Articles   School of Hospitality Management and Tourism

Motivations of Social Entrepreneurs: Blurring the social contribution and profits dichotomy

Karla Aileen Boluk
University of Ulster, kboluk@uwaterloo.ca

Ziene Mottiar
Technological University Dublin, ziene.mottiar@tudublin.ie

Recommended Citation

Karla Boluk, Lecturer

Hospitality and Tourism Management Department

Ulster Business School

University of Ulster

Cromore Road

Coleraine, County Londonderry Northern Ireland

BT52 1SA

Telephone: 44 028 7012 3932

k.boluk@ulster.ac.uk

Ziene Mottiar, Lecturer

School of Hospitality Management and Tourism

Dublin Institute of Technology

Cathal Brugha Street

Dublin 1,

Ireland

Telephone: 353 1402 7559

Ziene.Mottiar@dit.ie

Motivations of social entrepreneurs: blurring the social contribution and profits dichotomy

Abstract

Research has typically identified social entrepreneurs as characteristically superior to conventional entrepreneurs as they are motivated by making a contribution to society rather than by profits. Yet, few published papers investigate the motives of social entrepreneurs and explore if there are indeed any additional motivations aside from community interests. The aim of this study is to empirically investigate the additional motives, aside from the social interests that motivate social entrepreneurs. This paper does so by using an inductive approach and specifically carrying out a re-examination of two pieces of research examining social entrepreneurship that were carried out independently by the two researchers in South Africa and Ireland. During various discussions between the researchers it became clear that the findings were similar. Accordingly the researchers re-examined the transcripts of the twelve interviews carried out together. The findings indicate that the informants do have additional motivations with respect to their business ventures including lifestyle motives, receiving acknowledgement and generating profit.

Key words: social entrepreneurship, lifestyle entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurs, Greenbox Ireland, Fair Trade Tourism South Africa.

Introduction

Social entrepreneurship involves the recognition, evaluation, as well as the exploitation of opportunities (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillen, 2006) and demonstrates "risk-tolerance, innovativeness and pro-activeness"; similar to conventional entrepreneurship but does so in the social arena (Peredo and McLean, 2006, p.59). Specifically, the fundamental premise of social entrepreneurship is to use business knowledge and entrepreneurial principles, to solve critical dilemmas facing a society regarding economic, social and environmental problems (Germak and Singh, 2010). Therefore such entrepreneurs are more concerned with satisfying the social needs of communities (Newbert, 2003; Thompson, 2002) rather than the commercial needs (Roberts and Woods, 2005).

A majority of present research on social entrepreneurship examines definitional and theoretical issues (e.g., Harris, Sapienza and Bowie, 2009; Certo and Miller, 2008; Martin and Osberg, 2007; Christie and Honig, 2006; Mair and Marti, 2006; Peredo and McLean, 2006) or case studies (e.g., Anderson, Dana and Dana, 2006; Alvord et al., 2004; Thomson, 2002; Emerson and Twersky, 1996). Yet, there has been a lack of empirical studies (albeit Boluk 2011a, Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort, 2006; Sharir and Lerner, 2006) investigating the significance of social entrepreneurship. Specifically, Mair and Marti (2006, p.37) put forth that if social entrepreneurship is to become a 'structured field" of inquiry then efforts should be made to clarify the definition and accordingly, come to a better understanding of their motivations to get involved in social change. Such sentiments are supported by Kuratko

et al. (1997) who states that an integral part of understanding what motivates an entrepreneur to initiate a business are their personal characteristics, attitudes and motivations. Short, Moss and Lumpkin's (2009) seminal review of the past contributions and future opportunities of social entrepreneurship highlight that social entrepreneurship research is a global phenomenon yet there is still room for improvement. Of the 72 articles reviewed they highlighted that the most common discipline contributing to social entrepreneurship research was management. Short et al. (2009, p.177-184) then postulate how a number of fields (10 - mainly business, politics, psychology, sociology, anthropology) could further inform social entrepreneurship discourse.

Some researchers (e.g. Dees, 1998) have argued that a multidimensional construct encompassing many characteristics that define social entrepreneurship is necessary. Research has recognized that social entrepreneurs demonstrate their personal values (Tolve, 2009) while also exhibiting leadership capabilities (Tolve, 2009; Alvord, Brown and Letts, 2004; Drucker, 1989; Schumpeter, 1934). Social entrepreneurs are enterprising individuals "devoted to making a difference and reshaping the way we think about social value creation" (Mair and Morti, 2006, p.1). Mort, Weerawardena and Carnegie (2003, p.82) establish that social entrepreneurs require "balanced judgement" uniting purpose and action in addition to the recognition of an opportunity, risk and innovativeness. Thus, they encompass the ability to balance the interests of various stakeholders persevering in an ethical fashion thereby contributing "social value in a superior way" (Anderson and Dees, 2002, p.192; Johnson, 2000). Social entrepreneurship has been labelled 'caring capitalism' because of the achievement of relevant social goals within a market framework (Hibbert, Hogg, and Quinn, 2005; Herman and Rendina, 2001). It is similar to the notion of Corporate Social Responsibility in its concern for maintaining transparency, and 'being ethical' (Carroll, 1991) but is often the reason why specific business ventures are created.

