

The drivers of social entrepreneurship: agency, context, compassion and opportunism

¹Stirzaker, Rebecca; ²Galloway, Laura; ³Muhonen, Jatta; ²Christopoulos, Dimitris

¹Department of Business, Strategy and Political Sciences - University of South-Eastern Norway

²Edinburgh Business School - Heriot-Watt University

³University of Helsinki

Stirzaker, R., Galloway, L., Muhonen, J., & Christopoulos, D. (2021). *The drivers of social entrepreneurship: Agency, context, compassion and opportunism*. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2020-0461>

Publisher's version: DOI: [10.1108/IJEBR-07-2020-0461](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2020-0461)

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.



The drivers of social entrepreneurship: agency, context, compassion and opportunism

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research</i>
Manuscript ID	IJEBr-07-2020-0461.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Social Entrepreneurship, Social enterprise, Motivation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The drivers of social entrepreneurship: agency, context, compassion and opportunism

Purpose

The paper refers to the drivers of social entrepreneurship and critically explores the notion that it is prompted by a personal mission to enable social or ideologically motivated altruism. It refers to Shapero's Entrepreneurial Event Theory and the adaptation of it for social entrepreneurship in Mair and Moba (2006) and develops these so that both agency and context may be considered.

Methodology

Fieldwork comprised a qualitative study of 12 life-story narratives of social entrepreneurs in central Scotland. The location was chosen because of its reputation for support of social entrepreneurship, and the qualitative methodology allowed for a depth of inspection and analysis of complex and situational experiences.

Findings

Findings include observation of altruism but there are other drivers, including the appeal of the social entrepreneurship business model. Context emerges as a critical feature of social entrepreneurship too, including spurs for altruism and the human, financial and social capitals, skills and experiences of social entrepreneurs.

Originality

The paper finds that the social entrepreneurship process involves both agency and context and is complex, and for some, reflects a strategic approach similar to commercial entrepreneurship. The paper also proposes further adaptation to Entrepreneurial Event Theory to capture this complexity of the social entrepreneurship process.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, social enterprise, altruism, strategy, entrepreneurial event theory, context

Introduction

The outcomes of social entrepreneurship are widely understood to include and prioritize social contribution and social value (Brieger and DeClerq, 2019; Duncan, 2009). Connected to this, the motivations of the social entrepreneur are associated with social or ideological goals and compassion (Miller *et al.*, 2012; Petrovskava and Mirakyan, 2018). These key elements are broadly accepted as those that distinguish the social entrepreneur from the commercial entrepreneur. However, whereas the commercial entrepreneur has been the subject of much inspection of motivations and drivers, with many studies finding there are myriad and diverse influences (e.g. Carsrud and Brannback, 2011; Maalaoui *et al.*, 2020), in the social entrepreneurship context there is little exploration beyond the assertion of it as altruism. The most common interpretation is that an individual perceives a socially or ideologically-informed opportunity, and thereafter acts like an entrepreneur to build a social enterprise, and at both the opportunity identification and social enterprise creation stages, social entrepreneurship is regarded as a largely agential process (Miller *et al.*, 2012).

There is, however, some evidence emerging that suggests social entrepreneurship is more complex than just involving agential response to a social or ideological cause and subsequent social business development. First, Zahra *et al.* (2009) and Tucker *et al.* (2019) find that social entrepreneurs can be traditionally opportunistic, that some social entrepreneurs may act like commercial entrepreneurs *before* the realization of an opportunity. Second, Yitshaki and Kropp (2016) and Hu *et al.* (2020) find that, alongside agency, context is also an antecedent and ongoing influence on social entrepreneurship. These emerging lines of enquiry – querying the primacy of social mission and of agency – have implications in terms of questioning our established knowledge of the social entrepreneurship process more broadly, suggesting further scholarly inspection is required. This is the key purpose of this paper.

The paper reports an in-depth qualitative investigation of the drivers for enterprise creation of a sample of 12 social entrepreneurs in central Scotland. The central questions the empirical work

1
2
3 explore are:
4
5

- 6 a) What is the evidence for personally-informed altruism versus commercial entrepreneurial
7
8 opportunism?
9
10
11 b) Are contextual factors evidenced in the drivers of social entrepreneurship?
12

13
14 From a theoretical perspective, we refer to Entrepreneurial Event Theory (EET) (Shapiro and Sokol,
15
16 1982) and the version adapted for social entrepreneurship that is presented in Mair and Noboa
17
18 (2006) because they allow for inspection of both agential and contextual influences on motivations.
19

20
21 Our contributions from this research are threefold. First, we examine the drivers associated with social
22
23 entrepreneurship and find that while social mission and personal values are certainly evidenced, their
24
25 expression is observably strategic and self-orientated in some cases. Second, through the lens of Mair
26
27 and Noboa's adapted EET model we contribute data that shows that motivational drivers for social
28
29 entrepreneurship may be both agential and contextual. Third, we contribute some development to
30
31 the adapted EET model.
32
33

34
35 The paper proceeds as follows. First, we review the literature on social entrepreneurship and
36
37 associated drivers with a theoretical focus on activity in context. From this review, gaps in
38
39 understanding are identified and these inform our two research questions. Following a description of
40
41 the qualitative methodology applied to engage with these questions, findings are presented. We
42
43 discuss these and present conclusions, including the theoretical contribution and implications for
44
45 knowledge about social entrepreneurship.
46
47
48
49

50 51 **The drivers of social entrepreneurship** 52

53
54 Social entrepreneurs have been described as value-orientated individuals who create social change
55
56 through the start-up of an enterprise (Certo and Miller, 2008), as innovators who achieve social change
57
58 through enterprise (Newth, 2018; Zahra *et al.*, 2008), and as individuals who are motivated by the
59
60 opportunity to adopt an innovative approach to pull together resources and networks to satisfy needs

1
2
3 which the regular market or the state cannot, or fails to, provide (Thompson *et al.*, 2000). Elsewhere
4
5 in the literature, social entrepreneurship is used to describe a wide range of phenomena. For example,
6
7 Austin *et al.* (2006) refer to social entrepreneurship as a non-profit initiative in search of alternative
8
9 funding strategies and management structures that create or pursue social value. Elsewhere, Hockerts
10
11 (2017: 1-2) articulates it as “the identification of opportunities to create social impact through the
12
13 generation of market and non-market disequilibria”. However described, the focus on social value is
14
15 consistent, as is the notion that motivations for social entrepreneurship diverge somewhat from those
16
17 for traditional, commercial entrepreneurship.
18
19

20
21 The general entrepreneurship literature includes much research on the intentions and motivations
22
23 that precede entrepreneurial action (Carsrud and Brannback, 2011; Kautonen *et al.*, 2015). Overall,
24
25 empirical studies have shown various antecedents to motivations for entrepreneurship (Amit and
26
27 Muller, 1995; Dawson and Henley, 2012; Maalaoui *et al.*, 2020), most consistently including the desire
28
29 to exploit an identified opportunity and to be one’s own boss (e.g. Shane and Venkataraman, 2000;
30
31 Verduijn *et al.*, 2014). Yitshaki and Kropp (2016) propose that these do not vary particularly for social
32
33 entrepreneurship, but that social entrepreneurship is also based on solving specific social needs.
34
35 Germak and Robinson (2014) find similar, as do Miller *et al.* (2012), who suggest that social
36
37 entrepreneurs perceive social ventures as desirable because of specific emotional and cognitive
38
39 attitudes. Petrovskaya and Mirakyan (2018) and, more recently, Tiwari *et al.* (2020) explain
40
41 compassion as a key motivator and suggest social entrepreneurs rate higher on altruism, humility,
42
43 empathy, trust in others and integrity as compared to commercial entrepreneurs. Dickel *et al.* (2020)
44
45 propose links between social entrepreneurship and direct or indirect experience of a problem or
46
47 deficit in childhood as a strong influence. What all these have in common is that the social
48
49 entrepreneur is found to be motivated by an opportunity to make some social improvement and that
50
51 this may be personally meaningful to them.
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 Alternatively, however, recent studies argue that the good intentions of social entrepreneurs should
59
60 not be taken for granted and, for some, social entrepreneurship can be driven less by personally-

