

If not for profit,
for what and how?

S O C I A L
E N T E R P R I S E

The Conceptualization of Social Entrepreneurship by the Print Media: A Content Analysis of Print Media Stories Published in India and Singapore

Albert Chu-Ying TEO
National University of Singapore

Yirene Yi-Lin TAN
National University of Singapore

EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers, no. LG13-37

4th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise - Liege, 2013

Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP)
on Social Enterprise (SOCENT) 2012-2017

and



 **EMES network**



Abstract

Even as social entrepreneurial activities have risen significantly around the world, academia continues to be consumed by debates on the exact definition of social entrepreneurship. Different schools of thought have since emerged and a reconciliation of definitions has yet to be achieved (Cukier et al., 2009; Brock, Steinder & Kim, 2008). In fact, it has become routine for scholars to begin their academic writings by qualifying that a consensual definition of social entrepreneurship does not exist (Nicholls, 2010), and that definitions must be adopted and used with caution (Zahra et al., 2009).

Given the conundrum associated with scholarly definitions of social entrepreneurship, this study aims to address the confusion emanating from academic discourse by seeking clarifications from an alternative institution: the mass media. The mass media play a significant role in determining how the public perceives various social issues and topics such as social entrepreneurship. As such, the public's understanding of social entrepreneurship is likely framed or influenced by the topical information disseminated by the mass media. Thus, an analysis of the relevant stories carried by the mass media would yield invaluable insights on how the public perceives social entrepreneurship.

This exploratory study content analyzes the stories on social entrepreneurship that were published by the print media in India and Singapore over a five-year period, from January 1, 2007, to December 31, 2011. From the Factiva database, a total of 652 print media stories on social entrepreneurship published in India are retrieved. Likewise, a total of 137 print media stories on social entrepreneurship published in Singapore are retrieved from the Factiva database.

The choice of India and Singapore as the contexts of this study allows for a comparative analysis between a developing Asian country and a developed Asian country. Specifically, the first research question addressed by this study is as follows: In terms of the stories published, how differently is social entrepreneurship framed by the respective print media of a developing Asian country (i.e., India) and a developed Asian country (i.e., Singapore)? The second research question that this study addresses is as follows: How different are the print media's conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship from academia's conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship?

Using the grounded theory approach, content analysis of the print media stories yields the following five propositions:

1. Government policies seem to drive social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country, while educational institutions seem to drive social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country.
2. Social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country seems to focus on providing employment opportunities to the marginalized in society, while social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country seems to focus on improving the living conditions of the rural poor.
3. The print media seem to portray the social innovation and revenue generation motives of social entrepreneurship as convergent ideas; by the contrast, academia often portrays the social innovation and revenue generation motives of social entrepreneurship as divergent ideas.
4. The print media do not seem to differentiate among the terms, social enterprise, social business, and social venture; by contrast, scholars often differentiate among the terms, social enterprise, social business, and social venture.
5. The print media seem to view youth as potential social entrepreneurs; by contrast, academia often views potential social entrepreneurs as a rare breed of leaders.

The first two propositions address the first research question (i.e., regarding differences between the context of a developing Asian country and that of a developed Asian country). And the last three propositions answer the second research question (i.e., regarding the conceptual differences between academia and the print media).

© Albert Chu-Ying Teo & Yirene Yi-Lin Tan 2013. EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers are available on the EMES website (www.emes.net) and on the SOCENT website (www.iap-socent.be). These papers do not undergo any editing process. They are published with the support of the Belgian Science Policy Office, within an Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP) on social enterprise entitled "If not for profit, for what? And how?".

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the word “social entrepreneurship” was coined by Bill Drayton, founder of Ashoka, in the early 1980s, there have been many academic debates on the exact definition of social entrepreneurship. Different schools of thought have emerged, and a reconciliation of definitions has yet to be achieved (Cukier, Rodrigues, Trenholm & Wise, 2009; Brock, Steinder & Kim, 2008). In fact, it has almost become a routine for scholars to start off any academic discussion on social entrepreneurship with the argument that there is no definitive consensus on the term’s definition (Nicholls, 2010) and that definitions must be adopted with caution (Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum & Shulman, 2009).

With a burgeoning list of definitions, the importance of finding a rigorous definition of social entrepreneurship soon cannot be over-emphasized. According to Martin and Osberg (2007), should the field of social entrepreneurship continue without a rigorous definition, proponents of social entrepreneurship will find it increasingly hard to consolidate resources to build up this field. Furthermore, detractors of social entrepreneurship may view this lack of definitional rigor as an opportunity to question the legitimacy of social entrepreneurship (Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE), 2008). Without an established academic paradigm, Nicholls (2010), following Kuhn (1962), argues that social entrepreneurship is unable to gain as much resources and legitimacy as compared to a field with clear epistemology.

Also, the absence of a consistent definition of social entrepreneurship may lead to indiscriminate usage of the term (Martin & Osberg, 2007; Light, 2006), and this may cause social entrepreneurship to lose its significance and meaning. In addition, the term may be misused by “social entrepreneurs” in order to attract funding away from charitable organizations (CASE, 2008), causing social entrepreneurship to fall into disrepute.

Another important reason to support the need for a rigorous definition of social entrepreneurship is that with better understanding of the field, it will be easier for advocates of social entrepreneurship to predict the sustainability of the social entrepreneurship model (Martin & Osberg, 2007), which has less quantifiable outcomes (Peredo & McLean, 2005) as compared to traditional for-profit entrepreneurship. Moreover, by identifying social entrepreneurship in clearer terms, it will encourage social entrepreneurs to modify their existing social business models to emphasize the “correct” traits as governed by the rigorous definition (Boschee & McClurg, 2003). This will enable social entrepreneurship to become more sustainable and easier to evaluate.

Given the conundrum associated with scholarly definitions of social entrepreneurship, this study aims to address the confusion emanating from academic discourse by seeking clarifications from an alternative institution: the print media. The print media play a significant role in determining how the public perceives various social issues and topics such as social entrepreneurship. As such, the public’s understanding of social entrepreneurship is likely framed or influenced by the topical information disseminated by the print media. Thus, an analysis of the relevant stories carried by the print media would yield invaluable insights on how the public perceives social entrepreneurship.

This study observes how social entrepreneurship is framed by the print media in a developed country and a developing country in Asia. Specifically, published news articles from Singapore and India, dated between 1 January 2007 and 31 December 2011, are examined using a grounded theory approach to identify the key features of social entrepreneurship as defined by the print media in the two different contextual environments. Ultimately, this study seeks to address the following questions:

1. How is the concept of social entrepreneurship different in a developing country and a developed country?
2. How is the concept of social entrepreneurship understood and portrayed by the press media?
3. What are the main factors that influence and drive social entrepreneurship?

EXTANT THEORY

Discourse on social entrepreneurship currently revolves around four themes. These four themes are as follows:

1. innovation versus generation of revenue;
2. individuals versus organizations;
3. social transformation versus incremental social impact;
4. social entrepreneurship across sectors.

Innovation versus Generation of Revenue

One prevalent tension in social entrepreneurship definition contrasts the social innovation motive with that of generation of revenue (CASE, 2008). Authors such as Boschee and McClurg (2003) argue that social entrepreneurship is “any earned-income business or strategy undertaken by a non-profit distributing organization to generate revenue in support of its charitable mission” (p. 7). The authors emphasize the financial bottom line as they argue that without a source of earned income to maintain sustainability, social entrepreneurship does not fulfill the entrepreneurial aspect of the term itself.

However, advocates of social innovation frame the entrepreneurial aspect of social entrepreneurship differently. Citing work by Joseph Schumpeter and Baptiste Say, Dees (1998) asserts that entrepreneurs are innovators who create value. Thus, social entrepreneurs are innovators who create social value. According to Dees (1998), social entrepreneurship consists of five main elements (p. 5):

1. adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value);
2. recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission;
3. engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning;
4. acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand;
5. exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.

Dees (1998) further argues that financial profit should not be used to measure the success of social entrepreneurship as it is only a means, not the end. Instead, social innovation and social impact should be the focus of social entrepreneurship. This sentiment is also echoed by Drayton and MacDonald (1993), who reiterate that social entrepreneurs are innovators who seek social change as the final outcome of their venture. Similarly, Nicholls (2009) also defines social entrepreneurship as any innovative action done to address social inequality. Therefore, outcomes of social entrepreneurship should not be framed in terms of income but in terms of social impact.

Interestingly, there is also talk of blending the two schools of thought for a more dynamic and rigorous definition of social entrepreneurship (Dees & Anderson, 2006). By combining the two schools of thought, society can benefit from a more sustainable and long-lasting social entrepreneurship model as innovative social solutions must also be economically viable.

