How Social Benevolence Motivates Entrepreneurs

J. Phillip Harris
Columbia Southern University
University of Phoenix

The purpose of this study is to see if improving social causes motivates successful entrepreneurs more than it does other wealthy people. The design approach uses Forbes' 400 richest Americans list, which offers a self-made score identifying self-made people and people who inherit their wealth. A quantitative study using ANOVA compares score differences between charity made by self-made people and those inheriting wealth. Results revealed evidence supporting that entrepreneurs play a special role contributing to social advances. Compared with wealthy people who inherit their money, people starting enterprises more likely will support social causes by contributing.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurs are creative people because they discover needs creating new goods and services that fill market gaps. People founding companies learn how businesses work by seeking unusual answers and assembly approaches. Famous entrepreneurs often dropout from college because they had an idea they wanted to act on. These innovators did not want to wait and see other people act on their ideas before them. Acting quickly motivates company founders to avoid losing openings they foresee. Chasing new openings often overshadows company founders' pursuit of income coming at the expense of finishing their education. Oddly enough, as these innovators achieve higher education levels, they improve their chances their ventures succeed (Blanchflower, 2004; Fairlie & Woodruff, 2007). Company founders who achieve success understand how important a good education is, but many are nonconformists. These company founders often come from deprived settings enjoying a chance to build a successful enterprise. Entrepreneurs are bright, creative people who see new openings where others fear to tread. Scarcity often propels a person's passion to achieve what others fail foreseeing. Supporters often overvalue creating wealth as a motive for starting a venture undervaluing social kindness. Contributing to social causes may influence people starting businesses more than it does people just wanting to grow their wealth. Gautier and Pache (2015) reviewed journal articles on company generosity noting it "is surprisingly overlooked in the literature" (p. 363). Baker and Moran (2011) called for further research "into entrepreneurialism and philanthropy" (p. 148). This paper addresses both these calls for more research.

Because entrepreneurship promoters often credit company founders' success to how much wealth they can amass, they fail seeing value of their social advances. For example, Kidane and Harvey (2009) analyzed success of 35 American company founders on Forbes' 400 wealthiest people list. Forbes' list includes both wealthy "self-made" people and people who inherited their wealth (Fontevecchia, 2014). People who inherited their wealth likely experience different motives than "self-made" people. Often wealthy people inherit wealth as offspring of "self-made" people. Holding onto inherited wealth motivates people inheriting instead of laying groundwork for a better world like "self-made" people. Unlike, people inheriting wealth, "self-made" people's vision often emerged from a poor or needy position leading them to seek improving their way of life. Kidane and Harvey only studied "self-made" people excluding people inheriting their wealth. Schumpeter (1951) argued entrepreneurs take actions not normally done in ordinary company routines. Self-made entrepreneurs often take an original track.

An example of taking an unusual track comes from how the Internet started. Severance (2013) interviewed Kristie Hafner, author of *Where wizards stay up late* about Arpanet's origin, a modern Internet forerunner commissioned by Congress on February 28, 1990. Hafner revealed Arpanet began not to make money, but so computers could talk to one another (Severance, 2013). Severance noted large monopolies like International Business Machines, American Telephone and Telegraph, Honeywell, and Digital Equipment Corporation controlled computer markets. Hafner explained these companies enjoyed "the good life" wanting no part of Arpanet (Severance, 2013). Severance further explained how Hafner, a Newsweek magazine reporter, visited both Larry Roberts and Jon Postel at their homes. According to Severance, Roberts founded Arpanet, while Postel created a domain name scheme. Severance shared Hafner's remark that both Larry Roberts and Jon Postel expressed gratefulness monopolies never embraced Arpanet. According to Severance, Roberts and Postel never embraced Arpanet because they could not foresee its benefit. Monopolies embraced a "bigger is better" worldview widespread in industry today (Severance, 2013).

Most people recognize names of wealthy entrepreneurs, but few people herald someone like Larry Roberts. Internet is likely the single greatest 20th century industrial advance, yet so few people know how it began. Innovations like the Internet do not just fall from the sky. These radical advances come from bright, ingenious people with a passion to solve community problems. Many of these innovators have roots stemming from needy and deprived settings causing them to see problems overlooked by others. Williams (2009) found women are mainly need-driven, in contrast to men who take part in these advances more reluctantly. Slack (2005) revealed some drawbacks involve lacking trade skills, not enough financing, poor coaching support, and lack of local role models.

