

DEVELOPING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND SOCIAL INNOVATORS:

A SOCIAL IDENTITY AND SELF-EFFICACY APPROACH

ISAAC H. SMITH

University of Utah

David Eccles School of Business

1655 East Campus Center Drive

Spencer Fox Eccles Business Building, Room 1113

Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Telephone: (801) 518-2991

e-mail: isaac.smith@business.utah.edu

WARNER P. WOODWORTH

Brigham Young University

Marriott School of Management

568 TNRB

Provo, Utah 84602

Telephone: (801) 422-6834

e-mail: warner_woodworth@byu.edu

We would like to thank Associate Editor Thomas Lawrence and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions. We are also grateful to David Kryscynski and participants of the Organizational Leadership and Strategy Research Seminar at Brigham Young University for their advice on an earlier version of this article. And a special thanks to the thousands of students who have dedicated their time, effort, and passion to social entrepreneurship and social innovation.

DEVELOPING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND SOCIAL INNOVATORS: A SOCIAL IDENTITY AND SELF-EFFICACY APPROACH

ABSTRACT

Training social entrepreneurs and social innovators is becoming increasingly prevalent in business schools throughout the world, highlighting the need for effective pedagogical strategies. Drawing on *social identity theory* and research on *self-efficacy*, we present a *social identity and self-efficacy approach* to social entrepreneurship education that focuses on helping students develop an identity as a social entrepreneur and gain confidence in their ability to actually effectuate positive social change. We share examples of pedagogical devices and related content that have been used in the classroom to reinforce such an approach, and we offer four case examples that demonstrate the significant impact that group social entrepreneurship projects can have on both students and society. We also identify—and offer suggestions for overcoming—many of the potential challenges faced when attempting to teach social entrepreneurship and innovation in a university setting.

In addition to teaching relevant concepts, strategies, and theories, social entrepreneurship and social innovation education has the opportunity to actually *develop* social entrepreneurs and innovators. Students can be given the opportunity to actually *become* social entrepreneurs, learning to see themselves as capable social innovators. As more and more business schools begin to offer courses and training in this emerging area, identifying a variety of effective pedagogical approaches will become increasingly important for business education in particular and society in general.

Roughly two decades ago, Brigham Young University's Marriott School of Management began offering a new course that is now called "Becoming a Global Change Agent/Social Entrepreneur." Simply stated, the course objective is to empower students with a vision of how they can take initiative to address real societal problems. In the ensuing decades, as an outgrowth of the course, dozens of cooperatives and social enterprises have been established; 22 course projects have led to the creation of 501(c)3 non-profit organizations that are formally registered—operating in over 30 countries; thousands of micro businesses have received funding, training, or other support; and over 3,000 students have voluntarily utilized their skills and innovation throughout the world. As a result of the course, a diverse set of initiatives and projects have been undertaken, including micro-lending initiatives in the U.S. and abroad, entrepreneurial training in the Philippines, agricultural innovations in Brazil, and a tsunami-relief effort in Thailand. In 2010 alone, over \$36 million was raised to support projects and organizations that originally sprouted from the course.

The overriding approach of this course has been two-fold: (1) to instill a *desire* in students to proactively help find solutions to critical social issues, and (2) to instill a *belief* in students that they have the ability to actually make a difference. In social psychological parlance,

the aim has been to help students discover their *identity* as social entrepreneurs/innovators and to develop *self-efficacy* related to impacting the world for the better. The purpose of this paper is to contribute to a greatly needed and emerging body of literature on social entrepreneurship education by outlining a conceptual approach and offering practical insights based on over two decades of trial-and-error classroom experience. In what follows, we first describe a *social identity and self-efficacy approach* for educating social entrepreneurs. Second, we share examples of pedagogical devices and related content that have been used in the classroom to reinforce such an approach—highlighting the importance of group projects. Third, we offer four case examples that demonstrate the significant positive impact that utilizing various types of group projects can have on students, as well as society. And finally, we identify—and offer suggestions for overcoming—many of the potential challenges faced when attempting to teach social entrepreneurship and innovation in a university setting.