Individuals versus Organizations

In some definitions of social entrepreneurship, there is an emphasis on the importance of an exceptional individual who leads the social change. Dees (1998) argues that social entrepreneurs are a rare breed of leaders. Hence, the definition of social entrepreneurship should reflect their distinctive characteristics, which are unlike others'. Therefore, in Dees' definition of social entrepreneurship, adjectives such as “relentlessly pursuing new opportunities” and “acting boldly” (p. 5) are used to describe the laudable traits of social entrepreneurs.

Authors such as Sullivan Mort, Weerawardena and Carnegie (2003) also define social entrepreneurship in terms of the specific characteristics of social entrepreneurs. They argue that social entrepreneurship involves people who are able to deliver social products in a superior manner as they excel in seizing opportunities to achieve social missions. In addition, another behavioral characteristic cited in various social entrepreneurship definitions is the ability of the social entrepreneur to tolerate risk when creating social value (Peredo & McLean, 2005).

By contrast, an opposing view argues that over-emphasizing characteristic traits when defining social entrepreneurship runs the risk of over-glorifying individuals (CASE, 2008). Social entrepreneurship definition should instead move away from the individual to the idea and organization surrounding the social entrepreneurial activity (Light, 2006). Mair and Marti (2006) echo this sentiment and assert that the definition of social entrepreneurship should focus on the social entrepreneurs' activities and not the social entrepreneurs themselves.

Social Transformation versus Incremental Social Impact

According to Martin and Osberg (2007), social entrepreneurship requires "forging a new, stable equilibrium" that alleviates suffering(s) of the society from its previous "unjust equilibrium" (p. 35). By suggesting the establishment of a new equilibrium, the authors propose that a large-scale systemic change must occur in true social entrepreneurship. In other words, the society will experience a social transformation. Ashoka's¹ definition is congruent with Martin and Osberg's. Ashoka defines social entrepreneurship in terms of individuals providing innovative solutions to tackle pressing social problems, hence enabling wide-scale change. By insisting on achieving wide-scale social impact, it can be inferred that a social transformation is the expected outcome of social entrepreneurship.

By contrast, there are others who contend that the outcome of social entrepreneurship is any net positive social impact, regardless of the scale. Cukier et al. (2009) define social entrepreneurship as activities that "make the world a better place" (p. 3) and create social value. In a similar vein, Nicholls (2006; 2009) defines social entrepreneurship as innovations which are designed to better societal well-being. Hence, there is less emphasis on the magnitude of social value creation in these definitions. Rather, any form of betterment to society using innovative ideas, regardless of scale, can be considered as social entrepreneurship.

Social Entrepreneurship across Sectors

Much social entrepreneurship discourse has centered on the "domain of non-government not-for-profit organizations" (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006, p. 22). According to Boschee and McClurg (2003), social entrepreneurship must be undertaken by a non-profit organization. The authors go on to explain how traditional entrepreneurs (in for-profit organizations) who engage in charitable or socially responsible practices cannot be considered social entrepreneurs because their companies' missions are not directly tied to social problems. The main distinction between traditional entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship is that social entrepreneurship has an unadulterated social mission. The sole purpose of social entrepreneurship is to alleviate a social problem, unlike that of traditional entrepreneurship.

However, another group of scholars prefer to broaden the definition of social entrepreneurship to cover all three sectors: private, public and people (Austin, 2006). According to Ratten and Welpel (2011), social entrepreneurship is open to "individuals, corporations, organizations and the government to address any unmet social issue" (p. 283). An example of government-based social entrepreneurship which the authors provide is community development banks. They also cite Ben & Jerry's as an example of social entrepreneurial activities emanating from a for-profit.

¹Information retrieved from Ashoka official website: www.ashoka.org, on 27 August 2011.

Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006) argue that the main driver of social entrepreneurship should be the social mission and not the vehicle or format in which the social value is created. Therefore, social entrepreneurship should not be constrained by any legal form and can be pursued by players in the non-profit, for-profit and public sectors.

Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship

In addition to the four themes of social entrepreneurship discourse discussed above, there are yet many other definitions of social entrepreneurship found across various academic works. For instance, Brock et al. (2008) have compiled a list of definitions of social entrepreneurship based on their content analysis of articles and documents produced by scholars and foundations (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship (Brock et al., 2008)

Author(s) and Year	Definition
Ashoka	Social entrepreneurs are individuals with innovative solutions to society's most pressing social problems. They are ambitious and persistent, tackling major social issues and offering new ideas for wide-scale change.
Austin, J., Stephenson, H., & Wei-Skillen, J. (2006)	Social entrepreneurship is an innovative, social value-creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, businesses or government sector.
Bornstein, D. (2003)	A path breaker with a powerful new idea who combines visionary and real-world problem solving creativity, who has a strong ethical fiber, and who is "totally possessed" by his or her vision for change.
Dees, J. G. (2001)	Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value); • Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission; • Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning; • Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand; and • Exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.
Johnson, S. (2000)	Social entrepreneurship is emerging as an innovative approach for dealing with complex social needs. With its emphasis on problem-solving and social innovation, socially entrepreneurial activities blur the traditional boundaries between the public, private, and non-profit sector and emphasize hybrid model of for-profit and non-profit activities.
Light, P. C. (2006b)	A social entrepreneur is an individual, group, network, organization, or alliance of organizations that seeks sustainable, large-scale change through pattern-breaking ideas in what or how governments, nonprofits, and businesses do to address significant social problems.
Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006)	Social entrepreneurship: Innovative models of providing products and services that caters to basic needs (rights) that remain unsatisfied by political or economic institutions.
Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007)	The social entrepreneur should be understood as someone who targets an unfortunate but stable equilibrium that causes the neglect, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity; who brings to bear on this situation his or her inspiration, direct action, creativity, courage and fortitude; and who aims for and ultimately affects the establishment of a new stable equilibrium that secures permanent benefit for the targeted group and society at large.
Nicholls, A. (2007)	Social entrepreneurship entails innovation designed to explicitly improve societal well-being, housed within entrepreneurial organizations which initiate, guide or contribute to change in society.
PBS "The New Heroes"	A social entrepreneur identifies and solves social problems on a large scale. Just as business entrepreneurs create and transform whole industries, social entrepreneurs act as the change agents for society, seizing opportunities others miss in order to improve systems, invent and disseminate new approaches and advance sustainable solutions that create social value.
Schwab Foundation	What is a social entrepreneur? A pragmatic visionary who achieves large scale, systematic and sustainable social change through a new invention, a different approach, a more rigorous application of known technologies or strategies, or a combination of these.
Skoll Foundation	The social entrepreneur as society's change agent: a pioneer of innovation that benefits humanity. Social entrepreneurs are ambitious, mission driven, strategic, resourceful and results oriented.
Thompson, J. (2002)	People with the qualities and behaviors we associate with the business entrepreneur but who operate in the community and are more concerned with caring and helping than "making money".

Likewise, Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006) have also collated a list of social entrepreneurship definitions that have emerged in the field (see Table 2 below).

Table 2: Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006)

Author(s) and Year	Definition
King and Roberts (1987)	Social entrepreneurship defined in terms of innovation and leadership characteristics.
Waddock and Post (1991)	Creating or elaborating a public organization so as to alter greatly the existing pattern of allocation of scarce public resources.
Campbell (1997)	Social purpose ventures provide communities with needed products or services and generate profit to support activities that cannot generate revenue.
Henton et al. (1997)	Civic entrepreneurs recognize opportunities and mobilize other to work for the collective good.
Leadbeater (1997)	Identification of under-utilized resources which are put to use to satisfy unmet social needs.
Cornwall (1998)	Entrepreneurs have social responsibility to improve their communities.
Dees (1998b)	Not-for-profits discovering new funding sources and strategies.
Prabhu (1998)	Entrepreneurial organizations whose primary mission is social change and the development of their client group.
Wallace (1999)	Entrepreneurs have social responsibility to improve their communities – derives from social and political cohesion in a community.
Borins (2000)	Leaders that innovate in a public sector organizations.
Thompson et al. (2000)	The process of adding something new and something different for the purpose of building social capital – focuses on actions taken by private sector actors.
Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship (2001)	Innovative dual bottom line initiatives emerging from the private, public and voluntary sectors. The 'dual bottom line' refers to the emphasis placed on ensuring that investment generates both economic and social rates of return.
Hibbert et al. (2001)	The use of entrepreneurial behavior for social ends rather than for profit objectives; or an enterprise that generates profits that benefits a specific disadvantaged group.
Smallbone et al. (2001)	Social enterprises defined as competitive firms that are owned and trade for a social purpose (includes non-profits, worker-owned collectives, credit unions, etc).
Cook, Dodds, and Mitchell (2002)	Social partnerships between public, social and business sectors designed to harness market power for the public interest.
Shaw et al. (2002)	Bringing to social problems the same enterprise and imagination that business entrepreneurs bring to wealth creation.
Thompson (2002)	The process of adding something new and something different for the purpose of building social capital.
Sullivan Mort et al. (2003)	Searching for and recognizing opportunities that lead to the establishment of new social organizations and continued innovation in existing ones.