1
2
3 informed altruism and more by traditional entrepreneurial opportunism (Kimmitt and Muñoz, 2018).
4
5 To exemplify, there is empirical evidence that suggests that some social entrepreneurs are motivated
6
7 by attractions such as personal enjoyment (Dey and Lehner, 2017), autonomy (Dey and Steyaert, 2016)
8
9 as well as fame and recognition (Tucker *et al.*, 2019). This suggests that social entrepreneurial intent
10
11 may not necessarily, nor solely, arise from pro-social, altruistic motivators, and indeed, Zahra *et al.*
12
13 (2009), find evidence, akin to commercial entrepreneurship, of *scanning* the environment for (social)
14
15 entrepreneurship opportunities, as opposed to identifying an opportunity in response to a personally
16
17 perceived need. Therefore, rather than social entrepreneurship being a vehicle by which to engage in
18
19 a social agenda, in some cases at least, the motivation to become a social entrepreneur can *precede*
20
21 the identification of a social goal. This latter motivation is relatively unexplored in the social
22
23 entrepreneurship literature.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Elsewhere in the literature on motives for social entrepreneurship, the role of context and
30
31 circumstances is similarly little explored. This is not unique to the social entrepreneurship literature
32
33 of course, with critical studies of the role of context only appearing with regularity in the mainstream
34
35 entrepreneurship literature relatively recently (Korsgaard and Anderson, 2011; Lee and Jones, 2015).
36
37 In the social entrepreneurship area specifically, there is similar critical engagement emerging. Recent
38
39 research into the drivers of social entrepreneurship identify both agential and contextual
40
41 characteristics as determinants. Yitshaki and Kropp (2016), Hockerts (2017) and Hu *et al.* (2020), for
42
43 example, note the importance of multiple key factors associated with the social entrepreneur, and
44
45 critically, their background and current circumstances. Dickel *et al.* (2020) similarly describe how social
46
47 entrepreneurial motivations occur within a social context, where actors within a social entrepreneur's
48
49 family and community play a role not only in driving social entrepreneurship but also on the overall
50
51 entrepreneurial process. Elsewhere in the literature, research has taken an institutional approach to
52
53 focus on the context in which social ventures operate (Stephan *et al.*, 2015; Urban and Kujinga, 2017),
54
55 suggesting environmental factors are important for the emergence and implementation of social
56
57 entrepreneurship. These suggest that rather than being entirely agency-related, social
58
59
60

1
2
3 entrepreneurship is a socially and contextually embedded process and does not
4
5 occur in isolation. This too requires further investigation.
6
7

8 **The theoretical context**

9

10
11 Research on the drivers of social entrepreneurship are theoretically rooted in the traditional
12
13 entrepreneurship field (Bacq and Alt, 2018; Hockerts, 2017; Lehner and Germak, 2014). With
14
15 reference to specific theoretical engagement, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991)
16
17 has been widely applied to social entrepreneurial intentions, including inspection of its components
18
19 *perceived behavioural control, attitudes, and subjective norms* (Kruse *et al.*, 2019; Tiwari *et al.*, 2017).
20
21 Ernst (2011) adopts TPB, and extends it subsequently to include traits and pro-social personality for
22
23 the social entrepreneur. Elsewhere, Tran and Korflesch (2016) use Social Cognitive Career Theory (Lent
24
25 *et al.*, 1994) to suggest the formation of social entrepreneurial intention is predicated on *self-efficacy*
26
27 and the *expected outcome* of engaging in a behaviour. There is also reference to Entrepreneurial Event
28
29 Theory (EET) (Shapero and Sokol, 1982). Broadly, EET proposes that entrepreneurship is underpinned
30
31 by the elements *perceived desirability* and *perceived feasibility* which determine the *credibility* and
32
33 *potential* required to develop entrepreneurial *intention* in an individual. *Perceived desirability* refers
34
35 to the attractiveness of entrepreneurship and is composed of two discrete intrapersonal and extra
36
37 personal constructs, *attitude* and *social norms*, both of which are affected by contextual factors such
38
39 as the structural environment and the capitals (financial, social and human) of an individual, including
40
41 skills and experiences (Ajzen, 1991; Schlaegel and Koenig, 2014). *Perceived feasibility*, similar to the
42
43 concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), refers to the degree to which one believes him/herself
44
45 capable of performing entrepreneurial behaviour and access to resources, again both of these are
46
47 influenced by the experiences, backgrounds and circumstances of individuals (Shapero and Sokol,
48
49 1982). *Perceived desirability* and *perceived feasibility* combine to determine the *credibility* of
50
51 entrepreneurship and this in turn influences an individual's *propensity to act* and the *potential* for
52
53 entrepreneurship. According to EET, *potential* is realised in response to some *precipitating event*, a
54
55 displacement that can be a single or ongoing stimulus that spurs the individual out of latent potential
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and focuses the mind on the intention for entrepreneurship (Shapero and Sokol give the examples of
4
5 redundancy, migration, and even subjective circumstances such as critical birthdays).
6
7

8 Drawing from these earlier theories of entrepreneurial intent, Mair and Noboa (2006) developed an
9
10 adapted theory for social entrepreneurship specifically. Based on Shapero and Sokol (1982) and
11
12 borrowing also from Ajzen (1991), Mair and Noboa (2006) draw upon the EET antecedents of *perceived*
13
14 *desirability* and *perceived feasibility* and the three constructs of TPB in formation of social
15
16 entrepreneurial intent. This is presented in Figure 1. Critical to this model is the distinction (from
17
18 commercial entrepreneurship) that posits that, for social entrepreneurship, *perceived desirability* and
19
20 *perceived feasibility* are based on *empathy* and *moral judgement*, and *self-efficacy* and *social support*,
21
22 respectively.
23
24
25

26
27 Figure 1 here
28

29
30 Empirically, studies that have applied traditional models of entrepreneurial intent to social
31
32 entrepreneurship have tended to add cognitive and affective factors such as empathy, personal values
33
34 and moral obligation as antecedents, with affirmative results. Tiwari, *et al.* (2020), for example,
35
36 evidence a direct relationship between individuals engaging in social entrepreneurial behaviour and
37
38 high levels of empathy and moral judgement (also Ernst, 2011 and Hockerts, 2017). Bacq and Alt
39
40 (2018) find further that empathy indirectly affects social entrepreneurial intention through two
41
42 mediating factors of self-efficacy and social worth. Kruse, *et al.* (2019) find that perceived behavioural
43
44 control and attitudes towards the perceived desirability of social entrepreneurship mediate the
45
46 impact of subjective norms. Further, they suggest that personal values influence the dimensions and
47
48 formation of social entrepreneurial intent. These studies have expanded our understanding of the
49
50 social entrepreneur, but they are not without limitation. In particular, in most cases, emotional and
51
52 moral drivers are still given primacy over contextual and situational influences. Consequently, they
53
54 overlook the importance of the embeddedness of agency to inform social entrepreneurial behaviour.
55
56 Emerging recently in response to this are new studies that seek to combine both agentic and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contextual influences to investigate social entrepreneurship motivations (Brieger and DeClerq, 2019;
4 Grimes *et al.*, 2013, Hockerts, 2017; Hu *et al.*, 2020). These few new studies are largely underpinned
5
6
7 by theoretical development presented in Mair and Noboa (2006) with some promising outcomes for
8
9
10 understanding. Hockerts (2017), for example, finds past experience with social problems a strong
11
12 antecedent of social entrepreneurship intent. This is supported by Kruse (2020) who evidences
13
14 previous experiences of working in a social enterprise affect social entrepreneurial intent through
15
16 empathy and self-efficacy.

