan. Additionally, it is accepted that “individuals and organizations not actively engaged in innovative means of delivering products and services fall outside the field of social entrepreneurship (Zahra, et al., 2009, p. 522).

Social entrepreneurs are different from activists though they may certainly use activism as a tool to influence the creation of systemic change when necessary (Bornstein & Davis, 2010).

Much of this thinking about social entrepreneurship stems from the ideas of economists Jean-Baptiste Say and Joseph A. Schumpeter who characterized entrepreneurship as the creative destruction that motivates economic change to increase the productive capacity of society. Scholars today argue that social entrepreneurs can subsequently be said to do the same for social change by “creating new combinations of people and resources that significantly improve society’s capacity to address problems” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010, p. 1).

Though the language of social entrepreneurship is relatively young and still stirring debate (especially between disciplines), some would argue that the concept has been around since the world began to see imbalance in the scale of wealth and poverty (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). In fact, Bornstein (2007), a leading scholar of social entrepreneurs, cites the work of Florence Nightingale (who revolutionized nursing during the Crimean War in the nineteenth century) as a shining example of social entrepreneurial character. This character, which was first recognized by Bill Drayton in the 1970’s as the defining features of social change-makers, is defined by a high sense of self-efficacy, an inner locus of control, tolerance for uncertainty, high need for autonomy, and drive to action (Bornstein & Davis, 2010).

These social innovators bring their unique skill set to bear on social problems, but they rarely do it completely alone:

Important social change frequently begins with a single entrepreneurial author: one obsessive individual who sees a problem and envisions a new solution, who takes the initiative to act on that vision, who gathers resources and builds organizations to protect

and market the vision, who provides the energy and sustained focus to overcome the inevitable resistance, and who – decade after decade – keeps improving, strengthening, and broadening that vision until what was once a marginal idea has become a new norm. (Bornstein, 2007, p. 3)

Social entrepreneurial groups or organizations become an auxiliary limb to the founder's vision and as suggested by Bornstein (2007) are charged with the task of protecting and marketing the vision. The culture of the organization is shaped by the entrepreneurial spirit of the founder and provides the consistent guiding force for that marketing and communication. If indeed there is a common thread to social entrepreneurial culture, it becomes imperative then to have a clear sense of what that looks like within the social entrepreneurial organization in order to determine the best communications techniques to protect and disseminate that vision.

Though many scholars in various disciplines hint at the importance of communications to the social entrepreneur's task (Bornstein, 2007; Bornstein & Davis, 2010; Auwal & Singhal, 1992), there is currently nothing in the communications literature that addresses this potentially unique subset of social change makers. This naturally led the author to a few basic questions that could begin to shed light on this topic and give the academy a starting point for additional research if warranted. These questions about the intersection of documentary film, public relations and communications strategy, and the culture and work of the social entrepreneur are discussed below.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The literature review has shown that there is increasing attention being paid to the social entrepreneur as a transformative change agent in current society. The presumed role of the social entrepreneur as the innovative answer to bridging the gaps left by government and NGOs means that there are questions that have yet to be asked and hopefully answered through scholarly inquiry. As is the case with so many new and emerging phenomena, academia runs the risk of coming into the field far too late to inform and shape at critical junctions, instead being content to describe the effects after the fact. There is great potential and need to begin exploring the connection between communications and SE organizations offering the opportunity to discover new information that may inform communications practice in a timely way. For the purposes of this thesis, the following questions will begin the scholarly conversation:

RQ1: How do social entrepreneur organizations in different stages of development currently use visual media in their communications?

RQ2: How do social entrepreneur organizations differ in their communication needs from traditional models of business and NGOs?

RQ3: How does the practical communications culture of social entrepreneur organizations interact with the intent, content and effects of documentary?

METHODOLOGY

Considering the current research environment wherein new technologies lend themselves to quick and easy large quantities of numerical data, it might seem that the slower and more subjective textual data developed from qualitative methodologies is a less obvious choice for researchers who seek credence and rigor in their craft (Berg 2009). In fact, many scholarly studies have created models combining qualitative and quantitative techniques to decent effect in order to remedy this imbalanced perception and aid in the validity of their findings (McLaughlin, McLaughlin & Muffo, 2001; McLafferty, Slate, & Onwuegbuzie, 2010). However, the singular ability of qualitative methodology to give depth to questions of the what, why, when, and how of a particular subject makes it a clear choice for research that seeks to satisfy a beginning curiosity in a nascent subject (Berg, 2009).

There are several key reasons that qualitative methodology is the best choice for this particular study. First, the acknowledged lack of information and prior scholarly research connecting the specific cultural elements of social entrepreneurship to communications techniques and tools such as documentaries made the nature of this study exploratory. The inability to rely on extant theory to shape the findings required that these questions be addressed qualitatively rather than quantitatively in order to more fully capture the depth of the social entrepreneurial organizational reality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Second, this study attempts to understand how two distinct groups of people (social entrepreneurs and documentary filmmakers) with distinct cultures, goals, behaviors and practices interact with one another in the pursuit of a common creative endeavor. How these groups create meaning and interpret their individual and collective experience is necessarily colored by the world represented in their current views. Merriam (2014) contends that a defining feature of basic qualitative research is its

interest in discovering the subjective and experiential meaning created and assigned to a particular phenomenon by those who interact with it (pp. 23-24). If meaning is constructed, the qualitative researcher must therefore become alive to the architecture, building blocks, environmental, and external factors that initiate and sustain a subjective reality. This requires time, cultural immersion, and sustained interaction. Qualitative methodology is uniquely poised to give the researcher just that (Berg 2009).

Within the overarching category of qualitative research there are several sub-categorical methodologies that lend themselves to different types of studies including ethnography, grounded theory creation and narrative analysis (Merriam, 2014). Though this study employed elements of many of these sub-categories, the practical and exploratory nature of the research questions warranted a simple interpretive approach to the data. With this in mind, the author used combination of qualitative techniques to gather data and develop a text for analysis including observation and in-depth interviews.

Observation

Observation, according to Berg (2009), allows the researcher to “examine various phenomena as perceived by participants and represent these observations as accounts” (p. 191). It is especially useful when trying to interpret social interactions and expressions between different social groups such as social entrepreneurs and filmmakers. The researcher can describe her experience with a specific culture in order to determine perceived meaning and provide context for understanding the culture from the outside in.

In order to fully explore the research questions of this study, observation was an important tool for deeper understanding. Both social entrepreneurs and documentary filmmakers can be said to exist within separate and unique cultural frameworks that require the presence of specific characteristics and performative social practices for acceptance and entry (Bandinelli & Arvidsson, 2012). Observation provided the author with a better understanding of both cultures and how they interact with one another in the course of research.

Observations were conducted during the winter of 2011 when the author audited a weekly filmmaking class and attended a conference at Brigham Young University focused on the role of social entrepreneurs in current society. The filmmaking class was associated with the Peery Film Fellowship, in which student filmmakers were paired with a social entrepreneurial (SE) organization and given detailed instruction and mentoring on how to make a documentary film for that organization. As an observer, the author attended the class, took extensive field notes, and asked questions directly to teachers, students, and mentors about the process of their filmmaking and the things they were learning. These field notes became text for analysis along with the in-depth interview responses.

Researchers who engage in observation must make a conscious decision about whether to engage covertly or overtly with their subjects. Berg (2009) notes that there are advantages and disadvantages to either approach that will require mitigation. He quotes Denzin (1970) in suggesting that the very presence of a “foreign object” introduced into a situation alters the natural interactions that may or may not have occurred. Triangulation of data in such cases is an absolute requirement for validity, with additional textual sources either corroborating or refuting the “corrupted” data of the observation. Before observation began, the author made the decision to conduct her research overtly in the course for several reasons. First, the nature of the course

curriculum was highly collaborative and participatory with the entire class divided into filmmaking teams based on their expertise and experience as filmmakers. The author had neither the prerequisite expertise nor the time to be a full participant in the filmmaking aspects of the class and it would have created more disruption to the milieu to participate differently. Second, it was unnecessary to the validity or rigor of the research to remain covertly embedded with the class. And finally, it was not detrimental to subject access. As Berg (2009) notes, openness and overt observation can create additional access to subjects when the research context allows for it. Thus, it was clear to the teachers and students in the class that the author was there as an observer. The author was able to speak openly with students about the work they were doing and their thoughts about the class. It also allowed for clarification of processes and course materials with the professors and presented an opportunity to work directly with the director of the Peery Foundation for additional information.

The author also attended a TEDxBYU conference featuring talks by several locally well-known social entrepreneurs. This one day conference also included a film showcase by one of the first Peery Film Fellows who was now creating his own independent films about SE organizations. Merriam (2014) notes that, “observation is a research tool when it is systematic, when it addresses a specific research question, and when it is subject to the checks and balances in producing trustworthy results” (p. 118).

Due to the nature of the conference structure (too dark to write cohesive notes) and the subsequent lack of rigor in the author’s note taking, notes from that conference were not used as textual data. However, one of the benefits of observation is that it gives the researcher a deeper understanding of cultural context and behaviors that can help to influence other elements of the study such as interview questions and text analysis. This is especially valuable in research

involving emerging phenomena (Merriam, 2014). Though it did not yield valid text for analysis, participation and observation of the TEDxBYU conference did provide anecdotal value to the study in terms of access. It became clear during the course of the conference that there is a unique language that belongs to those who associate themselves with the culture of social enterprise and being able to speak within the framework of that culture helps to engender trust from others in the field. This understanding became foundational during the initial process of finding and securing interview subjects, determining the interview questions, and conducting interviews. Additionally, the basic principles of the conference lent themselves to normative understanding of coding constructs during analysis and provided anecdotal triangulation for emerging patterns and concepts.

In-depth Interviews

Interviewing is a common and effective data collection technique for qualitative research as long as it is done well and with purpose. If indeed the heart of basic qualitative research is to explore and discover meaning, interviews (and specifically in-depth interviews) can provide a sizeable text replete with first-person narration of the symbols and constructs that form a particular reality. Interviews allow researchers to gain insight into things that cannot be observed such as feelings, intentions, thoughts and past experiences (Merriam, 2014). Because the research questions of this study inquire about the intersection of culture and practice and because culture is ultimately a creation of perception, it was necessary to conduct interviews with those who are actively engaging with the phenomena: social entrepreneurs and the filmmakers who are making films about them and for them. The sample selection criteria and a more detailed description of the study subjects will be discussed in a later section of this paper.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that structured interviews, or interviews that start with specific, planned questions from researcher to subject, are best used when the researcher already knows what she doesn't know and can formulate concise questions with assumed answers that will meet the scope and interest of the study. A structured interview may also allow for a standardized stimulus to all subjects (assuming they all understand the meaning of each question in the same way) which ideally results in comparable responses from all study participants (Berg, 2009). However, in the spirit of true naturalistic inquiry, the author of this study utilized a semi-standardized interview structure to allow for a focused interview with the flexibility to pursue avenues of discovery rather than plain theory confirmation (Berg, 2009). This freedom to explore beyond the script was imperative in studying the new and emergent field of social entrepreneurs and documentary film where so little is currently documented.

The many pitfalls and limitations to the effective use of interviews in producing valid (or even useable) data required that the author seek proven interview techniques as part of her methodology. Berg (2009) suggests that the act and process of interviewing is performative for both the interviewer and the interviewee. He advocates creative interviewing techniques grounded in a dramaturgical, or symbolic exchange to help “move past the mere words and sentences exchanged during the interview process” (p. 103). This approach required that the researcher create an environment of mutual disclosure during the interview in order to elicit a more authentic response from the subject. In order to make the questions relevant to the subjects, it was necessary to create two distinct interview schedules with questions that pertained specifically to the different audiences (See Appendix A for full interview question schedule).

Sample Selection

One salient criticism of quantitative methodology is its heavy reliance on operationalism, or the belief that it is necessary to discretely define a construct in order to appropriately create measurements. Lincoln & Guba (1985) argue that this reliance on operationalization lacks meaning and is not a satisfying way to look at the world. In fact, “the strict practice of operationalism results in a meaningless splintering of the world” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 27) by allowing the reliance on measuring instruments to take precedence over the possible multi-faceted and nuanced interpretation of data. Berg (2009) takes a more moderate stance, noting that some level of operationalizing may be necessary in qualitative research to offer clarity and focus. Considering the breadth of varying definitions provided by the many disciplines studying social entrepreneurship (and the contention that pervades the field), it seemed not only impossible but also unwise to utilize a standard quantitative operationalized approach to this exploratory study. There were simply too many variations on the theme to choose from. However, Berg’s moderate approach of creating simple parameters in order to focus the scope of the study was helpful in narrowing in on a possible interviewing sample.

For this reason, the author looked to the selection criteria of the Ashoka organization to set parameters for the sample selection. Ashoka, a global organization that supports the work of social entrepreneurs through funding, research, and networking, was founded in 1980 by Bill Drayton, a former management consultant and administrator who is, for all intents and purposes, the father of the social enterprise movement. As mentioned in the review of the literature, it was Drayton who first recognized and codified the characteristics that to some degree define this category of entrepreneurs (Bornstein, 2010). Each year since its founding, Ashoka has elected a

cadre of fellows to its ranks who are chosen through a rigorous and tested application process that evaluates candidates on several important criteria described on the Ashoka website (2015) thusly:

A new idea. He or she is possessed by a new idea—a new solution or approach to a social problem—that will change the pattern in a field... (Ashoka) evaluate(s) the idea historically and against its contemporaries in the field, looking for innovation and real change potential.

Creativity. Does this individual have a vision of how he or she can meet some human need better than it has been met before? Does the candidate have a history of creating other new visions?

Entrepreneurial quality. It defines leaders who see opportunities for change and innovation and devote themselves entirely to making that change happen. These leaders often have little interest in anything beyond their mission, and they are willing to spend the next ten to fifteen years making a historical development take place.

Social impact of the idea. This criterion focuses on the candidate's idea, not the candidate. Ashoka is only interested in ideas that it believes will change the field significantly and that will trigger nationwide impact or, for smaller countries, broader regional change.

