

Social Entrepreneurship: How Social Entrepreneurs Pioneering Social Change - the Evidence from Tanzania

Mushumbusi Paul Kato^{1*} Lawrencia Dominick Mushi²

1. Rostocker Straße 21, 10553 Berlin, Germany
2. Makarenko Straße 47c - 3503, 17491 Greifswald, Germany

*Email: katoray100@gmail.com

Abstract

Social entrepreneur are genius, creative and innovative individuals who respond to the local problems by engaging their community in solving them to accelerate sustainable social transformation. This article aimed at understanding how social entrepreneurs create social value in the community. The paper is based on publicly available profiles of Fellows of Ashoka. We selected one sample out of five Ashoka fellows from Tanzania as a case study representing how social entrepreneurs create social value. The findings reveal that social entrepreneur identify problems which hinder social and economic development of the poor and marginalized group in the community and provide solutions to create sustainable social transformation.

Keywords: Tanzania, social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneur, Ashoka

1.0 Introduction

Entrepreneurial activities, businesses and organizations which embedded in social change or social value creation have existed throughout the years (Volkman, Tokarski, & Ernst, 2012); it is only recently, entrepreneurs, businesses and organizations with the social impact mission have got popularity. In 2006 the Nobel Prize was awarded to Grameen Bank and its founder Professor Muhammad Yunus for their struggle in attempting to reduce poverty in Bangladesh by helping the poor people especially women to access finance through the provision of small amount of credit (Lensink & Pham, 2012; Sengupta & Aubuchon, 2008). It was at that time the idea of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship reverberated around the global (Lensink & Pham, 2012; Volkman et al., 2012). Today than ever social entrepreneurship has become a recognized movement, popular concept among business people, researchers, governments, institutions, students and general public (Hoogendoorn, Pennings, & Thurik, 2010). Big and leading Universities, Institutes have set up centres for education and research in the area of social entrepreneurship and many articles dealing with social entrepreneurship have been published within the last 10 years (Heinecke & Mayer, 2012). Social entrepreneurship has become so popular because of its ability to challenge the status quo and our conventional thinking by providing goods and services to the poor people where the existing markets, institutions and policies have failed. Worldwide especially in developing countries, poor people have no access to education, health care, clean drinking water, and even basic human rights. Poor people have remained to be poor and the gap between the poor and the rich is widening everyday in developing world. Poverty in most of the developing world has been intensified by corruption, conflict over resources, and economic stagnation. Many people are marginalized because they do not know their rights.

Social entrepreneurs are innovative people who respond to local problems, engage their community in solving problems and accelerate change. They are people who realize where there is an opportunity to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet, and who gather together the necessary resources (generally people, often volunteers, money and premises) and use these to make a difference (Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000). Social entrepreneurs have the power to create the means-ends required for sustainable social transformation. They are mostly focuses on social and environmental issues that have an impact and benefit to the community and society (Danna & Porche, 2008).

This paper is divided into five sections. The next section presents the literature review of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneur. Then the study method used is described. The forth section presents the description of the case study used. This case provides the insight of the stages used by social entrepreneurs in creating social value, and the final section is the discussion and conclusion of this paper.

2.0 Social Entrepreneurship and social Entrepreneurs – Literature Review

2.1 Social Entrepreneurship

There is no agreement of what social entrepreneurship is or what is not (Hoogendoorn et al., 2010). Social entrepreneurship can be defined as businesses and/or organizations that are solving human needs that existing markets, policies and institutions have failed to satisfy. According to Dees (1998) Social entrepreneurship combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation and determination. Seelos & Mair (2005) argued that social entrepreneurship combines the resourcefulness of traditional entrepreneurship with the mission to change the society. Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern (2006) defined social entrepreneurship as “innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors.” Furthermore, Social entrepreneurship has been seen as a new model to serve