17
18
19 Interestingly, while Mair and Noboa (2006: 126) do recognise the importance of situational context,
20
21 they do not include it directly within the model presented in Figure 1 though. While *perceived*
22
23 *feasibility* does involve contextual factors, Mair and Noboa's antecedents to *perceived desirability* are
24
25 largely agential, comprising personal responses to underlying contextual and experiential influences.
26
27 Critically, the context and experience-based precipitating event in Shapero and Sokol's original theory
28
29 is not mandated for social entrepreneurship by the adapted model. Instead, emotional and moral
30
31 drivers are given primacy, and while these may have been informed by a preceding 'event' or
32
33 experience of course (e.g. Dickel *et al.*, 2020; Hockerts, 2017), Mair and Noboa's model implies this
34
35 happens *prior* to the intention formation process, if at all. This removal of context as an influence on
36
37 desirability and the potential for a displacement event to spur action, reduces the ability to explore
38
39 the effects of a social entrepreneur's circumstances, experiences and capitals on social
40
41 entrepreneurship, resulting in the potential for circular reasoning: since these are not explored, they
42
43 may be rendered not important.

44 45 46 47 48 49 **Methodology**

50
51
52 The empirical work reported here is based on a qualitative, exploratory methodology, involving
53
54 individuals in central Scotland who had created and operate a social enterprise defined as per the
55
56 Scottish Government (2020) criteria as "businesses with a social or environmental purpose and whose
57
58 profits are re-invested into fulfilling their mission". Central Scotland was chosen as the location of this
59
60

1
2
3 research specifically because the contribution which social entrepreneurs make to Scotland's social,
4 economic, cultural and environmental economy has increasingly been recognised in the last two
5 decades (Jenner, 2016). In 2016, the Scottish Government released 'Scotland's Social Enterprise
6 Strategy' setting out a long-standing commitment to stimulate social enterprise activity, develop
7 stronger organisations, and realise market opportunity (Scottish Government, 2016). Consequently, a
8 2019 report estimated that there were 6,025 social enterprises across the country, representing a
9 sixteen per cent growth in numbers since the social enterprise census in 2015 (Social Value Lab, 2019).
10 Based on the conductivity of this institutional environment (Urban and Kujinga, 2017), it is reasonable
11 to suggest that social entrepreneurs may be drawn to create social businesses there.

12
13
14 To explore, testimony and opinion of those who are engaging in social entrepreneurship activity was
15 required, including some depth of explanation of motivations. According to Bertaux (1981) and Smith
16 and Elger (2014) the most appropriate means of accessing this type of data is by allowing actors to
17 relate in their own words their experiences, reflections and opinions; their stories. In-depth life history
18 narratives were therefore sought that would allow participants to reflect on the immediate and
19 longer-term antecedents of and influences on their social entrepreneurship. As such, long interviews
20 were conducted with few participants (12 people) using techniques that encouraged narrative
21 histories, as used elsewhere for entrepreneurship research (Gartner, 2010; McCarthy *et al.*, 2014). The
22 participants were recruited to the study using two approaches. First, a call for participants was made
23 within the 2018/2019 cohort attending the School for Social Entrepreneurs (SSE), itself a social
24 enterprise which provides training and support for social enterprise start-ups. Five of these self-
25 selected to participate in the study. To include some more established social entrepreneurs, a second
26 'networking' approach was taken too that asked the initial five participants to name social
27 entrepreneurs who had inspired them. More than 30 names were generated by this process, of which
28 21 were within the geography of the research. These were contacted and seven agreed to take part.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Outline details about participants in the sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 here

1
2
3 Interviews were conversational to afford depth of testimony, but one specific item was included to
4
5 engage direct with EET and the research agenda. This was the question: “Was there any specific thing
6
7 that prompted you to start your social enterprise?”. This question allowed for a negative answer –
8
9 that there had been no specific catalyst – but also allowed direct investigation of the incidence, as
10
11 recalled by participants, of what Shapero and Sokol (1982) refer to as precipitating events (via the
12
13 follow-up question “Can you describe this?”). Thereafter, as per Stake (1995), interviews were semi-
14
15 structured using only an interview guide with thematic prompts, to encourage extensive relating of
16
17 experiences and reflections to allow for rich exploration of themes identified in the literature, and
18
19 also to enable and prompt issues not previously identified to emerge. All ensuing narratives were
20
21 recorded and transcribed verbatim and itinerant issues, experiences and challenges associated with
22
23 each participant’s motives and experiences of social entrepreneurship were explored with reference
24
25 to the adapted EET model in Mair and Noboa (2006) but including also inspection of any precipitating
26
27 event(s) as per the original theory in Shapero and Sokol (1982). Analysis applied the technique
28
29 described in King and Brookes (2016) with support from NVivo software. To reduce subjectivity and
30
31 individual bias, analysis was conducted in the first instance by three of the four researchers
32
33 independently, and consensus on themes emerging was achieved via consultation. This process
34
35 included the development of an initial template from which both a-priori and unanticipated themes
36
37 could emerge (Waring and Wainwright, 2008). Thereafter, King and Brookes’ six stages of template
38
39 analysis were stringently adhered to: (1) familiarisation, (2) preliminary coding, (3) clustering, (4) initial
40
41 template production, (5) template development, and (6) final template. Once the final hierarchical list
42
43 had been formulated, the researchers scrutinised patterns. The agreed template of hierarchical
44
45 themes and expanded examples of evidence, are given in Appendix 1.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 **Findings**

54
55 *What is the evidence for personally-informed altruism versus opportunism?*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Data relating to this question is elaborated in Appendix 1, but summary outcomes include that
4
5 motivations that are broadly in line with commercial entrepreneurship were evidenced in the sample;
6
7 personal income, flexibility and autonomy were cited by almost all. Beyond these, there were other
8
9 key factors specific to social entrepreneurship that emerged. Among these, there was clear evidence
10
11 of altruistic drivers of social entrepreneurship among participants, and sometimes these were deeply
12
13 personal. R8 for example, had experienced violence and bereavement in her family and was acutely
14
15 aware of the lack of support available, which then spurred her to start a social enterprise focused in
16
17 this area. She explains:
18
19

20
21 *"We got started because our family went through a trauma and we realised that there was no support*
22
23 *services to help people at the stage that they needed the help"* (R8).
24
25

26
27 R4 was similarly idiosyncratically influenced. He made a direct connection between his social
28
29 entrepreneurship and his experience of becoming ill in Nepal from drinking dirty water. He felt
30
31 fortunate to be able to come home and use the NHS, and so he wanted to help those in Nepal who
32
33 were less fortunate. In another example, R3's experiences as a child shaped his motivation to start a
34
35 social enterprise that delivers employment skills training for ex-offenders. His testimony is illustrative:
36
37

38
39 *"My stepfather was in prison repeatedly... So yes, it's probably deeply personal and sort of strange*
40
41 *solution to solving my own problem"* (R3).
42
43

44
45 Some participants' motivations were more ideological. R10's primary motives, for example, were
46
47 based on changing current structures in place in the support of the third sector itself. Influenced by
48
49 her previous experiences, she explains:
50
51

52
53 *"It was, and it still is, trying to create an alternative to mainstream supply streams. I think in the*
54
55 *UK particular it [business support] is just an example of sort of the worst of capitalism."*(R10).
56
57

58
59 R10 expresses here a personal and values-based mission to contribute to the social and charity sectors
60
in the face of the commercial market system that she feels ideologically opposed to.