A good example comes from Ben Franklin, a man born poor in 1706 and an original framer of the Declaration of Independence. Franklin first started a for profit library later transforming *Pennsylvania Gazette* into the University of Pennsylvania. Among other triumphs, Franklin developed the United States Post Office and invented bifocal eyeglasses (Otto, 2011). Franklin emerged from needy roots developing a need for improving the world.

People starting enterprises are not the same as those financing them. Adam Smith saw capitalists as different from entrepreneurs because he saw capitalists' sole role as bearing risk of loss for making capital available (Schumpeter, 1951) . Kirzner (1973) like Schumpeter (1994) argued discovery is at the heart of entrepreneurial theory. Mehlum, Moene, and Torvik (2003, September 16) coined "destructive creativity" (p. 1) as an effort by monopolies to find new profit streams people will not find worthwhile. Mehlum et al.'s idea contrasts with Schumpeter's creative destruction, where monopolies ground themselves for a limited time with superior expertise driving away any competition from socially worthwhile actors. Big companies stymie creativity because they stifle competition. Schumpeter argued creative destruction causes companies' death when they stop discovering advances. Both Kirzner and Schumpeter separated entrepreneurs from capitalists because they risk no money on discovery (Shockley & Frank, 2011).

Entrepreneurs' main role stems from their vision leading to advances. Baltar and Coulon (2014) asserted company founders play a key role creating groundbreaking advances because they can identify needs through strategic vision. Often large firms fail to see what entrepreneurs see. An example is in the late 70s and early 80s when computer industry people focused on large central computers rather than smaller computers because they gave producers control. Pittmann and Stewart (1978) took note of comments made about shared networks like "Lack of standards impedes progress." (p. 935), and "Who needs them?" (p. 935). Hayek (1998) argued market expertise is a discovery method and entrepreneurs play a critical role competing to find new markets. Unlike Schumpeter and Kirzner who left developing profits for capitalists, Hayek believed people starting companies played a critical role taking advantage of new prospects and increasing profits.

Government should promote entrepreneurs because monopolies cannot see needed advances. Ognev (2011) asserted advances have come from government promoting competition and reducing monopolies. Government plays a role developing mass demand and reducing dishonesty. Important moneymaking discoveries have come from projects like Human Genome Project and those Department of Energy started. Although government researchers do not receive the same hype as private industry, they do contribute to social order.

Aligned with government's support for starting companies is their role doing work monopolies do not do. Michael and Pearce (2009) backed government projects not just because they create jobs, raise competition, and lower prices, but also because they create national wealth. Government should advance policies promoting small enterprises because they out-innovate larger firms and cause worthwhile aftereffects. Gans and Persson (2013) added entrepreneurs more likely will market their ideas when large well-known firms cooperate with them instead of compete with them. Stronger patent defense for smaller firms promotes competition leveling bargaining power with larger firms. Hall, Matos, Sheehan, and Silvestre (2012) worried exclusive government policies could hamper small business development deterring national growth. Hall et al. pointed to Baumol's (1990) contrast between "productive and unproductive entrepreneurship" (p. 909). Baumol defined "productive entrepreneurship" (p. 909) as socially worthwhile stemming from "new or improved technology or new ways of doing business" (Hall et al., 2012, p. 786). Baumol pictures "unproductive entrepreneurship" as taking advantage of loopholes to gain competitive advantage bypassing socially worthwhile advances. Such behavior fosters destructive entrepreneurship such as criminal behavior and social loss.

Although some people have asserted company founders perform roles benefiting citizens, others argue they contribute little to company success. For example, Ahmad and Ramayah (2012) found effects of social duty on company success minor. Ahmad and Ramah asserted although people founding companies start out seeking good for public interests, they do not achieve success until moving from "philanthropy to profitability." Despite their view, Ahmad and Ramayah suggest founders start with ideas benefiting social causes moving toward more end-based views to achieve financial success. Changing views supports Schumpeterian and Kiznerian ideas that support keeping capitalists' roles separate from entrepreneurs' roles.

INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Often large companies squeeze out entrepreneurs despite the role they serve. Klatt (2006) conducted a longitudinal study covering 10 years of 100 high-growth firms that recently went public from a list of 500 smaller companies published by Inc. magazine. Klatt asserted international trade is no longer solely within the scope of large multinational firms. Most small to medium-sized enterprises turn out goods and services with promise for international markets, but are unsure how they can enter them. Taking a company international ranks nearly as important as deciding to start an enterprise. Klatt found major obstacles going international such as lack of executive depth, international trade skills, and not enough financing. Similarly, other obstacles involve dealing with government red tape, trade barriers, harmful views, and finding fitting foreign partners.