the poor (Seelos & Mair, 2005), as innovating for social impact, and as a new way to catalyze social transformations (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004), a process consisting in the innovative use and combination of resources to explore and exploit opportunities that aims at catalyzing social change by catering to basic human needs in a sustainable manner (Mair & Martí, 2006), the innovative use of resources combinations to pursue opportunities aiming at the creation of organization and/or practice that yield and sustain social benefits (Mair & Noboa, 2003). Nichols (2008) has also defined social entrepreneurship as a set of innovative and effective activities that focus strategically on resolving social market failure and creating new opportunities to add social value systematically using a range of resources and organizational formats to maximize social impact and bring about change. Generally, despite of many different definitions Huybrechts & Nicholls (2012) argued that there are some broad agreements about a number of key characteristics that set the boundaries of socially entrepreneurial action. First, all definitions of social entrepreneurship agree on a central mission on social or environmental outcomes that has primacy over profit maximization (Beckmann, 2012). Second is innovation, which can be pursued through new organizational models and processes, through new products and services, or through new thinking about, and framing of, societal challenges. Finally, many authors emphasize how social entrepreneurs diffuse their socially innovative models via market oriented action that is performance driven, scaling up their initiatives in other contexts through alliances and partnerships, with the idea of reaching broader and more sustainable outcomes (Beckmann, 2012).

2.2 Social versus Commercial Entrepreneurship

The term entrepreneurship existed before scholars, governments and institutions showed interest in social entrepreneurship in recent years. The existence of many definitions of entrepreneurship has led to greatest frustration, namely the lack of commonly understanding of what precisely entrepreneurship is (Davidsson, 2004). The word social modifies entrepreneurship, adding more frustrations in the field. Martin & Osberg (2007) argued that “if entrepreneurship doesn’t have a clear meaning, then modifying it with social won’t accomplish much, either.” However, this modification of the term entrepreneurship by adding social has made vital in the field of entrepreneurship to understand the difference between the social and commercial activities. Austin et al. (2006) compared social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship in their paper Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different or Both? According to them there are at least four ways to distinguish between social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship. First, they differ in the kind of opportunities perceived and exploited. Social entrepreneurship identifies and exploits the opportunities which are not met with the commercial entrepreneurship because has nothing to do with profit maximization rather than social value maximization including providing food, shelter, water, financial support, education and medical services to the member of society who are in need (Certo & Miller, 2008; Di Domenico, Haugh, & Tracey, 2010; Müller, 2012). Second, Social entrepreneurs are more concerned with social value maximization because of the passion to social mission (Dees, 1998). The mission of social entrepreneurs is to create social value and not profit. The gain to the social entrepreneurs is social value creation, which is completely different from commercial entrepreneurs. Third, Social entrepreneurial activities are those activities which its performance measurement is difficult because of the nature of mission and activities. Performance measures for social entrepreneurship are less standardized and more idiosyncratic to the particular organization and environment (Certo & Miller, 2008). It is difficult to measure the social changes happening in the society. Austin et al. (2006) states “the challenge of measuring social change is great due to nonquantifiability, multicausality, temporal dimensions, and perceptible differences of the social impact created”. Fourth, commercial and social entrepreneurship differ on resource mobilization (Austin et al., 2006; Certo & Miller, 2008). Social entrepreneurs before creating a business venture needs to mobilize financial and human resources, this is quite easy for commercial entrepreneurs; they can hire employees, and get the loan from the bank. The nature of the mission of social entrepreneurs makes difficult to mobilize resources easily. Starting a new social venture requires identifying funding sources that are interested in creating social value (Certo & Miller, 2008) and human resources which will be willing to work in a social venture. “Social enterprises often rely upon volunteers to serve key functions, such as board members, to help with fundraising or to provide professional services, or as staff to deliver their services on the ground” (Austin et al., 2006). This process might be very difficult for the social entrepreneur who does not have enough support. Social entrepreneurs need support from other firms, supporting institutions, donors, relatives and friends. Social entrepreneurs are faced with more constraints, limited access to best talent, fewer financial institutions, instruments and resources because of its nature, which hinder their ability to mobilize and deploy resources to achieve enterprises’ goals. Austin et al. (2006) argued that “given these constraints, it is critical for the social entrepreneur to develop a large network of strong supporters”. Social entrepreneurs need to build very strong sets of network that will provide access to funding, board members, and management and staff, among other resources to catalyze change and gain support for their mission (Alvord et al., 2004; Miller & Wesley II, 2010).