1
2
3 These examples testify to the fact that, for some, the desirability of social entrepreneurship was
4 informed by personally-meaningful mission, including compassion and altruism. But this was not
5 consistently the case. R6, for example, started an artisan bakery social enterprise and explains her
6 motives thus:
7
8
9

10
11
12 *“We have an adult autistic son... We decided that we were changing how we were doing things,*
13 *changing our lifestyle. We were motivated by doing something that we could do with our son” (R6).*
14

15
16
17 In this case the motivation was not underpinned by a particular concern about bread quality or
18 manufacture (ie., the social outcomes of the social business itself). Instead, the motivation here was
19 the opportunity to provide employment and support for this family in the context of their specific
20 circumstances.
21
22

23
24
25 Elsewhere, there was some evidence it that it was the alternative business model of social
26 entrepreneurship itself that was the main driver. Several participants had identified a commercial
27 business opportunity but had chosen a social enterprise business model as they believed it aligned
28 with their values better than traditional business models. The testimonies of R11 and R12 are
29 illustrative:
30
31
32

33
34
35 *“We said from the get-go that we wanted to work in an ethical way, and I think it’s a really*
36 *good business model” (R11);*
37

38
39
40 *“I needed to make a living... and I really liked the model that was emerging at that point which was*
41 *social enterprise” (R12).*
42

43
44
45 In these cases, the social entrepreneurship was influenced by values, but not necessarily underpinned
46 by a personal or experiential mission.
47

48
49
50 Departing further still from the influence of personal and ideological drivers, R1 had started her
51 business with the general desire to create a social enterprise, but without any particular social mission.
52

53
54
55 Pragmatically – indeed, entrepreneurially – she had systematically explored the environment for a
56 feasible opportunity:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “I put out a community survey and asked people what they wanted... The survey came back about co-
4 working, and physical activity and group activity. So, I’ve written a business plan based on that.” (R1).
5
6
7

8 In this case, R1 was not a social entrepreneur in response to a specific personal or ideological altruism,
9 but instead sought to be a social entrepreneur and *thereafter* scanned for an opportunity to that end.
10
11

12
13 Broadly, therefore, there was evidence of participants driven by altruism in this sample, but this was
14 observed along a spectrum, with some in the sample placing more importance on the business
15 opportunity identified than by a specific personally-driven social mission or the needs of particular
16 beneficiaries. For some in the sample it would appear that they were motivated to entrepreneurship
17 similar to commercial entrepreneurs but with some key personal or ideological underpinning. In some
18 of these cases, the motivation was to become a social entrepreneur, either because it aligned with the
19 values of the participants, as for R11 and R12, or because it facilitated some other opportunity, as for
20 R6’s family. For R11 and R12 the socially contributory idea came first and the choice of business model
21 followed. For R6 on the other hand, the business model came first and the social contribution
22 opportunity was identified afterwards. Departing further from normative understanding, R1 actively
23 sought to be a social entrepreneur and thereafter systematically investigated ways by which she might
24 achieve this.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Are contextual factors evidenced in the drivers of social entrepreneurship?*
41

42 Again, Appendix 1 provides elaborated data, but summary outcomes include that context emerged as
43 a strong influence on the process of creating the social enterprises in this sample. First, the particularly
44 supportive environment in Scotland does seem to have played a part in terms of the feasibility
45 perceived among participants. There was broad consensus that a strong supportive social context
46 exists within Scotland, with all participants expressing praise for its support of social entrepreneurship
47 and the opportunities available for those wishing to engage in social business venturing. Related to
48 this, seven out of the twelve social entrepreneurs in the sample were not originally from Scotland and
49 among these were references to having been attracted there for social entrepreneurship specifically.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 R6, for example, originally from Australia, stated explicitly that once she had identified the opportunity
4 to start the bakery social enterprise, she moved to Scotland because of the availability of funding
5 there. R3 shared a similar story, she moved from London to Glasgow, as she perceived Glasgow to
6 have fewer competitors and cheaper start-up costs. Therefore, in these cases, Scotland was the
7 pragmatically selected location for the social enterprise.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 The second notable evidence of the impact of context was that every participant replied in the
16 affirmative to the question about a precipitating event. These are presented in Table 2. Responses
17 varied enormously, from specific personal issues, as experienced by R3 and R4 for example, to broader
18 references to compassion, ideology or values, such as R7 and R11 who wished to conduct their
19 businesses in an ethical way. They included also quite pragmatic spurs, such as having an opportunity
20 to create a subsidiary business, as was the case for R9 who subsequently chose to operate it as a social
21 enterprise, or to manage work and life after becoming ill, as was the case for R12, who also elected to
22 start-up via a social enterprise business model.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The specific circumstances of each social entrepreneur in the sample were found further to be
34 influential too. For some there was reference to the supportive social enterprise community. Previous
35 experiences, and a social entrepreneur's human and social capital were also observably influential.
36
37
38 R3, for example saw her business background as central to her social entrepreneurship:
39
40

41
42
43 *"My talent is for numbers and for understanding the market and being quite adept at business. I see*
44 *my role as growing a business, and that business is as fiercely competitive and determined as the next*
45 *one" (R3).*
46
47
48

49
50 R1 similarly drew from her previous business experience:

51
52
53 *"I've started a business before so I had enough skills in terms of what is required to run your own*
54 *business. And when I discovered social enterprises, business savviness combined with the social aims...*
55 *the model was really perfect" (R1).*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Several in the sample had previous work experience specifically in other social enterprises and social
4
5 enterprise support organisations. For those with this experience, they were able to apply skills and
6
7 knowledge learned to their social enterprise, as well as draw upon their existing networks.
8
9

10
11 Alongside business and social enterprise-specific experiences and circumstances were also all the
12
13 other contextual influences identified already – those circumstances that led to the personal or
14
15 ideological mission, or the values-based preference for a social enterprise business model, or even the
16
17 pursuit of social entrepreneurship for other reasons. Each and all point to an agent acting in context,
18
19 with this interaction influencing both the desirability and the feasibility for social entrepreneurship for
20
21 these individuals.
22
23

24
25 In all cases explored, whether relating to personal or business experiences, the contexts of the social
26
27 entrepreneurs in this sample, their experiences and circumstances, had influenced and continued to
28
29 influence the motivation to become a social entrepreneur. With reference to EET theory, each
30
31 respondent was also able to identify particular key factors – entrepreneurial displacement events –
32
33 that had acted as triggers to their engagement in social entrepreneurship. Some were personal, others
34
35 more broadly values-based, others less so, but underpinned by antecedent desirability and feasibility,
36
37 all prompted action. Thus, contextual influences were observable as antecedents in all of the life
38
39 histories of participants in this research and their motivations could not be understood separate from
40
41 these.
42
43
44

