

Prevalence of Social Entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe

Estery F. Chinyani,
Chinhoyi University of Technology

Dennis Nikisi,
Chinhoyi University of Technology

Desderio Chavunduka,
Chinhoyi University of Technology

Abstract: Social entrepreneurship is one of the emerging fields in research which has aroused the interest of various researchers. This study sought to determine the prevalence of social entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe. A pragmatist paradigm was adopted and a cross-sectional questionnaire design of all the ten provinces of Zimbabwe was conducted on a sample of 384 respondents. A mixed method approach was used to ensure triangulation. This study aims at increasing the appreciation of the nation's share of social initiatives and influence policy to reflect and refine strategic interventions in stimulating and promoting the incidence of social entrepreneurship.

Key words: prevalence, social entrepreneurship, poverty alleviation

Introduction

Social entrepreneurship is increasingly being viewed as a panacea to complex and persistent social problems around the world (Kerlin 2009; Zahra et al. 2009; Shaw and Carter 2007). Notwithstanding this acknowledgement, there is a serious lack of understanding of the prevalence of social entrepreneurship both at the individual and country levels (Hoogendoorn 2016). Faruk et al. (2017) regard social entrepreneurship (SE) as a contemporary phenomenon of the socio-economic development of a country. They define SE as the 'creation of solutions to social problems through innovative ideas, increasing social value and consistently pursuing new opportunities for the benefit of society rather than private wealth creation by displaying innovativeness, leadership and risk management of the business' (p.2).

The informal economy in Zimbabwe has been driven by fluctuations in the socio-economic and political landscape and in 2000 subsidised 60% of GDP and 50% of total employment (Mudamburi 2012). These variations have resulted in poverty escalating in the nation. At independence in 1980 only 10% of the labour force in Zimbabwe were engaged in the informal sector; the number doubled to 20% by 1986/1987; and 27% in 1991, a year when the Economic Structural Adjustment Program (ESAP) was adopted and 40% in 2004 (Mahoso 2008). This led the nation into poverty due to numerous unemployed citizens. According to Coltart (2008), by June 2005 at least 3 million people out of a population of about 11 million depended on the informal economy for their living. The dire economic conditions led to a mass exodus of skilled workers, forcing the rest into the informal sector and many people struggling for basic commodities, thus living on less than \$1 per day (Tevera and Crush 2002). It is out of this calamitous environment that the researcher sought to explore the prevalence of social entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe and to then establish the nature of the strategic and entrepreneurial activities that are being employed to ameliorate the dire situation facing the people.

Establishing the prevalence of social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship research is an emerging field that has relied chiefly on theory appropriation rather than theory development (Haugh 2012). While some scholars suggest that existing theories of entrepreneurship can have explanatory power when accounting for social entrepreneurship (Chell 2007), others have suggested that certain attributes of social entrepreneurship such as its multi-stakeholder orientation pose new questions for the ways in which we explain entrepreneurial behaviour.

Despite the developing importance of social entrepreneurship and social ventures, the understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship is not yet unified amongst researchers (Short et al. 2009; Trexler 2008; Zahra et al. 2009). According to Lepoutre et al. (2013), despite the disconcerted debate over the definition, there seem to be several features that distinguish social entrepreneurs from traditional commercial entrepreneurs and traditional charities.

The discovery and exploitation of social entrepreneurship opportunities may be path-dependent and currently better established in more developed countries (Baker et al. 2005), while the demand for social entrepreneurship may be larger in less industrialised states. Second, it may have to do with the individual entrepreneurs' needs. In poorer countries, entrepreneurial activity is more related to sustaining the basic material needs for income and living, while in more superior financial systems, people search for means and ways that satisfy advanced demands by way of the communal undertakings and expectations.

Where is entrepreneurial activity most prevalent?

It is commonly known that in nations where social, governmental growth and economic situations are lower and where people reject unfairness in power, where collectivism is rather personal and where persons tolerate uncertainty entrepreneurial initiatives are generally higher. In this regard, social entrepreneurship does not appear to be influenced by the way the government progresses, and power distance remains the only attribute that is cultural importantly explaining its prevalence in the effectively over early and developed levels of activities.

Early literature of this nature presented meta-level accounts of the nature of social enterprise in different countries, with a particular focus on the influence of public policy and developments within the operating environment of the social economy (Defourny and Nyssens 2012; Kerlin 2006; Kerlin 2010). The use of non-governmental and market-based strategies are used to define social enterprise in addressing social matters, by availing financial source of income for various types of organizations and activities. Social enterprise as an activity is commonly equated with social entrepreneurship (Peredo and McLean 2006). More recent studies have sought to illuminate national transformations in social entrepreneurship relative to commercial entrepreneurship and to advance new empirical measures for this phenomenon to be understood (Lepoutre et al. 2013).

Social value

The prominence on social value creation over economic wealth creation differentiates social entrepreneurship from commercial entrepreneurship (Lepoutre et al. 2013), and the assumption is that this specific characteristic of social entrepreneurship has an influence on how the roles of institutions-including culture, socio-economic, and governance development-affect the prevalence of social entrepreneurship. What began as incidental reporting (Mair and Martí2004) on the concept of 'service beyond-the profit reward' of 40 years ago has now developed and grown to such an extent that the concept of 'social entrepreneurship' has embedded itself as a construct of entrepreneurship (Roper and Cheney, 2005; Herrington *et al.* 2009; Bosma and Levie 2009). Furthermore, social free enterprise and social innovativeness have mushroomed and in the process swelling momentous publicity in the popular media pertaining to their part and effect on the welfare and security of persons and societies.

Gradually, governments are recognizing the role of social entrepreneurship in addressing unyielding socio-economic encounters for example, primary healthcare, teaching and learning environments and poverty alleviation. Social entrepreneurship could take place in profit and non-profit making undertakings, social entrepreneurship is inclined to be more "other-oriented" than "self-oriented" (Douglas and Grant 2014). Douglas et al. (2014) validated the observation that private and social entrepreneurship ought to be understood as variants along the entrepreneurship continuum, instead of as distinct terrains of entrepreneurial exertion.

Several authors (Mair and Martí 2006; Short et al. 2009; Zahra et al. 2009) have mentioned that social entrepreneurship has contributed to the steering of an emerging exploration stream of attentiveness to academic investigators and scholars in organisational government and enterprise. In many developed and developing countries, social entrepreneurship is recognized as important in boosting the economic, environmental, and cultural wealth as well as social change.