THE SOCIAL IDENTITY AND SELF-EFFICACY APPROACH

The premise of a social identity and self-efficacy approach to social entrepreneurship education is based on the assumption that course instruction can be a catalyst that channels and enhances students' desires to make a difference in the world—helping them identify with the social entrepreneurship community and develop beliefs that they have the tools, abilities, and resources necessary to begin making a contribution. The goal is to have students leave the course with self-views that are reflected in statements such as, “I want to help tackle the world’s social ills *because that is who I am*,” “I can *be* a social entrepreneur,” and “I am confident that *I truly can make a difference* in the world, and I can begin right now.” We draw on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and research on self-efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1997) to provide a theoretical rationale for such an approach to developing social entrepreneurs and social

innovators.

Social Identity Theory

According to *social identity theory* (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people form social identities based on a sense of belonging to a certain social category (e.g., nationality, organization, religion, athletic team, etc.). The social category, in turn, becomes self-definitional, influencing a person's self-concept—as well as behavior—in terms of the defining characteristics of that category:

People have a repertoire of such discrete category memberships that vary in relative overall importance in the self-concept. Each of these memberships is represented in the individual member's mind as a social identity that both describes and prescribes one's attributes as a member of that group—that is, what one should think and feel, and how one should behave (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995: 259-260).

Self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) expands on the process in which people create a social identity, explaining how individuals depersonalize their self-concept and cognitively assimilate their own identity into that of an in-group prototype (Hogg & Terry, 2000). An individual's social identity is thus largely based on a sense of shared destiny, or fate, and a joint stake in future successes and failures (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

An identity approach to social entrepreneurship education, therefore, encourages the presentation of the social entrepreneurship community as a social category in which students can become active members. Students are given an opportunity to begin identifying with social entrepreneurs and innovators, and, consequently, develop desires consistent with that social identity (e.g., to make a positive contribution to society). Based on an integration of theoretical insights from social identity theory and two decades of experience teaching social

entrepreneurship in the classroom, we propose that educators can help facilitate the identification processes for students by defining the social category, giving examples of prototypical members and their characteristics, and providing opportunities for active engagement as members of the social entrepreneurship community.

Defining the Social Category

The first step to helping students identify with social entrepreneurship is to define it as a social category. Over the past two decades, social entrepreneurship has been conceptualized differently in the literature as either encompassing all attempts to create positive social change or being limited to income-generating endeavors with a social aim (Taylor & Phillips, 2007). Until a definitional consensus is reached, we follow Short, Moss, and Lumpkin's (2009) suggestion to define social entrepreneurship in broad terms, as proposed by Mair and Marti (2006; 37):

First, we view social entrepreneurship as a process of creating value by combining resources in new ways. Second, these resource combinations are intended primarily to explore and exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change or meeting social needs. And third, when viewed as a process, social entrepreneurship involves the offering of services and products but can also refer to the creation of new organizations.

Through a variety of pedagogical devices (several of which will be addressed below), educators can present students with a vision of social entrepreneurs and social innovators who devote their efforts—either individually or through the creation of organizations and enterprises—to finding and implementing novel solutions to society's problems, both large and small. One of the defining characteristics of this social category is the desire to help battle the world's social ills. Similar to the way that national origin can bind a people together, or how

support for the same athletic team can unite an otherwise disparate group of fans, simply desiring to innovatively effectuate positive social change in the world can be the basis for a social category with which nascent social entrepreneurs and innovators can begin to identify.