Social Enterprise Models

In addition to the varying definitions of social entrepreneurship, there is also disagreement on what constitutes a social enterprise model. The two most commonly cited social enterprise models are the social business and the social enterprise. ClearlySo², an organization which helps social entrepreneurs to raise capital from investors, has made a clear distinction between a social enterprise and a social business. ClearlySo defines a social business as any organization which places equal importance on both financial and social goals. An increase in investment to further the economic goal must therefore lead to an equivalent increase in social impact. On the other hand, according to ClearlySo, a social enterprise is unlike a social business as it places more emphasis on social than financial goals. Any surplus in a social enterprise is ploughed back into the organization to further its social goals. Therefore, shareholders of the social enterprise do not receive any financial returns on investment.

By contrast, Muhammad Yunus, Nobel Peace Prize laureate and founder of Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, has a different take on social businesses and social enterprises. Yunus (2007) defines a social business as a cause-driven but non-loss, non-dividend business; shareholders of the organization are more interested in pursuing social goals than economic goals and any surplus profit is reinvested into the organization for the advancement of its social mission. Yunus (2007) classifies social businesses into two types. The first type of social business focuses on providing a social benefit to the society while the second type of social business is owned by member(s) of a disadvantaged group and aims to alleviate the problem of poverty among them. Furthermore, Yunus (2007) differentiates a social enterprise from a social business by conceptualizing the former as an encompassing term which includes charities and non-governmental organizations.

In another interpretation of social business, Jager (2010) identifies three elements which define the term. Social businesses are both market- and social-oriented; they support communal solidarity; and they help to allocate resources to meet social needs. According to Jager (2010), there are three possible models of social businesses – market-integration business model, inclusive business model and member business model.

Additionally, there is yet another conceptualization of social enterprise known as the social business venture. According to Elkington and Hartigan (2008), a social business venture is a cause-driven and non-dividend business aiming for large-scale social change. On closer inspection, this definition is not dissimilar to Yunus' version of social business and ClearlySo's description of social enterprise. Therefore, it is important for one to understand the nuances of the different definitions and to take them into account when engaging in academic analysis.

Case for Further Research

Given that the social entrepreneurship literature is still fragmented and has yet to develop into an "empirically derived coherent theoretical framework" (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006, p. 25), scholars like Cukier et al. (2009) are calling for more rigorous empirical research, so as to strengthen the definition of social entrepreneurship. Lehner and Kansikas (2011) propose that more quantitative theory testing be carried out to build up the legitimacy and future direction of the social entrepreneurship field.

According to Mair and Marti (2006), one aspect of social entrepreneurship which future researchers can look into is the "concept of embeddedness" in social entrepreneurship (p. 40), also known as structuration theory. The authors contend that it is more useful to understand social entrepreneurship as a process resulting from the constant interaction between the change agents and the contextual

² Information retrieved from ClearlySo official website: <http://www.clearlyso.com/resources/what-is-social-business-and-enterprise.html>, on 27 August 2011.

environment which they are embedded in, as it is impossible to separate the social entrepreneurs from their social environment. As such, the authors propose further research in this aspect to understand how the context of the social environment moulds and alters the perception of social entrepreneurship, and the manner in which it occurs.

Furthermore, Nicholls (2010) describes social entrepreneurship as being in a “pre-paradigmatic state of development” (p. 625) that consists of multiple paradigm-building actors who constantly shape its legitimation discourse in a process of reflexive isomorphism. Therefore, resource-rich actors such as governments, foundations (e.g., Skoll Foundation), fellowship organisations (e.g., Ashoka) and network builders (e.g., Social Enterprise Alliance) in the contextual environment influence and affect the way in which social entrepreneurship is projected and legitimated.

METHODOLOGY

Grounded Theory Approach

The grounded theory approach asserts that basing theory on experimental data will make the theory irrefutable and convincing, and at the same time, reduce opportunities for academics to impose popular theories on the available data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This approach allows researchers to mitigate issues of biases and preconceptions, and enables them to examine data objectively. This methodology enables researchers to develop new theories from qualitative data, especially in exploratory research (Brown, 2006).

In this study, the grounded theory approach is used to derive new ideas on how social entrepreneurship is framed by the print media in Singapore and India; these ideas may not be evident in prior academic work on the definition of social entrepreneurship. Specifically, the study adopts Glaser’s (1978) concept-indicator model of theory development, which involves a multi-stage process:

1. developing key observations from content analyzing qualitative data;
2. developing concepts by combining related key observations;
3. developing propositions through conceptual reductions.

For this study, the empirical observations are all known print media articles on social entrepreneurship in Singapore and India, published from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2011. The content of each article is critically analyzed and open coded (Glaser, 1978) to develop as many categories as possible. Theoretical memos are also written along the way to capture the researchers’ thoughts while coding. Theoretical memos serve to provide flexibility and enhance creativity in grounded theory development (Glaser, 1978). Next, selective coding is done to further evaluate the categories against the data collected. This is carried out to focus on emerging core variables/concepts that are present in the data (Glaser, 1978). Finally, theory development is brought to a close when the theory becomes substantive and when further sampling of the data does not yield significant value (Fernandez, 2004).

Data Collection

The print media articles on social entrepreneurship, published in Singapore and India from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2012, are retrieved from the Factiva database. The search term “social entrepreneurship” is entered to identify all print media articles containing this term. Furthermore, only articles which have been published in the English language are considered for empirical analysis.

The search yields an initial collection of 158 articles for Singapore and 957 articles for India. After eliminating irrelevant and duplicate articles, 137 unique articles remain for Singapore and 652 unique articles remain for India. Articles which are considered irrelevant are those that only mention

the term "social entrepreneurship" but do not elaborate on the concept further or do not cite any examples of social entrepreneurship. The irrelevant articles are removed as they do not contribute to a better understanding of social entrepreneurship.

OBSERVATIONS

Observations Derived from Articles Published in Singapore

In line with the first stage of the concept-indicator model of theory development (Glaser, 1978), a series of categories or key observations are derived from content analysis of the print media articles. Content analysis of the articles published in Singapore yield four key observations.

Observation 1: The government is the main driving force for social entrepreneurship in Singapore.

Nearly one third of the articles published in Singapore mention the government's support for social entrepreneurship in Singapore. Specifically, the government has been administering the ComCare Enterprise Fund (CEF) since 2003, to provide start-up funds for local social enterprises:

"From next month, the Government will broaden the scope of its ComCare Enterprise Fund (CEF), which currently provides start-up funds to new social enterprises to provide training and employment for needy Singaporeans..."

"More funds for start-ups seeking to help others", TODAY, 10 Dec 2011"

In fact, the CEF has provided seed funding to nearly 50% of the existing social enterprises in Singapore:

"There are some 170 social enterprises here. Currently, start-ups can tap on the Comcare Enterprise Fund (CEF) which has distributed \$10 million to support 80 social enterprises since 2003. New entrants can apply for up to 80 per cent of their total project costs, capped at \$300,000 - but only for up to the first two years."

"Funding extended to existing social ventures", The Straits Times, 10 Dec 2011

Despite being the main fund provider for many social enterprise start-ups in Singapore, the government is still keen to extend its funding to existing social enterprises as they are eager to promote social entrepreneurship in Singapore:

"From next year, the Government will extend its funding for start-up social enterprises to existing ones which have a proven track record and potential to grow."

"Funding extended to existing social ventures", The Straits Times, 10 Dec 2011

In addition, the government's reach has also extended to educational facilities:

"She added that MCYS would also introduce a new tier of CEF funding for schools to develop programmes on social entrepreneurship education. This new tier, which will also start next year, will fund social entrepreneurial projects started by youths. The funding programme hopes to target more than 70 schools in the next three years."

"Government to broaden ComCare Enterprise Fund", Channel News Asia, 9 Dec 2011

The quotes above indicate that the Singapore government plays a major role in promoting social entrepreneurship by providing monetary incentives and assistance to social enterprises and schools. However, the government also acknowledges that monetary support is not sufficient to promote a culture of social entrepreneurship in Singapore; therefore, a more holistic approach is taken:

"Balakrishnan set up the Social Enterprise Committee in August 2006 to look for ways to grow the country's social enterprise sector. The committee came up with a report proposing the formation of a Social Enterprise Association and a Social Enterprise Development Centre for promoting a favourable social enterprise environment and a culture of social entrepreneurship."

"Singapore sets up Social Enterprise Development Centre", Singapore Government News, 24 Oct 2010

Although the government has taken steps to promote social entrepreneurship through funding and setting up relevant institutions, many social entrepreneurs still feel that the government can do more to ease the difficulties faced by social entrepreneurs when they start up their social enterprises:

"What the government could consider doing, on top of monetary incentives, is to help more parents or other entrepreneurs who want to start up something like this to help special needs children, by providing them tools, setting standards..."