Apart from these obstacles, country differences affect people wanting to start an enterprise. Engle, Schlaegel, and Delanoe (2011) found differences exist between countries' social standards affecting entrepreneurial intent. Background and gender bias are among these social influences. For example, women may have different influences that make them feel deprived affecting their drive to launch a moneymaking venture. Similarly, Williams (2011) found evidence entrepreneurs start early-stage enterprises off the books, mainly in deprived areas. The people from such areas justify behaviors because of their plight compared with more well off people who do not.

International entrepreneurs are a special breed. Kropp, Lindsay, and Shoham (2008) found international entrepreneurs are forward-thinking risk-takers, who start ventures at a deprived education level because they are older. These people do not need shape their start-up choices on making advances Similarly, Frishammar and Andersson (2009) presented evidence tactical approaches like discovery and risk taking have little influence on international functioning. Successful small enterprises depend more on effectuation logic or navigating what is unknown (Sarasvathy, 2001). Frishammar and Andersson and (Andersson, 2000) asserted small firms look not at marketing their path, but their traits, tastes, and abilities. Frishammar and Andersson found a "significant correlation between proactiveness and internationalization" (p. 71). According to Autio (2005), new international ventures growth depends on internal means and start-up theory. Frishammar and Andersson recognized international small company owners' focus is learning-by-doing and eccentricity

International entrepreneurs need special skills. Chitakornkijsil (2009) asserted declining domestic markets may cause entrepreneurs consider growing internationally, but people starting an international enterprise need worldwide vision, international marketing ability, and international executive experience. Other sought-after features needed for success involve ability to coordinate a firm well, develop a strong international network, and develop creative marketing approaches.

Besides needing such skills people starting international enterprises may find countries may embrace different thoughts about starting a company. Mbebeb (2009) asserted some countries believe families can offer early childhood education largely responsible for developing learned skills fitting with entrepreneurial livelihoods. Such a mind-set comes from family social dealings that break down major capitalistic learning values. Family social influences promote learning skills entrepreneurs need to survive and gain expertise. Western cultures leave young people out from taking part in new ventures seeing only harmful effects. For example, western society promotes unfriendly views about use of child labor, but other societies see lessons come from children working as part of family firms. Other ethnic groups have different views because they believe in instilling a mind-set needed for working at a family firm at a young age.

HOW WE GOT WHERE WE ARE AT

A historical view of social giving shows nineteenth century stock companies across Europe limited profit taking to five percent working toward relieving poverty. "Philanthropy and the Five Percent" is a model these companies favored for offering housing to working class families by limiting dividends to five percent (Adam, 2014, p. 337). Adam noted owners of these companies could set aside money to support causes honoring their civic duties. Humanitarian interests heralded donor groups as well as limited stock companies until World War I started.

Small enterprises should have no less a civil duty today, but organizations often leave workers to their own means.. Adam noted after 1900 cities and towns took over these donor groups because of private wealth devaluation. Tax funded state-run groups became seen as a gainful and trusted means of offering public welfare. Today private enterprise demonizes public welfare as overreach leaving social giving mostly to people of means. Rodger (2013) referred to this "New Capitalism" as a "neo-philanthropic turn in social policy" (p. 725) creating a anti-state social welfare platform. Rodger asserted this brand of capitalism "subordinates public activism to narrow market principles" (p. 725).

Abandoning these principles may have come from internationalization displacing founders by relieving them from civic duties. Eschenbach (2013) suggested internationalization has caused new models of social cause charity different from what existed before. This trend aligns with Rodgers (2013) idea that capitalists should only tie charity with narrow market principles despite any harm it may do.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

People place too much value on creating wealth, but not enough value on social advance when looking at entrepreneurial motives. It is not known if improving social causes motivates entrepreneurs more than it does other wealthy people. Too much weight on creating wealth undermines entrepreneur's role serving social causes. The purpose of this study is to see if improving social causes motivates successful entrepreneurs more than it does other wealthy people. This study aims at looking at differences between successful people who started a company and other wealthy United States citizens contributing to social causes.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND HYPOTHESIS

People put too much weight on entrepreneurs creating wealth compared with other more important reasons they start new ventures. Are successful entrepreneurs motivated by improving social causes more than other wealthy people who inherit their wealth? Based on this research question, I hypothesize as follows:

> *H_0: Improving social causes does not motivate successful entrepreneurs more than other wealthy people who inherit their wealth.*
> *H_1: Improving social causes does motivate successful entrepreneurs more than other wealthy people who inherit their wealth.*

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A sample is used of the 100 wealthiest people from Forbes magazine billionaires list (Brown, 2014). Although Forbes list had people from all countries, only those from the United States had a self-made score. Forbes also publishes a list of America's 400 richest people. Forbes assigns a score ranging from one to 10 rating only domestic billionaires on how they gained their wealth. Forbes describes the ratings as shown in Table 1 (Fontevecchia, 2014).