2.3 Social Entrepreneur

There is nothing more powerful than a new idea in the hand of a social entrepreneur

- Bill Drayton

There is no different between social entrepreneurs and business entrepreneurs, they are both entrepreneurs even though they are differently motivated and have different mission. Like business entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs establish new organizations, develop and implement innovative programs and organize or distribute new products and services (Sharir & Lerner, 2006). According to Leadbeater (1997) social entrepreneurs are: (1) entrepreneurial, they take under-utilized, discarded resources and spot ways of using them to satisfy unmet needs; (2) innovative, they create new services and products, new ways of dealing with problems, often by bringing together approaches that have traditionally been kept separate; (3) transformatory, they transform the institutions they are in charge of, taking moribund organizations and turning them into dynamic creative ones. Most importantly, they can transform the neighborhoods and communities they serve by opening up possibilities for self-development. Table 1 provides the main definitions of social entrepreneur according to different perspectives.

Summing up, from different view of social entrepreneurs presented in the work of Bacq & Janssen (2011) in table 1, social entrepreneur is an innovative individuals who indentify and exploit opportunities to achieve social value creation through solving social problems in the community that are not adequately met by the government, institutions and commercial entrepreneurship. In doing so social entrepreneurs undergo several stages. Thompson (2002) identified four stages which a “true social entrepreneurs” contribute before creating social value. The stages are: envision; engaging; enabling and enacting. Thus, social entrepreneurs go through these stages to create a social value in the community.

- (1) Envision – clarifying a need, gap and opportunity;
- (2) Engaging – engaging the opportunity with a mind to doing something about it;
- (3) Enabling – ensuring something happens by acquiring the necessary resources, such as people and money, and if necessary, premises;
- (4) Enacting – championing and leading the project to a satisfactory conclusion (Thompson, 2002, p. 416)

3.0 Method

This paper uses the publicly available profiles of the Fellows of Ashoka. Ashoka is an international organization supporting social entrepreneurs through various activities, among them training and seed financing. They search and support social entrepreneurs (men and women) who use entrepreneurial vision and skills to attack and solve social problems. They are also advocates for social entrepreneurship, constantly looking for Change makers. Since 1981, the Ashoka organization has elected and supported over 2000 leading social entrepreneurs or Fellows, “providing them with living stipends, professional support, and access to a global network of peers in more than 60 countries” (<http://www.ashoka.org>). We treat these profiles of individual fellows of Ashoka as the cases, which have been used in this study as the unity of analysis. The use of these profiles allow for a more intense examination of social entrepreneurship in the context of the intention to create social value in the society. The unique advantage of the case research design is that it facilitates derivation of deeper and more profound insights about the phenomenon under investigation (Martin & Novicevic, 2010). The insights derived in these profiles reveal how social entrepreneurs create society transformation. The Ashoka Fellows were chosen for this paper due to the Ashoka’s reputation of electing successful social entrepreneurs. Thus, this sample represents highly successful Tanzanian social entrepreneurs. The validity of these profiles is taken at face value as they are built from information provided to Ashoka and from observations of these social entrepreneurs by Ashoka staff (Meyskens, Robb-Post, Stamp, Carsrud, & Reynolds, 2010). This study focuses on the case of Emmanuel Kallonga, who was elected in 2008 to become Ashoka fellow. His social mission is to educate Tanzanian citizens about laws and public policies that affect their livelihoods and well-being, and equipping them with the skills needed to constructively engage with other stakeholders to secure their social and economic rights. So far Ashoka has five fellows in Tanzania namely, Emmanuel Kallonga, Yared Fubusa, Martin Saning’o Kariongi, Lazaro Moringe Parkipuny and Bart Weetjens.

4.0 The Case – Emmanuel Kallonga

Social entrepreneurs are not content just to give a fish or teach how to fish. They will not rest until they have revolutionized the fishing industry.

— Bill Drayton

Emmanuel Kallonga is educating Tanzanian citizens about laws and public policies that affect their livelihoods and well-being, and equipping them with the skills needed to constructively engage with other stakeholders to secure their social and economic rights. In Tanzania rural areas, about 70 percent of Tanzanians lives, education, health, and economic development services are in short of supply. The lack of public understanding about laws, development strategies, and public expenditure patterns is also an important factor to corruption at all levels of the government, especially at the community level. Emmanuel became increasing aware that many laws, public policies, and governmental initiatives are not understood by those they are designed to serve for the simple