It is a necessary condition to preserve the financial viability through the reflective economic value creativity. Perhaps social entrepreneurs should aim at seeking an optimal balance between market success in their businesses and social impact. It should be noted, however, that social entrepreneurs are not a homogenous group. Zahra et al. (2009) identified three types of social entrepreneurs: social bricoleur, social constructionist, and social engineer. Collective rouse about stereotypically concentrate on discovering and speaking to limited confined societal requirements, although social constructionists utilize market prospects and souk let-downs by filling gaps to unjustified customers so as to bring in restructurings and alterations to the broader social edifice. Social engineers are inclined to spot universal hitches that are resident in existing public organizations and desire to attend to them by introducing change in a radical manner.

The distinctiveness of social entrepreneurship has raised calls for more theory-driven, large-sample studies. Social entrepreneurship studies have primarily utilized small samples and case study methodologies. These authors confirmed that the generalizability of their results may be questionable, calling for further

scholarships that are concept oriented determining particularities of social entrepreneurship or that explain the impetuses behind these disparities. Tracy and Randles (2011) used institutional theory to build a model of hybrid organizations like social enterprises, identifying processes of opportunity recognition, organizational design, and legitimation at micro, meso, and macro levels, respectively. In response to the call for a more generalizable account of the emergence of social enterprise in different contexts, Kerlin (2010) made a global comparison of seven regions and countries. She discovered a lot more significant distinctions emanating from regions in the meaning of social enterprise, and in the way it is both supported and advanced. Explanations at least in part by the variation in regional socio-economic contexts are shown by differences in the regions according to her study. According to Kerlin's study, social entrepreneurship draws from those socio-economic elements that strengthen in a given region or country. Through her study it is understood that the growth of social initiatives trails alongside with those for the growth of non-profit regions.

Different social entrepreneurship perspectives

Most countries see social entrepreneurship as an essential aspect in the area of corporate social responsibility (Natsvlishvili 2018). Social entrepreneurship is viewed as a socially responsible business practice with particular emphasis on developing countries, for example, Georgia, a post-Soviet country that differs from those in the West in this aspect. Desk research provides conceptual analysis of the current quantitative and qualitative studies which are based on prominent scientists' works in economics and entrepreneurship. According to Natsvlishvili (2018) social responsibility is a business moral framework, suggesting a company's obligation to generate social benefit. This is possible especially if a 'moral economy' understands business activities as 'social services'. Even though social entrepreneurship appears to be a relatively new phenomenon in post-Soviet countries, nongovernmental organisations help in solving many social problems, this has not proved sufficient due to limited organisational capacity and low organisational maturity. This aspect of social entrepreneurship combines the best practices from the non-profit and for-profit activities to tackle social needs which are poorly addressed by governments and businesses (Natsvlishvili 2018). Economic history has provided many examples of moral standards driving the stability of socio-economic system and profitability of companies with both macroeconomic and microeconomic positive impacts. According to the studies carried out by Natsvlishvili (2018) companies operating in Georgia spend their funds on social projects and charity; moreover, such socially oriented activities are sometimes chaotic. Companies which adhere to social responsibility assignments show the evidence that social entrepreneurship is prevalent in different nations due to the social responsibility activities which they practice.

Social entrepreneurship has created a dynamic that is rapidly growing the market in European Union countries. As aforementioned social entrepreneurship is a relatively new phenomenon in post-Soviet countries where for decades only the government provided social services. The lack of governmental support after the collapse of the Soviet Union led to the emergence of the third sector, that is, non-governmental organisations, which assist to solve many social problems. According to Natsvlishvili (2017) there is a strong link that exists between the most important phenomena of social and economic developments. It is among these phenomena that the growing awareness of the need to develop a proper understanding of social responsibility as a major issue be established.

The Georgian context, generally entails that entrepreneurs be inspired to be committed to find a balance between the company's success, the workers' needs, and the environmental and social stability making it a triangle of priorities which today are what is called 'corporate social responsibility.' CSR is neither a social romanticism nor a nostalgic feeling but a strict corporate policy that has to meet these two basic issues: "moral principles" and "business performance". The economic and business history provides empirical evidence of moral standards, thus driving the stability of a socio-economic system and the profitability of a company at the same time, having a positive impact on successful results both at the macroeconomic and microeconomic levels.

Therefore, it means then that CSR faces the challenge of overcoming the frequent conflict between moral principles and business performance. Companies in Georgia spend certain funds on social projects and this shows how prevalent social entrepreneurship has been. However, such socially oriented activities are chaotic due to neither being systematised nor related to the company's strategies and priorities. There is lack of a system of social responsibility projects as part of their business plan. Chiladze (2015) postulates that researchers also suggest the use of social responsibility index in order to describe the quality of social responsibility which can be calculated as correlation of enterprise net profit and the volume of spending on social activities. Social enterprise has several functions and one of its roles is contribute to the country's economic development and is important in employment growth especially when a social enterprise employs the so called fragile groups, who have serious difficulties in finding jobs under diverse circumstances.

Social Enterprise

The Department of Trade and Industry (United Kingdom) defines a social enterprise as a business with primary social objectives whose surpluses are predominantly reinvested for that tenacity in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners. Social Enterprise Alliance (USA) defines a social enterprise as an organisation or initiative that marries the social mission of a non-profit or government program with the market-driven approach of a business.

The concept "Social entrepreneurship" is coupled with economic activities made by civil society organizations that aim to get financial returns. The profit obtained serves for accomplishing positive social changes associated with their mission and goals. Regardless of the fact that non-profit organisations in the USA and Europe have conducted such activities for a long time, the concept of social entrepreneurship takes its origins from the 1970s. According to The Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (2013) its particular dynamic development started in the 1990s. There are various types of organisations termed as cooperatives, funds, associations and many others in the third sector in Europe which often has the label "social economy."

For the social enterprise development, the first urge in Europe came from Italy's cooperative movement. The Italian parliament adopted the law that introduced the new distinct form of "social cooperative." It was from this point on that social entrepreneurship has been developing in Europe at a rapid pace. In various countries it receives significant support from government agencies. In the USA, non-commercial organisations have been undertaking such activities from the end of the nineteenth century. The year 1993 is considered as a point of change in social entrepreneurship when Harvard Business School began "social entrepreneurship initiative" (The Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia 2013).