"Profile of Joan Bowen Cafe raised after ND Rally mention", Channel News Asia, 15 Aug 2011

"Politicians and the government, he says, could help by creating an 'enabling' environment - such as putting in place 'painless' procedures to start organisations, manage their finances and seek donations."

"It's about heart, not formula", The Straits Times, 24 Oct 2009

As social entrepreneurs are used to the government's leading role in promoting social entrepreneurship, this inevitably leads to a heavy reliance on the government to create an environment conducive to the proliferation of social enterprises. The government is aware of these expectations, and is in fact inclined to take the lead by implementing public policies to promote social entrepreneurship:

"Singaporeans often expect the government to take the lead. The recent recommendations by the Social Enterprise Committee (SEC) chaired by Philip Yeo to create a culture of social entrepreneurship is certainly a step in that direction."

"Doing good isn't bad for business", Business Times, 15 Dec 2007

Additionally, the government also finds value in engaging social entrepreneurs as their work benefits the society:

"The Government recognises your potential to make a difference to our society and has been actively engaging people like you through several platforms and schemes."

"Speech by Mr Lui Tuck Yew, Minister for Information, Communications and the Arts, at the 2011 Citi-YMCA Youth for Causes official launch on 19 May 2011 (Thursday) at 8.00pm", Singapore Government News, 23 May 2011

To sum up, the government is the main driving force promoting social entrepreneurship in Singapore. It takes a leading role in raising awareness of social entrepreneurship and creating an enabling environment because: (a) it finds social value in doing so; and (b) it is expected to do so.

Observation 2: Most social enterprises in Singapore are interested in creating employment opportunities for the disadvantaged/marginalized.

40 out of the 137 articles offer examples of social enterprises that create employment opportunities for the disadvantaged/marginalized. This is not surprising as Singapore is a developed city state which does not face problems such as widespread poverty or the lack of rural development. Hence, social enterprises in Singapore tend to adopt a work-integration model as the lack of employment opportunities for marginalized communities is one of the more obvious social problems:

"In affluent, urban centres like the cities studied, the focus is primarily on providing disadvantaged or needy persons with employment, business opportunities and skills training," the Singapore researchers say."

"Social enterprise sector can do with more public support", Business Times, 31 Mar 2007

The problem of unemployment for disadvantaged Singaporeans is quite pronounced owing to the lack of an extensive social security net for Singaporeans. Therefore, there is a need for social enterprises to fill the gap and create jobs for disadvantaged Singaporeans who are, otherwise, unable to find jobs in the open labor market:

"The situation does not improve with another marginalised group - the 11,000 former offenders released from prison each year. Fewer than half of those who seek help from statutory board Score actually manage to be placed in jobs. Evidently, the numbers are not anything to smile about, especially for a society governed fiercely by a policy of workfare over welfare. That is why employment for the marginalised has been the model of choice for most social enterprises here..."

"What will it take for social enterprises to take off?", The Straits Times, 8 Apr 2007

In addition, social enterprises are further incentivized to adopt a work-integration model as it is favored by the government:

"Better yet if yours is an enterprise focusing on providing jobs, which is the Government's priority now."
"What will it take for social enterprises to take off?", The Straits Times, 8 Apr 2007

In fact, the government has even taken the liberty to narrow the definition of social enterprises:

"...Minister of State for Community Development, Youth and Sport, said social enterprises, which are businesses with a social mission, provide employment opportunities for those who find it difficult to get a job."

"Panel to help disabled and ex-convicts", The Straits Times, 10 Mar 2007

Consequently, many social entrepreneurs adopt the work-integration model for their social enterprises so as to benefit from government funding:

"Since 2003, the CEF has been providing seed grants to start-up social enterprises which provide training and employment to needy Singaporeans."

"Government to broaden ComCare Enterprise Fund", Channel News Asia, 9 Dec 2011

Upon adopting a work-integration model for their social enterprises, social entrepreneurs also need to determine the communities of people who are marginalized so as to reach out to them:

"These groups include "people whom the employment market would not so keenly take in", said Mr Yeo - such as those with physical and intellectual disabilities, ex-offenders, and the older and less educated."

"After science, Yeo turns to social enterprise", TODAY, 17 Mar 2007

Besides individuals with disabilities, ex-offenders, the elderly, and the less educated, single mothers may also be considered marginalized. This is because single mothers are more likely to experience poorer living conditions as they need to play the dual roles of breadwinner and caregiver simultaneously:

"Work-integration social enterprise A-changin Pte Ltd is on a mission to provide training and employment opportunities to work-capable women in need, especially single mothers."

"A stitch in time; Going out of her way to help women in need", TODAY, 9 Aug 2011

Government incentives aside, social entrepreneurs also find value in adopting the work-integration model because of their personal convictions:

"The power to create jobs, to create a service needed by people... there is economic value in it," he said. "It shouldn't be seen as a sacrifice."

"O, what a winning innovation; Founder started performing arts centre to fund non-profit school for dropouts", TODAY, 15 Dec 2007

"...goal of any social enterprise was to 'put people as first priority, social impact as priority"...We want to create jobs, help people do well..."

"Social entrepreneur to lead hawker centre panel", The Straits Times, 30 Oct 2011

Indeed, there are also Singaporean social entrepreneurs operating outside Singapore and adopting the work-integration model:

"Every month, the cafe sells about 80,000 cookies made by 10 villagers (in Cambodia), who now have jobs and steady incomes."

"'Businesses with a heart' catching on among youth", The Straits Times, 16 Jun 2008

This is mainly because social entrepreneurs are convinced that employment will allow marginalized communities to attain self-reliance:

"It is to give the needy and disadvantaged a permanent employment for income so that they can be independent."

"Key proposals unveiled to stimulate social entrepreneurship", Business Times, 4 Dec 2007

Finally, as social impact is intangible and hard to measure, creation of job opportunities for marginalized communities is a good proxy measurement to quantify the social impact generated by social enterprises. As a result, the work-integration model is a popular choice among social enterprises in Singapore:

"We are not as profitable as other businesses but it's about how we compensate by taking into consideration the social values and benefits we generate," said Dr Heinecke. "We conduct social impact studies and narrative studies, we show how many jobs we have generated."

"From the wallet to the heart; Social enterprises have to make money and serve a greater good", TODAY, 14 Dec 2007

In summary, most social enterprises in Singapore adopt the work-integration model as unemployment of disadvantaged groups is a significant social problem in Singapore. Moreover, owing to funding support from the government and their own personal convictions, social entrepreneurs are motivated to set up social enterprises that create jobs for the disadvantaged.

Observation 3: The social enterprise is the most common output of social entrepreneurship in Singapore.

The third observation has a different focus from the first two observations. Observation 3 relates to the issue of taxonomy in the social entrepreneurship discourse. The articles indicate that the most common term used for the output of social entrepreneurship is social enterprise, rather than social business or social venture. The term, social enterprise, appears 305 times, i.e., an average of 2.2 times per article. By contrast, the terms, social business and social venture, only appear 5 times and 14 times, respectively.

Social enterprises and their priorities are commonly described by the Singapore print media as follows:

*"...businesses that use market-based strategies to advance their social causes. Like any other business, a social enterprise aims to create surpluses, but seeks to reinvest them to achieve its social objectives."
"More funds for start-ups seeking to help others", TODAY, 10 Dec 2011*

"Social enterprises are profit-driven ventures that advance their social causes using the revenue generated from their businesses."

"Funding extended to existing social ventures", The Straits Times, 10 Dec 2011

"The consensus among social enterprises which have gone the distance is that any business must first be able to stand on its own before it can think of helping others."

"Business with a cause", The Straits Times, 28 Feb 2010

"The social enterprise must have some earned income stream so that it can go on with its business, and it must have a social bottom line, which measures the impact on the ground."

"Doing well, doing good", Business Times Singapore, 2 Mar 2009

Indeed, the success of a social enterprise in Singapore is measured in terms of its ability to maintain a double bottom line. The above quotes suggest that there is equal emphasis on both financial sustainability and social impact. However, some social entrepreneurs beg to differ. For them, social impact should be prioritized:

"...the goal of any social enterprise was to 'put people as first priority, social impact as priority'.

"Social entrepreneur to lead hawker centre panel", The Straits Times, 30 Oct 2011

"To me, a social enterprise is a business which has a social cause and uses the business mechanism to run and power the cause. I think the business and social aspects can mix, although somehow one of them has priority," she said. 'For ECO Travel, the priority is the social cause - it's about the intangibles that we get in return from doing this.'

"Travelling green around Asean", Business Times Singapore, 5 Jan 2009

"It doesn't make economic sense, but as a social enterprise, you have to do it."