reason that they are not distributed in an accessible form. More often than not, government policies aimed at stimulating economic development and poverty reduction are published in several volumes and densely packed with highly complex, technical language. Since these texts are not accessible to the public, it is nearly impossible for ordinary citizens to participate in democratic processes, or for communities to make full and effective use of the opportunities and resources that governmental initiatives provide. Emmanuel believes to successfully build effective democratic governance, fight corruption, and alleviate poverty through governmental initiatives is possible when the relevant laws, policies, and programs are understood by the public, and marginalized groups in particular. Drawing on his severance benefits from Oxfam, Emmanuel founded Hakikazi Catalyst to help poor farmers, women, and other marginalized and impoverished persons to understand laws and public policies relevant to their needs and enable them to identify and exploit the economic development and livelihood generating opportunities associated with those laws and policies.

With one staff member in a small shared office, Emmanuel quickly formed an informal network of “Friends of Hakikazi” that helped to identify laws, policies, and policy documents of particular importance to poor and marginalized groups. A small group of policy analysts clarify and make simple the complex and technical language of those laws and documents and re-writes the relevant information in simple, user-friendly texts that are comprehensible to those with a limited education. To capture the interest of the target audience, he employs cartoonists to illustrate key points with pictures to help readers better understand. When initial drafts of the “plain language guides” are ready, he engages a small group of policy experts with relevant public service and citizen sector backgrounds to serve as peer reviewers and assure that the final guide versions are true to the letter and the spirit of the laws and policies they have summarized. When semi-final drafts are completed, he sends them to communities for a trial use and gathers feedback about how to improve them.

Emmanuel has developed a set of strategies to ensure Hakikazi’s plain language guides and related pamphlets and posters reach their target audiences all over the country. With that aim, he distributes copies to any community organization, governmental body, or individual that makes a request. Today 300 organizations are on his mailing list. In addition, he has identified a growing number (now more than 1,500) “access points” across the country where Hakikazi publications are available to community leaders and other readers. In 2001 he entered a partnership with a private sector company that markets baking flour to transport Hakikazi publications through its distribution network; it spans the country. For wider usage of Hakikazi’s publications, Emmanuel has adopted a policy of “relinquishing control” over usage rights, with the intended outcome that any organization, large or small, faith-based or secular, can use Hakikazi’s guides and other materials however it chooses. Hakikazi has also partnered with a national newspaper to serialize publications relating to economic development and livelihood generation and with community radio stations across the country to air Hakikazi publications principal messages.

5.0 Discussion and Conclusion

I’m encouraging young people to become social business entrepreneurs and contribute to the world, rather than just making money. Making money is no fun. Contributing to and changing the world is a lot more fun.

-Muhammad Yunus

Social entrepreneurs are very important in the community. In this paper we sought to examine how social entrepreneurs create social value to accelerate social transformation and sustainability. We used Emmanuel as a cases study to understand the process social entrepreneurs used to create social value. As noted from the case above, Emmanuel as a social entrepreneur had the ability to identify a need in the community (Catford, 1998; Mort, Weerawardena, & Carnegie, 2003; Thompson, 2002) which were not adequately met by local systems (Urbano, Toledano, & Soriano, 2010). Social entrepreneurs are visionary and innovative in solving social problems (Mort et al., 2003; Roberts & Woods, 2005). They identify the opportunities which focus on the social problems (Corner & Ho, 2010). The social mission is explicit and central to social entrepreneurs (Peredo & McLean, 2006; Shaw & Carter, 2007) and not wealth creation (Thompson & Doherty, 2006; Weerawardena & Mort, 2006). Dees (1998) argued that Making profit, creating wealth, or saving the desires of customers may be part of social entrepreneurship, but these are the means to a social end, not end the in itself. From the case *Emmanuel became increasingly aware that many laws, public policies, and governmental initiatives are not understood by those they are designed to serve for the simple reason that they are not distributed in an accessible form.*