TABLE 1
SCORE BREAKDOWNS

Self-made vs. Inherited Explanation	Example
1. People who inherited wealth but did not work to increase it.	Laurene Powell Jobs
2. People who inherited wealth with a role in managing it.	Forrest Mars, Jr.
3. People who inherited wealth and helped to increase it slightly.	Penny Pritzker
4. People who inherited wealth, but increased it in a significant way.	Henry Ross Perot, Jr.
5. People who inherited a small or medium-size business growing it into a sizable pile of money.	Donald Trump
6. Hired or hands off investor not starting a company.	Meg Whitman
7. Self-made people from a rich background whose parents offered them a head start.	Rupert Murdoch
8. Self-made people coming from roots in upper- or upper-middle-class families.	Mark Zuckerberg
9. Self-made people from largely working class roots rising from a modest beginning.	Eddie Lambert
10. Self-made people who grew up poor, but overcame hurdles.	Oprah Whinfrey

Adapted from Brown, A. (2014). Forbes billionaires: Full list of the world's richest people. *Forbes* and Fontevecchia, A. (2014). Forbes 400: Full list of America's richest people. *Forbes*.

A content analysis assesses the top 100 people listed in Forbes full list looking at who gave charities money supporting social causes. Fontevecchia (2014) supplied a drop down profile offering insight about charitable giving by each person. Analysis of variance is run with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences comparing data for each person belonging in either an inherited or self-made group. Because people inheriting their wealth did not come from modest means, only people belonging to the self-made group displayed such characteristics. Not all people in the self-made group came from modest beginnings. Most people from working and poor classes have these features.

Reliability met a 78 sample size needed to achieve a 95% confidence level with a margin of error of 10% ranging from 70 to 86. A 100-person sample from a population of 400 people meets needed reliability boundaries. Both sample and population counts focused only on rich United States citizens not including wealthy people from other countries.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Those people classified as number one through five in Table I made up a group of people inheriting wealth in one form or another. People classified as number six through 10 made up a self-made group of people. A cross tabulation in Table 2 shows how many people are in each classification from the sample. This cross tabulation shows only self-made people with self-made scores of nine or 10. These people came from families with modest means consisting of 24 people. People with a self-made score of eight had 32 people or half of the 64 self-made people coming from an upper or upper-middle class background. All people inheriting their wealth came from wealthy families.

TABLE 2
FORBES' CLASSIFICATION SCORES

Forbes' Self-Made Score	Inherited	Self-Made	Total
1	9	0	9
2	6	0	6
3	3	0	3
4	4	0	4
5	14	0	14
6	0	3	3
7	0	5	5
8	0	32	32
9	0	13	13
10	0	11	11
	36	64	100

These results encompass some constraints. First, I assumed Forbes' content about these people is accurate. Another assumption is Forbes did not miss contributions to social causes by those with no idea they contributed to social causes. Less wealthy people Forbes listed may not contribute as much as more wealthy people. People who start companies may not contribute as much when they first start as they do after becoming successful. People coming to live as United States citizens can have a higher motive for starting an enterprise.

FINDINGS

Results revealed evidence supporting that entrepreneurs play a special role contributing to social advances. Compared with wealthy people who inherit their money, people starting enterprises more likely will support social causes by contributing. Self-interested people inheriting wealth will less likely contribute to social causes than self-made people will. Table 3 shows analysis of variance results reject the null hypothesis that says improving social causes does not motivate successful entrepreneurs more than it does other wealthy people. The critical F-statistic at df1 = 9 and df2 = 90 is 1.9758 at p = .05 (Soper, 2015). Analysis of variance shows F-statistic at 2.191, which is more than 1.9758 at p = .05. Analysis of variance revealed p = .030, which supports the alternative hypothesis thus rejecting the null hypothesis.