"What will it take for social enterprises to take off?", The Straits Times, 8 Apr 2007

To sum up, the social enterprise is the most common output of social entrepreneurship in Singapore. Also, social enterprises in Singapore emphasize the importance of meeting their double bottom lines; they must have both financial sustainability and social impact.

Observation 4: Social entrepreneurship in Singapore is mindful of generating revenue to support the social enterprise's social mission.

As discussed above, social enterprises in Singapore place equal importance on maintaining financial sustainability and creating social impact. Hence, most social enterprises are mindful of generating enough revenue to support their social causes:

"...the importance of social enterprises as a revenue-generating measure for delivering social services."

"Singapore sets up Social Enterprise Development Centre", Singapore Government News, 24 Oct 2010

"Social enterprises are revenue-generating businesses with social missions."

"DBS to roll out tailored social enterprise banking packages", Channel News Asia, 14 Dec 2007

Furthermore, due to the strong focus on income generation for the disadvantaged, the success of a social enterprise in Singapore is often measured by the amount of money it makes:

"...Highpoint, too, is another success story. It runs social enterprises such as a moving service to provide employment for work therapy for the ex-offenders it rehabilitates. Last year, its businesses had a combined turnover of over \$320,000."

"Business with a cause", The Straits Times, 28 Feb 2010

In essence, social enterprises in Singapore strive to generate revenue while advancing a social cause, hence, mixing business methods with social missions. In addition, they like to differentiate themselves from charitable organizations. Charities are about donating money to the disadvantaged while social enterprises adopt a more sustainable method to help the disadvantaged:

"There is a lot of scepticism over the charity model and people are wary about just giving money away,' he said. Social enterprises have therefore sprung up to create jobs for poor communities to make them more self-reliant."

"'Businesses with a heart' catching on among youth", The Straits Times, 16 Jun 2008

As such, social enterprises are looking to build sustainable operations that can provide sustainable solutions. This can only be achieved through engagement in income-generating activities. Social entrepreneurs are aware that without being financially self-reliant, they will be unable to pursue their social goals:

"...I wish to see more sustainable social enterprises being established so that more disadvantaged persons in our community can be helped."

"Government of Singapore: ComCare Enterprise Fund to support more disadvantaged and students", Singapore Government News, 8 Dec 2011

The notion of sustainability is deeply ingrained in many social entrepreneurs. As such, most of the social enterprises in Singapore are small in scale. By running small enterprises, social entrepreneurs find it easier to maintain the financial viability of their social enterprises:

"A social enterprise may be a tiny business venture like a cafe or retail outlet. But it has a lofty social goal: providing jobs and opportunities for the disadvantaged in Singapore, from the disabled to ex-convicts."

"Report on social enterprise out", The Straits Times, 3 Dec 2007

While social entrepreneurs are currently contented to run small operations, the government harbors a different idea. As the social entrepreneurship scene in Singapore starts to develop, the government is looking for ways to scale up existing social enterprises so as to maximize their social impact:

"...promising social enterprises with proven models and track records to scale up their operations."

"Government of Singapore: ComCare Enterprise Fund to support more disadvantaged and students", Singapore Government News, 8 Dec 2011

In summary, social entrepreneurship in Singapore follows the revenue generation model closely as social entrepreneurs are aware that financial viability needs to be established before social goals can be achieved. And because social entrepreneurs focus on generating revenue through their social enterprises, they usually keep their operations small and manageable.

Observations Derived from Articles Published in India

Content analysis of the articles published in India yield four key observations.

Observation 5: Social entrepreneurship in India centers around alleviating social problems related to the rural sector.

The term, rural, appears 855 times in the set of articles published in India. In other words, on average, the term appears at least once per article. This high word count highlights the close association between India's rural sector and social entrepreneurship. Such an association is not surprising because a large percentage of India's population reside in the rural areas and live below the poverty line:

"...over 45 million households in rural India are below poverty line. The Planning Commission of India estimated that rural poverty ratio is about 38%."

"XLRI to host 4th National Conference on Social Entrepreneurship", India Infoline News Service, 15 Dec 2011

"There's no better place than India to start doing this because you've got anywhere between half a billion to 700 million people who are living in the rural areas, most of them without electricity, drinking water, etc."

"Mohanjit Jolly, DFJ India: India's still a very 'roti-kapda-makaan' type of investment economy", YourStory.in, 25 Mar 2011

Indeed, the overwhelming presence of social inequality and poor living conditions faced by people living in the rural areas has made them the primary target for social entrepreneurship. The vast social gap between the people in the urban and rural areas has made the rural sector a fertile context for social entrepreneurship to take place:

"To fill this gap, during last few years, rural sector has not only opened up immense possibilities for entrepreneurship, but has also sprouted many innovative social entrepreneurial models. Moreover, rejuvenation of the rural ecosystem and livelihoods is also emerging as a significant national priority."

"XLRI to host 4th National Conference on Social Entrepreneurship", India Infoline News Service, 15 Dec 2011

Furthermore, the barren state of India's rural sector encourages social entrepreneurs to innovate and look for opportunities to fill the social gaps:

"But in rural India, there is no health-care system, so it's much easier to innovate there."

"From clean water to e-doctor - eHealthPoint brings health care to rural India", PluGGd.in, 19 Sep 2011

"Prof Unni said, "Setting up an incubation centre at IRMA for social entrepreneurship is another dream. This would encourage and help students to think and act in the direction of rural entrepreneurship."

"IRMA director keen to promote social entrepreneurship", Daily News & Analysis, 9 Sep 2011

Some social entrepreneurs are motivated to act because of their personal backgrounds:

"The 25-year-old BITS, Pilani alumnus, who grew up in rural Rajasthan, is a throwback on old values and modules, ideating and innovating in a bid to correct a lopsided social landscape... Even during his student days, Yashveer was focused on the problems and issues that rural communities in India faced."

"Taking ideals and ideas to the classroom", The Times of India, 14 Nov 2011

Other social entrepreneurs are motivated because they have witnessed or learned about social problems in the rural areas through their voluntary work or academic training:

"...making education available to the poor and rural children after we came face to face with reality - lack of academic facilities during our voluntary work with the Teach India campaign..."

"Teach India duo's idea hailed in US", The Times of India, 17 Mar 2010

Therefore, improving the livelihood and living conditions of the rural poor has become the mission of many social entrepreneurship ventures in India:

"...sustainable change in the lives of the rural poor."

"Villgro Innovations Foundation invites applications for its 2011 fellowship", YourStory.in, 25 Apr 2011

"...providing livelihood to rural artisans."

"Making rural artisans shareholders", The Times of India, 22 Nov 2011

"...provide employment opportunities to rural youth."

"Healthcare, pharma cos pick up interns from IIMA", Daily News & Analysis, 18 Nov 2011

"HPS provides reliable, renewable and affordable electricity to rural populations..."

"Neelam Chhiber awarded as India's Social Entrepreneur of the Year 2011", India Infoline News Service, 14 Nov 2011

As more social enterprises are established in the rural sector of India, an additional perspective is adopted by social entrepreneurs. No longer are the rural poor seen solely as the beneficiaries of the services provided by the social enterprises; additionally, they are also viewed as consumers and the future burgeoning market of India:

"Recently, the rural scenario in the country has emerged as a lucrative option for the mainstream economy. Various organizations are viewing rural areas as potential markets, resulting in a gamut of innovative solutions within the social entrepreneurship space that focuses on and emerges from rural areas."

"Social entrepreneurship in India: The complete guide to funding, profitable sectors [and more]", PluGGd.in, 20 Aug 2010

"...homing in on the rural landscape which, with 70 per cent of the population, has all the potential consumers."

"Big ideas, low cost", India Today, 30 May 2011

To sum up, social entrepreneurs in India are focused on improving the rural sector because of the significant social gap between the urban and rural sectors. In addition, the rural sector is viewed as a burgeoning market that can be tapped.

Observation 6: Educational institutions are the key drivers of social entrepreneurship in India.

Many of the articles suggest that educational institutions in India play an important role in promoting social entrepreneurship and creating opportunities for social entrepreneurs:

"The social sector needs entrepreneurs with necessary skills to build sustainable business models. This XLRI course aims to address that need."

"Entrepreneurship for a sustainable society", The Hindu, 13 Sep 2010

"Another option is Tata Institute of Social Sciences that offers a two year masters in social entrepreneurship. The course is aimed at training and developing change leaders for wealth generation in social sectors or not-for-profit markets."

"India's best MBA courses", India Today, 9 Aug 2010

Among students, there is also increased interest in pursuing careers in the social sector. Hence, besides providing academic training on social entrepreneurship, tertiary institutions are also engaging organizations in the social sector to participate in campus career fairs and to offer internship opportunities:

"The National Innovation Foundation (NIF) had hired interns from the IIMA campus last year. This year, they also recruited students interested in the social entrepreneurship sector."