Ethical fiber. Social entrepreneurs introducing major structural changes to society have to ask a lot of people to change how they do things. If the entrepreneur is not trusted, the likelihood of success is significantly reduced. The essential question is: "Do you trust this person absolutely?" If there is any doubt, a candidate will not pass. (Ashoka, 2015)

These five basic criteria are as stringent as they are encompassing; They create a focused and accepted framework for social entrepreneurship without delimiting the category arbitrarily by model, field of influence, or personality. While it wasn't possible to include only full-fledged Ashoka fellows in the study because of time limitations associated with issues of access, these criteria were employed informally to determine if an interview subject was an appropriate match for the study.

With this in mind, the original prospectus of this study called for a total of eight interview subjects consisting of four social entrepreneurs or representatives of SE organizations and four filmmakers who had made films for or about those organizations. Within the category of social entrepreneurs, the intention was to find two who were in the beginning stages of their endeavors and two who were more established in the field. Within the filmmaker category, the original intention was to interview two independent documentary filmmakers and two who had been hired by the organization. Though it is not necessary, nor possible according to Lincoln & Guba (1985), to create a representative sample for purposes of generalization in qualitative research (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011), this diverse group of interview respondents would allow for the study to have scope.

During the course of respondent recruitment, the author relied on personal networking and some cold introductory emails to gain access to social entrepreneurs and filmmakers who were currently working in the field. Though these methods worked well, time constraints related to the academic calendar and the author's full-time position as a marketing and communications professional ultimately led to a modification of the original sample. The author conducted a total of eight interviews with three different filmmakers and five different SE organizations. Two of the organizations were over ten years into their tenure and the other three SE organizations were

between two and three years old. Each of the SE organizations had a truly unique model and scope, some working globally and others focused on domestic issues. Several interview respondents held different roles in their respective organizations and the interviews represented the views of three founders, two communications professionals, and one fundraising professional. Of the filmmakers, one was relatively independent of the SE organization financially and creatively, one was hired by the SE organization as part of a creative agency, and one was uniquely positioned in that he was both the chief filmmaker and the founder of the SE organization.

For the purposes of this study, it is not necessary to give the names of the respondents or their specific organization, but it is helpful in the interpretation of data to differentiate between their respective roles and positions. The following is a brief description of each of the subjects and their affiliations:

Social Entrepreneurial Organization 1. SE1 was officially incorporated in 2013 and its work focuses on innovating the way the private sector and governments work together to end human trafficking across the globe. Through a robust public relations strategy that includes leveraging an independent film made about their work, SE1 is committed to raising awareness of the problem of child sex slavery and trafficking as well as modeling effective practical strategies for coalitions of private citizens, government agencies, and trained para-military forces to rescue and rehabilitate children involved in the trade. The organization started with just the founder and one full-time employee, but has since received a decent amount of national media attention and subsequent funding to allow them to grow to a staff of twelve full-time employees, including operatives, fundraisers and rehabilitation program director among others.

SE1 Founder. The founder of SE1 is a historian, author, and former government agent with more than twelve years of experience in working on the ground in cases dealing with the illicit sex trade of children. He is gregarious, well-spoken, and passionate about the work that he does while also acknowledging that there is a lot to learn and many lessons ahead for his organization. He began SE1 after becoming frustrated by the scope of the problem and the “bureaucratic restraints” and “stumbling blocks” created by inefficient government attention to what he believes is the human rights plague of our global society today. He sees the potential in his unique blend of innovative action and awareness to call other governments to “rise up” to the challenge of eradicating child slavery. He spoke confidently about his vision but deferred to his Chief Operating Officer to fill in the gaps of specific strategy.

SE 1 Communications Professional. The Chief Operating Officer of SE1 had been working with the organization for only eight months when the interview was conducted. His background as a marketing professional at a Fortune 500 internet security company has helped him to navigate the high profile media and public relations landscape of SE1 which was in full swing before he arrived. He works closely with the director of development on many of the communications strategies for SE1 including social media awareness campaigns, media relations, and the publicity and distribution of the documentary about their work. He and the founder of SE1 knew each other in college and remained in contact peripherally for the intervening years before he was invited to join the team. He feels fulfilled by the meaning inherent in the work they are doing as an organization.

SE 1 Filmmaker. The filmmaking team behind the documentary about SE1 owns their own production company that specializes in narrative fiction films. They’ve know each other and worked around one another for twenty years in varying capacities and have owned their own

production company together for the last five. Though they each have their own specialties in film production (one is primarily a career screenwriter and the other a producer), they share billing as both director and producer on all their work together including this documentary. This is their first long-form feature documentary and they jokingly admit, probably their last. After working with the founder of SE1 on a historical film project, they approached him about creating a feature film about his work which became the current documentary film project. The film is funded by independent investors and although the founder of SE1 has created and ensured a clear role for himself in guiding the messages of the film, it is not owned by the organization. The filmmakers plan to release the film through a studio and are also shopping around a reality television show based on additional footage of operations to major television networks.

Social Entrepreneurial Organization 2. This organization may best be described as global social enterprise, although SE2's founder might take issue with that categorization. The big idea or innovation of SE2 is grounded initially in microconsignment research which initially suggested that micro-enterprise as conceived by the proponents of microcredit wrongfully assumes that an entrepreneurial endeavor will be successful simply because it addresses a market need for both the entrepreneur and the consumer. Microfranchising was proposed as a solution that might allow for social enterprise to create replicable, scalable business models that can be managed rather than created, allowing for better returns regardless of the presence or lack of presence of entrepreneurial spirit (Christensen, Lehr, & Faibourne, 2010). SE2's current model is a testing ground for the next level of that micro-trajectory by asking if there is more potential for real social impact in the creation of a sustainable, purely for-profit business funded by venture capital and driven by the market demands of the developing economy than one that is a more mission-driven hybrid model. SE2 is a for-profit organization with one hundred and twenty

employees and a mission to grow quickly, make money for its investors, and take care of its employees while creating measurable social impact. Because of the newness and uncertainty of the model, the organization's communications are focused less on documentary storytelling and more on brand development.

SE 2 Founder. The founder of SE2 is an economist and researcher by trade who has worked in the field of micro-finance and social innovation at universities and as a global consultant since the late 1990's. He does not generally like to use the phrase "social entrepreneur" to describe himself, but says instead that he "became interested in doing good around the world" during a trip to Katmandu where he interacted with some homeless children and determined to do something more than just ski. That moment of obligation has helped drive his tireless work as a consultant to over thirty different social enterprise endeavors in more than fifteen countries over just five years. He believes that this newest iteration of his career, in which he is the owner/operator of a holding company, is the natural evolution of his life's work. He is optimistic about the potential results of his new company to produce social impact through a for-profit only model, but remains open to the possibility of failure and the lessons that will come from it. He has generally been agreeable to using documentary film to help promote his work when it has been handed to him, but did not previously see the need to seek it out on his own. Within the scope of his new endeavor, he finds himself actively positioning visual media as a key branding and public relations tool for his product marketing and social impact goals.

SE 2 Filmmaker. The filmmaker associated with SE2 is actually a cause-related creative firm with deep roots in making documentary films for and about social entrepreneurs. The author conducted the interview in person with three people associated with the films related to SE2 - the two founders of the firm who act as marketing expert and lead filmmaker respectively, and a film

producer. Their interactions and work with SE2 have spanned over five years and have produced at least four short documentaries about the founder at different stages of his work. The first short documentary with SE2 was voluntary work that qualified as a passion project for the filmmaker at the beginning of their business operations. In the years following that first film, they have collaborated with SE2 on at least two other work-for-hire projects and are in the process of collaborating on a more commercial video for the new business. The filmmakers have a great working knowledge of social entrepreneurship and traditional NGO structure because of their diverse clientele. They speak passionately about the importance of social impact.

Social Entrepreneurial Organization 3. SE3 has been incorporated since 2012 and represents a collective of projects that use first-person storytelling to encourage an empathic approach to large-scale divisive social issues. The founder and key actors in the organization believe that helping people ask and answer the question, “What is it like to be you?” using the medium that is most appropriate to the key stakeholders in the specific discussion will bring civility and compassion to some of the world’s most polemical conversations. Projects under the umbrella of this organization’s goals and mission run the gamut of communications tools and strategies, ranging from social media campaigns and live storytelling events to high school filmmaking festivals and feature-length documentary films. Media are seen as an integral part of the public relations efforts of the organization and meeting the goals and mission of its inception.

SE 3 Founder/Filmmaker. The founder of SE3 is unique in that he plays the role of both social entrepreneur and filmmaker. As a successful television producer and professor of documentary film, his professional career was founded on showing and teaching others about the power and value of film as a medium for storytelling. When his own call to large-scale societal innovation came four years ago during a deeply divisive politically charged conversation about

religion and homosexuality, it was natural that he would apply his passion for documentary to his passion for empathic exchange between warring factions. The organization started with the creation of a full-length documentary film that incorporates the founder's own story with the stories of other people caught in the middle of the debate. As a social innovator, he is always on the move from project to project and has amassed a coalition of supporters and partners who are motivated to move his vision along. As a filmmaker, he is as committed to the artfulness of the story as he is the message. He splits his time between the two pursuits and admits that it has slowed down his progress in some ways, but notes that he could not have impact for his organization without both.

Social Entrepreneurial Organization 4. This organization has been recognized as meeting all of the Ashoka criteria for social entrepreneurship and its founder became an Ashoka Fellow in 2011. SE4 began its work over ten years ago with an innovative microfranchise model that aimed to provide access to eyewear and improved vision for those at the bottom of the development pyramid while also empowering women as entrepreneurs in developing countries. Though it is a fairly compact organization with most employees residing outside of the United States, its partnership with other global social enterprises helps bring breadth and depth to its impact. Recent efforts to focus more on mission and reach have brought a wave of change to SE4 that includes shifting its impact model and the descriptive videos that tell who they are and what they do. Along with the continuous waves of recognition as an innovator in the field comes generous funding that has allowed SE4 to remain relatively self-sustaining. It has not needed to focus much of its domestic communications externally and at the time of the interview, had some short documentary films on the organization website but no plans to incorporate documentary or visual media more widely.

SE4 Development Professional. The author interviewed SE4's Senior Development Officer who is chiefly responsible for the fundraising and donor relations of the organization but occasionally steps in to work with filmmakers and communications strategies as they apply to philanthropy. At the time of the interview, she had been with SE4 for a little under two years and felt that her historical institutional knowledge was a little bit limited but she was able to speak clearly to the current use of documentary film in SE4's communications. She works closely with SE4's founder (he was unavailable for interview), who no longer manages the day-to-day operations of SE4 but remains actively engaged with the fundraising and overall direction of the organization. In her role at SE4, the senior development officer has helped other decision makers in the organization see the need for updated media, but also recognizes the need to prioritize based on mission.

SE4 Filmmaker. The filmmaker associated with SE4 was unavailable for interview at the same time as other interviews due to his travel schedule. Subsequent requests for his information were unsuccessful and an interview did not occur.

Social Entrepreneurial Organization 5. SE5 is another organization with a founder recognized as an Ashoka Fellow. SE5's social focus is on innovating sexual health education in grade schools across the United States using a model that incorporates peer teaching and mentoring by college-aged volunteers in traditionally underserved communities. SE5 has been in operation since 2003 when it was started by a group of university undergraduate students and is now replicated in over six metropolitan areas of the United States. SE5 is unique among the other SE organizations in this study because of its reliance on highly trained volunteers to meet its mission and goals. The diversity of its key stakeholders is reflected in its communications strategies which until recently were integrated with its development and program management

divisions. SE5 has created few documentary films in during its tenure and the ones that it has created have been used primarily as show pieces for donors and stakeholders. The current documentary pieces on the organization's website were produced by the development team.

SE5 Communications Professional. In the ten plus years that SE5 has been in operation, the founder (who was not available for interview) was focused almost entirely on the program development needed to make her vision a reality. As long as the organization was able to keep funding and key partnerships in place, public relations and media were a lower priority. At the time of this interview, the Director of Communications for SE5 had been in her newly created position for just under a year having migrated from the development team. She noted a significant shift in the organization after the team put pressure on the CEO/founder to create a communications position and engage in more outward facing communications.

SE5 Filmmaker. The SE5 communications professional couldn't remember the name of the filmmaker who helped with their most recent promotional video and further attempts to contact her to get that information were not successful. The author was unable to interview the filmmaker for this organization.

Data Collection

Whether an interview is conducted in-person or over the phone or computer, there are advantages and disadvantages to each method that affect the quality of the data gathered. The author of this study determined that the benefit of being able to symbolically interact with an interview subject to add depth and conversational flow to the interview process outweighed the safety of anonymity that the telephone interview offered (Berg, 2009). Therefore, whenever

possible, interviews were conducted in person and audio recorded using two methods of data capture: a computer with microphone and a smart phone. When location or the busy schedule of the subject made it impossible to conduct an interview in person, the author used Google Hangouts, a web-based video-conferencing tool to facilitate and record the interviews. One interview with a respondent living in Kenya required a simple telephone interview due to the poor internet capabilities in that country. In addition to digital recordings of all interviews, the researcher took copious notes during each interview as a way of helping to guide the flexible portions of the interview and as data backup should the recording technology fail. Technological failure on the first interview (SE5) rendered the audio and video recordings useless, leaving the researcher to use written notes to reconstruct general concepts and ideas.

Each interview lasted approximately forty-five to sixty minutes where possible. Because of the nature of the interview questions and subject matter, it wasn't necessary for the interviews to be longer. Where possible and necessary for clarification, interviews were followed up with additional questions via email.

The raw data gathered from these interviews was transcribed manually by the author. Those transcriptions, along with the field notes taken during observation, produced a sizeable text for analysis totaling 1,769 single-spaced lines.