Prototypical Members and Characteristics

A second step to helping students identify with social entrepreneurship and innovation is to expose them to prototypical members of the social category and highlight the prototypical characteristics of those members. According to self-categorization theory, prototypes serve as a cognitive representation of the qualities and prescribed attributes of a given social group (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). These prototypes embody the group's features and characteristics that distinguish it from other groups, such as beliefs, desires, feelings, and actions (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

For students to identify with social entrepreneurship as a social category, prototypes can help them form mental representations of what it means to actually be a member of the category. Although there is not an exhaustive list of social entrepreneurial attributes, Dees (1998) describes social entrepreneurs in terms of five behavior-related characteristics: they serve as social-sector change agents by (1) adopting a mission to create/sustain social value; (2) recognizing and pursuing opportunities consistent with that mission; (3) engaging in continuous innovation and learning; (4) acting boldly despite potential resource limitations; and (5) exhibiting accountability to those being served and for outcomes that are created. It is important to note that these five characteristics can be exhibited by people with different talents, skill sets, dispositions, and backgrounds. As educators familiarize students with prototypical social entrepreneurs, they should emphasize that all students can uniquely display similar characteristics in their own distinctive ways. Prototypes thus represent general models to be emulated, not examples to be

followed with exactness (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). Exposing students to such prototypes can help them understand how their unique strengths and individual abilities can be utilized within the social entrepreneurship community.

Active Engagement

A third—and critical—step to helping students identify with social entrepreneurship and innovation is by providing opportunities for active engagement in projects that create social value. As students begin to participate in and experience efforts designed to feed the hungry, bring water and electricity to the impoverished, or provide financial capital to low-income entrepreneurs, the reality of their potential contribution as a member of the social entrepreneurship community can become increasingly salient. Brower (2011), for example, describes how service learning—a type of action learning where course content is deliberately integrated with community service—can help students better understand course material, increase cognitive abilities to reflect, identify and resolve unstructured problems, and establish or strengthen moral values. Thus, by employing service learning—or other types of action-oriented group projects—within a social entrepreneurship context, instructors can help students take initiative and actively engage in efforts that reinforce social entrepreneurship as a social category. As they participate in efforts striving to create social value, they will begin to develop their own identities as social entrepreneurs and innovators, characterized by a strong desire to implement solutions to pressing social problems. In sum, educators can help students develop into social entrepreneurs by defining the social category, exposing them to prototypical members and characteristics, and by providing them with opportunities to actively engage in social-value-creating projects. As students begin to identify with the social entrepreneurship community, they will also begin to develop a confidence and belief in their own abilities (i.e., self-efficacy) to

actually make a difference in the world.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a term used to describe “people’s beliefs in their capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives” (Wood & Bandura, 1989: 364). An individual with high *social entrepreneurial self-efficacy*—i.e., a belief in one’s ability to effectuate positive social change—will thus be more likely to engage, persist, and perform well in efforts that create social value. Focusing on the development of self-efficacy—specifically in the domain of social entrepreneurship—is thus an important strategy for those interested in educating social entrepreneurs.

Wood & Bandura (1989) proposed three processes—that we view as particularly relevant to social entrepreneurship education—by which an individual’s self-efficacy is influenced: (1) mastery experiences (i.e., personal success in past performance), (2) modeling (i.e., vicarious learning by observing others), and (3) social persuasion (i.e., realistic encouragement). We submit that formal education in a university setting can be an effective means of harnessing such processes to positively influence students’ perceptions of self-efficacy. Entrepreneurship education in MBA programs, for example, has been shown to increase student ratings of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino, 2007), which, in turn, leads to higher levels of entrepreneurial intentions (Zhao, Seibert, & Hills, 2005). Moreover, exposure to entrepreneurial role models has also been shown to increase entrepreneurial self-efficacy (BarNir, Watson, & Hutchins, 2011). We contend that educators of *social* entrepreneurship can similarly utilize the multiple mechanisms listed above to increase students’ perceptions of self-efficacy. By using a variety of pedagogical techniques and devices, in addition to helping students identify with social entrepreneurs, instructors can help students develop social

entrepreneurial self-efficacy as well. As a result, students will be more likely to actually engage in social entrepreneurial behavior. A simple model of this process is outlined in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES

We suggest that educators should thus focus on three primary mechanisms to help students develop an identity as a social entrepreneur (i.e., defining the social category, identifying prototypical members and their characteristics, and encouraging active engagement) and three mechanisms to help students build social entrepreneurial self-efficacy (i.e., modeling (vicarious learning), using social persuasion, and providing mastery experiences). Below, we describe several pedagogical techniques that have been used successfully in university classrooms to teach social entrepreneurship to undergraduate and MBA students by utilizing these six mechanisms. Table 1 summarizes the mechanisms that these each of these various pedagogical techniques target to influence students' social identities and self-efficacy.