"Healthcare, pharma cos pick up interns from IIMA", Daily News & Analysis, 18 Nov 2011

In addition, some tertiary institutions are active in organizing social entrepreneurship business plan competitions, conferences and fairs:

"The Indian Institute of Technology-Madras (IIT-M), Tata Consultancy Services and Lemelson Recognition and Mentoring Program (L-Ramp) are jointly hosting 'Genesis,' a business plan contest open for students and NGOs in social entrepreneurship."

"Contest to support innovative business ideas", The Hindu, 12 Jan 2007

"... (IIM-A) will host the second social entrepreneurship fair - Pratyarpan - on November 9."

"Entrepreneurship fair to kick off at IIM-A tomorrow", The Times of India, 9 Nov 2008

And some tertiary institutions go even further by incubating and seed funding student-led social enterprises:

"The premier B school of the country, XLRI, Jamshedpur and Santa Clara University (SCU), California, USA, have signed an MoU to promote and foster social entrepreneurship in India. The two institutes have decided to collaborate where XLRI will be the Indian partner to manage and support Global Social Benefit Incubator (GSBI), the signature programme of Centre for Science, Technology, and Society of Santa Clara University."

"XLRI ties up with SCU", The Times of India, 15 Mar 2011

"... a few of the country's B-schools are helping student entrepreneurs to go ahead with their own ventures by providing seed funds, mentorship and using the alumni network to raise funds and get in touch with useful contacts."

- *"B-schools assist student-entrepreneurs; while venture capitalists (VCs) are reluctant to fund several entrepreneurial...", Business Standard, 3 Mar 2009*

In summary, educational institutions in India are very involved in promoting social entrepreneurship. They not only create an enabling environment for students to take up social entrepreneurship, but also take on the roles of social enterprise incubators and business angels.

Observation 7: Social innovation is the essence of social entrepreneurship in India; nevertheless, the need for financial sustainability is not discounted.

Most articles point out that social innovation is the way to go for social entrepreneurship in India. Such a focus on social innovation is evident, as it is often highlighted at conferences and forums that promote social entrepreneurship:

"NSEF promotes social entrepreneurship in universities across India...They designed this confluence to play as "a platform to catalyse social entrepreneurship among the youth, be a place to drive home

various social innovations and different facets of social entrepreneurship and a place to mutually learn about effective solutions to the most pressing social problems".

"How to marry social impact and business, and win", DNA Sunday, 24 Oct 2010

Educational institutions also emphasize the importance of social innovation:

"This is the first programme dedicated to social entrepreneurship in India and the aim is to create a strong cadre of men and women, who can come up with innovative solutions to existing and emerging problems."

"TISS centre says no to placements", Indian Express, 17 Dec 2011

Additionally, even incubators now target social entrepreneurs with innovative ideas:

"Mumbai-based Sankalp Forum and Chennai-based Villgro, for example, draw out hundreds of entrepreneurs from the country's rural heartlands and small towns, with innovative ideas to incubate business."

"Conscience over profit: Not business as usual", Hi India, 7 Aug 2011

Consequently, business ideas which are innovative and motivated by social causes are often rewarded:

"Highly innovative ideas such as rural retail supply chain with social inclusion and traffic information solutions in metros won appreciation from the judges of 'Samridhi', the general Bplan competition".

"Mgmt students impress with their innovative plans for new business", The Times of India, 28 Nov 2011

"The winners of this year's Staples/Ashoka YSE Competition are an innovative and tech-savvy group that will continue to drive social change and make a positive impact on communities..."

"Staples and Ashoka name winners in 5th Annual Youth Social Entrepreneur Competition", Journal of India, 25 Oct 2011

Beyond the institutional forces that encourage and reward social innovation, social entrepreneurs themselves are also convinced that social innovation is necessary to solve social problems in India:

"The first step is to use these to address the big six issues that rural and poor India faces - clean drinking water, employable vocational skills, sanitation, basic nutrition, health and housing - through social innovations".

"If I had Rs 50 lakh to spend..." The Times of India, 4 Oct 2007

"They call themselves social entrepreneurs and their business is to make the world a better place. Donning various roles and leading various organisations, these men and women are not only winning praise for their innovativeness but helping to change the lives of communities they touch with their altruism."

"Social entrepreneurs set out to change India", Indo-Asian News Service, 7 Jan 2007

While social innovation is perceived to be important, social entrepreneurs nevertheless also need to strive for financial sustainability. The social innovation can only become scalable and replicable if the social enterprise attains financial sustainability:

"They seek to be financially self-sustainable," he says, "but the primary goal is the social return." Gupta concurs, "They can surely make profits, but they choose social innovation and impact first."

"Goodwill corps", Business Line (The Hindu), 30 Nov 2007

"Social innovation is not a feel good activity but is becoming an imperative for any society to be peaceful, happy, and sustainable," he started off. "You should have an idea to become a social

entrepreneur," he said. The idea should be pursued with passion and social consciousness. Then you should hire people who believe in your vision and create a good team. After the team is formed, you should bet on excellence in execution. The idea should be scalable and replicable across the world to create sustainable social enterprise."

"Vishy gives useful tips for a social entrepreneur", YourStory.in, 5 Feb 2011

To sum up, social entrepreneurship in India tends to follow the social innovation model, in accordance with the view of Bill Drayton, the founder of Ashoka:

"...social entrepreneurs are individuals with innovative solutions to the society's most pressing social problems."

"The next big challenge for social entrepreneurship", Mint, 9 Oct 2011

However, financial viability cannot be discounted as it is necessary precondition for a social innovation to become scalable and replicable.

Observation 8: There are no perceived differences among social enterprises, social businesses and social ventures in India.

Although the term, social enterprise, is most commonly used by the print media in India to describe the output of social entrepreneurship, the terms, social business and social venture, are also spotted regularly to describe the same output. The most basic definition of a social enterprise is as follows:

"...a social enterprise model (using a business model to address a social or environmental issue) to solve issues facing society..."

"52 Bahraini youth mobilized for social entrepreneurship at 1st Annual Leadership Bridge Programme", Islamic Finance News, 24 Oct 2011

A more sophisticated definition of social enterprise, which includes the goal of sustainability, is as follows:

"In a social enterprise, you solve an old problem in a new way and make it saleable. The solutions have to be sustainable and use resources at your disposal,"

"Conscience over profit: Not business as usual", Hi India, 7 Aug 2011

This definition of social enterprise is very similar to a definition provided for social venture:

"...a social venture is one that seeks to provide a permanent social benefit by using entrepreneurial energy. This implies that there's a sustainable financial and business model in place but where providing social benefit is the primary goal and profits are only the means."

"Funding social ventures: What does it take?", Pluggd.in, 28 Jul 2009

The terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture, seem to be used interchangeably by journalists:

"Via its NSEF Authors programme, it selects students and connects them to leading social enterprises in India to give them a real time experience of operating a social business."

"Grassroots: National conference on social profit", YourStory.in, 27 Dec 2010

"In the last few years, it's been fashionable to talk of social business... But not many of them are able to push it through the years and shut it down dejected. One way to solve this sustainability issue is to look at profits, and not equate social ventures as non-profit alone..."

"How to marry social impact and business, and win", DNA Sunday, 24 Oct 2010

Therefore, given their similar definitions and the high level of interchangeability among the three terms, it can be concluded that there are no significant differences among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture, in India.

Observation Derived from Articles Published in Singapore and India

Content analysis of the articles published in both Singapore and India yield one key observation in common.

Observation 9: Youth should be nurtured to drive social entrepreneurship.

The print media in both Singapore and India are in agreement that youth should be the drivers of social entrepreneurship. In fact, the articles published in India demonstrate a greater interest in youth compared to the articles published in Singapore. The reason for India's interest in grooming its youth to become social entrepreneurs is as follows:

"Young people provide an untapped resource to bring about a much required change. Their idealism and open-mindedness to new solutions create opportunities to empower communities to develop solutions. Generation Y is the generation of social innovation, experts say."

"Career choices: Jobs with a purpose", The Economic Times, 2 Mar 2010

The view that youth are an innovative and idealistic group can also be found in articles published in Singapore:

"Sage targets youths because, as Mr Teo said, they possess 'the idealism and dare-to-dream mentality' needed to come up with exciting entrepreneurial ideas. They are also less adverse to risk and failure."

"Spore students join global business ventures contest", The Straits Times, 4 Feb 2008

The articles published in both Singapore and India report proactive strategies to inculcate the social entrepreneurship culture among the youth in both countries. In India, various social entrepreneurship conferences and business plan competitions are designed to target youth:

"NSEF promotes social entrepreneurship in universities across India and has student-run chapters at universities and colleges including IIMs, BITS etc. They designed this confluence to play as "a platform to catalyse social entrepreneurship among the youth, be a place to drive home various social innovations and different facets of social entrepreneurship and a place to mutually learn about effective solutions to the most pressing social problems..."