The 'Heroic' Image of the Social Entrepreneur

Typical research that dominates the social entrepreneurship literature usually focuses on individuals; this is particularly problematic because such research neglects the collective (Spear, 2006). The characteristics that are used to describe such individuals demonstrate idyllic and honourable characters. Effectively social entrepreneurs are described as "entrepreneurially virtuous" (Mort et al., 2003, p.82), community-centric individuals (Sharir and Lerner, 2006), reformers and revolutionaries (Schumpeter 1934) with a heightened sense of accountability for the outcomes created despite being limited by resources (Drucker, 1989). Therefore, they act out their vision and are representative of "change agents" (Sharir and Lerner, 2006, p.3; Schumpeter, 1934) also referred to as 'changemakers' (Ashoka Foundation, 2010). Ultimately the descriptions of social entrepreneurs in the literature reveal 'heroic claims' (Parkinson and Howorth, 2008, p.291) accordingly, such individuals are made out to be herculean.

Entrepreneurs and Social Entrepreneurs

To some, entrepreneurship may be perceived as a contradiction in terms. On the one hand, it is referred to as an 'individualistic economic action' and on the other hand entrepreneurs can also be motivated by moral attitudes (Anderson, 1998). Martin and Osberg (2007, p.34) state that the key differential between entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs is that entrepreneurs are motivated by 'money' and social entrepreneurs are motivated by 'altruism' or philanthropy (Ostrander, 2007). This sentiment is also reiterated by Pomerantz (2003, p.25) who states that social entrepreneurs are responsible for "the development of innovative,

mission-supporting, earned income" and Dees (1998, p.3) when he suggests that a "mission-related impact" becomes the central criterion, not individual wealth creation, "wealth is just a means to an end" for social entrepreneurs. So, although the processes of social entrepreneurship may be similar to those of conventional or commercial entrepreneurs, the purpose and motivation are different. This focus on social motives has become a central premise in all studies of social entrepreneurs and moreover, a defining characteristic. Entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs are often distinguished from each other on the basis of whether or not they are profit motivated.

However some have questioned this dichotomy in particular in consideration of well-known capitalists who have operated as social entrepreneurs. For example Bill Gates (U.S.) the owner and chairman of Microsoft established the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation focusing on global issues that they perceive are ignored by governments. In these cases wealth generated from their more commercial activities were used to support their social and community activities. Some researchers have described such actions as 'hybrids' (e.g., Davis, 1997) as a way to reflect their combined interest in creating social value (premise of social entrepreneurship) and also, generating profit (intention of commercial entrepreneurship).

Dees (1998) and Evers et al. (2004) developed models of hybrids of social enterprises and showed how many enterprises had both social and commercial attributes. Peattie and Morley (2008, p.102) observe that "the hybrids and sometimes paradoxical nature of social enterprises make them particularly challenging businesses to manage, to research and to develop effective policies for". In their empirical work Williams and Nadin (2011, p.125) encourage us to go beyond the commercial versus social entrepreneurship divide arguing that

> most entrepreneurs do not purely pursue either profit-oriented or social goals. Rather,
>
> they voice both commercial and social logics when explaining their entrepreneurial

endeavour, displaying that there are not two distinct types of entrepreneurship but rather a continuum from purely commercial to purely social entrepreneurship, with most combining both logics to varying degrees.

Perhaps rather than a dichotomy between those that are motivated by profits and those that are not, this could be set in the context of the need to achieve. This is a characteristic which is often attributed to entrepreneurs. Stewart et al. (2003, p.29) cite McClelland's observation that 'a high need for achievement predisposes a person to seek out an entrepreneurial position in order to attain more achievement satisfaction that could be derived from other types of positions'. As such, internal value may be reflected in the satisfaction in achievement or a job done well (McClelland, 1961). This is equally as true for social entrepreneurs as it is for other entrepreneurs. After all these social entrepreneurs could join other groups in an effort to 'make a difference' but they choose to set up their own enterprise, this reflects their need for achievement. So rather than there being a distinction between social entrepreneurs and other entrepreneurs in terms of what their key motivation is, instead it could be said that both of these types of entrepreneurs are driven by the need to achieve and how this achievement is measured may be different in each case. For some it may be in terms of profits for others in terms of the environment or society or for others simply in terms of survival. This need to achieve means that the entrepreneurs are motivated to achieve something that is important to them.

Environmental Entrepreneurs

For some entrepreneurs there is a blurring of pro-social and pro-environmental motivations (Mirvis, 1994). Anderson (1998) purports that entrepreneurship and environmentalism are both similarly founded on value. Environmentally responsible firms have been described as

being interested in preventing damage, responding to environmental issues and doing so in a socially responsible fashion (Murphy et al. 1995, p.5). Environmental entrepreneurs may carry out alternative lifestyles and/or they may choose to utilize natural resources in a sustainable fashion in their businesses (Linnanen, 2002). Environmentally concerned entrepreneurs are also referred to as 'ecopreneurs' representing the notion that some entrepreneurs have a threefold focus encompassing the environment, society and the economy (Dixon & Clifford, 2007). Schaper (2002, p.27) suggests that economic benefits that derive from being greener illustrates how environmental entrepreneurs can act as a 'pull' factor that encourages other businesses to consider viable green options.