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

ANOVA

Contributes to Social Causes

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.464	9	.496	2.191	.030
Within Groups	20.376	90	.226		
Total	24.840	99			

Analysis of variance assumes a normal distribution, but through tests of normality I determined the sample is not normal. I examined histograms and box plots detecting a non-normal distribution for this sample. Table 4 shows statistical tests I used to test for normality. Because this sample is not a normal distribution, I looked at nonparametric tests for sample testing.

TABLE 4
TESTS OF NORMALITY

Statistics

Philanthropic

1	N	Valid	9	6	N	Valid	3
		Missing	0			Missing	0
	Std. Deviation		.500		Std. Deviation		.577
	Skewness		.857		Skewness		1.732
	Std. Error of Skewness		.717		Std. Error of Skewness		1.225
	Kurtosis		-1.714				
	Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.400				
2	N	Valid	6	7	N	Valid	5
		Missing	0			Missing	0
	Std. Deviation		.408		Std. Deviation		.447
	Skewness		2.449		Skewness		-2.236
	Std. Error of Skewness		.845		Std. Error of Skewness		.913
	Kurtosis		6.000		Kurtosis		5.000
	Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.741		Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.000
3	N	Valid	3	8	N	Valid	32
		Missing	0			Missing	0
	Std. Deviation		0.000		Std. Deviation		.471
	Std. Error of Skewness		1.225		Skewness		-.849
					Std. Error of Skewness		.414
					Kurtosis		-1.368
					Std. Error of Kurtosis		.809
4	N	Valid	4	9	N	Valid	13
		Missing	0			Missing	0
	Std. Deviation		.500		Std. Deviation		.480
	Skewness		2.000		Skewness		.946
	Std. Error of Skewness		1.014		Std. Error of Skewness		.616
	Kurtosis		4.000		Kurtosis		-1.339
	Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.619		Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.191
5	N	Valid	14	10	N	Valid	11
		Missing	0			Missing	0
	Std. Deviation		.519		Std. Deviation		.467
	Skewness		0.000		Skewness		1.189
	Std. Error of Skewness		.597		Std. Error of Skewness		.661
	Kurtosis		-2.364		Kurtosis		-.764
	Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154		Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.279

Nonparametric testing involved running a Kruskal-Wallis H test, which mirrors analysis of variance for non-normal distributions. Table 5 shows mean rankings from this test with significant differences. Because tests results show p = .038, they achieve significance at a p = .05 level resulting in rejecting the null hypothesis.

TABLE 5
MEAN RANKS AND KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST RESULTS

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks

	Score	N	Mean Rank
Philanthropic	1	9	44.17
	2	6	35.83
	3	3	27.50
	4	4	40.00
	5	14	52.50
	6	3	44.17
	7	5	67.50
	8	32	61.88
	9	13	42.88
	10	11	41.14
	Total	100	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Philanthropic
Chi-Square	17.791
df	9
Asymp. Sig.	.038

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Score

I ran post hoc tests calculating effect size estimates for comparison of groups with significant differences from one another. For example, mean rank scores comparing people with a self-made score of three and seven showing a significant difference in mean ranks with a p = .02, which is significant at the p = .05 level. Mean rank of people with a score of three is 7.00 versus 19.03 for people with a mean rank score of seven. I also calculated an effect size using chi-square, which shows a value of 4.200. Dividing chi-square by n - 1, which in this case is 7, explains .6000 (60%) of the difference in mean ranks. Table 6 shows results of some of the more critical post hoc tests. Although not all comparison of groups are significant, those with significant differences result from people who are self-made versus inheriting their wealth.

TABLE 6
POST HOC TESTS AND EFFECT SIZE

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks

	Score	N	Mean Rank
Philanthropic	3	3	2.50
	7	5	5.70
	Total	8	

Ranks

	Score	N	Mean Rank
Philanthropic	3	3	7.00
	8	32	19.03
	Total	35	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Philanthropic
Chi-Square	4.200
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.040

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Score

Effect size 0.6

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Philanthropic
Chi-Square	5.394
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.020

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Score

Effect size 0.1586

Ranks

	Score	N	Mean Rank
Philanthropic	2	6	4.42
	7	5	7.90
	Total	11	

Ranks

	Score	N	Mean Rank
Philanthropic	2	6	11.17
	8	32	21.06
	Total	38	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Philanthropic
Chi-Square	4.011
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.045

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Score

Effect size 0.4011

Test Statistics[a,b]

	Philanthropic
Chi-Square	5.586
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.018