"How to marry social impact and business, and win", DNA Sunday, 24 Oct 2010

"The principal idea behind this summit was to foster the spirit of entrepreneurship among student community in India and nurturing young people with innovative ideas."

"IIFM holds first E-Summit, B-Plan competition", The Pioneer, 23 Nov 2009

"...Indian School of Business (ISB) on Tuesday launched 'ISB Idiya', showcased as a unique initiative inviting ideas for innovative social ventures from working professionals across India....In a press release, ISB Dean Ajit Rangnekar said the idea was to encourage social entrepreneurship among youth in India through 'Idiya' and hoped new age business models from youth would change the social sector scenario in the country."

"ISB invites ideas for innovative social ventures from professionals", The Hindu, 9 Sep 2009

In the context of Singapore, youth are similarly encouraged to engage in social entrepreneurship by the government and other institutional agencies:

"A study of Singapore youths undertaken by MTI in 2009 showed that there is an emerging desire among youths in Singapore to contribute back to the community. Hence, to tap on this increasing

popularity and acceptance of social entrepreneurship among youths, beginning next year, my Ministry will be introducing a new tier of CEF funding to support schools in developing programmes focused on social entrepreneurship education, as well as funding social entrepreneurial projects started by youths.”

“Government of Singapore: ComCare Enterprise Fund to support more disadvantaged and students”, Singapore Government News, 8 Dec 2011

“Last week, 100 youth teams each received \$1,600 in seed funding for social entrepreneurship projects.”

“Deeds list”, The Straits Times, 29 May 2010

Tertiary institutions in Singapore are also doing their part to encourage more youth to participate in social entrepreneurship activities:

“To encourage more students to take on such projects, the NUS Business School recently set up a centre for social entrepreneurship and philanthropy. It will offer courses in social entrepreneurship and involve students in community development.”

“Businesses with a heart' catching on among youth”, The Straits Times, 16 Jun 2008

Despite increased efforts to involve youth in social entrepreneurship, the level of youth involvement in Singapore still lags behind other countries such as India. It is not uncommon to hear views such as the following:

“The main difference, he said, was the great emphasis Singapore places on academic achievements. ‘There is a lot more support for youth entrepreneurship in other countries,’ he said.”

“Their gamble pays off”, The New Paper, 5 Aug 2008

Nevertheless, the efforts expended in both Singapore and India to nurture youth as the drivers of social entrepreneurship are undeniable. Youth are seen to have the potential to become excellent social entrepreneurs owing to their low risk aversion and their ability to innovate and think creatively.

CONCEPTS

In line with the second stage of the concept-indicator model of theory development (Glaser, 1978), related key categories are grouped together to form a series of key conceptual ideas. Specifically, the nine key categories are collapsed into six key concepts.

Concept 1: Social entrepreneurship is influenced by pro-social entrepreneurship public policies (based on Observations 1 and 2).

Concept 1 is derived from the combination of Observations 1 and 2. When the two observations are put together, a causal link becomes obvious – social enterprises in Singapore are influenced by government policies to adopt an operational model which creates job opportunities for the marginalized.

As the Singapore government is keen to promote social entrepreneurship, it has put in place public policies such as the establishment of the ComCare Enterprise Fund (CEF) to encourage the establishment of more social enterprises. In particular, the government is eager to promote social enterprises which create job opportunities for the marginalized. Hence, only social enterprises which provide training and employment opportunities for the marginalized are eligible for funding by the CEF. This incentivizes many social entrepreneurs in Singapore to adopt a work-integration model.

Therefore, Concept 1 asserts that social entrepreneurship is heavily influenced by the relevant public policies. This is especially true when the government plays an important role in promoting social

entrepreneurship in the country. Social enterprises naturally follow the lead of the government, and adopt operational models that are in accordance with the public policies.

Concept 2: Social entrepreneurship is concerned with addressing the main social gaps that exist in the society (based on Observations 2 and 5).

Concept 2 is the result of combining Observations 2 and 5. As the two observations point out, the majority of social entrepreneurs in both Singapore and India engage in social entrepreneurship to address the main social gaps in their respective societies. In the context of Singapore, the primary social gap is the lack of employment opportunities for the marginalized. And in the context of India, the primary social gap pertains to the poor living conditions of people living in the rural areas.

Concept 3: Social entrepreneurship occurs along a continuum (based on Observations 2, 4 and 7).

The third concept is derived from the combination of Observations 2, 4 and 7. Social entrepreneurship may take the form of social innovation (as suggested by Observation 7) and/or generation of income while advancing a social cause (as suggested by Observations 2 and 4). As such, social entrepreneurship occurs along a continuum, involving varying degrees of social innovation and advancement of social causes, and generation of revenue to attain financial sustainability.

Concept 3 suggests a convergence and balance of the motives of social innovation and social cause advancement on one hand, and revenue generation and financial sustainability on the other. The convergence and balance, which are reflected in the print media articles, contrast with the relative divergence of views espoused by different schools of thought in social entrepreneurship scholarship.

Concept 4: Social entrepreneurship is influenced by the activities of educational institutions (based on Observations 6 and 7).

Concept 4 is the result of combining Observations 6 and 7. Educational institutions play a big role in promoting social innovation in India. In particular, tertiary institutions which offer courses on social entrepreneurship often emphasize the importance of nurturing a generation of students who are socially aware and innovative. Social innovation is often the theme of conferences, forums and business plan competitions organized by tertiary institutions. Consequently, many young social entrepreneurs are encouraged and motivated to focus on innovating solutions to address social gaps.

Furthermore, tertiary institutions in India are beginning to act as incubators and business angels to start-up social enterprises. Such active and direct involvement by the educational institutions in the social sector has shaped the outlook of social entrepreneurs, and pointed them towards the direction of engaging in social innovation.

Concept 5: There are no significant distinctions among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture, which are used to describe the outputs of social entrepreneurship (Observations 3 and 8).

The fifth concept is derived from a deeper understanding of Observations 3 and 8. Observation 3 indicates that while the print media in Singapore almost always use the term, social enterprise, to refer to the output of social entrepreneurship, the media nevertheless do not differentiate among the

three terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture. Indeed, on the rare occasions when the print media in Singapore use the terms, social business and social venture, they invariably use them to describe the same type of social entrepreneurship output that would otherwise be labeled social enterprise. In the same vein, Observation 8 indicates that the print media in India do not differentiate among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture. Observation 8 further suggests that the print media in India use the three terms interchangeably. Hence, Concept 5 asserts that there are no significant distinctions among the three terms which are used to refer to the outputs of social entrepreneurship.

Concept 6: Youth are the key drivers of social entrepreneurship (Observation 9).

Concept 6 is a reiteration of Observation 9. The print media articles published in both Singapore and India report a high level of youth involvement in the social sector, particularly with the youth as key drivers of social entrepreneurship. The high level of youth participation can be attributed to two factors. First, youth are targeted by various institutional actors such as governments and educational institutions. Second, youth see themselves as change agents and change makers, and as the key drivers of social entrepreneurship in their respective countries.

PROPOSITIONS

In line with the third stage of the concept-indicator model of theory development (Glaser, 1978), a series of theoretical propositions are developed through the processes of conceptual reduction and theory delimitation. Specifically, five propositions are derived. The first two propositions (i.e., Propositions 1 and 2) highlight differences between social entrepreneurship that is carried out in Singapore (an example of a developed Asian country) and social entrepreneurship that is carried out in India (an example of a developing Asian country). The remaining three propositions (i.e., Propositions 3, 4 and 5) highlight differences between the print media's understanding of social entrepreneurship and academics' understanding of social entrepreneurship.

Proposition 1

The first proposition asserts that the institutional agencies that drive social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country are different than the institutional agencies that drive social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country. Concept 1 suggests that social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country like Singapore tends to be driven by the government. This can be attributed to the fact that most developed Asian countries, such as Japan, are used to relying on their respective governments for the provision of social support services (Tanimoto, 2008). Furthermore, as developed countries have strong institutional arrangements, government policies are more effective in directing the society towards a common goal. Hence, public policies are able to play a greater role in promoting social entrepreneurship by fostering the environment and removing barriers to entry (Babu & Pinstup-Anderson, 2007).

However, in developing Asian countries such as India, public policies are not a strong influencing factor, as the institutional arrangements necessary to ensure effective implementation of public policies are weak. Instead, educational institutions become the main drivers of social entrepreneurship, as suggested by Concept 4. As argued by Ozturk (2002), education raises people's productivity and induces them to engage in entrepreneurial activities. This argument can also be extended to the field of social entrepreneurship. Thus, it can be argued that education is the main driver of social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country, in the absence of a strong institutional infrastructure.