In many countries (Natsvlishvili 2017) there is no definition of social enterprise and in such cases attribution of organisations to social enterprise occurs on a base of principles coming from the concept. Social enterprise is private, independent, and entrepreneurial organization that uses business methods to decipher social and environmental problems successfully. Currently social entrepreneurship has fascinated growing interest in many countries, as it combines the attempt toward social mission and business-type accomplishments. Currently, social entrepreneurship runs differently in different countries; thus it has different definitions. All these definitions have one common attribute: This is a business approach to social goals. In countries around the world, social entrepreneurship has been developing in different ways meaning that different practices and experiences are accumulated.

Prevalence of Social Entrepreneurship

The prevalence of social entrepreneurship usually takes place in societies where the individuals have certain entrepreneurial attitudes. This is confirmed through the data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor-Georgian report whereby Georgians reflect on successful entrepreneurs to have an elevated status in society (75, 9 % of adult population), while 66% of adults think that entrepreneurship remains a noble career choice. However, motivation to engage in entrepreneurial activities shows up almost equally between necessity-driven (48.6%) and opportunity-driven (50.6%) entrepreneurship. A high motivational index indicates a high share of improvement-driven entrepreneurs, which ensures more long-term and ambitious expectations from the venture creation. From the surveys carried out in Georgia, positive attitudes of the respondents towards entrepreneurship indicate their self-confidence, feelings of social and political stability and expectations of success of market orientated economic reforms.

Global Social Enterprise Statistical Information

In Australia the estimated statistics of social enterprises ranged from twenty thousand giving up to thirty-seven percent within the past five years constituting two-three of GPA in 2010. In Belgium sixty-three percent self-manufactured above fifty percent of the intended incomes through fees or charges. In the United States of America, twenty-two percent had over twenty-two percent over \$2 million in income, eighty-nine were produced since 2006 while ninety percent was devoted on solving problems at home in 2012.

Greater efficiency is obtained in problem solving through social entrepreneurship in a variety of ways. In the increasing competition for funds, Social enterprises generate incomes for maintainable development. In this regard, economic revenues bring forth firmness in organisations and in this matter of financing; it affords businesses to excel with the main reasons to cover expenditures. Often goals of an enterprise usually reflect the expected results that can occur in a certain period of time, due to the successful performance of the enterprise (Natsvlishvili 2017). A social enterprise should critically define its social and business objectives that participate to achieving the enterprise's mission. However, social missions are related to achieving the mission of an enterprise for remarkable success and are distinguished according to the field and mission of organisations. Examples of social goals comprise creation of economic opportunities for the poor, employment of disabled

persons, protecting the environment, education and many others. Financial goals of a social enterprise can differ based on financial needs and business model. However, social enterprises always have to maintain a balance between social and financial goals since they might have different strategies for this (The Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia 2013). According to Natsvlshvili (2017) the practice of integration of commercial and social goals has existed in organisations for many years. Some of the examples of this include charitable and civil society organisations, using commercial and financial indicators for determining social consequences.

There are two approaches to the development of social entrepreneurship in the United States. The first one entails social enterprise acting on the market principles. According to this approach social enterprises should be principally focussed on implementing strategies that can bring revenues. A social enterprise is an organisation or enterprise that achieves social mission entrepreneurially through income generating strategies (Yunus 2007). Yunus describes social entrepreneurship as a business approach driven by mission, which is managed based on the without profit and dividends principle and aims to achieve a social goal. The second approach involves followers of social innovation school who pay special attentiveness to the social entrepreneur. Social entrepreneurs take an innovative approach to social problem-solving as change agents using new services, products, market segments, organisation and other innovative initiatives.

Prevalence of social entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe

A study by Katunga and Lombard (2016) focused on the contribution of social entrepreneurship in meeting the needs of orphans in the Mberengwa District, Zimbabwe. The study was done at the moment when the millennium experienced a drive of economically related issues and partisan challenges, aggravated overwhelmingly by consequences of the prevailing epidemic such as HIV/AIDS. The study clearly shows pivotal role played by social entrepreneurship in addressing social issues nationally. The study discusses the prevalence of social entrepreneurship through fundraising ventures to solve the difficulties faced by orphans in District of Mberengwa. These needs emanate from severe financial hardships, malnutrition, ill-treatment, neglect, child labour, lack of food, abuse, dropping out of school, lack of clothing and blankets, inability to obtain necessary documents like birth certificates, stigma and discrimination associated with their condition of being orphans.

The political and socio-economic context in Zimbabwe has a reflective bearing on the citizens 'access to social services, goods and economic opportunities (Kaseke 2010). The prevalent socio-economic environment in Zimbabwe is the consequent of a combination of factors including activities linked to the land reform, sanctions and structural adjustment programmes. Zimbabwe has been hard hit by several discriminatory colonial era land imbalances back-dating to the year 2000. The political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe has utterly eroded the country's social support system, resulting in public assistance benefits being further scoured by inflation to levels where they can be described as non-existent (Kaseke 2010). Around the year 2008, the transport costs incurred by the beneficiaries of social assistance hindered them to claim their benefits since they were greater than the value of those benefits hence leading to the unofficial suspension of the public assistance programme. This is evidence of the government's inability to rectify the problem faced by vulnerable for example, orphans. Following this predicament, economic instability, joblessness, health issues, insecurity, basic commodities like food, shelter, fresh clean water, and low salaries has hindered families to attend to orphans' needs, both nuclear and extended families (Kaseke 2010).

Since 2009, Zimbabwe has made strides in resurgence and recovery of its economy. In association with NGOs, the Government has embarked on social protection programmes aimed at providing relief from deprivation and averting social exclusion, improving livelihoods and promoting social equity amongst the poorest and most vulnerable members of society (Moyo 2011). Prevalence of social entrepreneurship is therefore evidenced by the fact that communities, with special emphasis to those in Mberengwa where this study was initiated, dedicated themselves in assisting the poor. However, various reasons including weak community and individual structures necessitated by various factors including migration, diseases particularly HIV/AIDS, demographic changes and struggles in sustaining nuclear and extended families became a major setback (Moyo 2011).

Since the fundamental purpose of social entrepreneurship is creating social value for the public good and commercial entrepreneurship aims at creating profitable operations which results in private gain, the income generating projects of Mberengwa District involved the merging of social interest with business practices to effect social change by combining social and economic value for wider value-cooperation possibilities. This enabled the community to provide needs of orphans using Sahlma's model to explore the entrepreneurial nature of the income-generating projects. This model concisely integrates the key elements of social entrepreneurship by creating a connection between the interrelated components of the people, (P) the context, (C) the deal (D) and the opportunity (O) which referred to as PCDO model.