Although the original scope of the study required that data be collected from four filmmakers and four social entrepreneur organizations, the decision to end data collection without the final filmmaker interview and begin analysis was made, though not arbitrarily. Merriam (2014) points out that, while in the process of data collection, it is common for the researcher to discover many more possible avenues of inquiry. It can become difficult to know

when enough data has been collected to begin analysis. Beyond the practical reasons to stop collecting data (such as running out of money or time) Lincoln & Guba (1985) indicate four criteria that should guide the researcher's data collection decisions, including:

Exhaustion of sources (although sources may be recycled and tapped multiple times); saturation of categories (continuing data collection produces tiny increments of new information in comparison to the effort expended to get them); emergence of regularities - the sense of "integration" (although care must be exercised to avoid a false conclusion occasioned by regularities occurring at a more simplistic level than the inquirer should accept); and over-extension - the sense that new information being unearthed is very far removed from the core of any of the viable categories that have emerged (and does not contribute usefully to the emergence of additional viable categories. (p. 350)

Many of these criteria are related to the process of constant comparative analysis which will be discussed in the next section; However, it is worth noting that the decision to end data collection for this study was related more to practical time constraints and an exhaustion of sources than a saturation of categories or emergence of regularities.

Data Analysis

The author used a modified version of Glaser and Strauss's (1967) constant comparative analysis method to organize data and derive a descriptive analysis of the results. Goetz and LeCompte (1981) note that constant comparative analysis is the process by which:

Social phenomena are recorded and classified while also being compared across categories. Thus, the discovery of relationships, that is, hypothesis generation, begins

with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process, and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding. (p. 58)

With the transcribed interviews and field notes as text, the first phase of analysis was to identify segments in the data that could potentially answer the research questions (Merriam, 2014). Each line of the text was entered into a computer spreadsheet and examined independent of its context in order to determine if that unit of data could have meaning to the study.

According to Lincoln & Guba (1985) a unit must meet two criteria:

First it should be heuristic - that is, the unit should reveal information relevant to the study and stimulate the reader to think beyond the particular bit of information. Second, the unit should be the "smallest" piece of information about something that can stand by itself - that is, it must be interpretable in the absence of any of the context in which the inquiry is carried out. (p. 345)

Using the research questions as a guide, the author used open coding, or emergent coding, to discover previously unknown ideas and possible categories, starting first with the most general categories related to the study. As main categories began to take shape, the author utilized Glaser and Strauss' (1967) first rule of the method to return to previous data units in different groupings that are coded similarly and compare them, making notes about the similarities and differences and adding subcategories and cross-referential categories. Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate that this process of constant comparative analysis forces the researcher to think both descriptively and explanatorily about their text. Throughout this process of data mining, the author kept detailed notes about possible connections and links which she was later

able to corroborate or refute during the process of axial coding in which she combined all the data independently of groupings and sorted by category looking for relationships (Merriam, 2014). Coding, both inductive and deductive, continued until the author felt the categories met the criteria of saturation in which no new ideas were emerging.

The goal of this study was to provide a descriptive context to the communications environment of social entrepreneur organizations and make some provocative suggestions about the ways in which they use (or don't use) documentary film. Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that constant comparative analysis in its full form is meant to lead to the creation of theory, which does not meet the scope of this thesis. However, constant comparative methodology offered this study a clear, step-by-step process for informing data categorization and organization in light of emergent information found in the semi-structured interview.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Regardless of the rigor and care applied in the use of any technique or method of qualitative research, it is impossible to mimic the hard objectivity of quantitative research. The inherent fallibility of the human instrument as well as the reality that the use of any methodology imposes a certain perspective on reality (with theoretical assumptions) means that concepts of validity and reliability common to quantitative results seem much harder to achieve in qualitative research (Berg, 2009). Merriam (2014) suggests that the difference lies in the fact that the qualitative researcher is tasked with proving the rigor of the study in the results themselves:

Unlike experimental designs in which validity and reliability are accounted for before the investigation, rigor in a qualitative research derives from the researcher's presence, the

nature of the interaction between researcher and participants, the triangulation of data, the interpretation of perceptions and rich, thick description. (p. 166)

This assurance of rigor is termed “trustworthiness” by Lincoln and Guba (1985). They suggest there are four tenets of trustworthiness in qualitative research - truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality – and more importantly, that there are several techniques that can be employed during the collection of data, analysis of data, and data reporting in order to establish it. The author of this study implemented three key techniques to ensure that her research was valid and reliable.

Triangulation is the technique whereby the researcher combines several lines of site in the process of interpreting symbolic and social meaning (Berg, 2009). In layman’s terms, triangulation requires that the researcher have three different ways of looking at a piece of data before she can supply an interpretation that means something. Triangulation can offer more confidence that the research has truth value and neutrality. Triangulation for this study came from the use of two different data sources to create the text for analysis and close readings of seminal texts about the culture and positioning of documentary filmmakers and social entrepreneurs respectively. These three viewpoints intersected to confirm that any reading or interpretation of reality had a viable context for conclusions.

Constant comparative analysis also offered a perfect opportunity to utilize member checks to ensure trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Informal member checks were included throughout the interview process and helped to inform categorization of data. Additionally, a formal member check as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) was performed at the finish of the report, to “test the credibility of the inquiry report as a whole with

respondents” (p. 373). By choosing a representative sample of each of the stakeholders in the social entrepreneurial organizations and filmmakers to receive feedback on the verity of the findings the author was able to ensure that the reality presented in the study was true to those experiencing it.

Finally, this study utilized a modification of the technique that Geertz (1973) called thick description in the explanation of results and findings relevant to the data. Though true thick description is specifically connected to ethnographic research in which the ethnographer provides deep context to a cultural phenomenon, the process of contextualizing and offering more instead of less information was useful in this study. When appropriate, lengthy textual representations of the subjects’ reality were included to corroborate an idea or thought. Thick description is not an assurance of transferability, but its presence offers the opportunity for “someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Although no one methodology can ensure accurate results without acknowledged limitations, the author of this study implemented several checkpoints throughout the research process that will hopefully mitigate concerns of validity and trustworthiness. The results of this research are recounted in the following section organized by way of the prescribed research questions.

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

RQ1: How do SE orgs in different stages of development currently use visual media in their communications?

It became clear during the coding analysis that the construct of use had more meaning to both categories of subjects than originally anticipated and required that the text be examined for two separate and distinct ideas related to use - first, the intended audience that the filmmaker and the SE organization hoped to reach (the people) and second, the channels of distribution they intended to use to reach that audience (the location).

Intended Audience Use

This study found that with regard to audience and reach, there were specific patterns that developed but they were not based necessarily on the stage of organizational development and instead correlated more to the stated missions and goals of the organizational model.

Developing relationships with key partners. Communication with partner stakeholders with the intention to recruit, demonstrate accountability, and influence advocacy was a large category for all SE groups regardless of the stage of development. Since one of the key components that define social entrepreneurship is the ability to create useful partnerships and bring diverse actors together to tackle the problem (Bornstein, 2010), it makes sense that maintaining these relationships would be a key focus of SE organization communications. SE2 used a short form documentary video to recruit learning fellows for a new social entrepreneurial endeavor:

We launched a little thing called the mill which was a marketing innovation lab and I recruited a number of fellows. We got graduate students and post graduates from around the world to come ...and that video was the primary recruiting tool. If I sent that out over my networks, we got hundreds of applications of people wanting to come...So it ended up being quite useful in the end. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

SE5, which has been in operation for more than twelve years, routinely used its documentary promotional video to recruit college students for long-term volunteer partnerships and as a show piece for anniversary galas to demonstrate successes and growth opportunities. SE4 used short form documentary to recruit corporate partners for both fundraising and advocacy:

We've got a big corporate partnership push going on in India, so I've been working on a promotional video for them. They'll show the three minute video to, you know, the auto manufacturer with the idea that they will then partner with us to bring eyeglasses to other people. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21,2015)

SE3 saw documentary film as the key to engaging stakeholders who act as gatekeepers and powerbrokers around the social issues of their organization, “We want them to buy into the concept of empathizing with people first and then deliberating over dogma and politics etc... second”(SE3 Filmmaker/Founder, personal communication, July 24,2015). SE1 also viewed their full-length documentary film as a way to invite political and government partners to “rise up” and “get on board” as potential partners. In the Peery Film Fellow course, the filmmakers were told that they must find ways “to enact more advocacy through media”(Peery Film Fellows Class, 2011).

Soliciting Funding. Fundraising, whether through investor capital or donations, was another cross-stage use of documentary film for SE organizations. In some cases, the fundraising use could be described as direct and the solicitation aim of the documentary was an overt element in the content of the piece. For example, SE3 used a documentary film with a direct ask for donations at the end as part of a Kickstarter fundraising campaign. SE4 noted that they were looking for the best ways to use documentary film in their annual direct online fundraising appeal. However, many of the organizations' use of the documentary films as a fundraising tool was more indirect. SE2 commissioned a documentary film explaining the complex concept of its newest endeavor as a show piece to aid the founder in his direct ask to investors. The film did not directly ask for money, but rather aided in the live ask. SE4's founder, who currently keeps his involvement in the organization at high-level administrative and big donor fundraising, also showed documentary films about the organization during his many speaking engagements. As one of the organization's main fundraisers, these speaking engagements are often a part of the fundraising funnel. SE1's founder and communications professional both indicated that they see the potential in the film to solicit funding in direct and indirect ways:

The hope is that so many people will see it and agree with what we're doing that we won't have to worry about fundraising anymore. Wouldn't that be nice. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

I would love to have it to be able to leverage it with organizations. As we go out and try to get donations from business, I would love to be able to use it a little more freely than what we have to this point as part of presentations. (SE1 Communications Professional, personal communication, August 4, 2015)

We can rent out a movie theater and have people pay for tickets. We have (a theater owner) who has said that if it's released, they'll show it in all of their theaters in the intermountain area and give us all the proceeds. (SE1 Communications Professional, personal communication, August 4, 2015)

Raising awareness among publics. This particular use of documentary was directly correlated to the mission of that organization and as such didn't ring true for all organizations in the study. However, the pattern of use was clearly present in SE organizations that had a stated mission of raising awareness to an issue or a cause. In fact, among those organizations, the use of documentary film in all aspects of their communications strategies was more prevalent. SE3's founder stated their mission is "to do whatever it takes to enable people to answer the question "what is it like to be me" and to enable other people to receive that story"(SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24,2015). Its use of documentary film as the main tool to meet this mission was informed by its founder's inherent belief, as both a social entrepreneur and filmmaker, in the power of film. He said, "...my sense, my instinct says, that's the most powerful art form and the most powerful tool available to us to accomplish the ultimate goal of getting people to empathize" (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015).

SE1 also stated its vision and mission in broad terms – to rescue and rehabilitate child sex slaves and ultimately to eradicate child sex slavery all together. They viewed consumer-facing awareness as a key to this mission and saw the documentary film and subsequent television show about their organization as a key to this awareness among broad swatches of publics who otherwise might not want to know or have access to information about the problem. SE1's

founder likened the power of documentary film to the work of author Harriet Beecher Stowe who brought awareness to the true problem of slavery in the 1800's. He said:

What I'm seeing is the same exact parallel, the same exact problem today where we've all heard of human trafficking, we've all heard of modern slavery but it's so easy to turn a blind eye to it because we don't see it. It's not in our face. It's easy to dismiss it. It's something that happens far, far away. It has nothing to do with me... We can create a movement and an awareness while it's happening and people can see it and rise up and deal with it. So that really is the motive and purpose I guess behind this documentary.
(SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

Beyond these three key uses, there were several mission-driven uses of documentary film that were expressed in the course of the study that might represent an unintended benefit. SE1's film was developed for issue awareness, but because it captured real footage of child slave rescue missions, that footage has been used as evidence in court hearings and other legal proceedings. SE3's films were created in service to their mission to bring awareness and empathy to the plight of those caught in the middle of divisive conversations, but the first-person stories in those films have also been used by the film subjects to aid in therapeutic situations.

Perhaps most interestingly, if mission was a driving force in the ways the films were utilized in communications strategies, it also affected the ways in which film was absent. Several SE organizations reported that their mission did not directly call for a more robust use of documentary film in their communications or that the mission was creating competing priorities. SE4 noted that their minimal use of documentary was not a matter of money:

I think more than anything for (SE4) it's about priority. I think if we wanted to do a big documentary film of the work that we've done of the issue of all of that, we could probably find the resources. I think it would be possible. I think it's more about the priorities within SE4 to do something like that. It's not really our priority to get these out too broadly. I think for now, I'm just happy with what we're getting. So and again, our focus really is on the fundraising and there are only so many places you can use them (documentary film) for fundraising purposes. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

For SE2, the dearth of use was more about being careful of the information they give the public while in the beginning stages of its experimental (and investor funded) development. SE2's founder noted that they were staying quiet on purpose:

We're really not telling our story at all right now... But I think once it has been a few years or so, we might say 'Hey, this is working and we're profitable and we have several businesses and I can see the impact on employees and society.' and I think we'll start telling our story and these microdocumentaries will be a great way to start putting that together. For now, I don't know that we have a story to tell...and I'm probably more careful up front, because...I didn't want to get distracted with telling stories. I just wanted a pure focus on business and have that little bit of the impetus of my investors to force me to be prudent in all things related to business. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

Distribution

The way an organization chose to distribute its documentary film was directly related to the intended use of the film and the form of the film. There was no apparent correlation between distribution and the stage of SE organizational development.

Theatrical Release. Documentaries intended to raise awareness and promote advocacy that were also long form or feature-length were using theatrical release strategies to distribute the film. That did not preclude those films from also being used in smaller, more intimate settings for fundraising, donor relations, and film festivals. One of the two filmmakers whose films fit this description noted that they hoped their film would be purchased by a major studio and distributed widely through their channels.

Social Media. Four of the five SE organizations specifically discussed their use of social media channels to distribute their documentary films. SE3 noted that the social media distribution plan that was part of the original communications strategy helped shape the form and content of the videos they used in their awareness campaign. The Peery Film Fellows course talked about the technology and form necessary to create a video specifically for social media. SE4 planned to distribute sixty-second customer vignettes on social media as part of their annual funding appeal but discussed the fact that they didn't have a distinct communications strategy related to distribution. While SE1 used clips of their feature length video on social media, they didn't currently have plans to distribute it there.

Website. A cursory glance at the websites of the different SE organizations in this study showed that only three out of the five have short-form documentaries on their websites at the

time of writing. However, four of the five mentioned the need and intention to distribute video on their websites as part of their communications strategy.