In the context of green entrepreneurship Gliedt and Parker (2007) argue that contemporary businesses are more likely pursuing business strategies intended to capitalize on environmentally sustainable products and services. As a result, some for-profit businesses perceive the notion of sustainability and specifically, climate change as a business prospect to exploit (Hanson, 2005). Dixon and Clifford's (2007) study found that 'ecopreneurs' can operate an economically viable business whilst maintaining the core values that motivated the creation of the business.

Lifestyle Entrepreneurship

The tourism literature has recognized the importance of lifestyle entrepreneurs. Rimmington, Morrisson and Williams (1999, p.13) classify them as those "who are likely to be concerned with survival and maintaining sufficient income to ensure that the business provides them and their family with a satisfactory level of funds to enable enjoyment of their chosen lifestyle". The key distinguishing feature of these entrepreneurs is that they are motivated by lifestyle rather than profit. Accordingly, they have been identified in a variety of sectors including

accommodation, adventure tour operators, arts and crafts and surfing (Getz and Petersen, 2005, Hall and Rusher, 2004, Shaw and Williams, 2004, Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001).

Similar to the social entrepreneurship literature, there has been some discussion concerning the extent to which lifestyle entrepreneurs are concerned with profits. Much of the discussion in regard to the distinctiveness of lifestyle entrepreneurs centres on the fact that profit is not the key motivation. However Morrison, Baum and Andrew (2001) note that while profits may not be their primary motive it will be one of the goals associated with their business. Shaw and Williams (1998) propose two categories of lifestyle entrepreneurs: non entrepreneurs and constrained entrepreneurs. Where the former are primarily motivated by a desire to live in an area rather than by entrepreneurial factors, the latter are often young professionals looking for a balance between lifestyle and profit motives (Shaw and Williams 1998). Accordingly, their growth is constrained by their lifestyle desires.

Lifestyle entrepreneurs are focussed on engaging in an activity which will change their personal everyday lives. As such, lifestyle entrepreneurs at face value, contrast the motivations of social entrepreneurs who are motivated by the desire to change society and so the lives of others. However this article posits that perhaps such objectives can be entwined. This paper contributes to this argument by identifying the importance of lifestyle and recognition as key motivations for social entrepreneurs. Case studies have permitted us to examine in more detail the nuances of motivations for social entrepreneurs and to delve beneath the profit social dichotomy.

The sections that follow document two pieces of research that were carried out independently in South Africa (by the first author) and in Ireland (by the second author). The objective of both studies was to identify social entrepreneurs but during the research it became apparent that many entrepreneurs had both social and lifestyle objectives. As such, previous research

has led to this inductive study which poses the question: may social entrepreneurs also be motivated by lifestyle choices and concerns?

Methods

The research is consistent with an inductive approach. Therefore theory is derived from the data rather than using theory to support the data (Veal, 2006). Consequently, the goal of this study is to integrate new discoveries which have emerged from two studies that were conducted independently by the authors. Both studies identified the existence of social entrepreneurs in tourism in the context of South Africa (Fair Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA)) and Ireland (Greenbox). Further comparison and discussion of the cases led the authors to identify the fact that although the entrepreneurs did display social motivations other motivations were also evident.

The method used for the paper is a content analysis. Research using qualitative content analysis focuses on the characteristics of language, talk, conversation (Sarantakos, 2005) with attention paid to the content or contextual meaning of the text. Thus, a qualitative content analysis is concerned with an examination of the uses of language. According to Downe-Wamboldt (1992, p.314) the aim of content analysis is "to provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study".

For the purpose of this study, a qualitative content analysis is used as a way to subjectively interpret the content of the textual data collected in two cases. Upon further investigation, when examining the two cases side-by-side, it was discovered that in addition to the entrepreneurs' social interests, the informants also demonstrated personal objectives and

lifestyle interests. The aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between lifestyle and social entrepreneurship among these entrepreneurs to further understand entrepreneurial motivations. Two geographical areas were the focus of this study one in South Africa and the other in Ireland. Furthermore, two brands were examined in the context of tourism Fair Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) and leisure (Greenbox, Ireland).

Fair Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) is a certification scheme that emerged in 2003 in South Africa. The purpose of the FTTSA certification is to facilitate improved conditions in the context of South Africa, contributing to positive on-going transformation in post-apartheid society, as well as create conditions for the practice of a fairer tourism. FTTSA is thus focused on increasing national tourism while also providing employment opportunities and ensuring that the benefits of tourism reach disadvantaged communities (Seif, 2001, p.5). FTTSA has certified well over 60 tourism businesses around South Africa ranging from businesses in the accommodation sector such as hotels, hostels and Bed & Breakfasts and day tours such as city tours and adventure tours. This paper focuses on six entrepreneurs two in the Western Cape, three in the Eastern Cape and one in the Limpopo province. These individuals who are the focus of this study were identified in previous research (Boluk, 2011a, Boluk 2011b) as social entrepreneurs whose objective was to use tourism as a mechanism to bring sustainable economic and social benefits to their local communities.