Social entrepreneurship elsewhere

Social entrepreneurship is a relatively young, knowledge-intensive area and a social practice of concern to researchers since the 20th century (Short et al. 2009). It comprises an array of events and processes leading to the establishment of social worth by persons, clusters of country residents, and institutions. The entrepreneurial initiative aimed at social/or communal proceeds, concerned with change and/or innovation, relay market-centred resolves. According to Mair and Marti (2006) social enterprise results from the interaction between social entrepreneurs and the environment in which their activity is embedded. Kerlin (2012) states that the knowledge of models shaping the development of social enterprises operating in Central and Eastern Europe, including Poland, remained limited. Poland may provide an interesting example for the analysis of the development of social enterprises of which it has rich experience in both cooperative and reciprocal activities, as well as centuries-old traditions of works of charity. Poland's integration with the European Union significantly enhanced the debate on social enterprises' relevance to solving social problems.

Empirical evidence of prevalence of social entrepreneurship

The growing global interest in social enterprises can be justified by the economic, social and political changes which have taken place in recent decades. There has been an increasing social inequality, accumulating environmental problems, decreasing availability of public funds, and concentration on market mechanisms in the distribution and redistribution of resources which have tended to escalate the incidence of social entrepreneurship around the globe. Social entrepreneurs throughout the whole world are characterised by their focus on creating social value in addition to the economic value. Social entrepreneurs differ from social activists and advocates. They utilise entrepreneurial skills and business methods to build concrete and sustainable for profit or non-profit organisations which become vehicles for achieving their social objectives. Another justification for the recognition of social entrepreneurship is the work of Christian Felber, an Austrian who initiated the concept of an 'Economy for the Common Good' (EGG). The initiative won exhilarating support of NGOs, politicians, private individuals and companies. Currently, there are now more than a thousand companies in support of the initiative. It is very difficult then to deny the fact that social entrepreneurship has become a worldwide phenomenon.

The EGG concept is therefore defined on the systematic level: "An economy for the Common Good is an alternative economic system built on values that promote the needs of the entire population. It is a tool for economic, political, and social change; a bridge to a better future" (Hein and Kapel 2016). In all European democracies, the 'Common Good' is defined as the six dominant values namely; human dignity, ecological sustainability, solidarity, social justice, democratic co-determination and transparency.

Bangladesh has shown the prevalence of social entrepreneurship by inspiring the world how much can be achieved by lending a small amount of money through the Grameen Bank (Hein and Kapel 2016). The Grameen Bank in Bangladesh was founded for the purpose of lending money to people without any access to capital. Grameen describes the very character of the social business philosophy starting small which made this bank a great success and enabled many people to get out of extreme poverty. Another approach which Grameen bank came up with was through fostering new entrepreneurial solutions to the poor people's problems. Hein and Kapel (2016) state that the poor do not only need capital in order to work out their way out of poverty. There are a lot more other things including health, education, good food, clean water, transport, access to electricity just to mention a few. This is why Grameen formulated seven ideologies of social business as presented below: 1) to overcome poverty and other tribulations such as education, health, technology access and environment which threaten the society; not profit maximisation, 2) financial and economic sustainability, 3) investors getting back their investment amount only and that no dividend is given beyond investment money, 4) when investment money is paid back, company profit stays with the company for development and improvement, 5) environmentally conscious, 6) personnel gets market wage with better working conditions and 7) do it all with joy

Another social entrepreneurship prevalence indicator is the EHAS Foundation in Peru. This is a building which is specifically for mobile medical diagnosis services through the innovative telecommunication utility. This bridges the gap between rural medical outposts staffed by paramedics, and larger, physician-run medical centres by increasing the range of WiFi technology from the recommended standard 300m range to a much longer 100-kilometre range. The company started in 1995 through a research cooperation with David Chavez Munoz of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru. The activities were funded by EHAS (Enlace Hispano-Americano en Salud), which permitted it to channel financial resources of countless origins into telecommunication research in health. The activities focus on pregnant women: a health package consisting of three ultrasounds, two urine tests and one blood test for \$30 paid for by the public health system in certain Peruvian contexts and in Guatemala (Hein and Kapel 2016).

The Taka Taka Solutions is a Nirobian-based waste collection and resource recycling business. By recycling and composting 80-90% of collected waste, Taka Taka Solutions is able to offer affordable waste collection services across all income areas. Taka collect services are distinguished by the fact that they are provided for all income levels, attain high environmental friendliness with 80-90% of collected waste recycled, modern infrastructure and trucks and provision of different bins to clients in waste separation. One-dollar glasses are made from such recycled waste which in turn enables more than 150 million people with a set or a pair of glasses. Provision of such a commodity assists many people to learn, to work and to provide for their own families. Another indicator for the prevalence of social entrepreneurship is the African Renewable Energy Distributor (ARED) which originated in Rwanda founded in 2012. This seeks to provide and supply stable and reliable energy solutions to rural and urban areas in East Africa where at least less than 20% of the population have access to electricity and at least 60 % has a cell phone. This is affordable due to the low cost mobile solar kiosks and the mobile solar Cell chargers. ARED uses a low-cost franchise business model which seeks to promote entrepreneurship at the base of the pyramid.

According to Defourney and Nyssens (2012) many business schools and foundations currently advocate the idea of mission driven business that promote extensive business. The social innovation school of thought concentrates on the social entrepreneurs as persons who solve social problems and embrace social needs in a manner that is innovative following Schumpeter's conceptualisation of entrepreneurship. However, on another note, various social enterprises find it challenging to balance the business and social mission as they are inclined to shift to prioritize their business venture over their social mission.

This has been illustrated by the field of microfinance as numerous prominent organisations have drifted away from their original social mission in search of increased and better revenues (Yunus 2010). This shows how difficult social initiatives are in trying to maintain dedications to either social welfare or marketable logics. Researchers like Zahra, et al. (2009) have foreseen the behaviours of institutional actors who initiate and maintain social trades. Moreover, in order to accommodate contradictory logics social enterprise need entrepreneurs with an exceptional commitment to and passion for the social mission, an ethic of care to sustain the focus on social welfare, and most importantly individuals who have the aptitude to manage contradictory demands that arise from multiple logics including an ability for counterfactual or a thinking which is paradoxical (Tracy and Randles 2011).

Social welfare and commercial logics happen to grow as social enterprises increase in number and influencing societal-level institutions. It has been noted in different countries that there is a designated legal status for perusing a double or triple bottom line, such as low-profit limited liability companies or a benefit corporation in the United States, community companies in the United Kingdom (Haugh 2012) and social cooperatives in Italy. Regarding this scenario, the emergence of social oriented organisations appearing to have hybrid or integrative interests, can legalise social enterprises contributions to synchronise commercial and social logics.