After he has recognized *that many laws, public policies, and governmental initiatives are not understood by those they are designed to serve*, Emmanuel thought on doing something about that problem in order to create social change. Ideally, social entrepreneur has to figure out how he/she can develop a new means – ends framework to recombine resources (Shane, 2000) to generate social value creation in the targeted community. Shane (2003) argued that a means-ends framework is a way of thinking about the relationship between actions and outcomes. Social entrepreneurs believe that a certain action in the society by a government, institutions, or commercial entrepreneurs left the needs of a certain group of people in the community unsatisfied. Shane (2003)

argued new frameworks are formulated when something – such as information about prior errors in decision-making, or knowledge of new demand leads a person to believe that there is a potential exists to generate a better alternative solutions. Thus, social entrepreneurs develop a new means – ends framework after identifying the gap in the community which is not covered by the government, institutions and commercial businesses. In the case of Emmanuel, *He draws on his severance benefits from Oxfam, founded Hakikazi Catalyst to help poor farmers, women, and other marginalized and impoverished persons understand laws and public policies relevant to their needs and enable them to identify and exploit the economic development and livelihood generating opportunities associated with those laws and policies.*

Furthermore, after creating a mean-end social entrepreneurs ensuring something happens by acquiring the necessary resources, such as people and money and, if necessary, premises (Thompson, 2002). Austin et al. (2006) argued that the nature and financial resources for social entrepreneurship differs in some key respects, primarily because of difficulties in resource mobilization. Social entrepreneurs often rely upon volunteers to serve key functions of their activities, such as board members or as staff to deliver their services on the ground and they also “often faced with more constraints like limited access to the best talent; fewer financial institutions, instruments, and resources; and scarce unrestricted funding and inherent strategic rigidities which hinder their ability to mobilize and deploy resources to achieve the organization’s ambitious goals” (Austin et al., 2006). Apart from these problems which hinder social entrepreneurs in undertaking their initiative, they act courageously without being limited by resources currently at hand (Bacq & Janssen, 2011; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Schuyler, 1998; Sharir & Lerner, 2006; Thompson et al., 2000). Dees (1998) argued that “social entrepreneurs do not let their own resources keep them from pursuing their vision.” They are skilled at doing more with less. They use scarce resources efficiently, and they leverage their limited resources by drawing in partners and collaborating with others (Dees, 1998). Emmanuel *with one staff member in a small shared office, He quickly formed an informal network of “Friends of Hakikazi” that helped to identify laws, policies, and policy documents of particular importance to poor and marginalized groups. A small group of policy analysts clarify and make simple the complex and technical language of those laws and documents and re-writes the relevant information in simple, user-friendly texts that are comprehensible to those with a limited education.*

After take-off social entrepreneurs protects and leading their project to a satisfactory end. They act as society’s change agents (Chell, 2007; Sharir & Lerner, 2006; Thompson et al., 2000). Social entrepreneurs are reformers and revolutionaries by moving resources towards places offer superior return for society (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurs make sure they have brought about social transformation and sustainable development. “They attack the underlying causes of problems, rather than simply treating symptoms” (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurs enact social improvements that benefit their communities, including attractive return on social and financial investment to their key stakeholders (Gundry, Kickul, Griffiths, & Bacq, 2011). As noted in the case that Emmanuel made huge effort by making sure his work reach many intended people through getting into partnership with different actors in the country.

Finally, although the methodology used and the case study hinder generalization, but still this study contributes to the field of social entrepreneurship. The study support the claim made by Thompson (2002) that a true social entrepreneur contribute to four stages (envision, engaging, enabling and enacting) toward creating social value. This study also shows that social entrepreneurs are capable of bringing social changes regardless of the difficulties and challenges they are facing. They are capable of bring resources together and creating a team of network to support their initiatives. Today in the world than ever, the business modal set by the social entrepreneurs is what needed especially in developing countries to help the marginalized group in the society.

Success isn't about how much you make, it's about the difference you make in people's lives.

-Michelle Obama

References

- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study Sarah H Alvord; L David Brown; Christine W Letts. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 40(3), 260–282.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1–22.
- Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 373–403.
- Beckmann, M. (2012). The Impact of Social Entrepreneurship on Societies. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies* (pp. 235–254). Gabler Verlag.
- Catford, J. (1998). Social Entrepreneurs are vital for health promotion - but they need supportive environments too. *Health Promotion International*, 13(2), 95–97.