The Greenbox in Ireland comprises of an area close to the border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, which has suffered significant economic decline and de-population. In an effort to regenerate a decision was made to develop this area as an eco-tourism destination and Greenbox was established as the organisation responsible for doing this. Significant INTERREG funding was acquired and used to aid the development of eco-tourism businesses in the area. There are currently 42 eco-tourism firms in the area, they are marketed under the Greenbox brand via the website in particular and Greenbox provides eco-

tourism training to many other tourism businesses in Ireland. The businesses include organic farms, accommodation suppliers, an adventure centre and a health farm. The six entrepreneurs which are the focus of this study were identified in previous research (Mottiar, 2009) as social entrepreneurs whose objective was to increase environmental awareness and to aid development of their local economies.

Results

All informants that participated in this research study are considered to be social entrepreneurs based on the contributions they have made in their communities. Although it became evident that informants demonstrated additional motivations alongside their social objectives. Three themes emerged from the data upon a re-investigation of the two studies together, recognizing a number of additional motivations as described by informants. Table 1.1 depicts the themes that emerged from the analysis, informants' affiliations (with either FTTSA or Greenbox) and business type.

Table 1.1 Additional Motivations and Informant Details

Additional Motive	Entrepreneur	Affiliation	Type of Business
1. Lifestyle	Entrepreneur 1	FTTSA	Accommodation
	Entrepreneur 2	Greenbox	Organic farm, environmental/eco-tourism training and events.
	Entrepreneur 3	Greenbox	Health farm
	Entrepreneur 4	Greenbox	Adventure Centre
	Entrepreneur 5	FTTSA	Accommodation
	Entrepreneur 6	FTTSA	Accommodation
2. Acknowledgement and entering a network	Entrepreneur 5	FTTSA	Accommodation
	Entrepreneur 7	FTTSA	Tour Company

	Entrepreneur 8	FTTSA	Tour Company
	Entrepreneur 2	Greenbox	Organic farm, environmental/eco-tourism training and events.
	Entrepreneur 4	Greenbox	Adventure Centre
	Entrepreneur 9	Greenbox	Adventure Centre
3. Profit	Entrepreneur 2	Greenbox	Organic farm, environmental/eco-tourism training and events.
	Entrepreneur 1	FTTSA	Accommodation
	Entrepreneur 4	Greenbox	Adventure Centre

Additional Motivation One: Lifestyle

The first theme that emerged from the analysis of the data centred on the lifestyle motives of some of the informants interviewed. Therefore it seemed as though these social entrepreneurs were drawn to a certain way of life and/or a connection to a specific place and this has influenced their social enterprise.

Choosing specific places to live and establish their businesses was mentioned or alluded to by a number of the informants. Such lifestyle interests were obvious when FTTSA informant 1 put it like this: "the rural African context is where I like to live the most. Moving here seemed like a natural synergy between enjoying the travelling aspect, the community development aspect and the rural kind of lifestyle". Personal and lifestyle interests were established by five of the six Greenbox informants. For example one informant said: "myself and my husband come from an environmental science background […] we were looking for an opportunity to combine environmental science and farming and have a home for our family" (Greenbox informant 2). Accordingly, this informant had additional interests in establishing her business and appears to have been similarly focused on environmental

concerns and attracted to lifestyle elements. The lifestyle element was established by another informant who said that she moved to Leitrim because she was looking to live in the countryside and she wanted to join a band and the person who responded to her advertisement was from Dromhair so she moved to Leitrim. In addition, she went on to say that "instinctively I am a person who conserves everything [...] I am an environmentalist through and through", this suggests that her interests in environmental sustainability and living in the country are combined with her decision to run this type of business (Greenbox informant 3).

Lifestyle in the context of retirement from an athletic career was also described as a reason to initiate a business. One informant explained his interest in initiating an adventure centre when he said: "I like the outdoors. I was coming towards retirement from running and had to make plans. The resources are here [and] there is nothing like this" (Greenbox informant 4). In a similar situation, was a FTTSA informant who was a retired surfer. His business was established on a coast line where he had direct access to the surf (FTTSA informant 5). Although this was not mentioned as a motive by the individual in the first instance, his discussion about his life and what was important to him unearthed the importance of surfing in his decision to move to this area.

Working and living in close relation to the environment and nature was described as a significant reason stated by three of the Greenbox informants and two of the FTTSA informants for starting ventures in a particular area. Consequently rural and/or country side living and a consideration for the environment in business development is salient for many of the social entrepreneurs.

One unique example illustrated by informant 6 highlighted a preference for living in a cosmopolitan environment such as Cape Town. Accordingly, on a number of occasions

during the interview the informant explained that her children attended the most expensive private school in South Africa (FTTSA informant 6). Similarly in the Greenbox informant 2 stated that "in terms of location there is no perfect location for our business but when it came to choosing [a] quality of lifestyle this influenced our choice in terms of school facilities, education, events etc". These two cases demonstrate a parallel importance regarding a lifestyle objective of a choice which is best for the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurs' family in combination with the social objectives of their enterprise.