In Africa, social entrepreneurs are participating to expand educationally, health-wise, economically, environmentally and other social matters. In the Ethiopian context, Haverkort (2016) described a social enterprise as an enterprise that directly addresses social needs through its products and services or through the numbers of underprivileged people they provide work. Social initiatives are distinctive as compared to "socially responsible businesses", since they create acceptable social difference indirectly through the way of corporate social responsibility. Though it is less common for individual entrepreneurs to set up a business as a Social Enterprise, there are some deep-rooted Social Enterprises in Ethiopia, that offer products and services together with employment and training of disadvantaged young boys and girls and they have made a real impact in society for decades (Haverkort 2016). There is inadequate research on social enterprises in Ethiopia (British Council 2017) that can tell us about the practices, challenges, and prospects of social enterprises.

Considering the significance of social enterprises deliberations in Ethiopia, people still argue and degrade the value of social enterprises on the reduction of poverty. Social entrepreneurship could play an important role in development given that social entrepreneurship has limited potential for structural transformation and poverty alleviation. Similarly, social entrepreneurship can benefit as a microeconomic strategy that can subsidise in small ways through its support for state led development and democratic reforms making.

Through the study conducted by British Council it has been revealed that there is no discrete legitimate form or registration procedures in Ethiopia for social enterprises. Furthermore, majority of the social enterprises in the study area were found to have been registered as MSEs followed by sole proprietorship, cooperatives, partnerships, and charitable activities respectively. Another main obstacle reported in the study was lack of access to capital while obtaining grant funds (British Council 2017). Considering the absence of legal form for social enterprises, there is need for Ethiopians to take care not misrepresent the very livelihood of the social enterprises. According to Montero (2016) social entrepreneurship is not about conferences, accelerators, contests, charity, and philanthropy or wealth distribution. The whole issue is about power distribution within the

confinements of the poor to enable themselves independence to aid. Debate, created by social entrepreneurship is continuously going on among scholars as it results in both for-profit business and social value theory.

From a historical and a socio-political perspective, Roper and Cheney (2005) pose the question as to who should accept accountability for the needs of civil society. Much of this discourse is resultant from the application of different economic models by Western democratic countries (Johnson 2000). Neoliberal models failed to provide for the welfare of people, which resulted in increasing income discrepancies between rich and poor. In order to address these national and international inconsistencies, Giddens (1998) argues that governments started applying market principles into government, while the private sector progressively became involved in elements of social responsibility. Giddens refers to this type of overlap as a 'distorting of the boundaries' between government and business and introduces the concept of the 'Third Way' which is based on the establishing partnerships between government and the private sector to address persistent challenges and difficulties of a socio-economic nature. Due to the innate complexities of social entrepreneurship along a very wide range of activities with a social mission, it is not easy to define the concept. As in any other new area of research, the body of literature has begun to emerge only during the past twenty-one years, from which (Johnson, 2000) considers that consensus still needs to be achieved.

Leadbeater (1997) states that although many traits and behaviours are shared between social entrepreneurs and business entrepreneurs, the former possess a significant characteristic of adding something of value to progress the quality of life of the less privileged sectors of the economy. From a South African perspective, Smith states that there is a gap in understanding social entrepreneurship and the potential for development and growth that it holds. Social enterprises step into this void to take issue with challenges such as the eradication of poverty, promotion of human dignity and equality, achievement of peace and democracy and environment protection. Not only do social entrepreneurs adopt the 'rules' of the game for social enterprises, they also become equally adept at using the 'rules' of business enterprise and combine and integrate these imperatives into an organization that merges economic, social and environmental values that is, a social enterprise.

In its simplest form, social enterprise is about finding solutions to socio-political problems. The search for answers to socio-economic ills cannot be assigned to the domain of one department only or a particular private organization. In a world with an increasing divide between the wealthy and the poor, it has become the sphere of individuals, private groups, donors, not-for-profit organizations and public structures, as well as private business, to become involved and address the challenges of the economy, the environment and the society. This is what social entrepreneurs do and what social entrepreneurship is about.

The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) is one of the world's principal research projects designed to develop understanding of the relationship between entrepreneurship and national economic development. GEM produces an annual survey: in 2009 some 54 countries contributed (Bosma and Levie 2009). In the 2009 report the survey document also included questions on social entrepreneurship: 49 countries participated. The 2009 review identified three possible reasons for the apparent low incidence of social entrepreneurship: a general lack of understanding of the concept; a possible under-representation in the sample of organizations working for social good; and those profit-oriented enterprises may exclude themselves from the arena of social entrepreneurship (Herrington *et al.* 2009). Notwithstanding its limitations, this section of the GEM report assesses all activities with a social purpose across the spectrum, from organizations involved in social and community work, including NGOs and the activities of business enterprises' social activities.

Methodology

A pragmatist paradigm was adopted and a cross-sectional questionnaire design of all the ten provinces of Zimbabwe was conducted on a sample size of 384 respondents. A mixed method approach was used to ensure triangulation.

A sample size of 39 participants was calculated using Cochran's formula and proportionate stratification. Simple random sampling was used to select shopping centres in suburbs and districts where participants were selected conveniently. Interview participants were chosen purposively. A total of 100 data collectors were employed for this study, 10 for each province. Each data collector was assigned between 4 to 5 shopping centres selected using simple random sampling. In rural areas the first step was for the data collectors to introduce themselves to village heads indicating their intention to collect data. The data collectors then chose one participant at each shopping centre conveniently to whom they also introduced themselves and established good rapport. In urban areas the data collectors obtained a letter from the police allowing them to collect data on the condition that they were to observe strict Covid-19 regulations such as wearing of face masks, social distancing and use of sanitizers. The data collectors then sought informed consent from the targeted participants by first explaining the purpose of the study and how it would benefit the respondents' communities and the respondents themselves. The data collectors assured anonymity and confidentiality to the respondents by explaining how the

collected information will be stored and used and distributed questionnaires to individuals who agreed to participate in the study. All data collectors reported that data collection was smooth which is reflected in the number of completed and returned questionnaires. After the questionnaires were collected, they were put in an envelope and sealed and put in a safe for 28 days to make sure there were no Covid-19 viruses still surviving if any during coding and data capture.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: SE prevalence

The table above shows that $\alpha = 0.798$ is greater than 0.7 indicating good internal consistency or reliability. The items are correlated; hence no items were removed from the questionnaire.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Table 2: Response Rate

The table above shows that there was a 100% response rate in Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West, Matabeleland North, Bulawayo Metropolitan, Harare Metropolitan and Masvingo provinces. The response rate in Manicaland was 91.1%, Mashonaland Central 86.7%, Midlands 86.7% and Matabeleland South 97.8%. The overall response rate was 96.2%. The response rates were very high due to the fact that the researcher engaged a trained data collection team in each province who established good rapport with the research participants before handing out the questionnaires. According Kraemer (1992) the response rate above 50% for a survey is considered good. The high response rate in this study enhanced the validity and reliability of the research findings.