Insert Table 1 about here

Many traditional techniques and assignments (i.e., readings, lectures, and cases) can be tailored to specifically focus on identity development (e.g., by defining the social category and identifying prototypical members and characteristics) and self-efficacy acquisition (e.g., through modeling and using social persuasion). Additionally, the use of a biography assignment can give students a more intimate opportunity to identify a specific prototypical member and vicariously learn from modeling. Most importantly, however, we encourage educators to incorporate group social entrepreneurship projects into their course curricula. We contend that

the most effective mechanism for helping students build identity is through active engagement, and the best way for students to develop self-efficacy is through mastery experiences. Group projects target these two influential mechanisms directly, thus playing a key role in successful social entrepreneurship education.

Used collectively, these pedagogical techniques can be holistically employed to help students actually develop into social entrepreneurs. Course instructors can coordinate the use of classroom instruction, activities, and assignments to reinforce one another—each targeting specific mechanisms designed to effect students’ social entrepreneurial identities and self-efficacy.

Readings, Lectures, Cases, & Biography Assignment

Consistent with their broad use in modern business school education, readings, lectures, and cases can be used effectively in social entrepreneurship education as well. As shown in Table 1, readings (e.g., Bornstein, 2004) and lectures are well-suited to lay the groundwork for helping students identify with social entrepreneurship by first, providing information that helps students define it as a social category, and second, giving examples of the social category’s prototypical members and their characteristics. Course reading assignments and lectures can also help students develop social entrepreneurial self-efficacy by modeling effective strategies and tools (i.e., vicarious learning) that have been used to benefit society. Additionally, case discussions can be used to build student identity and self-efficacy by providing contextualized examples of successful (or unsuccessful) social entrepreneurship. The case method is an effective means of eliciting student involvement, and it provides opportunities for students to apply relevant skills, knowledge, and concepts to solve problems (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011).

Importantly, instructors can use whatever content they select and whichever medium they

decide to employ (i.e., readings, lectures, and cases) to help students develop into social entrepreneurs by tailoring their instruction to specifically focus on the development of identity and self-efficacy. Specific content might include—but is certainly not limited to—the following four areas: social issues/problems, economic models, poverty-fighting strategies, and other theoretical approaches. First, course material can help broaden students’ perspectives related to the breadth and scope of social challenges facing both local and global communities, helping students identify areas where they can and want to make a positive contribution. Second, a variety of economic models can be introduced (e.g., capitalism, socialism, Social Darwinism, etc.), providing students with a broader context from which to view social issues. Third, pros and cons of various poverty-alleviation strategies might be explored, including microfinance, microfranchising, base-of-the-pyramid, foreign aid, and social enterprise creation. Finally, students can also be introduced to a variety of other theoretical approaches and tools, such as action research, positive deviance, and appreciative inquiry.

In addition to course content, one out-of-class assignment that can help students identify with social entrepreneurship and further develop self-efficacy is to assign students to write an in-depth paper about a social entrepreneur. This biography assignment is designed to help students better understand what makes such people “tick.” What are they like? How did they become change agents? What made them successful? Students are encouraged to contact and request a short interview with social entrepreneurs that are still alive or rely on secondary sources if they are deceased. The biography assignment helps students identify with an actual social entrepreneur on a more personal level, and it can help students learn more specific lessons, techniques, and strategies that can lead to successful social outcomes. As reflected in Table 1, readings, lectures, cases, and the biography assignments can all be deliberately used and adapted

by course instructors to help students begin to identify with social entrepreneurship and develop self-efficacy. They also prepare students with the knowledge and skills necessary for successfully engaging in a group social entrepreneurship project.