Additional Distribution Channels. In accordance with the varying types and uses of documentary film, SE organizations reported distribution in several other ways. SE5 sent visual media through mass email blasts to volunteers and other stakeholders. Both SE4 and SE5 noted that many of their partners link to the SE videos from their various website, thereby creating a secondary channel of distribution. The filmmakers from SE1, SE2, and SE3 all mentioned film festivals as a potential distribution channel.

Barriers to Use

Beyond limitations of mission scope and purpose, the study found several additional natural barriers to the use of documentary film for all SE organizations. The most overarching of those barriers reported was simply categorized as time. However, the construct of time required a more nuanced breakdown into several sub-categories.

First, documentary filmmaking is a slow and deliberate process that sometimes isn't fast enough to capture the zeitgeist of the moment. The issues are timely, the SE needs are timely, and it can take months of work to gain access to the right people, the right places, and the funding that it takes to make something valuable in the moment that requires it. This can mean wasted money and resources as it did in the case of SE2's investor recruitment video: "We got funded before the video was finished. We didn't need it. We still sent it out, but by the time we got it out there we were done at the bank" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). Or, as SE3's Founder noted, time delays can affect the spirit of the whole operation.

Navigating the tension between the need to be culturally relevant and of the moment and yet do a lot of stuff to get it done in the moment can be frankly demoralizing sometimes. I can't put together this thing in time to be culturally relevant. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

Time constraints also manifested as a barrier in relationship to the human resources of SE organizations. This lack of human resources bandwidth was characterized by SE4's Senior Development Officer in the following quote:

Every once in a while we get approached by somebody who's interested in doing something like that, but I think up until now, the problem with something like that is that even though its somebody coming in and they say that they'll do all the work, it takes a lot of time and resources from our team and we just don't have the that bandwidth right now. It would also be the question of "what are we going to use this for? What is the benefit?" (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

The perceived amount of time that it takes to work with a filmmaker, even if independent of the organization, was corroborated by these instructions given to student filmmakers in the Peery Film Fellows course: "Condense what you are doing. You should only take two hours of their (SE) time. Set up a predetermined time plan for a busy communications person" (Peery Film Fellows Class, 2011).

Another significant barrier to using documentary film was COST. Every subject in the study, including filmmakers and the Peery Film Fellows course, made reference to the expense of visual media, even if that expense was not perceived as a direct barrier to use. Most of the SE organizations discussed the lack of funding as a barrier. SE5's Communications Director noted

that they were on a tight budget and when given money to make a documentary film, she was charged with trying not to use the whole amount on the film. SE1's Founder acknowledged that without independent outside funding, they would not have been able to make a film like the one they currently have:

I mean, look, if we had to spend our own money, we'd be out of business. They have thirteen episodes. Thirteen full episodes. That's millions of dollars. That was a private investor who came in with that to make that happen and it has happened...If I didn't have them come in and I had to use our own budget, what we would produce would not be that good. It would be really low-budget and we'd have very little ability to market it. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

SE3's Founder acknowledges that even if you make the film in-house and are a skilled filmmaker yourself, there are outsourced skills that require money:

Technology takes money. Other people's skillset that you want to bring to bear, that costs money... Whether it's animation of some of the music ...I'm not a composer so I had to pay money to a composer to get the music. Had to pay money to get additional editing assistance. We can edit in general and tell the stories we basically want to tell but it's an entirely specific skillset to be a great editor - to really get the cuts down to the perfect pace. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

There were some outliers to this discussion of cost as a barrier. For example, as noted previously, SE4 did not see cost as a barrier to creating and using even a feature-length film as long as their mission and priorities would allow for it. Though she was confident they could find the funding for such an endeavor, she did say that it would take time to find that funding,

effectively creating another barrier. And while most SE organizations discussed the impact of cost on their budgets, the SE2 filmmaker pointed out several times that newer technology was actually making documentary filmmaking a more affordable option. In fact, he cited this cheaper new technology as a central feature of their current agency business model:

Our founders, when they got started, they saw that a lot of non-profits or do-good companies or companies with a social aspect, they didn't have any media or they had really poorly made media....with the digital filmmaking coming with cheaper cameras, cheaper editing software, it made it more accessible. The democratization of media. Suddenly all these high end tools where they could get really good quality stuff was available to people. Let's find a way to make high quality products for these companies that are less expensive. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

For the social entrepreneurial organization, there are as many uses for documentary film as there are constraints and barriers. Whether these are unique to SE organizations is not born out by this question or these results and is something that requires further research and discussion.

RQ2: How do SE organizations differ in their communication needs from traditional models of business and NGOs?

The data collected in this study did not offer the correct type of information to answer this question fully. In a review of the study design, it became clear that the exclusion of traditional NGO respondents to the study made it impossible to compare and contrast the two needs. However, the survey of SE organizations did yield valuable data about communications

strategies within this group which allowed for some possible conclusions about the current landscape in which these organizations are working.

First, there was a clear line between older, more established SE organizations and the younger, more recently developed SE organizations in terms of their communications strategies. The older SE organizations, represented by SE4 and SE5, admittedly lacked a formal communications strategy. In fact, when asked about the strategy, SE4 responded:

I don't know if we really have any. It's something that I've been pushing since I've been there... we don't have to do a lot of public-facing communications for fundraising purposes. And the decision was made about a year ago that we weren't in the position to do any type of advocacy work or anything like that and use communications for those purposes. I'm thinking that might change in the next year, but I don't know. It's a tough one when you have so many competing priorities in an organization and your communications isn't linked directly to your ability to fundraise. It's hard to make communications a priority. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

At the time of this interview, SE4 was moving away from a cost-covering model of social enterprise to one that focused more simply on the lowest possible subsidy to get their much needed product to the customer. SE4's Senior Development Officer believed this move was more mission-driven. It also moved their organization a little closer to a traditional NGO model. While communications was a lower priority for the SE4 organization because their model did not call for it, SE5 was in a different position. The organization had just created the Director of Communications position more than eleven years in to their operations after what the subject

called the “positive pressure” on the CEO for a shift of goal and mission. Though SE5’s communications “department” of one was new, the language in the interview indicated that a communications strategy was forthcoming. SE5’s Communications Director spoke of branding, crowd-sourcing for media, and strategically planning to communicate to several key audiences in their website redesign – all traditional marketing-driven strategies. She also noted that although she didn’t feel like she knew how to use the documentary film they have or distribute it more effectively, she knew that there could be a better way. She repeatedly asked the author to share the information from the study so she could learn more. What was similar about these two organizations was that both were going through a transition of priorities at a modular level at the time of the interviews, but their transitions created very different communications needs for each based on the model that they were either going toward or away from.

The lack of a clear communications strategy or at least the perception that SE organizations don’t generally have one was held up by a note about practical use of the documentary film given to student filmmakers in the Peery Film Fellow course: “They (the SE organization) might not know how they are going to use things. They are not used to thinking about these things. Ask them these questions: Where will people use it? What audience are you targeting?” (Peery Film Fellows Class, 2011).

In contrast, the newer SE organizations (SE1, SE2 & SE3) had a better grasp on their communications plans, strategies, and tactics especially with regard to the films that they were using in that strategy. All three discussed the important role that media relations and public relations played in their ability to serve their mission. Even if the communications strategy was in nascent stages of development, it was a high priority.

One similarity that the author observed anecdotally about the newer SE organization was their inability to articulate basic information about their mission and brands in a succinct manner. In some cases, the interviewee made it clear that these elemental pieces of information were still being developed. For example, SE1's Chief Operating Officer discussed the current reworking of their brand identity:

We're doing a lot of refining of that strategy right now trying to figure out what are our key messages. What's our brand? How do we communicate with all the different stakeholders that are out there? I think it's tremendous what we've been able to do before I arrived in terms of getting the word out. Now we're trying to fine tune that. Who are we and who do we want to be. And how do we get that to resonate with different groups of people. (SE1 Chief Operations Officer, personal communication, August 4, 2015)

In other cases, it seemed that the SE organization was unaware of the discrepancy. SE3's founder repeated the mission of his organization four times during the interview in four different iterations as though working on the verbiage during the course of the conversation. The filmmaker for SE2 suggested that this lack of brand direction is reality for many SE groups as well as NGOs and represents a need that is generally unmet in the social entrepreneurial world:

One thing I wanted to say really quick (*sic*) is that a lot of the problem with these nonprofits a lot of the time is, you show up to a nonprofit and they themselves are still discovering their own story. One of the reasons we're not just filmmakers and one of the reasons we are a full service creative agency is because we wanted to make sure that they understood their story and their brand and why they hope to tell their story, so that when

they make that video, their impact can be as big as it could be. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

SE2 Filmmakers also suggest that creating and refining this brand identity is an important step for social change-makers in the competitive world of fundraising and venture capital:

Ultimately people come to us because they want to distance themselves...the nonprofit and the social entrepreneur world they're still trying to distance themselves from competitors, set themselves apart, because you're essentially asking for money sometimes without a product. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

One similarity across the board for all SE organizations (and their filmmaking counterparts) was the reliance on the “founder’s story” as part of the communications messaging and strategy. For SE1, this story is a key to their emerging brand identity. They incorporate the founder’s face prominently on the main page of their website, film posters, and magazine articles and he is the main protagonist of their feature film. All three subjects that were interviewed from SE1 acknowledged the importance of that story to differentiate them from other human-trafficking organizations and meet their mission. For his part, SE1’s founder is conflicted about this focus on his story as a communications strategy:

I think people can relate to my story. It's exhausting for me. I've been talking to my media people and asking them to take my picture off the website and let's make this more about SE1 than about me because it really is exhausting to me. There's this expectation that I fear I'll never live up to...And then there's pressure. I've really struggled with that and I've kind of been fighting with my media and PR people because they say we can't take your picture off. We can't take your story off. ...yet. Maybe someday, but for now

people relate to you... I was just like everyone else before I knew what was happening. I felt like vomiting too and here's the rest of the story and the why I created it and the confidence people can have in me because I've been working in this field. So I get it. I get that my story needs to be out there, but there's a lot of pressure. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

SE4's Senior Development Officer has a background in traditional NGO and noted that, "with the social enterprise sector in general, with our donors, our funders and kind of our general public within the social enterprise space, the focus is really on the social entrepreneur" (personal communication, August 21, 2015). She also said that while the age of the organization makes that founder's story a little less important in the day-to-day work of SE4, they "do still very much leverage him and his involvement and his history with the organization in any of our conversations with donors and things like that" (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015).

In the case of SE2, their current public relations strategy to "fly under the radar" and refrain from storytelling is as much about the power of the founder's story to create a brand identity as anything.

Someday, if it's successful, I want to start telling our story again. But I don't want to tell the story on a theory right now. We don't know if we're going to be successful or if we fail, then I can tell the story too about how we failed. I'll be comfortable with that. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

It is an acknowledgement that if he actively told their story now, it could create a perception before they are, as an organization, ready to manage that perception. The Peery Film Fellow

course also spoke to this general sense that the founder's story has the power to define the organizational brand identity. The student filmmakers were given the charge that they must get founder footage because "they (SE) communicate a unique energy about the organization" (Peery Film Fellows Class, 2011).

While it wasn't clear from the research if NGOs and social entrepreneurial organizations differ in their communications needs, we can see that there are some patterns of communications needs that seem to exist within the SE culture.

RQ3: How does the practical communications culture of SE organizations interact with the intent, content and effects of documentary?

In answering this research question, it first becomes necessary to define the practical communications culture of SE organizations. The results of this study suggest that the practical communications culture of the social entrepreneur organizations is influenced by the character of the social entrepreneur, the social innovation model of the organization, the mission and goals of the organization and finally, the role that filmmakers play within the organization. Based on the constant comparative analysis of the research data, it became clear that the two influencers of the practical culture that seem to interact with documentary film most deeply are SE character and the role of the filmmaker. The next part of this paper will look at each cultural influencer separately and show the ways that documentary film finds itself integrated in intent, content, and effect.

SE Character & Documentary

Social Entrepreneurs have several unique characteristics that make them different from other creative problem solvers (Bornstein, 2010). Within the scope of this study, the author has identified seven of these characteristics that were true of at least four organizations concurrently and impacted the communications strategies present in these organizations' documentary films.

Social Entrepreneurs rely heavily on research and active listening to accomplish their goals. During the author's observation of the TEDxBYU event, she wrote that, "social entrepreneurs are excellent qualitative researchers who activate their knowledge". SE3's founder demonstrated how this characteristic affected the practical culture of his organization:

So I began researching and researching and researching and that, still to this day, will always be what is at the core of SE3 - if we're trying to get people to respond with empathy as their first reaction, we need to continue to investigate and understand what the heck is this thing. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

SE2's founder also spoke about the way that research influenced his life and social entrepreneurial endeavors.

I guess I could break my life into pieces and the piece at the university was coming up with this theory and writing about it. In the field out there doing case studies, research, longitudinal studies, one-off studies. Building a foundation and then consulting was testing it. And so I felt like throughout those next 5 years I tested out a theory and a process. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

This characteristic of SE2's founder was also present in the filmmakers that he trusted to tell his story and the story of his organization:

They came and sat down for maybe two hours in my office and just asked me a bunch of questions and then two weeks later, they said, we've reserved these two to three hours and we want to come film you. I think that they just took a bunch of the questions they asked and learned about me and my background and the organization...they really took that interview and put together the piece and I just showed up. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

For his part, SE2's filmmaker noted that without research and a deeper understanding of the organization and its mission, it would have been impossible to tell the "right" story that could help affect impact.

We're not interested in telling our version of our client's story so we go in and we ask a lot of questions and try our best to just listen and then usually what happens is that we'll break off and really think about those things and then come back to them and say this is what we think...We bring our thoughts together, we kind of make a decision on this is what we want to say, this is how we want to say it, and then we move forward. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

SE2's founder believed that this focus on research and active listening had an effect on the quality of the content that the filmmakers produce.

It comes down to the filmmaker being able to understand the organization and the message you really want to share and be able to tell it almost in a better way than you could tell it yourself. I kind of felt like they were able to accomplish that. I've worked

with other groups who say, we want to do this or do that. And the videos are not that great. Nothing that we've ever really used. There's a lot of garbage out there. I think the fact that it was what I felt was a quality piece that I was comfortable with and confident in sharing, I think it had a larger impact. I give a lot of that credit to the SE2 Filmmakers. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

When discussing his role as a filmmaker, SE3's founder said that his research skills and active listening were keys to developing the trusting relationships that provided him with access to subjects who would be authentic on camera. Specifically, this special access made it possible for SE3 to quickly and effectively distribute media that was timely and impactful.