- Certo, S. T., & Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Business Horizons*, 51(4), 267–271.
- Chell, E. (2007). Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship: Towards a Convergent Theory of the Entrepreneurial Process. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1), 5–26.
- Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 635–659.
- Danna, D., & Porche, D. (2008). Establishing a Nonprofit Organization: A Venture of Social Entrepreneurship. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, 4(10), 751–752.
- Davidsson, P. (2004). *Researching Entrepreneurship*. Boston, MA: Springer.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The Meaning of “Social Entrepreneurship”.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681–703.
- Gundry, L. K., Kickul, J. R., Griffiths, M. D., & Bacq, S. C. (2011). Creating Social Change Out of Nothing: The Role of Entrepreneurial Bricolage in Social Entrepreneurs' Catalytic Innovations. In G. T. Lumpkin & J. A. Katz (Eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth. Social and Sustainable Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1–24). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Heinecke, A., & Mayer, J. (2012). Strategies for Scaling in Social Entrepreneurship. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies* (pp. 191–209). Gabler Verlag.
- Hoogendoorn, B., Pennings, E., & Thurik, R. (2010). What Do We Know about Social Entrepreneurship? An Analysis of Empirical Research. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 1–42.
- Huybrechts, B., & Nicholls, A. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Definitions, Drivers and Challenges. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies* (pp. 31–48). Gabler Verlag.
- Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of the social entrepreneur*. London: Demos.
- Lensink, R., & Pham, T. T. T. (2012). The impact of microcredit on self-employment profits in Vietnam. *Economics of Transition*, 20(1), 73–111.
- Mair, J. & Noboa, E. (2003). *Social Entrepreneurship: How intention to create a social enterprise get formed*. IESE Business School.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.
- Martin, J. S., & Novicevic, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship among Kenyan farmers: A case example of acculturation challenges and program successes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(5), 482–492.
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: The case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, (Spring), 29–39.
- Meyskens, M., Robb-Post, C., Stamp, J. A., Carsrud, A. L., & Reynolds, P. D. (2010). Social Ventures from a Resource-Based Perspective: An Exploratory Study Assessing Global Ashoka Fellows. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 661–680.
- Miller, T. L., & Wesley II, C. L. (2010). Assessing Mission and Resources for Social Change: An Organizational Identity Perspective on Social Venture Capitalists' Decision Criteria. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 705–733.
- Mort, G. S., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76–88.
- Müller, S. (2012). Business Models in Social Entrepreneurship: Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies* (pp. 105–131). Gabler Verlag.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56–65.
- Roberts, D., & Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship. *University of Auckland Business Review*, (Autumn), 45–51.
- Schuyler, G. (1998). Social Entrepreneurship: Profit as a Means, Not an End. *Digest*, 98(7), 1–4.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 241–246.
- Sengupta, R., & Aubuchon, C. P. (2008). The Microfinance Revolution: An Overview. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 90(1), 9–30.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior Knowledge and the Discovery of Entrepreneurial Opportunities. *Organization science*, 11(4), 448–469.

- Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Sharir, M., & Lerner, M. (2006). Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 6–20.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), 418–434.
- Thompson, J. (2002). The world of the social entrepreneur. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5), 412–431.
- Thompson, J., & Doherty, B. (2006). The diverse world of social enterprise: A collection of social enterprise stories. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 361–375.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328–338.
- Urbano, D., Toledano, N., & Soriano, D. R. (2010). Analyzing Social Entrepreneurship from an Institutional Perspective: Evidence from Spain. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 54–69.
- Volkman, C. K., Tokarski, K. O., & Ernst, K. (2012). Background, Characteristics and Context of Social Entrepreneurship. In C. K. Volkman, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies* (pp. 3–30). Gabler Verlag.
- Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 21–35.

Mushumbusi Paul Kato is a lecturer and researcher in the Department of Business Administration and Entrepreneurship at the School of Business, Mzumbe University in Morogoro, Tanzania. He teaches and conducts research on Entrepreneurship and the Management of Small and Medium Enterprises. Currently, he is doing a PhD and lectures in the field of Social Entrepreneurship at the Chair of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, Technical University of Berlin, Germany.

Lawrencia Dominick Mushi is a lecturer and researcher at the School of Public Administration and Management, Mzumbe University in Morogoro, Tanzania. She obtained her Master degree from Erasmus University in Rotterdam, Netherlands in the field of Urban Management and Development in 2008. Currently, she is pursuing her PhD studies at Ernst Moritz Arndt University of Greifswald in Germany, focusing on Health Care Management.

