

TOMS: Reinventing Social Enterprise Through Ethical Evolution

Deanne E. Hagan

Department of Business Administration, Jackson State University

MNGT 482: Business Ethics

Dr. Alisa Mosley

October 10, 2025

TOMS Shoes revolutionized social entrepreneurship by embedding philanthropy directly into its business model. However, changing market conditions and evolving consumer expectations forced the company to reimagine its famous One for One approach. This analysis examines why TOMS needed to evolve, identifies key stakeholders, and evaluates the broader applicability of its business model through the lens of ethical frameworks.

TOMS faced a critical juncture that demanded transformation for several interconnected reasons. From a utilitarian perspective, the company needed to maximize overall benefit for the greatest number of people, which required adapting to financial realities. Despite donating over 100 million pairs of shoes, TOMS experienced slowing sales and accumulated significant debt over five years. The company's growth had plateaued as the brand became mainstream and lost its initial novelty.

Applying virtue ethics, TOMS demonstrated practical wisdom (phronesis) by recognizing that sustainable giving requires financial viability. Mycoskie acknowledged that the formula only works "if it's fresh, provocative, radical and somewhat newsworthy." The company's 90 percent reliance on footwear despite diversification attempts into eyewear, coffee, and bags revealed a fundamental need for strategic reinvention rather than mere product expansion.

Additionally, stakeholder theory demands that companies respond to evolving stakeholder expectations. Modern consumers increasingly want agency in determining how their purchases create social impact. The shift from the original One for One model to the "Stand for Tomorrow" initiative, and eventually to contributing one-third of net

annual profits to a giving fund, reflects this ethical imperative to empower stakeholders while maintaining organizational sustainability.

TOMS operates within a complex stakeholder ecosystem where multiple groups hold significant claims on the company. The most important stakeholders include customers, recipients of aid, employees and interns, Giving Partners, and investors or creditors.

Customers represent TOMS's primary stakeholders because they drive revenue while simultaneously enabling the philanthropic mission. These consumers seek products that align with their values, making them co-creators of social impact. Their importance intensified as TOMS allowed them to choose which causes their purchases would support, recognizing customers as moral agents deserving autonomy in charitable decision-making.

Aid recipients constitute another critical stakeholder group. From a deontological perspective based on Kantian ethics, these individuals must be treated as ends in themselves, not merely as means to enhance TOMS's brand image. The company's commitment to providing replacement shoes every six months and adapting products to local terrain demonstrates respect for recipients' dignity and ongoing needs rather than one-time charitable gestures.

Employees and interns warrant significant consideration because TOMS's mission-driven culture attracts passionate individuals willing to work for potentially lower compensation. The company's practice of involving 60 percent of employees in giving trips exemplifies stakeholder integration theory, which suggests that engaged employees become more effective organizational advocates. This group's importance

extends beyond labor contributions to their role as brand ambassadors spreading TOMS's message through word-of-mouth marketing.

Giving Partners serve as essential intermediaries who possess local expertise and sustainable programming capabilities. These organizations enable TOMS to distribute resources effectively while avoiding the paternalism that critics associate with traditional charity models. Their involvement addresses ethical concerns about dependency creation by ensuring community-rooted solutions.

The One for One business model presents both promising opportunities and significant limitations for replication across industries. Mycoskie himself acknowledged that this concept must be embedded into business strategy from inception and that the business must achieve independent sustainability, which proves difficult for many nonprofits dependent on fundraising.

From a justice ethics perspective, the model works best when addressing fundamental needs where market failures create significant inequities. TOMS succeeded initially because shoes represent a tangible product addressing real deprivation that prevents school attendance and causes health problems. Companies like Warby Parker have replicated this approach successfully in eyewear for similar reasons.

However, applying rights-based ethical theory reveals limitations. The model requires that products be tangible, identifiable, and emotionally resonant with consumers. Commodity products lacking differentiation struggle to inspire the consumer engagement necessary for success. Furthermore, the model faces legitimate criticism that it may create dependency rather than empowering communities through education

and job creation, though TOMS attempted to address this by establishing manufacturing facilities in communities they serve.

The model appears most appropriate for businesses where the core product directly correlates with a specific, measurable need, and where the company commits to long-term community relationships rather than transactional charity. Success also demands authentic commitment to social mission rather than using philanthropy merely as marketing strategy.

TOMS's evolution demonstrates that ethical business models must balance idealism with pragmatism. The company's willingness to disrupt its own successful formula shows moral courage and stakeholder responsiveness. While the One for One model inspired a generation of social entrepreneurs, its applicability remains limited to specific contexts where product, mission, and market align authentically. TOMS's ongoing transformation reminds us that ethical business practices require continuous adaptation to changing circumstances while maintaining core values.

References

Ferrell, O. C., Fraedrich, J., & Ferrell, L. (2021). *Business ethics: Ethical decision making & cases* (13th ed.). Cengage Learning.