Having access to the subjects made it possible. I might have had the idea, wouldn't it be good if we told a story like this, but if I don't have access to the real people to tell their stories, that can take years to cultivate access and relationships to them to get them to the point where they'll trust me enough to tell their story. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

Social entrepreneurs are fusion experts. They can bring people and ideas from several different fields of inquiry to bear on the problem at hand. SE1 provided a model example of this characteristic. The organization is characterized by its multi-disciplinary approach to attacking the problem of child sex slavery. Their founder brings his knowledge of history, government, and military operations to the table and finds other people, such as his Chief Operating Officer, to fill in the gaps. He is able to attract attention and funding easily because he is charismatic, but even more than that, he knows how to work across disciplines to see the bigger picture. The SE1

vision to eradicate child slavery globally requires a vantage point much bigger than the world view of one person adept at one thing.

From the perspective of the Peery Film Fellows course, ability to network and collaborate was the number one factor in determining a successful entrepreneur. They also discussed that the unique heterogeneity of SE organizations, which are a “conglomeration of nonprofit, private, and public values”, may require an equally unique perspective on communications strategy. Additionally, this characteristic of SE’s prompted one course professor to say that SE founders are not used to “thinking about these things” implying that SE’s generally gather experts in their sphere to help with communications strategy (Peery, 2011). This was certainly true of SE1’s founder. While comfortable explaining the mission and goals of the organization and able to give a broad stroke description of communications strategy, he deferred any deeper strategic conversation to his Chief Operating Officer.

The role of SE’s as bridge-builders between disciplines and organizations directly affected the way they connected to and participated with their filmmakers. When the mission and goals of the organization called for it, the SE founder directly interacted with the filmmaker in guiding the content of the films being made for and about them. SE1, SE2, and SE3 each had a personal relationship with the filmmakers who were working for their organizations (or in the case of SE3, they were one and the same). Each of these organizations had a mission that required active and wide communication about their cause or product. The founder’s character as a gatherer of talented and skilled people to help her meet her mission did not preclude filmmakers.

Additionally, SE2's filmmaker suggested that good filmmakers able to impact the effectiveness of a media piece must also be fusion experts in their own right.

Every person that we hire is not just an artist. Everyone is equal parts journalist, activist, and artist. Because if you're not passionate about how you go about trying to tell these stories, it's going to be easy to want to approach it the same way you did five years ago, looking for manipulation and not sincere connection. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

Social entrepreneurs are results oriented but willing and able to learn from mistakes.

SE5 points out that up until one year ago, their founder was only really focused on growing SE5. However, now she was reflexively looking at how to reach key audiences and creating a new model. SE2's founder did not mince words about his drive to see results and measure success. He spoke about his reluctance to spend time on public relations or communications right now because he "just wanted a pure focus on business and have that little bit of the impetus of my investors to force me to be prudent in all things related to business" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). SE1's founder says that while their detractors were set on pointing out the weaknesses in their model and operations, SE1's impact spoke for itself. That focus on results is what set them apart from other organizations focusing on similar social problems.

There are a lot of trafficking organizations that... are building a flag of awareness which is great, but the flag of awareness is generally just sadness and darkness. Whereas, we are very solution based and we're not vague about that part. Like, so many people are kind of vague about what the solution is going to be, whereas our main product is

extraction of kids who are enslaved. And when they see that that's what we're doing and that's what we promise we do and what we do, it makes it all the more compelling and people want to get on board. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

SE1's founder also said that it's "good to be humble" in the face of detractors. This humility is connected to a willingness to learn that was echoed by SE2's founder. He was quick to point out that whether they fail or succeed, he will be comfortable telling that story and learning from it.

In relationship to documentary film, this particular characteristic of being intent on impact but ultimately more interested in learning often interacts with content. For SE1, this focus on impact and results was present in the way that they built the documentary film overall so that it was not a "name and shame" film. For SE1's founder, it was important that they present the film as a roadmap to hopeful solutions:

This is positive. This is a solution. We're not here to be one more group that's just waving the flag of misery. Saying, "look how horrible everything is." The whole point of this is that you can walk out of that movie feeling like there is hope. And they totally did that. It ends with, "yeah this is really hard, this is a big mountain to climb, but people are climbing it. It's actually doable. Kids can be saved." I think that's a message especially in this world that gets lost a lot. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

Additionally, the filmmakers of SE1 told of the organization's first failed mission and how that shaped the tenor and content of their film from something that was admittedly "testosterone-driven" and focused on "getting the bad guys" to something that focused more entirely on the victims.

It's funny because very little of it when we first started was about the victims. The series had a very sort of macho training and gun and all sorts of silly stuff. And then after that first op(eration) failed, everybody kind of shifted and it did become more about these little girls that were back on the streets. We had 'em. They were in a van one hundred yards away. They were really close to our location and we had to just let them go. That was the first op and it really imprinted on everybody the importance that it's not about "let's go and get these guys", it's about the victims. It's really about the victims. At that point, everything shifted and from that point on for both the SE org and our film team, the focus was always about the victims. (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

They continued on to explain that this shift is what ultimately made the film effective as a communications and public relations tool. It gave them access to an audience that they believed is “actually going to stand up and shout and stand up and do something” (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015).

SE3's founder talked about experiencing what he called a “narrative of failure” in which the intention of the film and its actual effect were completely at odds. This drove them to create a system of constant evaluation and make some changes to the way they created and distributed their media.

So we thought, were there things that we could have done differently or better that would have made it much harder to weaponize? And we've done that a lot and we now have pretty well built instincts. We can see the narrative – “so and so will weaponize it this way.” So now we think, how can we preemptively shift it on this end before it's done so

that it doesn't go there. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

The Peery Film Fellows course perhaps summed this up when they said to student filmmakers, “Detours are part of the journey. Listen to your mistakes” (Peery Film Fellows Course, 2011).

Social entrepreneurs are restless and constantly innovating around their ideas. In the Peery Film Fellows course (2011), students were told that a large part of SE’s inability to focus on communications and public relations is the fact that they are “too busy innovating”. This perception was corroborated in this study by SE4’s founder who had taken a step back from his work with the parent organization to focus on a new endeavor that will collaborate with several other key partners to do more advocacy work for eye care in developing countries. The evolution of SE2’s founder from student to researcher to consultant to business owner also speaks to this characteristic. SE2’s founder was also in the process of starting a second economically-sustainable company while still in the throes of getting his first endeavor off the ground. The sheer number and breadth of projects under the umbrella of SE3’s model was also a testament to the founder’s commitment to constant media innovation.

With regard to film and use, this constant innovation and restlessness can create a barrier to using film for the social entrepreneur. It’s hard to document what they can’t explain or what is still in process of becoming. SE2’s founder put it this way:

It was during that time period when those terms were being created and started being used. We weren't really telling our story to anybody. We were just out there in a sense kind of learning and doing as we were going. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

Social entrepreneurs are comfortable with uncertainty and take calculated risks. First, the Peery Film Fellows students were taught to make themselves as flexible as possible to meet the demands of their clients: “In these organizations, things change from week to week: geography, location, people to interview. They are used to flexibility so you must be flexible”(Peery Film Fellows Course, 2011). SE2’s founder said, “We don't know if we're going to be successful or if we’ll fail, then I can tell the story too about how we failed. I'll be comfortable with that” (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). He also talked about the risks he has taken by noting that it might have been easier for his organization if they had just gone the safer route and taken grants and donations rather than investor capital to test out the idea. However, he ended the discussion with, “so, we’ll see.” SE1’s founder spoke candidly about the lack of ability to always know missions were fully successful because of circumstances outside the organization’s control.

Unfortunately, we don't always know because the governments won't always tell us. We hand the kids over, we have a good partner, a rehab partner that we always put in place, but then there are laws in some countries that say, "Ok, thank you. You can't access these kids anymore”. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

They work hard to mitigate this uncertainty where possible, but it doesn’t stop them from continuing their work: “We still get reports and we hope they're telling us the truth and we continue to give resources to our rehab partners. And we think they're telling us the truth” (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015).

For the filmmakers associated with social entrepreneurs, this flexibility and general comfort in uncertainty as well as the propensity toward calculated risk-taking coincides with the content and intent of documentary film on many levels.

For the filmmakers of SE1, the uncertainty of documentary film and the uncertainty of SE1's organizational mission affected the content in several ways. Because of the nature of the SE1 jump missions, there was ever only one opportunity to get the shot. This meant that they needed to incorporate several cameras in every situation which gave them a lot of footage to work with in the editing process. Even with the extra footage, there were simply pieces of the story missing when they got to the editing process.

We keep copious journals about every moment that happens and they're awesome. And ninety percent of it isn't in the film because we just don't have it. We don't have cameras in those quiet little moments during prayers or dinners or they happen to take place with a person that we couldn't film... Because they're real cameras, *I can only cut and tell the story of what I have and what footage I have* (emphasis added). You're editing and thinking there are all these great things that happened that aren't in the film. (SE1 filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

Ultimately, this uncertainty also affected the intent of the film in unexpected ways. Though it was unclear to the Chief Operating Officer if it was intended from the beginning of the film project or the organization, the role of the film in the organizational model became integral when they realized it could be used as both evidence in legal proceedings and an awareness tool.

For this model to be successful, we needed the film to not only just make the stakeholders aware but to also use the film to help solve the case...provide evidence to the prosecutors

to put the bad guys away, so it served dual purposes there. (SE1 Chief Operating Officer, personal communication, August 4, 2015)

Social entrepreneurs believe that they can influence large-scale transformational change.

SE3's founder self-identified as a filmmaker second and a "World Changer... the altruist... the rookie altruist" first and foremost. He talked about the genesis of one project in broad, sweeping terms: "The very first kernel of that project began with 'hey, let's tell the world what it's like to be us'. It fits so well into the SE3's mission" (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015). His focus on the "world" illustrated the general belief that SE's have in the power and scope of their ideas. The Peery Film Fellows course pointed out to students that SE's are innovators who are interested in solving the world's intractable problems at a societal level. The words 'scalable', 'systemic', and 'replicable' were used several times to describe the ideal SE model. SE1's founder describes their efforts as "force multipliers" for people who are like he once was: overwhelmed by the enormity of the problem and feeling limited by resources. SE1's larger mission to eradicate child slavery speaks to their belief in their ability to affect systemic, large-scale social problems. SE4's work to provide "affordable access to eyewear everywhere" again speaks boldly about large-scale potential and goals.

For those social entrepreneur groups that were currently using documentary film regularly in their communications strategies, the intended effect of their media was directly associated with their desire and mission to play a role on the world stage. SE3's founder/filmmaker told the story of his first cognitive childhood interaction with film and his subsequent understanding of its potential to create an effect on people:

Wow. This is power. I literally remember feeling...that's a lot of power and I want that power. Really, ever since then I grew up and I said I want to work in media some way somehow telling stories in a way that does what it did to me. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

When SE2's founder was first approached about using documentary film to further his mission, he admitted that he was, "just kind of doing it to do it. Not necessarily expecting much out of it. I guess you could say that I had low expectations" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). The shift in his perspective regarding the power of documentary to meet the wider scope and intended impact of his organization was reflected in his description of a new project with the SE2 filmmakers:

There's a lot of tension here in Kenya right now with Al Shabaab (a militant religious group) and it has created a really big divide between the Muslim and Christian worlds and just people living on the streets and all these different tribes. There are thousands of tribes and people who are disenfranchised and it's not a very cohesive country in that sense. It's really divided. So we want to have this video of someone running through all cultures and facets of Kenyan life - kind of like pulling Kenya together but also being the branding for our water (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

His belief that documentary can act as both a branding tool and a large-scale bridge building tool for a divided society was eerily similar to the dual nature of social enterprise itself.

For SE1's leadership, documentary film offered a way to meet their global mission and scope, but only if the content was carefully shepherded by the founder. SE1's founder talked about the need for governments in other countries to get involved and "rise up" like he did. He

was insistent with the filmmakers that the film frame his organization's efforts a specific way to facilitate that effect:

We were going to show the efforts that other governments are making, to focus attention on them more than us. That's a hard thing to do because we're the protagonists of the show. But to show them that we are working under them - I demanded to show that. And they did that in the documentary. They made sure that there was a scene, at least one scene where, I make it very clear that this is their operation and we're just helping them. The idea behind that was to show and empower other governments to say, "look, these guys didn't do it. They're just facilitators. We can do this." (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

Social entrepreneurs are trustworthy and have integrity. SE4's Senior Development Officer believed that their founder's story was especially valuable because of the credibility it brings to the organization's fundraising efforts:

As a side note, I think SE4's founder is a special case because he has such a high level of credibility because he's actually an eye doctor. So he's a practicing eye doctor and has his own practice in New York and so that brings credibility to the work that we do or his involvement in the work that we do and his leadership. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

SE1's founder noted their success with the public is based on the integrity of their organization:

Our main product is extraction of kids who are enslaved. And when they see that that's what we're doing and that's what we promise we do and what we do, it makes it all the

more compelling and people want to get on board. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

For SE3's founder, his life story is the document of trust for many of the people who connect to his organization. Because he is someone who identifies as both Mormon and homosexual, he was uniquely poised to negotiate between divisive ideologies and show others how to do it in new and different ways. Additionally, he noted the ethical role he plays as a SE to authentically represent his constituents in film:

it becomes my job as a documentarian and a SE to take whatever time it takes and whatever work it takes to get to know you, who you are, what your story is what your context is, everything about you and your situation and your subject so that I can then be an accurate agent of storytelling and help you tell your story and help others do the work to empathize with you. (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

Ultimately this integrity offers a framework for his organizational goals as well as the art and ethics of his film. The intention is authenticity in both.

SE1's filmmaker said that documentary films, like SE organizations, require a narrator/guide who is credible and authentic in order for the message to make it to the intended audience.