45 **Discussion**

46
47 Results in this research suggest that motivations for social entrepreneurship are highly complex,
48
49 involving personal values and experiences, backgrounds and circumstances of individuals. Altruism
50
51 and compassion, much-asserted virtues of social entrepreneurship, were clearly evidenced, but were
52
53 certainly not the only drivers. Other, more classic entrepreneurship drivers were observed too,
54
55 including that even the opportunity may be systematically identified – as was the case for R1. This
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suggests that drivers of social entrepreneurship, while involving altruism and compassion, do so in a
4
5 complex and inconsistent way.
6

7
8 Table 2 summarizes key information that emerged from the narrative testimonies in terms of the
9
10 antecedents to participants' social entrepreneurship. First, two clear modes of motivation emerged
11
12 among this sample of social entrepreneurs. These are labelled P and B in Table 2 to signal *personally*
13
14 *informed mission* (P) and ideological preference for the social enterprise *business model* (B). In this
15
16 latter type, some broad ideological opposition to commercial forms of business and capitalism may
17
18 spur social entrepreneurship, with specific cause less of a prompt than the attraction of an alternative
19
20 business model. These findings complement evidence from Yitshaki and Kropp (2016) suggesting,
21
22 among other factors, ideological motivation as a key factor for becoming a social entrepreneur. There
23
24 is additional evidence, notably from R1 and R6 in our sample, that the motivation to become a social
25
26 entrepreneur can also precede identification of the specific opportunity. Consequently, supporting
27
28 Zahra *et al.* (2009) and Tucker *et al.* (2019), we find that the identification for social entrepreneurship
29
30 opportunity *can* resonate with that for commercial entrepreneurship, in that a broadly interpreted
31
32 mission to engage in an ethically-informed cause through social entrepreneurship may be the driver
33
34 and *thereafter* a specific focus is sought.
35
36
37
38

39
40 In each interview, clear precipitating events were identifiable too, critical events that catalyzed
41
42 actions, but which were informed also by the cumulative effects of background and experiences. Table
43
44 2 shows the displacement events identified and reported by each participant. These findings support
45
46 findings in Dickel *et al.* (2020) on 'critical incidents', suggesting childhood experiences can provide a
47
48 positive influence in social entrepreneurial intentions, and we extend this further to include critical
49
50 events later in life too.
51
52

53
54 Other findings that mirror commercial entrepreneurship include the processes of realizing the social
55
56 entrepreneurship observed. To elaborate, Scotland has a highly supportive and well developed
57
58 institutional framework for the development and sustainability of social enterprises. This
59
60 infrastructure is internationally celebrated and has been described as the best in the world. It is

1
2
3 unlikely to be coincidental therefore that more than half of the social entrepreneurs in this sample did
4
5 not come from Scotland, and instead had moved there in order to pursue their values-based mission.
6
7 While the social issues with which the social enterprises included in the sample engaged were not
8
9 peculiarly Scottish, the social entrepreneurship – the engagement with the cause and the contribution
10
11 to social value – was being played out in a Scottish context. While this does not preclude altruism and
12
13 values, it does suggest influence on the feasibility of engaging in social issues via an environment
14
15 where that will be enabled and supported as per Urban and Kujinga (2017). We contend that this
16
17 resonates clearly with classic notions of entrepreneurialism. More broadly, analysis supports the
18
19 contention in Yitshaki and Kropp (2016), that context is an influence on social entrepreneurship, as
20
21 it is in commercial entrepreneurship. In this study, motivations were observed to be influenced by
22
23 myriad factors, including agential, emotional and values-based ones, influenced by circumstances, and
24
25 other contextual factors such as the capitals of the social entrepreneurs, their backgrounds and their
26
27 experiences.
28
29
30
31

32 *Implications for theory*

33
34 From a theoretical perspective, by viewing the findings of this research through an EET lens, there is
35
36 evidence of the nuances to perceived desirability and perceived feasibility added by Mair and Noboa
37
38 (2006). In terms of *perceived desirability*, as extrapolated in Appendix 1, we find evidence of empathy
39
40 and compassion emanating from previous personal experiences. Additionally, personal moral values
41
42 were observed to play a strong part in the formation of motivations to start a social enterprise, notably
43
44 a desire to operate business ethically, alongside more traditional factors such as autonomy, flexibility
45
46 and desire for income.
47
48
49

50
51 In terms of *perceived feasibility*, as per Hockerts (2017) we find previous experience enables the
52
53 perceived feasibility of some in the sample. We also find the influence of the availability of social
54
55 support, as added by Mair and Noboa, relating to national support from government and other
56
57 support organisations. Again, evidence of this is extrapolated in Appendix 1. Departing from Mair and
58
59
60

1
2
3 Noboa (2006) though, this research does find evidence of precipitating events as key influences of
4 social entrepreneurship, as detailed in Table 2. As such, we propose development of Mair and Noboa's
5 adapted EET model as shown in Figure 2.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2 here

This revised model of social entrepreneurship intentions takes account of drivers of social entrepreneurship that set it apart from commercial entrepreneurship, but allows that these might be mission-based in ways that include both personally-meaningful and also more opaque forms of social contribution. We assert that EET is a useful lens through which to view social entrepreneurship drivers, and that Mair and Noboa's work refines this for social entrepreneurship. We go a step further though and add two further elements. First, we assert context remains a key antecedent to perceived desirability and the wider circumstances of a social entrepreneur's experiences, skills, and capitals are as much an influence on social entrepreneurship motivations as any other type. Second, we observe in this research that precipitating events, as per the original EET theory, still prevail as drivers of social entrepreneurship, but that they may be flavoured by a particularly social or personal experience or ideological position. Thus rather than understand social entrepreneurship as entirely values-driven and agential, the developed EET presented in Figure 2 affords us a more nuanced view of the influence of social and personal antecedents to the pursuit of social entrepreneurship.

Implications for practice and support

Findings here evidence that the drivers of social entrepreneurship are myriad and complex, and while they may involve compassion and mission, in fact these are not mandated and in isolation are unlikely to be sufficient for social enterprise creation and operation. Other drivers, including contextual ones, are clearly implicated as important too. A central feature for more than half of our small sample was the attractiveness of the institutional environment, including the support available. This illustrates that policy and support can be instrumental in terms of the perceived feasibility of social entrepreneurship. Where there is specific need not met by market provision, the fostering of an

environment conducive to social enterprise-based alternatives might be fruitful. In addition, the evidence in this research that the choice of social enterprise business model may be as strategically generated as values-based has implications in terms of support for such enterprises. It certainly suggests a heterogeneity amongst practitioners, in turn implying variation in support, training, and resourcing needs.