It is clear that there is an element of lifestyle choice which plays a significant role in these social entrepreneurs' decision-making processes. This needs to be considered further in the literature. While the key focus may indeed be altruistic and focused on society such individuals may also have private concerns and motivations regarding their personal interests and their family lives and these things that they personally wish to achieve also influence their decisions.

Additional Motivation Two: Acknowledgement and Entering a Network

It is interesting to note that alongside the desire to effect change in society the importance of public acknowledgement of the work that the entrepreneurs were involved in was identified as an important factor among the informants. Seven of the twelve informants identified an interest in receiving some form of acknowledgement based on their involvement in FTTSA or the Greenbox. Acknowledgement was identified by the informants based on reputation and marketing opportunities.

Four informants were interested in receiving some kind of acknowledgement based on the reputation FTTSA has achieved. For example one informant said: "I suppose it is really a bit of acknowledgement of what we do [...] we do a fairly good job [...] and we are reasonably good role models [...] sometimes being part of organizations like this is to just be a part of the

bigger picture" (FTTSA informant 5). Another informant highlighted the significance of being upfront with their client base when he said "we fit into this category [...] we want to be transparent so this is another add-on for us" (FTTSA informant 7). Acknowledgement was also highlighted in another way when one informant clearly wanted to differentiate his business from others that have operated in a less ethical manner. He put it like this: "we are sick and tired of being lumped into a category of businesses that work in townships and we don't like it because a lot of what is done in the name of township tours is exploitative" (FTTSA informant 8). He went on to state the significance of being measured so that their proactive actions are "no-longer just marketing speak".

A member of the Greenbox, informant 2, noted that being a member means that entrepreneurs can "market together as we can afford to do more as a group than individually". Similarly informant 4 said that "being part of the [Greenbox] network has definitely delivered value". The publicity around the development of the Greenbox has also been useful as informant 4 stated "we get a lot of journalists coming here and press and publicity because of the environmental thing". Another informant was more reticent and questioned how much business Greenbox and the eco-tourism brand is actually bringing into the area (Greenbox informant 10). The practical attitude of these participants is noticeable. While they note the importance of the environment they are also aware of the tangible practical benefits that membership of Greenbox can result in, in terms of marketing and increasing customer/tourist numbers.

Thus it is not just the desire to contribute to change in society that drives these entrepreneurs they also choose to join bodies such as FTTSA or Greenbox as such membership re-affirms, publicizes and acknowledges the contribution that they are making. The importance of such factors highlights the importance of acknowledgment as a motivating factor for social entrepreneurs, it is this acknowledgement which crystallises and markets their social

contribution. It also shows the practicality of many such entrepreneurs who know that being part of such groups can improve their business in terms of marketing and networking opportunities.

Additional Motivation Three: Profits and financial viability

Profits are a key differentiating factor between social and lifestyle entrepreneurs and other types of entrepreneurs. As discussed above while profits are not their key motivation they are recognised as an essential part of ensuring that they can continue their activities. While these entrepreneurs are not primarily focussed on profits and revenue per se, they are aware that they need to be financially viable to continue with their activities. This pragmatic approach towards the need for profits and financial viability was evident among our participants. Three of the six FTTSA informants and three of the six Greenbox informants indicated that profitability was important. One informant said that a great deal has been done in the context of green businesses as such "you can be green and be profitable […] lifestyle people make ok profits" (Greenbox informant 2). Effectively, this informant argued that for her, being a green business was the "initial motivator" however such ideals needed to be supported with profits. Accordingly she said "there is no point in having the lifestyle if you can't pay your bills […] it is possible to choose profit and have an ethical core" (Greenbox informant 2). As a consequence of becoming a member of FTTSA one informant said "we probably get five times the amount of business based on being Fair Trade" (FTTSA informant 1). Furthermore he highlighted the significance of proving that the status will have an economically beneficial influence on businesses from the perspective of FTTSA. Another informant alluded to the fact that "profits take care of themselves if you mind the other things" (Greenbox informant

10) thereby indicating that profit is an important element even though he did not seem to be preoccupied with making a fortune.

It is important to note the wording of the responses and to reflect back to the earlier discussion regarding the need for achievement. These entrepreneurs are focussed on achieving in the area in which they are concerned, in order to do this they recognize that they have to make profits; and sometimes this can even be aided by being involved in a social activity as the member of the FTTSA mentions above.

Discussion

The results in this paper reveal that the individuals originally identified as social entrepreneurs, in the context of Fair Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) and the Greenbox in Ireland exhibit additional motives that have not been fully investigated in the existing literature. Calls have been made to explore the motivational interests of social entrepreneurs (by Mair and Marti 2006; Kuratko et al. 1997) as a way to gain further insights into what social entrepreneurship is and why entrepreneurs get involved in such ventures. Our research indicates that a fundamental desire to make a contribution to their community was present as well as a strong interest in the environment.