Therefore, the following are postulated:

Proposition 1A: Government policies drive social entrepreneurship in developed Asian countries.

Proposition 1B: Educational institutions drive social entrepreneurship in developing Asian countries.

Proposition 2

The second proposition argues that the focus of social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country is different than the focus of social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country. While Concept 2 suggests that social entrepreneurship is concerned with addressing the primary social gaps in the country, it is also true that different countries have different primary social gaps.

As the print media have pointed out, the main social problem which plagues a developing Asian country like India is the poverty of the majority of the population living in the rural areas. Social entrepreneurship is therefore seen as a viable approach to address the social challenges faced by the rural poor (Molteni & Masi, 2009). Consequently, social enterprises in developing Asian countries focus on rural development and poverty alleviation.

By contrast, the print media have observed that the primary social problem that confronts a developed Asian country like Singapore is the unemployment of various marginalized communities. Thus, in Taiwan, for instance, social entrepreneurship is adopted mainly to bring about inclusion and empowerment of marginalized communities in the society (Pelchat, 2005). In order to foster social inclusion and empowerment of the marginalized communities, social entrepreneurs in Taiwan adopt a work-integration model that is similar to that in Singapore.

Therefore, the following are posited:

Proposition 2A: Social entrepreneurship in developed Asian countries focuses on providing employment opportunities to the marginalized communities in the society.

Proposition 2B: Social entrepreneurship in developing Asian countries focuses on improving the living conditions of the rural poor.

Proposition 3

The third proposition asserts that the print media and academia differ in their understanding of the social entrepreneurship process. As Concept 3 suggests, the print media recognize that social entrepreneurship involves both the social innovation and revenue generation motives to varying degrees. Specifically, there is convergence of the social innovation and revenue generation motives, as social entrepreneurs strive to advance social causes and achieve financial sustainability.

By contrast, the literature on social entrepreneurship reflects conceptual tensions between advocates of social innovation and advocates of revenue generation. On one hand, scholars like Boschee and McClurg (2003), who advocate revenue generation, argue that the financial bottom line is extremely important as without earned income to attain sustainability, social entrepreneurship does not fulfill the entrepreneurial aspect of the term. On the other hand, advocates of social innovation frame the concept of social entrepreneurship differently. For instance, Nicholls (2009) defines social entrepreneurship as any innovative action done to address social inequality, and emphasizes social impact rather than revenue generation. Although there is talk on blending the two perspectives

together (Dees & Anderson, 2006), extant literature still frames social entrepreneurship in terms of either one of the two motives.

Consequently, the following are postulated:

Proposition 3A: The social innovation and revenue generation motives of social entrepreneurship are viewed as converging ideas by the print media.

Proposition 3B: The social innovation and revenue generation motives of social entrepreneurship are viewed as diverging ideas by academia.

Proposition 4

The fourth proposition argues that the print media and academia discuss and categorize the outputs of social entrepreneurship differently. As Concept 5 suggests, the print media do not differentiate among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture. In fact, the three terms are used interchangeably by the print media in both Singapore and India.

By contrast, various scholars make distinctions among the three terms, and attribute different meanings to the terms. For instance, Yunus (2007) defines a social business as a cause-driven but non-loss, non-dividend business; shareholders of the business are more interested in pursuing social goals than economic goals and any surplus profit is reinvested into the business to advance its social mission. He then differentiates a social enterprise from a social business by defining the former as an encompassing term which includes charities and non-government organizations.

Thus, the following are posited:

Proposition 4A: The print media do not differentiate among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture.

Proposition 4B: Academia differentiates among the terms, social enterprise, social business and social venture.

Proposition 5

The fifth proposition asserts that the print media and academia have different views on the key drivers of social entrepreneurship. As Concept 6 suggests, the print media hold the view that youth are the key drivers of social entrepreneurship. A large proportion of the print media articles cover success stories of young social entrepreneurs and highlight the strong participation of youth in social entrepreneurship-related activities organized by educational institutions and the government. Concept 6 also points out that many youth see themselves as the society's change makers and change agents.

By contrast, scholars like Dees (1998) argue that social entrepreneurs are a rare breed of leaders and must possess special personality traits and leadership skills (Thompson, Alvy & Lees, 2000). Furthermore, the trait of youthfulness is disregarded in the academic discourse on social entrepreneurship.

Consequently, the following are postulated:

Proposition 5A: The print media view youth as potential social entrepreneurs.

Proposition 5B: Academia view potential social entrepreneurs as a rare breed of leaders.

CONCLUSION

This study is motivated by the conundrum associated with academic definitions and conceptions of social entrepreneurship. The study attempts to address the confusion emanating from academic discourse by seeking clarifications from an alternative institution: the print media. Print media articles on social entrepreneurship that have been published in Singapore and India are content analyzed, to determine how the print media define and conceptualize social entrepreneurship.

Content analysis of the print media articles yields five theoretical propositions. Two of the propositions argue that social entrepreneurship in a developed Asian country and social entrepreneurship in a developing Asian country are driven by different institutional forces and target different primary social problems. The other three propositions assert that the print media and academia hold different perspectives on the social innovation and revenue generation motives of social entrepreneurship, the types of organizations that social entrepreneurs set up, and the characteristics of potential social entrepreneurs. These propositions offer insights into how the print media view social entrepreneurship, and contribute to the extant academic literature on social entrepreneurship.

REFERENCES

- Ashoka official website: www.ashoka.org. Retrieved on 27 August 2011.
- Austin, J. (2006). Three avenues for social entrepreneurship research. In C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change* (pp. 21-35). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30, 1-22.
- Babu, S., & Pinstrop-Andersen, P. (2007). Social innovation and entrepreneurship: Developing capacity to reduce poverty and hunger. In J. von Braun, R. Hill & R. Pandya-Lorch (Eds.), *The Poorest and Hungry: Assessments, Analyses, and Actions* (pp. 541-548). Washington, DC: IFPRI.
- Boschee, J., & McClurg, J. (2003). *Toward a Better Understanding of Social Entrepreneurship: Some Important Distinctions*.
- Bowen, G. (2008). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(3), 12-23.
- Brock, D. D., Steiner, S. D., & Kim, M. (2008). Social entrepreneurship education: Is it achieving the desired aims? *United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship Conference Proceedings*.
- Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE). (2008). *Advancing for the Field of Social Entrepreneurship*. Durham, NC: Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University.
- ClearlySo official website: <http://www.clearlyso.com/resources/what-is-social-business-and-enterprise.html>. Retrieved on 27 August 2011.
- Cukier, W., Trenholm, S., Carl, D., & Gekas, G. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: a content analysis. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 7(1), 99-119.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship: Comments and Suggestions Contributed from the Social Entrepreneurship Funders Working Group*.
- Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2006). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. In R. Mosher-Williams (Ed.), *Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field. ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series*, 1(3), 39-66.
- Drayton, W., & MacDonald, S. (1993). *Leading Public Entrepreneurs*. Arlington, VA: Ashoka: Innovators for the Public.
- Elkington, J., & Hartigan, P. (2008). *The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets that Change the World*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Heath, H., & Cowley, S. (2004). Developing a grounded theory approach: a comparison of Glaser and Strauss. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41(2), 141-150.
- Jager, U. P. (2010). *Managing Social Businesses: Mission, Governance, Strategy and Accountability*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lehner, O., & Kansikas, J. (2011). Social entrepreneurship research across disciplines: Paradigmatic and methodological considerations. 3rd EMES International Research Conference, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark.
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 4(3), 47-51.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 36-44.
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: the case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 28-39.

- Molteni, M., & Masi, A. G. (2009). Social entrepreneurship in developing countries: Green technology implementation to push local social and economic innovation. 2nd EMES International Conference on Social Enterprise, ALTIS, Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy.
- Nicholls, A. (2006). Playing the field: A new approach to the meaning of social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 2(1), 1-5.
- Nicholls, A. (2009). 'We do good things, don't we?': 'Blended value accounting' in social entrepreneurship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 34(6), 755-769.
- Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 611-633.
- Ozturk, I. (2002). Economic and social issues of east and southeast Turkey: Policy implications.
- Pelchat, M. C. (2005). Social entrepreneurship in Taiwan: Possibilities and challenges for empowerment. Fourth ISTR Asia and Pacific Conference, Bangalore, India.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Ratten, V., & Welpe, I. M. (2011). Special issue: Community-based, social and societal entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 283-286.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedure and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sullivan Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76-88.
- Tanimoto, K., (2008), The emergence of social entrepreneurship and its strategy in Japan. Corporate Responsibility Research Conference 2008, Queen's University, Belfast, UK.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship: A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338.
- Weerawardena, J., & Sullivan Mort, G. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 21-35.
- Yunus, M. (2009). Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism. PublicAffairs. Chapter 2
- 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(5), 519-532.