Table 1: Definitions of the Social Entrepreneur

Author	Year	Page	Definition
Bornstein (citing Drayton)	1998	37	Ashoka's social entrepreneur is a <i>pathbreaker</i> with a powerful new idea, who combines <i>visionary</i> and real-world problem-solving creativity, who has a strong <i>ethical fiber</i> , and who is 'totally possessed' by his or her vision for change
Catford	1998a, b	96	Social entrepreneurs combine street activism with professional skills, <i>visionary insights</i> with pragmatism, and <i>ethical fibre</i> with tactical trust. They see <i>opportunities</i> where others only see empty buildings, unemployable people and unvalued resources
Dees	1998a, b	3-4	Social entrepreneurs play the role of <i>change agents</i> in the social sector, by: adopting a <i>mission</i> to create and sustain <i>social value</i> (not just private value); recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new <i>opportunities</i> to serve that mission; engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning; acting boldly without being limited by <i>resources</i> currently at hand; and exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created
Schuyler	1998	1	Individuals who have a <i>vision</i> for social change and who have the financial <i>resources</i> to support their ideas [. . .], exhibit all the <i>skills of successful</i> business people as well as a <i>powerful desire for social change</i>
Schwab Foundation	1998		Someone who: identifies and applies practical solutions to social problems [. . .]; innovates by finding a new product, service or approach [. . .], focuses [. . .] on social value creation [. . .]; resists being trapped by the constraints of ideology and discipline; has a vision, but also a well-thought out roadmap as to how to attain the goal
De Leeuw	1999	261	Rare individuals with the ability to analyze, to envision, to communicate, to empathize, to enthuse, to advocate, to mediate, to enable and to empower a wide range of disparate individuals and organizations
Thompson, Alvy, and Lees	2000	328	People who realize where there is an <i>opportunity</i> to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet, and who gather together the necessary <i>resources</i> (generally people, often volunteers, money and premises) and use these to 'make a difference'
Guclu, Dees, and Battle Anderson	2002	14	Social entrepreneurs must be able to <i>articulate</i> a compelling <i>social impact theory</i> and a plausible <i>business model</i>
Sullivan Mort, Weerawardena, and Carnegie	2003	82	Social entrepreneurs are first driven by the social mission of creating better social value than their competitors which results in them exhibiting <i>entrepreneurially virtuous behavior</i> . Second, they exhibit a <i>balanced judgment</i> , a coherent unity of purpose and action in the face of complexity. Third, social entrepreneurs explore and recognize opportunities to create better social value for their clients. Finally, social entrepreneurs display <i>innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking propensity</i> in their key decision making
Dearlove (about the Skoll Foundation)	2004	52	At the Skoll Foundation, we call social entrepreneurs ' <i>society's change agents</i> ': the pioneers of innovation for the social sector. Social entrepreneurs usually have a <i>vision</i> of something that they would like to solve in the social sector
Roberts and Woods	2005	49	<i>Visionary, passionately dedicated</i> individual
Peredo and McLean	2006	64	Social entrepreneurship is exercised where <i>some person or group</i> aims either exclusively or in some prominent way to <i>create social value</i> of some kind, and pursue that goal through some combination of (1) recognizing and exploiting <i>opportunities</i> to create this value, (2) employing <i>innovation</i> , (3) tolerating <i>risk</i> and (4) declining to accept limitations in available <i>resources</i>
Sharir and Lerner	2006	7	The social entrepreneur is acting as a <i>change agent</i> to create and sustain <i>social value</i> without being limited to <i>resources</i> currently at hand
Boschee and McClurg	2003	3	A social entrepreneur is any person, in any sector, who uses <i>earned income strategies to pursue a social objective</i>
Nicholls	2008	20	For social entrepreneurs, there is always a ' <i>socio-moral motivation</i> ' or <i>social-mission focus</i> to their entrepreneurial activity and ambition
Boschee	1995	1	<i>Non-profit executives</i> who pay increased attention to market forces without losing sight of their underlying mission, to somehow <i>balance moral imperatives</i> and the <i>profit motives</i> – and that balancing act is the heart and soul of the movement
Tracey and Phillips	2007	264	Individuals who <i>combine social and commercial objectives</i> by developing economically sustainable solutions to social problems. It requires social entrepreneurs to identify and exploit <i>market opportunities</i> in order to develop products and services that achieve <i>social ends</i> , or to generate surpluses that can be <i>reinvested in a social project</i>

Source: Bacq & Janssen (2011)