Nationwide Respondents' Characteristics

Table 3: Gender

The results in the table above show that 41.6% of the respondents were male and 58.4% of the respondents were female. Effort was made to get responses from both males and females to get balanced information in the process increasing the validity of the findings. But it can also be inferred from the results that more women seem to be involved in social entrepreneurial activities than their male counterparts. Amin (2010) concurs with these results when pointing out that anecdotal evidence existed that shows that women entrepreneurs and workers constitute a much higher proportion in the informal sector. This is also an expected result when taken from an African point of view where the burden of fending for the family falls on the shoulders of women. Women are generally said to exhibit more modest business growth ambitions than men but they also bear an unfair share of domestic workload constraining their intended growth thresholds (Cliff, 1998).

Table 4: Age

The results show 13.2% of the respondents were below 20 years of age, 27.9% from 21 to 30, 30% from 31 to 40, 19.2% from 41 to 50 and 9.7% above 50 years. All age groups were represented giving a balanced view. It is also interesting to note that social enterprises are distributed across all age groups. There is however a growing trend of young people in particular that facilitate their passion for social change into new enterprises. There are more social entrepreneurs in the 18-34 age group than commercial entrepreneurs in every global region except in Latin America indicating high contribution of millennial generation to socio-economic transformation (Bosma et al. 2016).

Table 5: Marital Status

The composition of respondents by marital status was 36.7% single, 47.6% married, 7.9% divorced and 7.6% widowed. The positivity of this research allowed the investigator to gather evidence from a wider cluster of individuals increasing the validity and reliability of the findings. In the entrepreneurship literature several scholars have affirmed that support from a spouse/companion is a key factor for success. Spousal support in entrepreneurship can be instrumental, informational and emotional in nature (Parasuraman et al. 1996; Brockhaus 1980). Hence one could posit that entrepreneurs with spouses may be more optimistic about their chances of success, and subsequently have a stronger desire to grow their firm.

However, while having a spouse can be seen as beneficial for the nascent entrepreneur, it may also be a source of problems, particularly for women. According to social role theory, the behaviour of men and women is governed by the stereotypes of their social roles.

Table 6: Number of Children

Regarding the distribution of respondents according to the number of children they have the results are as follows: 0 to 1 child 41.6%, 1 to 5 children 52.4%, 6 to 10 children 5.3% and above 10 children 0.7%. The results show that the majority of respondents 59.4% had responsibilities to provide and prepare a better life for their children. For entrepreneurs, being a parent may impact growth intentions in different ways. It could be argued that becoming a parent would increase an entrepreneur's perception of the minimum acceptable financial rewards that a new venture should yield and thus increase their growth intentions (Davis and Shaver, 2012). It can be argued that this is particularly the case when it comes to single parents, as there is only one income in the household to rely on (one breadwinner). On the other hand, parental demands have important implications for the time available to devote to business and the work role for entrepreneurs (Parasuraman et al. 1996). Previous research has found that entrepreneurs with dependent children have lower career/achievement motivations and higher personal life motivations (DeMartino and Jacques 2006). Higher personal life motivations i.e. looking for more flexibility and a better work life balance) may imply lower growth intentions. When dependent children are included in the analysis, the differences between men and women entrepreneurs increase. The balance between family responsibilities and work is more often considered a challenge by women compared to men (Jennings and McDougald 2007).

Table 7: Extended Family

On the question of whether the respondents had extended family 56.8% said yes and 43.2 % said no. In the African culture and tradition taking care of the extended family is very important and something that is expected but increases the burden of responsibilities on the social entrepreneur.

Table 8: Employment Status

The table above shows that 37% of the respondents were once employed, 21.9% were never employed, 24.7% were retrenched and 16.4% were self-employed. According to Kolb's Theory of Experiential Learning, work experience knowledge is defined as those procedures involving creation of knowledge through procedures whereby knowledge is created through the alteration of familiarity (Kolb 1984). It is inevitable for everyone to have a story past even though these stories ranges from bad to worse. According to (Gomes 2013) we cannot change the things which happened in the past, but we can alter some of the portion in the future taking past as standards. Usually the futuristic disposition or job security is shaped by one's prior work experience. There are three types of pre launched experience most entrepreneurs have behind their successful businesses: first they have worked in the same industry, second, related industry and third, frequent user of the product (Glauser 2016). Gaining knowledge for experience prior to occupation has a variety of definitions. One of these definitions depict someone's involvement at the same time working in a particular field or employment. In order to have a brilliant profession, work exposure is important. Additionally, it demands the absence of worries about longevity of working periods, be it short or longer work experience, gaining future jobs is certain. Family ties are valuable, but not essential, in establishing transnational ventures. According to Gielnik et al. (2018) people over 40 years, having wider prior work experience related to entrepreneurship as compared to younger people stated that prior work experience positively influenced their self-efficacy as well as entrepreneurial expectation. While Fatoki (2014) finds that university students having prior work experience have greater levels of entrepreneurial intention (vs students having no exposure). However, the difference is not statistically significant. According to Liguori, Bendickson, and McDowell (2017) the engrossment in the creation of diverse businesses also offers a chance of having insights of the perils and glitches allied with new firms. Entrepreneurial exposure is a key element connected with contributions and part of the entrepreneur in new firm establishment (Lee and Tsang 2001). Precisely, insightful prior work knowledge can offer a competitive edge and an indicator to an individual's likelihood of his/her creating a new venture.

Table 9: Vocational skills

The table above shows that 5.5% of the respondents had carpentry skills, 8.3% building skills, 7.2% motor maintenance and repair skills, 9.9% food and nutrition skills, 16.4% fashion and fabrics skills, 4.8% wood working skills and 47.8% other skills like agriculture and metal fabrication. Results from a study done by Oyeniyi, Adeyemi and Cole (2020) in Nigeria reveals that: There is significant relationship among the socio-economic characteristics and type of skills acquired by the trainees, there is significant relationship between vocational skills utilization and entrepreneurship development and there is significant relationship between choice of skill and entrepreneurship development. This research and educative study has also discovered the way students continuously kept distinguishing entrepreneurial study as one of the critical aspects which regulates a person's achievement in social entrepreneurship.