And it has to be a smart voice. That voice has to be able to eloquently deliver your message. If it's not, then everybody looks at you and says, 'you don't know what you're talking about.' At the end of the day we got supremely lucky that the person who guides us through this narrative happens to look like someone who stepped off the pages of a

central casting brochure. And he's still so compelling and knowledgeable about the subject that we can listen to him and know with confidence that what you're watching is accurate. If we sat down and said we want to do a documentary about child trafficking and we didn't have SE1's founder ... we'd just be a couple of numbskulls with a camera wanting to make a difference. (SE1 filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

The practical culture of social entrepreneurship and its valuation of integrity and authenticity make finding a credible voice for persuasive media more possible.

SE1's filmmakers were also quick to point out that they are normally narrative filmmakers, but the documentary form offered them a more authentic and more powerful way to tell the story. If integrity is a key to the social entrepreneurial character, documentary with no second takes is perceived to be an art form that honors that integrity in its realness. As SE2's filmmaker says,

This is real. It's real people doing it. Our goal was to try to teleport the viewer into the environment in the way we experienced it ourselves. I think the film does that. I don't know that you could do a more powerful narrative version of this film to be honest with you. (personal communication, July 15, 2015)

The Role of the Filmmaker in the SE Organization

During analysis, the involvement between the filmmaker and the organization and the role that the filmmaker played in the organization emerged as consistent categories and were in the data set to the point of saturation. Most importantly, they interacted with one another regularly enough that a clear pattern began to emerge. The way that SE founders and institutions engaged with their filmmakers made a difference in the intent, content, and effect of the

documentary film that they were making. This involvement can be categorized in three different ways: *collaborative, independent, and interdependent*.

Collaborative Involvement

Collaborative involvement between an SE organization and a filmmaker is most easily characterized by a continuous and indivisible flow between filmmaker and SE. The filmmaker adopts the SE organization's mission, storytelling narratives, and certain aspects of its character in essence becoming an extension of the social entrepreneur and organization. The SE organization in turn becomes a producer in the film, lending its unique voice, direction, and resources to the film to influence intent, content, and distribution.

Collaborative involvement is most clearly seen in the relationship between both SE1 and SE2 and their respective filmmakers.

In both cases, the social entrepreneur and the filmmakers told very similar stories to illustrate their relationship to the mission and communication goals of their organizations. For example, SE1's founder cited Harriet Beecher Stowe and her example of using the mass media of the day, her book *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, to incite the people to action.

So she comes out with this book, it does tremendously well and people can't believe it, they are outraged, they start listening to the abolitionists. They rise up and they make so much noise that the government has to act and that action in essence brings us to the civil war and the end of slavery... And the people rose up, not because of the government, they rose up because of people like Harriet Beecher Stowe, Frederick Douglas, Harriet Tubman who started the underground railroad. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

SE1's filmmaker evoked the same story as a way to frame their mission and goals for the film as entertainment with a cause:

The goal with this documentary is to really have the same effect that entertainment had on slavery originally. Harriet Beecher Stowe used entertainment to help start a war essentially. I don't know if she set out to do that in the beginning, but she wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and sold over 19 million copies and brought an awareness to the problem in the North and literally started a war... That's really our goal with the documentary and tv series... We want it to be entertaining but to really build an awareness and a campaign behind it. (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

SE2's founder and filmmakers also share a similar narration regarding their affinity for Coca Cola and Nike's branding prowess as a model for powerful and effective film. SE2's founder said:

This is going to sound odd, but I've always admired Coca Cola... They're one of the coolest companies - poison aside. They are marketing geniuses, the way they create feelings and emotions and I just watched a number of their videos and how they told stories - like share a Coke at these critical moments in time. There's this video that they show at the Coca Cola museum in Atlanta - where you're at a wedding or your first kiss - there are these moments and Coca Cola is always there...and then realizing that there's this issue in Kenya that is holding the country back that I think we can help address indirectly and string this together and have that Coke moment (mixed with Nike) ...and the product just happens to be SE2's product. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

When the SE2 filmmakers talked about persuasive and subtle use of branding, they also mentioned Coca Cola and Nike in very similar terms:

That's Coca Cola. Coca Cola sells happiness, unity. They sell, “if you drink coke you're gonna feel better, you're gonna be more likely to smile at someone on the street”. All these companies, what they're doing is saying, “yes we have a product, and we want you to take part in this product, but not just because it's our product and it's good but because we're selling ‘if you do this you can feel this way or you can accomplish this thing’...”

The biggest coolest brands are already doing that. Like Nike does that. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

In articulating the goals and intended effects of their film, SE1 filmmakers used language that mirrored the mission statements made by SE1’s founder and communications professional. The filmmakers talked of finding the balance in their content that will cause publics “to stand up and shout and stand up and do something”. They noted that the solution to the cause is the creation of a movement (of which their film is an integral part):

It was the people who stood up. Not the government. So the governments are never going to do anything. It requires the people to stand up. We need to replicate SE1 all over the world as many times as humanly possible. I hope that it's replicable. I hope that people out there stand up and say, "You know what? This bothers me as much as it does you and I'm not just going to go to work every day from now on and not think about it. (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

SE1's founder articulated the goals similarly, "We can create a movement and an awareness while it's happening and the people can see it and rise up and deal with it" (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015).

SE2's filmmakers and founder also mirrored one another in describing the social enterprise and market-driven model for social impact of SE2. SE2's founder outlined his model as follows:

I really think that by focusing on a business that is possible to grow and scale, you'll have a larger impact socially than by focusing on just social issues *per se*. The idea is that I can raise more capital if I'm profitable, I can scale faster. I'll have more employees. Part of the social impact is having jobs created for individuals. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

SE2 filmmakers summarized SE2's principle model and ideology in this way:

We work with SE2's founder and he goes to a country and I mean, he's a business guy...He wants to help people, but he's a business guy. So not only does he find out something that they want that improves their existence but also gives these people this opportunity to have a business and he doesn't view them as "Oh, I'm lifting them up", it's like, oh, these are my business partners, how can I make money. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

Beyond just mirrored storytelling and similar articulation of goals and ideology, some filmmakers also became an extension of the SE organization in a more practical fashion. SE1's filmmakers talked of being embedded in the SE1 organization during the filming of the documentary. As the filmmaker put it:

It's important to note that we're not all that separate. You don't know where one organization stops and the other begins and we kind of like it that way. I don't know if SE1 likes it, but we like it that way. (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

And SE2's filmmaker stated that the path to a quality film that meets the intended effects of the organization "requires that (the filmmaker) is involved from step one. Otherwise the mission, the vision, whatever the hope for the video- it will be either our version of their story or a complete miss" (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015).

It is important to also note that the business relationship between the filmmaker and the SE organization seems to be of little import when it comes to collaborative involvement. It didn't matter if the film was being produced independently of the organization or if it is a work-for-hire agreement. What distinguished collaborative involvement was its reliance on connectivity and fusion of the two groups.

For their part, the social entrepreneur and his organization become full partners in the production work of the film. SE1's founder has participated in the creation of the documentary from the beginning, heavily influencing the content:

I was careful about that. I fought really hard to the point that it affected my friendship with the filmmakers even. But I demanded to have a say in this. The rights are the filmmakers' but there are certain things carved out that allow me to have (a say) - and a lot of that was for the purpose of messaging but also for the purpose of safety, security - making sure that no one's face is revealed that shouldn't be revealed and that nothing is taken out of context. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

The Peery Film Fellows course instructed student filmmakers to “show the SE footage as you go. They are a partner. This sets up trust” (Peery Film Fellow Course, 2011). Trust interacts with collaborative involvement throughout the data. SE2’s founder said that as his relationship and trust with the filmmakers grew over the years, his involvement as a full partner in the content and intent of his films increased.

It has changed. It's actually probably changed in a different way than you would think. In the beginning I just totally handed it over to them... The third one was more like, I want to tell a story and this is the story I want to tell. You need to help me tell it. So I didn't want them to create the story. I had the story I wanted to tell. It took a little bit more collaboration to help them see my vision. I had to be really clear and make sure we were all on the same page. It's not like it was cumbersome, but it was definitely more involved and they probably don't like that as much. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

The flow of a collaborative involvement between SE and filmmaker also has implication in the distribution channels of the films. For the independent filmmakers creating a film about SE1, this gave their film the benefit of the organization’s grass roots campaign resources. SE1’s filmmakers acknowledged the advantage this gives them as they try to get the film and television series picked up by a major studio or network.

SE1 has been out there building an awareness of themselves and building their own eyeballs and building thousands if not hundreds of thousands of fans liking and following them (on social media). The bigger that SE1 gets, the more it will help when the film comes out. That's a given. That will be a huge benefit (to us) from SE1 in helping the

film. When you launch a film like this that's smaller, even if you have a studio do it, they want six to nine months of a grassroots campaign (which SE1 already has). (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

Another important benefit to collaborative involvement in the distribution of the film may be the role that the founder plays as someone who attracts attention and funding. Because they were “producers” of the film in both content and intent, the founder’s role in distribution became an asset to the filmmakers.

But (SE1 Founder’s) face and who he is and his participation and standing up and talking and meeting. He is the face. He's the one out there talking about it. He's the one that people want to talk to which is totally fine by me. You know we got supremely lucky in having (SE1’s Founder) as our guide. (SE2 Filmmakers, personal communication, August 7, 2015)

For SE3, there is no other model possible. Since he is both the SE and the filmmaker, he is left to grapple with the barriers that such a model presents in a very real way. He noted that the collaboration between SE and Filmmaker created a unique tension around the need to create something beautiful that also meets the needs of the organizational mission and messaging.

Having worked in both (film and social endeavors) the thing that always comes to my mind most about this intersectionality and trying to sort of negotiate relationships between the filmmakers and the SE is the tension between the need to tell a good story and the need to get our message out there...we want to promote ourselves as an organization because we need money and we need support. But then a filmmaker says, ‘but I need to tell a story.’ People don't like to sit through a ninety-minute commercial

and so getting people to negotiate that space so that both are accomplished is always the toughest tension in doing that. And ultimately, of course, people like me believe that you're going to sell your idea best if you wrap people up in a story. (SE3

Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015)

The barrier presented by this tension between artful quality and impactful messaging present in collaborative involvement was corroborated by all of the filmmakers in the study.

One very interesting finding was the interaction between collaborative involvement and the role of the filmmaker to the social entrepreneur. The data suggested that in a collaborative involvement, the filmmaker becomes a sort of coach or process expert to the SE organization in matters of distribution and brand development. The Peery Film Fellows course gave student filmmakers a great deal of instruction on how to guide the SE in their communications strategy and brand development. SE2's filmmaker speaks often about the need for SE organizations to allow them to help with branding:

A lot of the problem with these (organizations) ...you do branding work, you show up and they themselves are still discovering their own story. One of the reasons we're not just filmmakers and one of the reasons we are a full service creative agency is because we wanted to make sure that they understood their story and their brand and why they hope to tell their story, so that when they make that video, their impact can be as big as it could be. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

Independent Involvement

If collaborative involvement is a connected flow between the SE organization and the filmmaker that intersects with the intent, content, and effectiveness of the film, independent

involvement is the opposite. It can easily be described as a completely independent entity making a film about the SE organization with or without the consent or participation of the SE founder or organization on some level. This level of involvement manifested in several different ways in this study.

When SE2's founder started to work with the SE2 filmmakers, his involvement was best described as independent. He says that the first film was "their concept. As far as the content of it and direction of it, they really took that interview and put together the piece and I just showed up. It was just another interview" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). Though he was approached by the filmmakers and agreed to be the film subject, he had nothing to do with the content or intent of the film. In fact, he was surprised to discover the film's usefulness to his business after it was created and handed to him. He described the film this way:

Once it was all done, it was a great storytelling piece. I still randomly do get several emails a day from people who say, "we saw this video and we heard about you" and it randomly starts conversations on how we do what we do and how to do business in emerging markets. I think the initial documentary really helped do a lot of that. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

The barriers and opportunities with independent involvement are vastly different but both interact with public relations. For SE4, independent involvement with a filmmaker represented a threat to the control of messaging. SE4's Senior Development Officer noted the inherent difficulty in reigning in an uncontrolled film:

I imagine that SE4 and most NGOs would be a little uncomfortable with hiring or even agreeing for a third party to come in and do a film that could potentially get out there

without being able to somewhat control the message. Because then we also get into potentially a situation where we're using all of our resources to respond to a very public critique as opposed to using our resources... to improve.(SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

The Chief Operating Officer of SE1 saw the lack of control inherent in independent involvement as an opportunity rather than a barrier.

I appreciate that it's a third party. I think it adds some credibility to it. This is a third party group that's not us, taking the footage. We didn't hire them to do this. We're not paying them to do this. They're an independent venture and...they were there. They can provide a first-hand account through their creation, through this product that they're creating. I think it actually helps. It makes our job easier. And if they don't like it, I can say that it wasn't us. (SE1 Chief Operating Officer, personal communication, August 4, 2015)

Interdependent Involvement

Perhaps interdependent involvement represents a middle ground between the polar opposites of collaborative and independent relationships. Interdependent involvement seems to be characterized by an SE and a filmmaker who work together and need each other to tell the story and meet the organizational mission, but the filmmaker functions mainly as a support to the SE without really becoming connected to the mission and the organization enough to bear much on content or intent.

SE5's Director of Communications mentioned a sort of interdependent involvement with their filmmaker. She noted that the videographer was helpful but perhaps SE5 micromanaged the

process a bit much. They gave him the script to work from and then SE5 found the subjects and did the interviewing to ensure messaging cohesion. The end product was professional and well built, but if she could do them over again, she would focus the storytelling more on impact. She was also not sure where else to use the films or how to distribute them more effectively. Perhaps the interdependent involvement restricted the role of the filmmaker as a coach regarding distribution.

Interdependent involvement also characterizes the way that SE4 interacted with its filmmaker most recently. Although the author was unable to interview the filmmaker to get more clarity, SE4's Senior Development Officer said that for their domestic visual media, she is taking the lead on content creation: "I went with the filmmaker to Bangladesh. I'm the one who did all the interviews through a translator. I am really controlling the story and hopefully it will come out well" (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015).