Many of the informants' discourses revealed motivations that crossed both pro-social and pro-environmental impetuses (Mirvis, 1994). As such, their affiliation and consequent membership with FTTSA or Greenbox illustrated the potential benefits which can derive from association. Particularly, some informants purported the economic benefits and publicity acquired as a result of their affiliation which may support Schaper's (2002) theory that environmental entrepreneurs can act as a significant 'pull' factor encouraging other

businesses to consider their green options. An interest in 'being green' also has the potential to increase interest in brands such as FTTSA and Greenbox. The popularity of green organizations illustrates the importance of sustainability in business, as well as the economic viability of such values in business. Interestingly, this study has provided further empirical evidence for Dixon and Clifford's (2007) notion that entrepreneurs can operate economically viable businesses whilst maintaining their core values that motivated them to create their business in the first place.

Ultimately the findings in this study identified that some social entrepreneurs are motivated by additional factors in concurrence with their social and environmental values. This finding challenges our understanding of the meaning of social entrepreneurship and its mainstream definition. Currently the literature on social entrepreneurship depicts individuals as virtuous and practically heroic in character. Our findings suggest that although they are making significant contributions to society their motives are varied and influenced not only by the needs of society but by their personal interests and need for achievement.

One of our goals for this paper as pointed out based on Williams and Nadin's (2011) work was to go beyond the commercial versus social entrepreneurship divide. As such, perhaps the most significant finding of this research is the identification of the importance of lifestyle as a motivation for social entrepreneurs. Some informants' decisions to initiate businesses with a social and environmental focus also responded to their personal interests. Specifically, some informants demonstrated an interest in a certain lifestyle which they associated with living in specific urban or rural settings. Such settings seemed to appeal to their particular interests such as environmental concerns, spending time in the outdoors, engaged in specific activities (e.g., surfing) or access to certain amenities such as top ranked private schools.

The results exemplify that our focus on profits versus social objectives as the choice in terms of motivations is too narrow. As the literature shows entrepreneurs can often be hybrids and have elements of both commercial and social objectives but this research challenges us to think more deeply about each of these motives independently. Accordingly, it is helpful to consider motivations in terms of those that have an internal impact on the entrepreneurs and those that are external and have an impact on those around the entrepreneur, thus traditionally the internal motivations would have been profits and the external social. This research indicates that we need to think more carefully about the internal motivations, they are not always just about profits they can also include lifestyle objectives.

But the nature of lifestyle objectives presents challenges as they can straddle internal and external objectives. For example those who have a keen interest in the environment may wish to live their lives in a more sustainable way, in an effort to be more consistent and resolve tensions that may exist between their personal and professional lives. As such, an interest in personal consistency represents an internal lifestyle objective, but often they also want to encourage others to act in a similar way. Thus the distinction between lifestyle and social and internal and external objectives become blurred. The nature of motivations is that they are subjective and personal therefore, the balance between profits, lifestyle and social objectives are likely to differ between each individual and this is something that one may not be consciously aware of as they make strategic and operational decisions on a daily basis. Sometime one motivation may influence their strategy and at other times decisions may be based on balancing all objectives.

Further to the various lifestyle interests a few informants alluded to an interest in receiving some form of acknowledgment based on their actions and affiliations with FTTSA and the Greenbox. One informant specifically suggested that becoming a member of FTTSA was, in a way, to receive some recognition which this individual may have hoped would prompt a

response. This sentiment raises the question: what are social entrepreneurs *really* interested in? Are they interested in increased business via their affiliations and/or a better personal or business status? Alternatively another informant suggested that becoming a member of FTTSA was a way to be recognized as distinctive from other tours that have a reputation for being exploitative. The desire to receive accolades contradicts Ostrander's (2007) notion that social entrepreneurs are motivated solely by 'altruism' and brings back to the fore the idea that social entrepreneurs are driven by the need to achieve and this can be social but can also involve other factors such as personal interests and public recognition. Perhaps such sentiments regarding acknowledgement confirm the significance of group affiliation and/or membership within the context of social entrepreneurship. This leads us to the question: what benefits are created by membership and/or group affiliation for social entrepreneurs? And furthermore, what types of resources do social entrepreneurs have access too and what resources do they need to be successful?

Lastly, our analysis identified the underlying significance of profit in social entrepreneurship. The view that an entrepreneur can be ethical and still profitable was forwarded and while being ethical might be the initial motivator this must be followed up with profit. While the notion of profit generation in the context of social entrepreneurship is a bone of contention for some researchers, others perceive it as a necessary way to contribute to positive change. For example, social entrepreneurs concerned with profit are described as 'hybrids' by Davis (1997) thus demonstrating combined interests. However, many other researchers suggest that a partial focus on profit generation may create an opportunity to produce universal changes, as well as support sustainable progress (Tracey and Phillips 2007; Brinckerhoff 2000). This research has added to this debate and in some ways presented another layer in our understanding of social entrepreneurs and what motivates them. The results presented moves us away from a dichotomy to a much murkier set of motivations which include a greater

variety of factors which can be independent but also entwined. In this way it facilitates our understanding of entrepreneurs as complex individuals who are influenced by a wide range of factors.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to empirically investigate alternative motives, aside from the social interests (dominated in the literature) that motivate social entrepreneurs. The purpose of the paper was to contribute to a more holistic understanding of the social entrepreneur moving beyond the existing standard definitions which refer to such individuals as being virtuous, heroic and only motivated by the desire to make a social contribution. Furthermore, the researchers were interested in examining some of the nuances motivating tourism and leisure social entrepreneurs and delving beneath the profit/commercial and social dichotomy.