Therefore, recommendations from this study entail the urgent need for establishments by institutions for entrepreneurial courses as fundamental courses for academic programs their schedules either offering certificates, diploma or degree. In this regard, this enables the greatest number of graduates to successfully engage in self-employment instead of continuously looking for salaried occupations.

Table 10: Academic qualification

The distribution of respondents by education level was as follows: primary level 0.5%, ordinary level 35.1%, advanced level 6.9%, tertiary certificate 8.8%, diploma 20.8%, undergraduate 15.2%, postgraduate 12.2%. A research carried out by Dragomir and Panzaru in 2015 across Europe reveals that there is significant relationship between education and entrepreneurial spirit development. Education increases the interest to become an entrepreneur. Based on these aspects, it turned out that most respondents agreed that their education helped them to better understand the role of entrepreneurs in society. Also, this research suggested that the interest for the status of entrepreneur is stimulated by education.

Table 11: SE Prevalence

The table above shows that 65.4% of the respondents were of the opinion that social entrepreneurship is not prevalent in Zimbabwe. We therefore conclude that social entrepreneurship is not prevalent in Zimbabwe.

SE PREVALENCE: NATIONAL

Table 12: Social Entrepreneurship

The table above shows that about 12% of the respondents strongly agreed that social entrepreneurship is prevalent. About 27% agreed giving a total of about 39% in agreement. About 22% of the respondents strongly disagreed, about 24% disagreed giving a total of 46% in disagreement and about 16% were not sure. Results clearly show that social entrepreneurship is not prevalent in Zimbabwe.

These findings are interesting but not surprising. Despite the positive disposition of demographic factors and the socio-economic situation in favour of rigorous social entrepreneurial activities prevailing in the country, social entrepreneurship is still low in Zimbabwe. These could be the results of decades of spoon-feeding by NGOs on the Zimbabwean populace which has emasculated them of creativity and promoted a dependency syndrome.

The low incidence of social entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe could imply that the enterprises that people endeavour in are solely for-profit and not social enterprises. A lot of people in Zimbabwe are struggling and most of them depend on hand to mouth. It is easily noticeable in their day to day living that in Zimbabwe very few people manage the basic meals a day and mostly to have two meals is luxurious. One meal is the order of the day and to obtain it is a result of hard work and sweat. In this regard it is undoubtedly evidenced that there are organisations; public or private taking care of this social entity in order to develop an economy of vulnerable people by carrying out not-for profit enterprises. Therefore, this study informs policy makers, the government, NGOs and other institutions to embrace and promote social entrepreneurship as a mechanism to confront societal problems.

Conclusions

To synthesise this paper, this subject of entrepreneurship remains a wonder that has spawned important attention. The general understanding of the definition of social entrepreneurship is debatable and the argument concerning its true definition peruses to address both societal and glitches in the environment either overlooked or incompletely regarded by the government entities that are for-profit. A variety of prospects including enhanced image, improved culture and social value creation are presented which in turn reflect several challenges such as contending clashes of interests, proving legality and creating capital.

The implication caused by social entrepreneurship is need for wider research and study in this area taking cognisance of comparative novelty, extensive scale, and its complexity. Nonetheless, an ineradicable impression has been established by social entrepreneurship, introducing an effective means to addressing social apprehensions on how conglomerates can function.

References

- [1]. Amin, S. 2010. *The law of worldwide value*. New York: NYU Press.
- [2]. Baker, T., Gedajlovic, E., and Lubatkin, M. 2005. "A framework for comparing entrepreneurship processes across nations". *Journal of International Business Studies* 36 (5): 492–504. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400153>.
- [3]. Bosma, N., and Levie, J. 2009. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2009 Executive Report*. Boston, MA: Babson College.
- [4]. Bosma, N. S., Schott, T., Terjesen, S. A., and Kew, P. 2016. "Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2015 to 2016: Special report on social entrepreneurship." Global Entrepreneurship Research Association. Accessed May 20 2021 www.gemconsortium.org.
- [5]. British Council. 2017. "The state of social enterprise in Ethiopia." Accessed May 20 2021 <https://ethiopia.britishcouncil.org>.
- [6]. Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia. 2013. "Guide into Social Entrepreneurship." Tbilisi. (in Georgian)
- [7]. Chell, E. 2007. "Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process." *International Small Business Journal* 25 (1): 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607071779>
- [8]. Chiladze I. 2015. "Business social responsibility and Christianity". In *Christianity and economics*, edited by R. Gogokhia and G. Shikhashvili, 169-176. Tbilisi-Batumi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University Publishing.
- [9]. Cliff, J. E. 1998. "Does one size fit all? Exploring the relationship between attitudes towards growth, gender, and business size". *Journal of Business Venturing* 13: 523-542.
- [10]. Coltart, D. 2008. "A Decade of Suffering in Zimbabwe: Economic Collapse and Political Repression under Robert Mugabe." *Development Policy Analysis* 5 (5): 1–21.
- [11]. Davis, A. E. and Shaver, K.G. 2012. "Understanding gendered variations in business growth intentions across the life course". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 36 (3): 495-512.
- [12]. Defourny, J., and Nyssens, M. 2012. *Social Enterprises: An Organizational Perspective*. California: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [13]. DeMartino R, B.R. and Jacques. P. 2006. "Exploring the career achievement and personal life orientation differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs: the impact of sex and dependents". *Journal of Small Business Management* 44 (3): p350-368
- [14]. Douglas, H., and Grant, S. 2014. "Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: domain, dimensions and future directions." In *Social Entrepreneurship and Enterprise: Concepts in Context*, edited by H DOuglas and S Grant: 3–32. Tilde: Tilde University Press.
- [15]. Dragomir, C. C., and Pânzaru, S. 2015. "The relationship between education and entrepreneurship in EU member states." *Review of General Management* 22 (2): 55-65.
- [16]. Faruk, M. O., Hassan, N., and Islam, N. 2017. Factors Influencing the Development of Social Entrepreneurship in Bangladesh. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi./10.2139/ssrn.2856210>.
- [17]. Fatoki, O. 2014. "The Entrepreneurial Intention of Undergraduate Students in South Africa: The Influences of Entrepreneurship Education and Previous Work Experience." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (7): 294-299.
- [18]. Giddens, A. 1998. *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
- [19]. Gielnik, M., Zacher, H., and Wang, M. 2018. "Age in the entrepreneurial process The role of future time perspective and prior entrepreneurial experience." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 103 (10): 1067-1085.
- [20]. Glauser, M. 2016. "Entrepreneur Europe." Accessed 20 June 2020. <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/275091/10.2139/ssrn.2856210>
- [21]. Gomes, K. 2013. *Past Experiences Help Change the Future*. Srilanka, Sunday Observer.
- [22]. Haugh, H. 2012. "The importance of theory in social enterprise research." *Social Enterprise Journal* 8 (1): 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611211226557>
- [23]. Haverkort, T. 2016. A Social Enterprise. Capital Ethiopia Newspaper [online] Accessed 20 September 2017 <http://www.capitalethiopia.com/2016/03/29/9149/>
- [24]. Hein, W., and Kappel, R. 2016. *A background paper on the performance and impact of social entrepreneurs*. München: Siemens Stiftung.
- [25]. Herrington, M., Kew, J., and Kew, P. 2009. *Tracking Entrepreneurship in SA: A GEM Perspective*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town, Graduate School of Business.
- [26]. Hoogendoorn, B. 2016. "The Prevalence and Determinants of Social Entrepreneurship at the Macro Level." *Journal of Small Business Management* 54: 278–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12301>