Interdependent involvement offers a great amount of control to the SE especially with regard to content and intent. However, the lack of a filmmaker guide can present a barrier to a more meaningful experience with documentary for the organization and a decrease in the quality and ultimately the effect of the media. It is difficult to know whether the lack of collaborative involvement preceded lower prioritization of documentary film for SE4 and SE5 or if it came as a result of previous lackluster experiences with filmmakers, distribution, and impact.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to begin exploring the intersection of social entrepreneurs and their use of documentary film with the intention to map out current practices for future research. There are a few conclusions that we may make as a result of the information gleaned from the research that speak to that goal.

Documentary's usefulness to social entrepreneurs is conditional

According to this study, documentary film is a useful tool for social entrepreneurs who are implementing it in various forms to help support their communications strategy. However, that use is not wholly unconditional. Documentary is most impactful for an SE organization when the content of the film directly contributes to the stated mission of the organization, the organization has some control over that content, and/or they have the resources (human and financial) and infrastructure to support the making and the distribution of the film in a way that directly reaches their target audiences. In fact, in some cases where that criteria is not honored or met, the social entrepreneur or his organizational leaders may actually perceive the film as a threat to their mission, an additional burden on already thinly stretched schedules, or a waste of energy and time.

Considering what we have learned about the unique character of the social entrepreneur, it makes sense that mission alignment, message control, and lack of resources would be barriers to the use of documentary. Bornstein & Davis (2010) point out that social entrepreneurs differ from business entrepreneurs in one key way: they choose to maximize social impact over profit. Additionally, Bill Drayton attributes an unusual commitment and focus to their cause to the modern social entrepreneur. This focused intent on their goals means that anything beyond the

scope of their work, no matter how personally interesting or attractive, gets put aside. Film, if it is not in service to the mission of the organization, does nothing to help maximize impact and is therefore placed on a back burner of priorities.

With regard to the need to have a modicum of control in the film's messaging, we can look to the way social entrepreneurs must work within the societies in which they operate for answers. As fusion experts, SE's are constantly surveying the lay of the land and trying to negotiate a complex social system to get their work done.

Social entrepreneurs don't control major resources, and, unlike governments, they can't command compliance. They have to leverage resources that others control and influence people by articulating goals that are meaningful. Social entrepreneurs are most effective when they demonstrate ideas that inspire others to go out and create their own social change (Bornstein, 2010).

Social entrepreneurs don't control resources, but they do control their own story. That story, whether it is the story of their "moment of obligation", the story of their innovative model, or the story of their failures and subsequent learning, is the greatest resource they have for leveraging support and attracting followers and funding. When Bornstein (2010) profiles two well-known social entrepreneurs, he says that, "both worked intentionally to 'market' their ideas, repeating the same stories over and over to help mobilize resources, form partnerships, disarm enemies, and woo political power brokers." It makes sense then, that the story be protected and wielded carefully.

If storytelling is at the heart of the social entrepreneurial experience, it might also explain why filmmakers and SE organizations working collaboratively mirror one another in their

rhetoric. As an extension of the social entrepreneur, the collaboratively involved filmmaker internalizes and repeats the same stories because they have bought in to the social entrepreneur's well-articulated goals and found meaning in them. They in turn, become advocates of the cause.

Any tension between filmmakers and social entrepreneurs around message control may be explained in part by the definition of documentary proposed by Grierson (1934): "The creative treatment of actuality". Documentary film in this normative form is a crafting of experiences into a compelling narrative. It is, in essence, storytelling. The Filmmakers for SE2 discussed the importance of creative, artful storytelling in film:

Quality matters in storytelling. If you just have a handy-cam that's going around and capturing it, it can tell people what's happening, but they're not going to feel an emotional attachment to it. Stakeholders aren't going to feel proud of the product, they'll say oh cool, "I went and did good and now I can feel good." But you tell a story...say it's a well you've built somewhere... you flip that story just a little bit and you show people's lives before the well and you show the anticipation and the work that goes into the well, you show that it's not just the well being built, it's the well and the jobs that it creates. And then you connect it to a kid in the village, connect it to education and the possibilities that brings. All the sudden the stakeholder sees that they didn't just build a well, they built part of a community, and as they do that it becomes shareable. They want to share that story. (SE2 Filmmaker, personal communication, July 15, 2015)

It is possible that the heavy focus on storytelling as part of both the filmmaker and social entrepreneurial identity creates a competitive environment when it comes to controlling the message. This might speak to the several times in the study when social entrepreneurs and

filmmakers respectively harkened to feelings of insecurity about their partner's perceptions of their increased control of the content and messaging, saying things like, "it was definitely more involved and they probably didn't like that as much" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). Regardless of the level of involvement, message control is of paramount importance to both groups since both see their value in terms of their ability to tell the story well, whether to garner funding, be accepted into a film festival, or perhaps as Bornstein & Davis (2010) note, fulfill their life's purpose.

Trust is an important mitigation tool for the filmmaker in these situations. SE2's filmmakers garnered the trust of the founder by creating independent pieces of documentary film at the beginning of their relationship free of charge. As he saw the quality of their work and the artfulness of their storytelling, he began to see them as a partner to his own function as a storyteller: "We weren't really telling our story to anybody, we were just out there in a sense kind of learning and doing as we were going. And so the documentary was great for us because we were able to tell our story" (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015). Even as he became more involved with the content and concepts of the films he and the filmmakers work on together, he still deferred to the filmmakers to craft a well-built narrative:

I have a bit of a working piece of this in mind and how it will work but I'm sure it will end up totally different once they start putting their touches on it. They come and say we have this type of camera, we should take this type of angle - they always add a lot of creativity to it. I'm excited about it. (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

For SE1's founder, having control over content was important enough to his mission and the success of his organization, that he required a legal agreement with the filmmakers.

No because I was careful about that. I fought really hard to the point that it affected my friendship with (SE1 Filmmakers) even. But I demanded to have a say in this. The rights belong to SE1 Filmmakers but there are certain things carved out that allow me to have (a say)- and a lot of that was for the purpose of messaging but also for the purpose of safety, security - making sure that no one's face is revealed that shouldn't be revealed or that nothing is taken out of context. (SE1 Founder, personal communication, August 1, 2015)

Colloquial trust was not enough in the case of an organization that services vulnerable populations. And, while filmmakers don't have to have the consent of every subject they film in a documentary, the filmmakers for SE1 needed the cooperation of SE1's founder in order to tell the story in the most impactful way. Even collaborative involvement requires negotiation and balance.

Though barriers of control and mission alignment are enough alone to hinder documentary use by social entrepreneurs, the lack of financial and human resources is especially problematic in the world of the social entrepreneur. Every SE organization in this study mentioned some form of want when it came to resources that affected their use of documentary film more effectively. Whether this resource problem is unique to social enterprise is not clear from the results of this study. Whether it is unique or not, the challenge of continually raising growth capital is an acknowledged constraint on social entrepreneurial organizations (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). The slower, research-driven, wait-and-see approach that characterizes social entrepreneurship affects investment opportunities, which can in turn limit financial resources.

This study did not show that there was a difference in financial resources for film between newer SE organizations and older, more established organizations, but it is still worth noting for future research.

Documentary filmmakers bring much more than footage to the table

Since this particular study showed that the division between marketing and public relations is so murky for social entrepreneurial organizations anyway, filmmakers may be able to offer a service that falls firmly in the marketing camp. This study also showed that brand development is a haphazard process for newer SE organizations by virtue of the constant innovation and restlessness of the social entrepreneurial culture. This is one area where the filmmaker can act as a true partner to the SE organization to maximize impact. SE2's founder discovered this when he allowed the filmmakers to take what he calls "complex and niche" subject matter and independently create films about it.

I wasn't doing any marketing at all, partially because the work that I was doing was so niche. It took a lot of explaining. People didn't really understand it. It was before the words social enterprise and impact investing were even out there. It was during that time period when those terms were being created and started being used. We weren't really telling our story to anybody. We were just out there in a sense kind of learning and doing as we were going. And so the documentary was great for us because we were able to tell our story. What we do and how we do it and why we do it and I think it opened up quite a few doors. People would see it and go, "oh wow, we've been wanting to do that" or "this is exactly what we need". (SE2 Founder, personal communication, August 28, 2015)

Social Entrepreneurs may also use the filmmaker as a communications partner and coach to brainstorm ideas about audience as SE1 did with its filmmakers. In fact, the filmmakers discovered an unintended audience for SE1 that they are now able to work together to reach.

Although this study showed that every level of involvement has both positive and negative impacts on content and effect of documentary, it seems that the best way for an SE organization to involve their filmmaker as a communications coach is collaboratively. Bringing the filmmaker into the fold as an extension of the SE provides him with an additional measure of connection to the goals and missions of the organization. In that space, the filmmaker can use his or her expertise to actively coach the organization on distribution, content, format, and other possible uses for the film.

Whiteman (2004) proposed a coalition model of assessing the impact of political documentary in which all parties to the documentary, including activists and distributors, are considered as part of the impact and success of the film. Though Whiteman's coalition model doesn't advocate for a specific type of involvement between filmmaker and activists from the beginning, it does recognize that documentary impact cannot be separated from the producers, end users, and key stakeholders. It may be that coalitions and collaborations are exactly the way effective and persuasive documentary are best created.

Paradox is present

The very use of documentary film in SE communications might indicate that both social entrepreneurial organizations and documentary filmmakers are looking for the same thing: authenticity that services the purpose of their work. The filmmakers in this study spoke of the

tension between artful storytelling and meeting the needs of the organization and several pointed to documentary film specifically as the answer to this particular paradox. Both SE2 and SE1's filmmakers cited perceived authenticity of documentary film as a boon to the impact and effect of their film in getting the message far and wide.

However, when SE3's founder reflexively noted that "no one likes to sit through a ninety-minute commercial" (SE3 Founder/Filmmaker, personal communication, July 24, 2015), it seemed that the filmmakers may also be aware of the inherent problem with using documentary film in a promotional sense. If SE organizations and filmmakers were to subscribe to the purpose of documentary film in its Greirsonian iteration to serve the public good independent of institutions, then the only type of involvement between the two parties that really allows for such purpose is independent involvement.

For their part, SE organizations seemed to be more conflicted about the need for authenticity when compared to the need to control their message. This is no more apparent than in the level of involvement they had with their filmmaker. Though we see elements of independent involvement in SE1 and SE2, collaborative and interdependent involvement are ultimately where all five SE organizations find themselves in relation to their filmmakers. Though we cannot make a conclusive argument from the data present in this study, it might be that the use of the documentary form for SE visual media is an unconscious mitigation of the actual lack of authenticity inherent in their need for crafted, branded, and frankly, marketed messaging.

Perhaps Nichols (2010) gives SE organizations a way out of the paradox and the judgement of the documentary purists with his expanded definition of documentary film and

admission that academies and institutions play an important role in getting documentary to the people:

Whatever its role, these institutions contribute to the reality of what gets made and how it looks. They often impose standards and conventions on the work they support, and their goals and criteria change over time. Without them far fewer documentaries would reach their intended audience. (p.19)

At the beginning of this paper, the author reviewed literature that called for a shift from marketing constructs to more relationship building features of public relations as a way to further imbue social causes with authenticity and truth-telling. It is interesting to note that throughout the interviews, terms such as “branding”, “audience”, “reach”, and even the word “marketing” were mixed with more relationship-based terms that spoke to the need to develop two-way communication with relevant publics.

Perhaps the paradox inherent in the very culture of social entrepreneurship is worth looking to for answers. The two terms “social” and “entrepreneur” that come together to define the category indicate a delicate balance or tension between more traditional market-driven goals and the social good. Although this study has used a definition of social entrepreneur that does not force the market-driven social enterprise model as a qualification for inclusion, it becomes difficult to ignore the cultural influence of social enterprise in the category. SE organizations may even find themselves navigating the confusion in their communications as SE4 did when they determined to shift their focus and revise their model:

In the past, up until this year over the past several years, we've been focused on trying to become a sustainable company or have sustainable operations in the countries

where we work. For example in India, we were really focused on our stores becoming what we call cost-covering. The sale of glasses pays for the operation of the store.

However, what we were finding was that in doing that we were confusing our staff in the sense that we were asking them to focus on profit or cost coverage as opposed to focusing on the population that we're trying to reach which is people at the base of the

pyramid...And so what we did is we took a really hard look at that and decided that instead of focusing on cost coverage, we're focused on the lowest philanthropic subsidy possible needed to ... bring a pair of glasses to the people within our target population.

So it's been a really interesting shift for us because it's much more...I'm much more comfortable with it because I think it's much more mission aligned. And I feel like we're reaching the people that we want to be reaching and that's an important goal for us. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

SE4 also discussed the way this confusion of competing goals that represent the “social” and the “entrepreneurship” affected their communications. She said,

I think when we first started out it was focused on not only bringing glasses to people but also giving jobs to women in particular and giving them income potential. I don't know exactly when we moved away from telling that story. What was happening was that the message was getting kind of confused. Are we telling the story about the need for eyeglasses and the access to eyeglasses or are we telling the story about entrepreneurs being able to support their families. Again, I wasn't here at the time but my understanding was that the message was confusing. (SE4 Senior Development Officer, personal communication, August 21, 2015)

Bandinelli and Arvidsson (2012) address the paradox of messaging involved in the confluence of these competing priorities and the impact they have on authenticity in the world of the social entrepreneur. They note that social entrepreneurs are encouraged to “brand” themselves as changemakers in order to gain a reputation that will lead to trust in their personal ethics and impact that will eventually lead to access to financial capital. The irony of self-branding as a path to reputation is not lost on the authors. Branding in and of itself is a marketing construct that speaks to the media-logic that Cottle and Nolan (2007) so fiercely rallied against as a barrier to authentic communication. In this particular way, social entrepreneurs are not unique from other social organizations trying to differentiate themselves.

In fact, one of the biggest questions that arose during analysis of this data was exactly how social entrepreneurial organizations differ from their NGO counterparts, especially in consideration of documentary film. The scope of this study did not allow for definitive conclusions in one direction or another. The role of the founder’s story in communications strategies and documentary content may, in future research, rise to the surface as one of the truly unique cultural phenomena in the social entrepreneurial landscape. As further study contrasts and compares traditional NGOs and SE organizations, the role of documentary film as a tool for both may provide an interesting case study for differences and similarities.