The research sought to address the research question: Are there additional motivations which encourage social entrepreneurs aside from how the majority of the literature has characterized them and what are they? The results in this study identify that indeed social entrepreneurs are motivated by an array of motivations. Such motivations were elicited in three themes. Firstly, informants demonstrated an interest in a certain way of life, a connection to a certain place and an interest in the outdoors, nature and/or the environment. Secondly, social entrepreneurs exhibited a concern for receiving some acknowledgment for the good that they were creating and accordingly thought membership (with FTTSA or Greenbox) would improve and/or provide reputation enhancement, as well as positive marketing opportunities. Finally, some of the informants identified the importance of profit. Such findings empirically contribute to a

more holistic understanding of the social entrepreneur. Furthermore, we argue that our findings demonstrate how these additional motivations may contribute to a more sustainable form of social entrepreneur based on their interest in achieving balance in the various areas of their lives. The motivations we discovered in our research illustrates an individual who is mutually concerned with their communities, the environments in which they live in, lifestyle interests, acknowledgement and profit which may suggest that such community contributions could be sustained over time.

Further areas still need to be explored in the context of social entrepreneurship. It is obvious that most of the current research is focused on the development of definitional theory and case studies. Furthermore, research on social entrepreneurship is nearly non-existent in the tourism literature. As such there still remains a lack of empirical studies demonstrating how social entrepreneurs behave in the day-to-day and furthermore how they balance their various objectives. Hence empirical studies of both qualitative and also quantitative nature should be carried out to draw awareness to not only the unique characteristics of social entrepreneurs but also their challenges, struggles and various motivations.

Acknowledgements

References

Alvord, S.H. Brown, D. & Letts, C.W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 40(3): 260-282.

Anderson, A.R. (1998). Cultivating the gargen of Eden: Environmental entrepreneuring, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 11(2), 135-144.

Anderson, R.B., Dana, L.P. & Dana, T.E. (2006). Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: "Opting-in" to the global economy. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 45-55.

Anderson, B.B. & Dees, J.G. (2002). Developing viable earned income strategies. In J.G. Dees, J. Emerson, & P. Economy (Eds.), *Strategic Tools for Social Entrepreneurs: Enhancing the Performance of your Enterprising Non-Profit* (New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc).

Ashoka Foundation (2010). *Changemakers*, http://www.ashoka.org/changemakers (Accessed on 26 March 2010).

Ateljevic, I. & Doorne, S. (2001). 'Staying within the fence': Lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 8(5): 378-392.

Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practise,* 30(1): 1-22.

Boluk, K. (2011a). Revealing the discourses: White entrepreneurial motivation in black South Africa. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 8(2): 199-213.

Boluk, K. (2011b). Fair Trade Tourism South Africa: A pragmatic poverty reduction mechanism? *Tourism Planning and Development*, 8(3): 237-251.

Brinckerhoff, P. (2000). Social entrepreneurship: The art of mission-based venture development (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons).

Carroll, A.B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39-48.

Certo, S.T. & Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Business Horizons,* 51, 267-271.

Christie, M.J. & Honig, B. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New research findings. *Journal of World Business* 41, 1-5.

Davis, T. (1997) The NGO business hybrid: Is the private sector the answer? (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University).

Dees, J.G. (1998) *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship,* (Stanford University: Draft Report for the Kauffman Centre of Entrepreneurship) pp.1-6.

Dixon, S.E.A. & Clifford, A. (2007) Ecopreneurship-a new approach to managing the triple bottom line, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(3): 326-345.

Downe-Wambolt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13, 313-321.

Drucker, P.F. (1989). What businesses can learn from non-profits. *Harvard Business Review*, July/August.

Emerson, J. & Twersky, F. (1996). *New Social Entrepreneurs: The Success, Challenge, and Lessons of Non-Profit Enterprise Creation* (San Francisco: Roberts Foundation).

Evers, A. Laville, J.L., Borgaza, C., Defourny, J., Lewis, J., Nyssens, M. And Pestoff, V. (2004). Defining the third sector in Europe in Evers, A. And Laveille, J.L. (eds), *The Third Sector in Europe* (London: Edward Elgar).

Germak, A.J. & Singh, K.K. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Changing the way social workers do business. *Administration in Social Work,* 34(1): 79-95.

Getz, D. & Petersen, T. (2005). Growth and profit-oriented entrepreneurship among family business owners in the tourism and hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 24(2): 219-242.

Gliedt, T. & Parker, P. (2007). Green community entrepreneurship: Creative destruction in the social economy, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34(8): 538-553.