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Score

Effect size 0.151

Table 7 shows I used all 10 Forbes' groups for testing, but only a distinction between self-made people and people inheriting their wealth is important. Inclusion of a more detailed breakdown of these two main groups offers some other insight as shown in Table 7. Mainly, of the 46 people who contributed to social causes people from an upper- or upper-middle class background contributed most. This group consisted of 22 people contributing to social causes closely followed by the next two groups. People coming from working class background with little means and people growing up poor accounted for another seven people. Together these three groups account for 63% of people who contributed. People who inherited a modest company and grew into a company worth more than 10 digits (group five) account for another 15%. Five self-made groups numbered six through 10 accounted for 34 people of 46 total people contributing or almost 74%.

TABLE 7
CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIAL CAUSES BY GROUP

Forbes' Self-Made Score	Did Not Contribute	Contributed	Total
	Counts		
1	6	3	9
2	5	1	6
3	3	0	3
4	3	1	4
5	7	7	14
6	2	1	3
7	1	4	5
8	10	22	32
9	9	4	13
10	8	3	11
	54	46	100

The results confirm people starting companies align themselves with social causes remembering where they came from later when they contribute. Self-interested people who are not self-made are capitalists supplying money for starting projects. Self-interested people want to invest their money so they can earn more money. Advancing social causes does not have the importance as it does for self-made entrepreneurs. People with roots from needy positions understand promoting social causes because they connect them. Capitalists simply focus on growing their money.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Entrepreneurs offer unique value capitalists cannot match simply by supplying capital funding new start-up ventures. Although capitalists supply capital, they do not contribute to social advance without some influence from entrepreneurs. People starting companies want to make money, but connect with social values advancing ideas creating new value. Entrepreneurs collaborate finding new ideas promoting social causes, but other self-interested wealthy people only supply capital so they can earn a return. Wealthy people who supply capital look at their investments as their social cause offerings because they bear the risk of loss. Galaskiewicz (1997) asserted wealthy people give not because of common class beliefs, but because of some association with minorities, gender, religion, or region. Martin and Pimentel (2014) noted entrepreneurs with modest beginnings have a different value philosophy they called "labor theory of value." Galaskiewicz's conclusion implies people wanting to start an enterprise must convince capitalists of the value they may not see if they seek funding. Understanding associations of capitalists can help company founders who seek funding appeal to them.

Government should offer entrepreneurs a fair market, but large international companies do not welcome new rivalries. Without people advancing social causes, these needs go unmet. Big companies lose because they do not see what people starting new enterprises see. Ealy (2014) went as far as saying there is a crisis in company benevolence that stems from self-interest. Hay and Muller (2014) described benevolence by wealthy people as "the new philanthropy" (p.635) where government caters to big companies through favorable tax policies. Government should promote entrepreneurship instead of just serving monopolies. Promoting people starting enterprises keeps new ideas flowing fulfilling unmet needs. Rajabi and Daraei (2014) asserted entrepreneurs can revive an enterprise bringing its life back. A good lesson is had from Claude Blanchet's story. Louis Jacques and Mircea-Gabriel (2012) described Blanchet as "a builder of collective firms" (p. 369) who changed his values by his involvement in social issues, which gave him courage allowing him to follow unusual paths. Government should offer entrepreneurs a space where they can collaborate without attack by big companies. How international companies can create grounding-breaking advances without entrepreneurs needs more research. Research findings suggest self-interested charity may cause entrepreneurship enduring damage.

Many proponents of private industry justify their behavior suggesting government does not do anything well. This idea is wrong because government has allowed creative people develop their ideas involving social needs. Government should play a bigger role ensuring entrepreneurs have a fair setting so they can advance their ideas (Baumol, 1990).

International companies should cooperate with small enterprises instead of trying to squelch them. Entrepreneurs do not work alone and need collaboration. Ideas do not come into fruition until people with ideas can test them. International companies should value entrepreneur's role developing advances. Successful markets need both entrepreneurs and capitalists. How markets achieve success without people who start enterprises advancing social causes needs more research. Madrakhimova (2013) asserted big companies have conflicting outlooks about charity because they do not value ideas outside their central focus. Chan and Laffargue (2014) showed how China's elite blocked rebuilding so it could restrict growth of its merchant class because it feared losing its power. China's emperor reversed his thinking when he found rebuilding its merchant class strengthened its defense powers.