- [27]. Jennings, J. E. and McDougald, M.S. 2007. "Family interface experiences and coping strategies: Implications for entrepreneurship research and practice" *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (3): 747-760.
- [28]. Johnson, S.J. 2000. *Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship*. Edmonton: Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship.
- [29]. Katunga, W, and Lombard, A. 2016. "The contribution of social entrepreneurship in meeting the needs of orphans in the Mberengwa district, Zimbabwe." *Social Work* 52 (2): 188-207. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15270/52-2-500>
- [30]. Kaseke, E. 2010. The role of social security in south africa. *International Social Work*, 53 (2): 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872809355394>
- [31]. Kerlin, J. A. 2009. *Social Enterprise: A Global Comparison*. Lebanon: Tufts University Press.
- [32]. Kerlin, J. A. 2010. "A comparative analysis of the global emergence of social enterprise." *Voluntas* 21 (2): 162–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-010-9126-8>
- [33]. Kolb, D. A. 1984. *Experiential learning Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs NJ Prentice.
- [34]. Leadbeater, C. 1997. *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. London: Demos. Accessed 24 January 2011 <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/theriseofthesocialentrepreneur.pdf?1240939425>.
- [35]. Lee, D. Y., and Tsang, E. W. 2001. "The effects of entrepreneurial personality, background and network activities on venture growth." *Journal of management studies* 38 (4): 583-602.
- [36]. Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S., and Bosma, N. 2013. "Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor social entrepreneurship study." *Small Business Economics* 40 (3): 693–714. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9398-4>
- [37]. Liguori, E., Bendickson, J., and McDowell, W. 2017. "Revisiting entrepreneurial intentions: a social cognitive career theory approach." *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 14 (1): 67-78.
- [38]. Mahoso, T. 2008. "Reading the 2005 Tibaijuka report on Zimbabwe in a global context". In *The Hidden Dimensions of Operation Murambatsvina* edited by M Vambe. Harare: Weaver Press.
- [39]. Mair, J., and Marti, I. 2004. "Social entrepreneurship: What are we talking about? A framework for future research." *IESE Research Papers, April 2004*, Article D/546. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ebg/iesewp/d-0546.html>
- [40]. Mair, J., and Marti, I. 2006. "Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight." *Journal of world business*, 41 (1): 36-44. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1090951605000544>
- [41]. Montero, M. 2016. What Social Entrepreneurship Isn't. Addis Fortune News Paper [online] Accessed 19 September 2017 <http://www.addisfortune.net/columns/what-social-entrepreneurship-isn't/>
- [42]. Moyo, S. 2011. "Three decades of agrarian reform in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (3): 493–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.583642>
- [43]. Mudamburi, T. 2012. "Sustainable Millennium Framework for Managing Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries in Africa (Zimbabwe Case Study)." *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship* 2 (1): 009–020. <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:grg:02entp:v:2:y:2012:i:1:p:9-20>
- [44]. Natsvlshvili, I. 2017. "Gender Inequality and Women's Entrepreneurship-Challenges and Opportunities (Case of Georgia)." *Eurasian Studies in Business and Economics* 5: 491–505). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46319-3_30
- [45]. Natsvlshvili, I. 2018. "Social Entrepreneurship and Corporate Social Responsibility in the Context of a Moral Economy: Dilemma for Developing Countries (Case of Georgia)". *Naše Gospodarstvo/Our Economy* 64 (4): 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ngoe-2018-0022>
- [46]. Oyeniyi, A. A., Adeyemi, O. A., and Cole, K. 2020. "The Role of Vocational Training on Entrepreneurship Development." *Pacific Journal of Science and Technology* 20 (1): 266-278.
- [47]. Peredo, A. M., and McLean, M. 2006. "Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept." *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007>
- [48]. Parasuraman, Saroj, Yasmin S. Purohit, and Vernica M. Godshalk. 1996. "Work and Family Variables, Entrepreneurial Career Success, and Psychological Well-Being" *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 48: 275-300.
- [49]. Roper, J., and Cheney, G. 2005. "The meanings of social entrepreneurship today." *Corporate Governance* 5 (3): 95–104). <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700510604733>

- [50]. Shaw, E., and Carter, S. 2007. "Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes." *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 14 (3): 418–434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529>
- [51]. Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., and Lumpkin, G. T. 2009. "Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3 (2): 161–194. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.69>
- [52]. Tevera, D. S., and Crush, J. 2003. *The new brain drain from Zimbabwe*. Waterloo, ON: The South African Migration Programme. SAMP Migration Policy Series No. 29.
- [53]. Tracy, J. L., and Randles, D. 2011. "Four models of basic emotions: A review of Ekman and Cordaro, Izard, Levenson, and Panksepp and Watt." *Emotion Review* 3 (4): 397–405. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073911410747>
- [54]. Trexler, J. 2008. "Social entrepreneurship as an algorithm: Is social enterprise sustainable?" *E:CO Emergence: Complexity and Organization* 10 (3): 65–85.
- [55]. Yunus, M. 2007. *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. New York: Public Affairs.
- [56]. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., and Shulman, J. M. 2009. "A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges." *Journal of Business Venturing* 24 (5): 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>