Hall, C.M. & Rusher, K. (2004). Risky lifestyles?: Entrepreneurial characteristics of the New Zealand Bed and Breakfast sector. In Thomas R. (Ed) *Small Firms in Tourism: International Perspectives*, pp. 83-98, (Amsterdam: Elsevier).

Hanson, C. (2005). The business case for using renewable energy. Corporate guide to green power markets, *Climate, Energy, and Pollution Program* (Washington DC: World Resources Institute).

Harris, J.D., Sapienza, H.J., & Bowie, N.E. (2009). Ethics and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 407-418.

Herman, R. & Rendina, D. (2001). Donor reactions to commercial activities of non-profit organizations: An American case study, (2nd ed). *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 12, 157-169.

Hibbert, S., Hogg, G. & Quinn, T. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Understanding consumer motives for buying The Big Issue. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4, 159-172.

Johnson, S. (2000). Literature review on social entrepreneurship, *Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-16.

Kuratko, D., Hornsby, J. & Naffziger, D. (1997) An examination of owner's goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(1): 24-33.
Linnanen, L. (2002) An insider's experiences with environmental entrepreneurship, *Greener Management International*, 38, 71-80.

Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006) Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business* 41(1): 36-44.

Martin, R.L. & Osberg, S. (2007). *Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition*, (Stanford: Stanford Social Innovation Review).

McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*, Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Mirvis, P.H. (1994). Environmentalism in progressive businesses*, Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 7(4): 82-100.

Morrison, A., Baum, T. & Andrew, R. (2001). The lifestyle economics of small tourism business. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research* 1 (1-2): 16-25

Mort, G.S. Weerawardena, J. & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8(1): 76-89.

Mottiar, Z. (2009). *An alternative vista: Social entrepreneurs in tourism*, Critical Tourism Studies Conference June 2009, Croatia.

Murphy, P.R., Poist, R.F. & Braunschweig, C.D. (1995) Role and relevance of logistics to corporate environmentalism: An empirical assessment, International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 25(2): 5-19.

Newbert, S.L. (2003). Realizing the spirit and impact of Adam Smith's capitalism through entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46, 251-161.

Ostrander, S.A. (2007). The growth of donor control: Revisiting the social relations of philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2): 356-372.

Parkinson, C. & Howorth, C. (2008). The language of social entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 20, 285-309.

Peattie, K. and Morley, A. (2008) Eight paradoxes of the social enterprise research agenda. Social Enterprise Journal, 4(2): 91-107

Peredo, A.M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 56-65.

Pomerantz, M. (2003). The business of social entrepreneurship in a "down economy". *In Business* 25(3): 25-30.

Rimmington, M., Morrison, A. & Williams, C. (1999). *Entrepreneurship in the hospitality, tourism and leisure industries* (Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann).

Roberts, D. & Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship. *University of Auckland Business Review,* 45-51.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (3rd Ed). (Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Schaper, M. (2002). The essence of ecopreneurship, *GMI Theme Issue: Environmental Entrepreneurship*, Greenleaf Publishing, 26-30.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development.* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press).

Seif, J. (2001). Facilitating market access for South Africa's disadvantaged communities and population groups through "fair trade in tourism", Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa, (IUCN South Africa and University of Chicago) (unpublished).

Shane, S.A. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*. (UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited).

Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Journal of Management*, 25(1): 217-226.

Shaw, G. & Williams, A. (2004). From lifestyle consumption to lifestyle production: changing patterns of tourism entrepreneurship. In R. Thomas (Eds.). *Small Firms in Tourism: International Perspectives* (Amsterdam: Elsevier) pp.99-114.

Shaw, G. & Williams, A. (1998). Entrepreneurship, small business culture and tourism development. In Ioannides, D. & Debagge, K.D. (Eds.) *The Economic Geography of the tourism Industry*. (London: Routledge) pp.235-255.

Sharir, M. & Lerner, M. (2006). Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 6-20.

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. & Lumpkin, G.T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3, 161-194.

Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A different model? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33, 399-410.

Stewart, W.H., Carland, J.C., Carland, J.W., Watson, W.E. & Sweo, R. (2003) Entrepreneurial dispositions and goal orientations: A comparative exploration of United States and Russian entrepreneurs, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 41(1): 27-46.

Thompson, J. (2002). The world of the social entrepreneur. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5): 412-431.

Tolve, A. (2009). Never Let a Crisis go to Waste, http://www.bcorporation.net/resources/bcorp/documents/Social%20Entrepreneurship%20A%20-%203-22-09.pdf (Accessed 17 March 2010).

Tracey, P. & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 6(3): 264-271.

Veal, A.J. (2006). Research methods for leisure and tourism (3rd Ed). (Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Education Limited).

Weerawardena, J. & Sullivan Mort, G. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business* 41, 21-35.

Williams, C. and Nadia, S. (2011) Beyond the commercial versus social entrepreneurship divide: Some lessons from English localities. Social enterprise Journal 7(2): 118-129

Zahra, S. & Dees, G. (2001). Entrepreneurship as a field of research: Encouraging dialogue and debate. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 8-10.