Conclusion

This paper concludes with the observation of two types of key drivers of social entrepreneurship. For some the driver was a personal, social or philanthropic mission, pre-identified as a social entrepreneurship cause and opportunity. For others the driver was the social enterprise business model, used to conduct commercial business in a socially and ethically-informed way, and within this group was evidence of social entrepreneurship involving scanning the environment for an opportunity just as a commercial entrepreneur would. In all cases, empathy and values were observable, as per Mair and Noboa's refinements to EET theory in terms of perceived desirability, but this altruism was inconsistently expressed, pointing to a heterogeneity of social entrepreneurship motivations, rather than a common type. Certainly, the choice of some of the social entrepreneurs in this research to locate in the social enterprise-friendly environment of Scotland is suggestive of a social entrepreneurship process that is calculated and strategic rather than emotional and responsive – though these are not mutually exclusive. Further, in terms of motivations, it is clear that some participants had started their social enterprise to respond to a personally-informed cause while others had scanned the environment to find one. Thus, while social mission and values did appear to have an influence on drivers, their expression was observably strategic in some cases, and this has implications for further research on the things that motivate those who would make social contribution through social entrepreneurship. In addition, further exploration of the critical events that spur social entrepreneurship is likely to be revealing, particularly where these are understood in terms of the

1
2
3 social and personal circumstances of the individuals who start social enterprises and the social
4 contexts in which they operate.
5
6
7

8 The research reported in this paper has some key limitations. Common to small qualitative studies,
9 data relates to a particular environment and is not generalizable. In addition, methodological
10 approaches to both sampling and analysis do not eliminate the risk of subjective interpretation or bias
11 regardless of the measures taken to mitigate these. Further, the paper cannot claim to have exhausted
12 the possibilities of scrutiny of extant knowledge and theory. Notwithstanding these limitations
13 though, we propose three key contributions of our work. First, we provide evidence that non-altruistic
14 drivers of social entrepreneurship are possible and observable. Second, we demonstrate that
15 motivations for social entrepreneurship include both agency and context and in fact arise as an
16 embedded process amongst agents and their circumstances. Third, influenced by the findings and
17 analysis in this study, we propose a refined EET for social entrepreneurship. This includes the
18 importance of context, and in particular, reinstates Shapero and Sokol's *precipitating event* as central
19 in the theory.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.50, No.2, pp.179-211.
- Amit, R. and Muller, E. (1995), "'Push' and 'pull' entrepreneurship", *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, Vol.12 No. 4, pp.64-80
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006), "Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.30, No.1, pp. 1-22.
- Bacq, S. and Alt, E. (2018), "Feeling capable and valued: a prosocial perspective on the link between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 33, No.3, pp. 333-350.
- Bandura, A. (1977), "Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, pp. 191-215.
- Bertaux, D. (1981), *Biography and Society: the Life History Approach in the Social Sciences*, Sage, London.
- Brieger, S.A. and De Clerq, D. (2019), "Entrepreneurs' individual-level resources and social value creation goals: the moderating role of cultural context", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 193-216.
- Carsrud, A. and Brännback, M. (2011). "Entrepreneurial motivations: what do we still need to know?", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol.39, No. 1, pp.9-26.
- Certo, S. T. and Miller, T. (2008), "Social entrepreneurship: key issues and concepts", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp.267-271.
- Dawson, C. and Henley, A. (2012), "'Push' versus 'pull' entrepreneurship: an ambiguous distinction?" *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp.697-719.

- 1
2
3 Dey, P. and Lehner, O. (2017), "Registering ideology in the creation of social entrepreneurs:
4 intermediary organizations 'ideal subject' and the promise of enjoyment", *Journal of Business Ethics*,
5 Vol.142, No.4, pp. 753-767.
6
7
8
9
10 Dey, P. and Steyaert, C. (2016), "Rethinking the space of ethics in social entrepreneurship: power,
11 subjectivity, and practices of freedom", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.133, No 4, pp. 627-641.
12
13
14
15 Dickel, P., Sienknecht, M. and Hörisch, J. (2020), "The early bird catches the worm: an empirical
16 analysis of imprinting in social entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Economics*,
17 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11573-020-00969-z>
18
19
20
21
22
23 Duncan, E. (2009), *A Grounded Theory Study on Social Entrepreneurship: comparison of Traditional*
24 *and Social Entrepreneurial Nonprofit Model*, Lambert Academic, Koln.
25
26
27
28 Ernst, K.K. (2011), *Heart over Mind: an Empirical Analysis of Social Entrepreneurial Intention Formation*
29 *on the Basis of the Theory of Planned Behaviour*, Doctoral thesis, Schumpeter School of Business and
30 Economics, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal.
31
32
33
34
35 Gartner, W.B. (2010), "A new path to the waterfall: a narrative on a use of entrepreneurial narrative",
36 *International Small Business Journal*, Vol.28, No. 1, pp.6–19.
37
38
39
40 Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J. and Miller, T. L. (2013), "Studying the origins of social
41 entrepreneurship: compassion and the role of embedded agency", *Academy of Management*
42 *Review*, Vol.38, No.3, pp.460-463.
43
44
45
46
47 Germak, A. J. and Robinson, J.A. (2014), "Exploring the motivation of nascent social
48 entrepreneurs", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol.5, No 1, pp.5-21.
49
50
51
52 Hockerts, K. (2017), "Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and*
53 *Practice*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.105-130.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hu, X., Marlow, S., Zimmermann, A., Martin, L. and Frank, R. (2020), "Understanding Opportunities in
4 Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Realist Abstraction", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Vol.
5 44, No. 5, pp.1032-1056.
6
7
8
9
10 Jenner, P. (2016), "The role of the intermediary in social enterprise sustainability: an international
11 comparative study", *Journal of New Business Ideas & Trends*, Vol.14, No. 1, pp.23-39.
12
13
14 Kautonen, T., Gelderen, M. and Fink, M. (2015), "Robustness of the theory of planned behavior in
15 predicting entrepreneurial intentions and actions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 39,
16 No. 3, pp.655-674.
17
18
19
20
21
22 Kimmitt, J. and Muñoz, P. (2018), "Sensemaking the 'social' in social entrepreneurship", *International*
23 *Small Business Journal*, Vol. 36, No.8, pp.859-886.
24
25
26
27 King, N. and Brookes, J.M. (2016), *Template Analysis for Business and Management Students*, Sage,
28 London.
29
30
31
32 Korsgaard, S. and Anderson, A.R. (2011), "Enacting entrepreneurship as social value creation",
33 *International Small Business Journal*, Vol.29, pp.135-151.
34
35
36
37 Kruse, P., Wach, D., Costa, S. and Moriano, J. A. (2019), "Values matter, don't they?: combining theory
38 of planned behavior and personal values as predictors of social entrepreneurial intention", *Journal*
39 *of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol.10, No.1, pp: 55-83.
40
41
42
43
44 Kruse, P. (2020), "Can there be only one?: an empirical comparison of four models on social
45 entrepreneurial intention formation", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*.
46 Vol.16, pp.641-665.
47
48
49
50
51 Lee, R. and Jones, O. (2015), "Entrepreneurial social capital research: resolving the structure and
52 agency dualism", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol.21, No. 3,
53 pp.338-363.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lehner, O.M. and Germak, A.J. (2014), "Antecedents of social entrepreneurship: between public
4 service motivation and the need for achievement", *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*
5 *and Innovation*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.214-229.
6
7
8
9
10 Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., and Hackett, G. (1994), "Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career
11 and academic interest, choice, and performance", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol.45, No.1,
12 pp.79-122.
13
14
15
16
17 Maalaoui, A., Tornikoski, E., Partouche-Sebban, J. and Safraou, I. (2020), "Why some third age
18 individuals develop entrepreneurial intentions: exploring the psychological effects of
19 posterity", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol.58, No. 3, pp. 447-473.
20
21
22
23
24
25 Mair, J., and Noboa, E. (2006), "Social entrepreneurship: how intentions to create a social venture are
26 formed", in Mair, J., Robinson, J. and Hockerts, K. (Eds), *Social Entrepreneurship*, Palgrave Macmillan,
27 London, pp.121-135.
28
29
30
31
32 McCarthy PT, O'Riordan, C. and Griffin, R. (2014), "The other end of entrepreneurship: a narrative
33 study of insolvency practice in Ireland", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior &*
34 *Research*, Vol.20, No. 2, pp.173-192.
35
36
37
38
39 Miller, T. L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. and Vogus, T.J. (2012), "Venturing for others with heart and
40 head: how compassion encourages social entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.
41 37, No. 4, pp.616-640.
42
43
44
45
46 Newth, J. (2018), "Hands-on vs arm's length entrepreneurship research: using ethnography to
47 contextualise social innovation", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*,
48 Vol.24, No.3, pp.683-696.
49
50
51
52
53 Petrovskaya, I. and Mirakyan, A. (2018), "A mission of service: social entrepreneur as a servant leader",
54 *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 755-767.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schlaegel, C. and Koenig, M. (2014), "Determinants of entrepreneurial intent: a meta-analytic test and
4 integration of competing models", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.291-332.
5
6
7
8 Scottish Government (2016), "Scotland's social enterprise strategy 2016-2026", available at:
9 <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-social-enterprise-strategy-2016-2026/> (accessed 11
10 November 2020).
11
12
13
14
15 Scottish Government (2020) "Third Sector", available at [https://www.gov.scot/policies/third-](https://www.gov.scot/policies/third-sector/social-enterprises/)
16 [sector/social-enterprises/](https://www.gov.scot/policies/third-sector/social-enterprises/) (accessed 23 October 2020).
17
18
19
20
21 Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000), "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research", *The*
22 *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp.217-226.
23
24
25
26 Shapero, A. and Sokol, L. (1982), "The social dimensions of entrepreneurship" in: Kent, C. A., Sexton,
27 D. L. and Vesper, K. H. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs,
28 pp. 72-90.
29
30
31
32
33 Smith, C., and Elger, T. (2014), "Critical realism and interviewing subjects", in Edwards, P.K.,
34 O'Mahoney, J. and Vincent, S. (eds.) *Studying Organizations Using Critical Realism*, Oxford University
35 Press, Oxford.
36
37
38
39
40 Social Value Lab. (2019), "Social Enterprise in Scotland- Census 2019", available at:
41 <https://socialenterprisecensus.org.uk/wp-content/themes/census19/pdf/2019-report.pdf>
42 (Accessed 12 November 2020).
43
44
45
46
47 Stake, R. E. (1995), *The Art of Case Study Research*, Sage Publications, London.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L. M. and Stride, C. (2015), "Institutions and social entrepreneurship: the role of
institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations", *Journal of International*
Business Studies, Vol.46, No.3, pp. 308-331.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G. and Lees, A. (2000), "Social entrepreneurship: a new look at the people and the
potential", *Management Decision*, Vol.38, No. 5, pp.328-338.