Because these findings are for United States entrepreneurs, they may not reflect similar results for people from other countries. Behavior of rich people in other countries needs more research. Although rich people in other countries need may behave differently, these findings suggest as a country becomes wealthier rich people who are not self-made lose sight of social needs. More wealthy people will come from inheriting wealth than from creating it. Acs and Phillips (2002) argued American capitalism is unlike other forms. America's version winds up with people contributing to social causes focusing not just creating wealth, but restoring wealth by advancing wealth of others. Recent trends involving rich people's charity has changed from long-established views. Wyland, Bollmus, Freimark, and Hedrich (2012) suggested some social charity of business leaders signals lawful behavior, while covering illegal behavior. Already rich people do not see any benefit associated with giving unless it benefits themselves.

Entrepreneurs serve as an engine for innovation and growth. Rich people should want to leave a legacy by contributing to entrepreneurs' innovations. Phillips (2014) reviewed Zolton Acs' book, *Why philanthropy matters: How the wealthy give, and what It means for our economic wellbeing*. Phillips' review notes how rich people's charity gives us an understanding of how the United States' version of capitalism works compared with other places. Charity is the fuel that sparks advances by entrepreneurs who take advantage of new ideas. Charity by wealthy people who found success as entrepreneurs helps pass the torch to next wave of people. People inheriting wealth give mainly because of self-interested causes.

SUMMARY

Research revealed in this paper shows self-made entrepreneurs give more to social causes than people who inherit their wealth. Self-made people are closer to consumers, which results in a better understanding of what consumers need and want. Wealthy people who inherit wealth prefer giving money to people who will further their own cause. Often entrepreneurs give more to social causes because they come from deprived or disadvantaged conditions, Self-made entrepreneurs understand consumers' needs because they share similar experiences. Wealthy people who inherit their wealth fail to see any benefit associated with making contributions to social causes.

REFERENCES

Acs, Z. J., & Phillips, R. J. (2002). Entrepreneurship and philanthropy in American capitalism. *Small Business Economics, 19*(3), 189.

Adam, T. (2014). Profit and philanthropy: Stock companies as philanthropic institution in nineteenth century Germany. *Voluntas, 25*(2), 337-351.

Ahmad, N. H., & Ramayah, T. R. (2012). Does the notion of 'Doing Well by Doing Good' prevail among entrepreneurial ventures in a developing nation? [Report]. *Journal of Business Ethics, 106*, 479-490.

Andersson, S. (2000). The internationalization of the firm from an entrepreneurial perspective. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 30*(1), 63-92.

Autio, E. (2005). Creative tension: The significance of Ben Oviatt's and Patricia McDougall's article 'toward a theory of international new ventures'. *Journal of International Business Studies, 36*(1), 9-19.

Baker, C., & Moran, M. (2011). Entrepreneurialism and philanthropy. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability, 7*(2), 148-169.

Baltar, F., & Coulon, S. d. (2014). Dynamics of the entrepreneurial process: The innovative entrepreneur and the strategic decisions *Review of Business & Finance Studies, 5*(1), 69-81.

Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy, 98*(5), 893-921.

Blanchflower, D. G. (2004). Self-Employment: More may not be better: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Brown, A. (2014). Forbes billionaires: Full list of the world's richest people. *Forbes*.

Chan, K. S., & Laffargue, J.-P. (2014). The growth and decline of the modern sector and the merchant class in imperial China. *Review of Development Economics, 18*(1), 13-28.

Chitakornkijsil, P. (2009). SMEs, entrepreneurship and development strategies *International Journal of Organizational Innovation, 1*(4), 127-138.

Ealy, L. T. (2014). The intellectual crisis in philanthropy. *Society, 51*(1), 87-96.

Engle, R. L., Schlaegel, C., & Delanoe, S. (2011). The role of social influence, culture, and gender on entrepreneurial intent. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 24*(4), 471-492,603.

Eschenbach, T. P. E. (2013). Movement is life: Organizations, management, and leadership. *Engineering Management Journal, 25*(4), 3-4.

Fairlie, R. W., & Woodruff, C. (2007). Mexican entrepreneurship: A comparison of self-employment in Mexico and the United States. In G. J. Borjas (Ed.), *Mexican Immigration to the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fontevecchia, A. (2014). Forbes 400: Full list of America's richest people. *Forbes*.