LIMITATIONS

As with any research, there are factors that may have unwittingly impacted the results and findings of this study. For the purpose of full disclosure and by way of invitation to improve upon any aspect of the study, those limitations are listed here.

First, the author's relative inexperience at conducting qualitative research, including coding and constant comparative analysis, may have impacted the quality of the results. The author used thick description in order to mitigate any error in coding as possible.

Second, the sample breadth was limited by the lack of access to SE4 and SE5's filmmakers. Having their perspective may have offered an additional insight into the interdependent involvement segment of the text and it is worth exploring in more depth in another study.

Third, technological failure in recording the interview of SE5 limited the text for analysis. This gave the author only snippets of data to work with and inhibited a fuller comparison between newer SE organizations and more established ones.

Fourth, the lack of inclusion of traditional NGO models in the interview text for comparison did not allow the author to fully answer one of the research questions. It now seems that the question was too broad for the scope of this study and would have required too much text to analyze. The author suggests isolating that research questions for future study and developing a separate research paradigm to address it.

Fifth, as a human instrument, the author acknowledges her own bias as a limitation in the study. Because the interviews were conducted in person and via video conferencing, human interaction was at play. In transcribing the interviews and coding, it was impossible for the

author to separate her feelings and experiences from the interviews in a completely neutral way from the data. However, this limitation is also what makes qualitative interviewing a rich research experience.

CONCLUSION

From the beginning of its existence, documentary film has been an express partner to the interests of various causes, ideologies, and social movements. In the literature review of this paper, the author has shown that research about the intent, content, and effect of documentary film, as interpreted by scholars, often focuses on its relationship to activism and awareness campaigns. Because there was still a great deal of uncharted territory with regard to how documentary is used in practical ways by different groups of social change-makers, this study attempted to answer questions that would illuminate the current landscape of use by one specific category of social actor: the social entrepreneur. The relative newness of the terminology related to the category of social entrepreneur coupled with the constant reinvention of communications channels and strategy have made it necessary for this research to be viewed as exploratory in nature.

As an exploration, this study begins to paint a picture of the ways documentary film is currently being used as a tool for these organizations and the barriers that exist to using it more effectively in public relations and communications strategies. Because of the sample selection and the choice to have both the social entrepreneur and the filmmaker as interview subjects, interesting data emerged that showed how the relationship of the filmmaker to the social entrepreneur can affect documentary film use either positively or negatively. The study also initially describes barriers to use, distribution, and effectiveness of documentary in social entrepreneurial organizations' mission-driven work. These initial broad strokes of understanding are exactly that - a beginning.

There is still much more to learn to help influence the practical use of documentary by social entrepreneurs. This study raised questions that might be beneficial to address in future

studies both qualitatively and quantitatively. What elements of the social entrepreneur's "moment of obligation" story actually persuade people to action? Does the innovation model of the social entrepreneurial organization impact the need for and content of documentary film? Are there other types of film that could do the job just as well for social entrepreneurs and if so, what needs to be present in those films to make them successful? For that matter, what does "success" look like for both the filmmaker and the organization? If success looks different, how does that impact content, distribution, and audience? For those organizations that need film to fulfill their mission, what happens to the filmmaker role over time as the organization grows? Do they ultimately need to have a filmmaker embedded in the organization in order to have the biggest impact? What other characteristics need to overlap in the filmmaker and the social entrepreneur to ensure a good working relationship and a professional match?

It seems that the next important step in this research track would take the findings of this paper and apply quantitative methodology to some of the same questions in order to add scope. Now that there is a clearer sense of the questions that need to be asked, a larger sample size of social entrepreneurs, founders, and communications professionals along with more pointed and direct questions in the form of a survey might allow for the findings of this study to be either corroborated or refuted. On a very practical level, this might lead to the creation of a best practices guide or "how to" for social entrepreneurs who need to include persuasive visual media in their communications strategies.

Perhaps the best conclusion to this study came from SE2's filmmaker when he learned of the purpose of his interview. He said,

If anyone wants their cause to get out there, that's what you have to do. You have to be able to put it on the level that the masses can do something. You have to educate them to the problem and then you have to provide them with an avenue where they can actually do something. Where they can participate. That's the only way to make it go viral which gets your cause out there and stops the problem. (SE1 Filmmaker, personal communication, August 7, 2014)

Whether documentary film is the right tool for that job or not, it is the hope of the researcher that this beginning examination will quickly lead to more scholarly conversations about how to help the world's most thoughtful and careful innovators "get their causes out there" and support them in their efforts to solve the deepest and most troubling problems of our day. Academia can be a contributor to that end.

REFERENCES

- Aguayo, A. J. (2013). Paradise lost and found: Popular documentary, collective identification and participatory media culture. *Studies in Documentary Film*, 7(3), 233-248. doi:10.1386/sdf.7.3.233_1
- Auwal, M. A., & Singhal, A. (1992). The diffusion of Grameen Bank in Bangladesh: Lessons learned about alleviating rural poverty. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 14(1), 7-28.
- Bae, H.S. (2008). Entertainment-Education and recruitment of cornea donors: The role of emotion and issue involvement. *Journal of Health Communication*, 13, 20-36.
- Bandinelli, C., & Arvidsson, A. (2013). Brand yourself a changemaker! *Journal of Macromarketing*, 33(1), 67-71. doi:10.1177/0276146712465186
- Barnouw, E. (1993). *Documentary: A history of the non-fiction film (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Berg, B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (7th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bob, C. (2005). *The marketing of rebellion: Insurgents, media and international activism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bornstein, D. & Davis, S. (2010) *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, W. (2010). Film in antitrafficking and antislavery campaigns. *Media Development*, 57(3), 51-54.
- Christensen, C. (2007). Political documentaries, grassroots distribution and online organization: The case of brave new films. International Communication Association.
- Clarke, P., & Mount, P. (2001). Non-profit marketing: The key to marketing's "mid-life crisis"? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6, 78-91.
- Cottle, S., & Nolan, D. (2007). Global humanitarianism and the changing aid-media field. *Journalism Studies*, 8(6), 862-878.
- DeLuca, K. M., & Peebles, J. (2002). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy, activism, and the 'violence' of seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(2), 125.

- Dimitrov, R. (2007). ChilOut: Strategic communication by small advocacy groups. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 34(3), 129-143.
- Dow, B. (2004). Fixing feminism: Women's liberation and the rhetoric of television documentary. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90(1), 53-80.
- Eitzen, D. (1995) When Is a Documentary?: Documentary as a Mode of Reception. *Cinema Journal*, 35(1),81-102.
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGDOs as a moment in history: Beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly*, 21(4), 637-654.
- Fox, K.A, & Kotler, P. (1980). The marketing of social causes: The first ten years. *Journal of Marketing*, 44 (fall), 24-33.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York, NY; Basic Books, Inc.
- Gose, B. (2010). Nonprofit groups hope film will stir public passion for improving schools. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 22(15), 28-28.
- Grierson, J. (1971). *First principles of documentary*. In F. Hardy (Ed.), *Grierson on Documentary* (pp. 145-156). New York, NY: Praeger Publishers
- Grierson, J. (1971). *Documentary, the bright example*. In F. Hardy (Ed.), *Grierson on Documentary* (pp. 339-345). New York, NY: Praeger Publishers
- Grunig, J. E., Hunt, T. T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Hardy, F. (1979). *John Grierson: A documentary biography*. London, UK: Faber and Faber, Limited
- Jayasinghe, S. (2011). Erosion of trust in humanitarian agencies: what strategies might help? *Global Health Action*, 4,1-5. doi:10.3402/gha.v4i0.8973
- Kaplan, E. A. (2008). Global trauma and public feelings: Viewing images of catastrophe. *Consumption, Markets & Culture*, 11(1), 3-24. doi:10.1080/10253860701799918
- Khorana, S. (2015). Self-distribution and Mary meets Mohammad : Towards ethical witnessing. *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, 9(1), 66-76. doi:10.1080/17503175.2014.1002271
- Kotler, P. (2002). *Social marketing improving the quality of life (2nd ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Kotler, P., & Zaltman, G. (1971). Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing*, 35(3), 3-12.
- LaMarre, H. L., & Landreville, K. D. (2009). When is fiction as good as fact? comparing the influence of documentary and historical reenactment films on engagement, affect, issue interest, and learning. *Mass Communication & Society*, 12(4), 537-555.
- Lim, J., & Jones, L. (2010). A baseline summary of framing research in public relations from 1990 to 2009. *Public Relations Review*, 36(3), 292-297.
doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.05.003
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lindenfeld, L. (2010). Can documentary food films like food inc. achieve their promise? *Environmental Communication*, 4(3), 378-386.
- McLafferty Jr., C. L., Slate, J. R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2010). Transcending the quantitative-qualitative divide with mixed methods research: A multidimensional framework for understanding congruence and completeness in the study of values. *Counseling & Values*, 55(1), 46-62.
- McLaughlin, J. S., McLaughlin, G. W., & Muffo, J. A. (2001). Using qualitative and quantitative methods for complementary purposes: A case study. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 112, 15-44.
- McPherson, E. (2015). Advocacy organizations' evaluation of social media information for NGO journalism: The evidence and engagement models. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(1), 124-148. doi:10.1177/0002764214540508
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mullman, J. (2008). Sudan's lost boys hire euro to find spotlight. (cover story). *Advertising Age*, 79(12), 1-25.
- Nichols, B. (2010). *How can we define documentary film? In Introduction to documentary (2nd ed.)*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Nisbet, M. C., & Aufderheide, P. (2009). Documentary film: Towards a research agenda on forms, functions, and impacts. *Mass Communication & Society*, 12(4), 450-456.
- O'Neil, J. (2008). Linking public relations tactics to long-term success: An investigation of how communications contribute to trust, satisfaction, and commitment in a nonprofit organization. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 14(3/4), 263.

- Plantinga, C. (2005). What a documentary is, after all. *Journal of Aesthetics & Art Criticism*, 63(2), 105-117. doi:10.1111/j.0021-8529.2005.00188.x
- Pope, J. A., Sterrett Isley, E., & Asamoah-Tutu, F. (2009). Developing a marketing strategy for nonprofit organizations: An exploratory study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 21(2), 184-201.
- Popova, L. (2009). Compassion desensitization: Comparing reactions to nonfiction disaster and fictional television violence. Conference Papers -- *International Communication Association*, 1-42.
- Pouliot, L., & Cowen, P. S. (2007). Does perceived realism really matter in media effects? *Media Psychology*, 9(2), 241-259.
- Rabiger, M. (1998) *Directing the Documentary (Third Ed.)*. Boston: Focal Press.
- Rothschild, M. L. (1979). Marketing communications in nonbusiness situations or why it's so hard to sell brotherhood like soap. *Journal of Marketing*, 43(2), 11-20.
- Schiller, N. (2009). Framing the revolution: Circulation and meaning of the revolution will not be televised. *Mass Communication & Society*, 12(4), 478-502. doi:10.1080/15205430903237832
- Selection Criteria (n.d.). Ashoka Innovators for the Public. Retrieved November 1, 2015 from <https://www.ashoka.org/support/criteria>
- Seo, H., Kim, J. Y., & Yang, S. (2009). Global activism and new media: A study of transnational NGOs' online public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 35(2), 123-126.
- Small nonprofits hitch their PR wagons to major hollywood movies.(2005). *PR News*, 61(45), 1.
- Thrall, A. T., Stecula, D., & Sweet, D. (2014). May We Have Your Attention Please? Human-Rights NGOs and the Problem of Global Communication. *International Journal Of Press/Politics*, 19(2), 135-159. doi:10.1177/1940161213519132
- Tsiotsou, R. (2004). The role of involvement and income in predicting large and small donations to college athletics. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 6(2), 117-123.
- Wakefield, R. I., Burnett, K. J., & Van Dusen, C. (2010). Toward a new framework for pro-social public relations: What makes NGOs successful in gaining support and influence. Paper presented at the fourteenth Annual International Public Relations Research Conference, Miami, FL.

- Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 35(2), 102-106.
- Whiteman, D. (2009). Documentary film as policy analysis: The impact of *Yes, In My Backyard* on activists, agendas, and policy. *Mass Communication & Society*, 12(4), 457-477.
- Whiteman, D. (2004). Out of the theaters and into the streets: A coalition model of the political impact of documentary film and video. *Political Communication*, 21(1), 51-69.
- Whiteman, D. (2003). Reel Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1(1), 60-63.
- Wimmer, R. D. & Dominick, J. R. (2011). *Mass media research: An introduction (9th ed.)*. Belmont Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Yeon, H. M., Choi, Y., & Kiouisis, S. (2005). Interactive communication features on nonprofit organizations' webpages for the practice of excellence in public relations. *Journal of Website Promotion*, 1(4), 61-83.
- Yunus wins peace Nobel for anti-poverty efforts. (2006, October 13). Msnbc.com. Retrieved April 18, 2011 from http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15246216/ns/business-world_business/
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(2009), 519-532.

APPENDIX A: Interview Questions

For social entrepreneurial organization

1. What is the mission/goal of your organization?
2. What are the communications goals of your organization?
3. Who are your target audiences and key stakeholders for general communication?
4. Why did you choose to make a documentary as opposed to another form of visual media?
5. How did you decide whether you make your film in house or out of house?
6. Who are your target audiences and key stakeholders for the documentary?
7. What are the target outcomes and behaviors that you are trying to elicit with your documentary?
8. How are you currently distributing or using your documentary?
9. How do you plan to distribute or use your documentary in the future?

For filmmaker

10. What are your missions and goals as a filmmaker?
11. What do you hope to communicate by making documentaries?
12. Who are your target audiences and stakeholders for your films? (perhaps need to define stakeholders)
13. Why did you choose to make a documentary as opposed to another form of visual media?
14. What was the motivating factor for making a film for this organization?

15. How aligned do you feel with the goals and mission of the organization for which you made the film? Can you tell me the goals and mission of the organization for which you made the film?
16. What are the target outcomes and behaviors that you are trying to elicit with your documentary?
17. How are you currently distributing or using your documentary?
18. How do you plan to distribute or use your documentary in the future?