- 1
2
3 Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K. and Tikoria, J. (2017), "The role of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on
4 social entrepreneurial attitudes and social entrepreneurial intentions", *Journal of Social*
5 *Entrepreneurship*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.165-185.
6
7
8
9
10 Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K. and Tikoria, J. (2020). "Mediating role of prosocial motivation in predicting social
11 entrepreneurial intentions", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol.1, No 24,
12 DOI: [10.1080/19420676.2020.1755993](https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2020.1755993)
13
14
15
16
17
18 Tran, A. T. and Von Korflesch, H. (2016), "A conceptual model of social entrepreneurial intention based
19 on the social cognitive career theory", *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*,
20 Vol.10, No.1, pp.17-38.
21
22
23
24
25 Tucker, R., Croom, R.M. and Bacq, S. (2019), "Feeling your pain, pursuing my gain: assessing status-
26 striving, empathy, and social entrepreneurship intent", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.12,
27 e00142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2019.e00142>
28
29
30
31
32 Urban, B. and Kujinga, L. (2017), "The institutional environment and social entrepreneurship
33 intentions", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. Vol.23, No.4, pp.638-655.
34
35
36
37 Verduijn, K., Dey, P., Tedmanson, D. and Essers, C. (2014), "Emancipation and/or oppression?
38 Conceptualizing dimensions of criticality in entrepreneurship studies", *International Journal of*
39 *Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol.20, No. 2, pp.98-107.
40
41
42
43
44 Waring, T. and Wainwright, D. (2008), "Issues and challenges in the use of template analysis: two
45 comparative case studies from the field", *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, Vol.6,
46 No. 1, pp.85-94.
47
48
49
50
51 Yitshaki, R. and Kropp, F. (2016), "Motivations and opportunity recognition of social
52 entrepreneurs", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol.54, No. 2, pp.546-565.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. and Shulman, J. (2009), "A typology of social entrepreneurs:
4 motives, search processes and ethical challenges", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.24, No. 5,
5
6 pp.519-532.
7
8
9

10 Zahra, S. A., Rawhouser, H.N., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D.O. and Hayton, J.C. (2008), "Globalization of
11 social entrepreneurship opportunities", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol.2, No. 2, pp.117-
12
13 131.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Sample Information

Respondent	Age	Gender	Sourced via SSE or Network	Business	Social Mission	Employees
R1	30-40	Female	SSE	Coworking space	Community support	4
R2	30-40	Male	Network	Food and Drink	Health	55
R3	30-40	Male	SSE	Food and Drink	Employment for ex prisoners	4
R4	30-40	Male	Network	Food and Drink	Clean water in Nepal	7
R5	41-50	Male	SSE	Psychology	Mental health	3
R6	41-50	Female	SSE	Food and Drink	Health	4
R7	41-50	Female	Network	Coworking space	Supporting arts and community	16
R8	41-50	Female	Network	Media	Mental health	3
R9	51-60	Male	SSE	Housing	Community support	6
R10	51-60	Female	Network	Coworking space	Social Enterprise Support	16
R11	30-40	Female	Network	Housing	Community support	20
R12	30-40	Female	Network	Horticulture	Work skills for disadvantaged groups	7


Table 2: Contextual backgrounds to social entrepreneurial motivations

Respondent	Business	Contextual Background	Precipitating Event	Social Mission
R1	Co-working space	B*	Worked for social enterprise support organisation and decided to start a social enterprise	Community support
R2	Food and Drink	B	Saw social enterprise as a means to generate income to fund charitable projects	Health
R3	Food and Drink	P**	Childhood experience of parental recidivism	Employment for ex-prisoners
R4	Food and Drink	P	Becoming ill in Nepal	Clean water in Nepal
R5	Psychology	P	Left previous employment due to an accident	Mental health
R6	Food and Drink	B	Having an autistic son	Health
R7	Co-working space	P	Artists' need for affordable studio space	Supporting arts and community
R8	Media	P	Family went through trauma and recognised lack of support from public services	Mental health
R9	Housing	B	Subsidiary of a commercial enterprise	Community support
R10	Co-working space	B	Worked in third sector and saw the need for people to have a place to network	Social Enterprise Support
R11	Housing	B	Wanted to start a business in an ethical way	Community support
R12	Horticulture	B	Left previous employment due to ill health	Work skills for disadvantaged groups

* B- ideological preference for social enterprise business model


**P-personal informed missions

Figure 1: Mair and Noboa (2006) Model of Social Entrepreneurial Intention.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2: Developed model of social entrepreneurship motives



Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research

Appendix 1: Hierarchical Analysis Examples of Social Entrepreneurship Motivations