Frishammar, J., & Andersson, S. (2009). The overestimated role of strategic orientations for international performance in smaller firms. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship, 7*(1), 57-77.
Galaskiewicz, J. (1997). Money for change: Social movement philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund / Why the wealthy give: The culture of elite philanthropy. *Social Forces, 75*(4), 1470.
Gans, J. S., & Persson, L. (2013). Entrepreneurial commercialization choices and the interaction between IPR and competition policy. [Article]. *Industrial & Corporate Change, 22*(1), 131-151.
Gautier, A., & Pache, A. (2015). Research on corporate philanthropy: A review and assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 126*(3), 343-369.
Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L., & Silvestre, B. (2012). Entrepreneurship and innovation at the base of the pyramid: A recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion? [Article]. *Journal of Management Studies, 49*(4), 785-812.
Hay, I., & Muller, S. (2014). Questioning generosity in the golden age of philanthropy: Towards critical geographies of super-philanthropy. *Progress in Human Geography, 38*(5), 635-653.
Hayek, F. (1998). *Los fundamentos de la libertad*. Madrid: Unión Editorial.
Kidane, A., & Harvey, B. H. (2009). Profile of entrepreneurs: Employing stepwise regression analysis to determine factors that impact success of entrepreneurs *Review of Business Research, 9*(3), 55-65.
Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
Klatt, L. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial firms in the international arena *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 10*, 21-42.
Kropp, F., Lindsay, N. J., & Shoham, A. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation and international entrepreneurial business venture startup. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research, 14*(2), 102.
Louis Jacques, F., & Mircea-Gabriel, C. (2012). Claude Blanchet, entrepreneur, intrapreneur and public sector manager. *Journal of Enterprising Communities, 6*(4), 369-382.
Madrakhimova, F. S. (2013). *Corporate philanthropy.* Paper presented at the Global Conference on Business & Finance Proceedings, Hilo.
Martin, E. J., & Pimentel, M. S. (2014). Social analysis, social justice, and the welfare state: Post great recession social welfare policy. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 7*(1), 95-121.
Mbebeb, F. E. (2009). Developing productive lifeskills in children: Priming entrepreneurial mindsets through socialisation in family occupations *International Journal of Early Childhood, 41*(2), 23-34.
Mehlum, H., Moene, K., & Torvik, R. (2003, September 16). Destructive creativity. *University of Oslo*, 1-13.
Michael, S. C., & Pearce, J. A., II. (2009). The need for innovation as a rationale for government involvement in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 21*(3), 285-302.
Ognev, I. A. (2011). Government in the innovation field. *Problems of Economic Transition, 53*(10), 66-80.
Otto, L. (2011). Benjamin Franklin: America's original entrepreneur. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal, 2011*(4), 132-149.
Phillips, R. J. (2014). Why philanthropy matters: How the wealthy give, and what It means for our economic wellbeing. *Journal of Economic Issues, 48*(1), 247-249.
Pittmann, T., & Stewart, R. (1978). Microprocessor standards. *0*, 935-935.
Rajabi, A., & Daraei, M. R. (2014). Analytical investigation of the role and position of "Entrepreneur Organization" in progress of twenty first century's organizations. *Asian Journal of Research in Marketing, 3*(2), 108-127.
Rodger, J. J. (2013). “New capitalism”, colonisation and the neo-philanthropic turn in social policy. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 33*(11/12), 725-741.
Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 243.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1951). Economic theory and entrepreneurial history. In R. V. Clemence (Ed.), *Essays on entrepreneurs, innovations, business cycles, and the evolution of capitalism* (pp. 253-271). Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley. (Reprinted from: *Change and the entrepreneur,* pp. 63-84, 1949).
Schumpeter, J. A. (1994). *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy* (5th ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
Severance, C. (2013). Katie Hafner: The origins of the Internet. *46*(7), 6-7.
Shockley, G. E., & Frank, P. M. (2011). Schumpeter, Kirzner, and the field of social entrepreneurship. [Article]. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 2*(1), 6-26.
Slack, J. (2005). The new entrepreneur scholarships: Self-employment as a means to tackle social deprivation. *Education & Training, 47*(6/7), 447-455.
Soper, D. S. (2015). Critical F-value calculator [Software]
Williams, C. C. (2009). Informal entrepreneurs and their motives: a gender perspective. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 1*(3), 219-225.
Williams, C. C. (2011). Entrepreneurship, the informal economy and rural communities. *Journal of Enterprising Communities, 5*(2), 145-157.
Wyland, R., Bollmus, M., Freimark, M., & Hedrich, E. (2012). Organizational illegal behavior as an unanticipated consequence of philanthropy: Explaining a paradox. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 9*(3), 41-52.