Broad Theme	Sub-theme (1)	Sub- theme (2)	Sub- theme (3)	Evidence
Perceived desirability	Attitude towards the behaviour	Emotional and cognitive drivers	Empathy	<p>“I was in an international development project and... I got quite sick and I came back home and went to the doctor who gave me a prescription and I was fine. But for me that stayed with me because, it came to me through the notion that I could be born in the exact same time and date somewhere else and not have access to water and access to the NHS and access to common medications and my life would be very, very different.” (R4)</p>
				<p>“We realised that there was no support services to help people...Sowe decided that the best thing that we could do was to go from using the video production that we knew how to use, and combine it with a service that would actually help other people who found themselves in the same kind of situation as ourselves, and so what we did was we felt that the best way, the best thing that helped us was basically talking to other people who had gone through a similar thing.” (R8)</p>
			Moral judgement	<p>“We use the profits to invest into clean drinking water projects and that could be anything from well drilling to waterhole rehabilitation or wash projects around hygiene and sanitation... and so on. Lots of different stuff but the idea is basically that you drink beer and you give water, a philanthropic act through drinking beer.” (R4)</p>
				<p>“These are kids that don’t matter but they should matter to everyone in society” (R5)</p>
				<p>“We believe that we have a duty and a responsibility to support individuals, families in communities, in which are some of Scotland’s most disadvantaged areas.” (R9)</p>

1
2
3
4 “The basic background was that I wanted to make effective social change
5 happen.” (R10)
6

7
8 Personal values Business ideology Business model “When I discovered social enterprises, business savviness combined with the
9 social aims... the model was really perfect.” (R1)
10

11 “We said from the get-go that we wanted to work in an ethical way, and I think
12 it’s a really good business model because we want to provide social impact, but
13 to provide that social impact we need to be a working profitable company.”
14 (R11)
15

16 “It was, and it still is trying to create an alternative to mainstream supply streams.
17 I think in the UK particular it’s just an example of sort of the worst of
18 capitalism.” (R10)
19

20 “So [I] got interested in social enterprises, saw it as sort of a solution to doing a
21 lot of the good stuff that we were doing through charitable projects but in
22 a way, which brings in money as well.” (R2)
23

24 “I feel quite passionately that people deserve to be paid for their work, and they
25 deserve to be paid well, and I felt that at that moment social enterprises allowed
26 that. To deliver social benefit and provide a decent living for people, where those
27 involved were going to be paid properly for their contribution.”(R12).
28

29
30 Traditional factors Saw an opportunity “I put out a community survey and asked people what they wanted. I thought I
31 was going to build artist studios and do events, and then the survey came back
32 about co-working, and physical activity and group activity. So, I’ve written a
33 business plan based on that. Just kind of what people wanted locally” (R1).
34

35 “It was all about economics. It was going to be a lot cheaper starting up here and
36 a lot cheaper to live here, particularly if it all went wrong and I didn’t have any
37 income at the end of it. So there was a bit of risk aversion, it was a bit of...there’s
38 an opportunity here because I sort of saw the market as underdeveloped
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

				compared to where I lived before in London” (R3).
			Income	“So yeah, I needed to make a living... and I really liked the model that was emerging at that point which was social enterprise” (R12).
				“My talent is for numbers and for understanding the market and being quite adept at business. I see my role as growing a business, and that that business is as fiercely competitive and determined as the next one” (R3).
			Career alternative	“I wanted to change careers...I’d just finished in Cambridge then I ended up getting a job in a shop, packing up cardboard and chucking it into a dumpster. That was my work.” (R3)
				“I handed in my notice and I left and to be honest, I was happy to leave because I had got to a point where the manager and myself weren’t in a great place with each other.” (R10)
				“I actually missed working... and I was thinking of ways in which I could bring together my horticultural passion and passion for working with folk.” (R12)
			Flexibility	“So I’d previously been running a software development company, and we’re both programmers, both project managers. So we decided that we were changing what we were doing, changing our lifestyle.”(R6)
Perceived feasibility	Social support	Personal social support	Family	“The main resources I had were people who I had met who had either worked in the field already, or who had sort of transferrable experience, and it was very much predicated on small networks of people like that. So for example in London through a family connection I knew a guy that has quite a large food business.” (R3)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Local community “Well, I was quite involved in the local community, so I was the chair for a city council of a local senior school and had been involved in local primary school councils when my kids were younger, I was on their board of the local rugby club, so I had quite good community presence and relationships. So, that all helped, and I knew people in a local development trust... had good relationships there. I didn't really have any financial support at all, but I was able to tap in fairly quickly into community funds in a small scale and that got me started and that mean that somebody was willing to come on board.” (R12)

Friends

Wider social support Support organizations “I think that the landscape in Scotland at the moment and in the UK is quite open to social entrepreneurs. I think it's greater in Scotland than in England. As long as you have a clear and concise idea of what you want to do then you can get there.” (R11)

Funding availability “There's lots of opportunities financially I think and there's lots of money that's coming into the sector in terms of investment, which I think is unlike what it may have been 10 or 20 years ago for people who may have started out during earlier editions of social enterprises.” (R4)

Governmental support “I think social enterprises have opened up. I think there's more opportunities in social enterprise [in Scotland] than there is in private, commercial.” (R6).

Support from social enterprise network “I think the government has a fantastic strategic view of the importance of social enterprises and what they can contribute particularly in a time when you know there are big financial constraints nationally. And I think that the policies that come out of that are really great.” (R12)

“Scotland is a great place to be a social entrepreneur because there's all sorts of ecosystem support out there if you've got an idea.” (R10)

“I think Scotland's done a really good job to cultivate a very supportive social

1					enterprise network area...I think it's a really good culture here particularly in
2					social enterprises... I have to say credit to however that is, why ever that is. I
3					feel it's quite unique." (R1)
4					
5					
6					
7					
8		Previous work	Social enterprise	Support	"I worked for [social enterprise support organisations]. So, I did social enterprise
9		experience	and third sector	organisation	and health and community food. And then before that I worked for a big
10				employee	charity... and I set up a social enterprise through them."(R1)
11					
12					
13				Charity	"I came back to Glasgow and stuck with a charity and then the social enterprise,
14				employee	I'd only been out of university a couple of years so, I've got very little experience
15					with anything else." (R2)
16				Social enterprise	
17				employee	"I first started with [social enterprise] which is a café and restaurant in
18					Edinburgh...so, I got that exposure...and I wanted to contribute to something
19					that was quite personal to me." (R4)
20					
21					"I've worked in the third sector my whole life. I understand that things happen
22					because of relationships that people have." (R10)
23					
24	Contextual	Precipitating	Past personal	Childhood	"My stepfather was in prison repeatedly...what I wanted was stability and to do
25	background	event	event	trauma	well... So yes, it's [starting a social enterprise] probably deeply personal and sort
26					of strange solution to solving my own problem" (R3).
27					
28					
29				Family trauma	"We got started because our family went through a trauma and we realised that
30					there was no support services to help people at the stage that they needed the
31					help" (R8).
32					
33				Health problems	"I wanted to contribute to something that was quite personal to me, I was affected
34					by the lack of clean water access. I was sort of affected by that when I was in
35					Nepal when I was younger." (R4)
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

On-going
personal event

Caring
responsibilities

“We have an adult autistic son... We decided that we were changing what we were doing, changing our lifestyle. We were motivated by doing something that we could do with our son.” (R3).