Group Social Entrepreneurship Project

One of the most powerful pedagogical devices for developing social entrepreneurs is to help and encourage students to actually engage in a social entrepreneurship project. Whereas readings, lectures, cases, and the biography assignment help students define social entrepreneurship as a social category, identify prototypical members, learn vicariously from models, and receive encouragement, the group project gives them the opportunity to actively engage in social entrepreneurship mastery experiences—which helps solidify their social identity and self-efficacy. Students can be given the opportunity to work on a group social entrepreneurship project in any of a variety of ways, including (1) a *crisis-response* project aimed at collectively responding to a major crisis (e.g., a natural disaster) as a class, (2) a *student-initiated* group project (e.g., starting a social enterprise), (3) an *instructor-initiated* project presented to a group or a class, or (4) a *student consulting* project in partnership with a non-governmental organization (NGO) or other existing social enterprise.

The primary purpose of these projects, as depicted in Table 1, is to encourage students to actively engage in activities as members of the social entrepreneurship community and to provide them with opportunities to effectively put their skills to practice. A recent meta-analysis found significant positive relationships between service-learning in general (of which group social entrepreneurship projects are an example) and both skill development and students' self-perceptions—specifically related to identity and self-efficacy (Yorio & Ye, 2012). By participating in service-related activities with and for others, students receive self-revealing

information through social interactions that influence their self-definition (Rhodes, 1997). As they learn to take initiative and actively engage in implementing social solutions, students will more fully identify with the social entrepreneurship community. And as they see the positive social impact that their successful projects of a single semester can have, they can develop stronger perceptions of social entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

In the following section, we provide a brief case example for each of the four types of group projects mentioned above. As supporting evidence that the social identity and self-efficacy approach to social entrepreneurship education can be effective in helping students actually become social entrepreneurs, these mini-cases demonstrate a student commitment to social ventures that extends beyond the prescribed boundaries of the classroom.

CASE EXAMPLES

Over the past two decades, as an outgrowth of social-entrepreneurship-related courses taught at BYU, over forty international projects have been initiated. In 2010 alone, these collective initiatives—many of which focus on microfinance—trained more than 320,000 clients who received loans to start microenterprises. Millions of dollars dedicated to serving the poor have been raised, and the amount continues to grow each year. The lasting impact of engaging students in social entrepreneurship can be both far-reaching and long-lasting. As students begin to identify themselves as social entrepreneurs and develop the requisite self-efficacy, small group projects can transform into social entrepreneurship in action. Below, we present four short cases that provide examples of different types of group projects and how they target identity and self-efficacy by *encouraging active engagement* and *providing mastery experiences*, respectively (see Table 1). Following a brief description of the cases, we explore the facets of group projects that directly influence students' identities and self-efficacy.

Case 1: Crisis-Response Project (Wave of Hope)

On December 26, 2004, a massive earthquake struck the floor of the Indian Ocean, producing powerful tsunami waves that claimed the lives of over 200,000 people in Southeast Asia. Ten days after the tsunami had shocked the world, a new semester began at Brigham Young University (BYU) in Provo, Utah, and a class of students convened for the first session of a course on social entrepreneurship. In response to the devastating crisis, the professor challenged the students to consider how they, as just a small group of college students, might design a project that could provide relief and comfort for some of the tsunami's survivors. From that opening question, students were encouraged to take initiative and actively engage in designing a humanitarian strategy to empower the poor who had survived the horrific tsunami. At the suggestion of one of the students, the class voted to call the project "Wave of Hope"—a sharp contrast to the tsunami's huge waves of devastation, death, and hopelessness.

Fully aware of the enormity of the tsunami's destruction, the class decided to limit the focus of their initial efforts to helping hard-hit areas of Thailand. As an early first step, students established self-organizing teams to research, develop, and begin implementing an overarching Wave of Hope strategy. In addition to receiving conceptual training in social entrepreneurship, the teams focused on areas such as NGO start-up steps, fundraising, volunteer recruitment, public relations, Thai culture, travel logistics, meeting effectiveness, and conflict resolution. A representative from each team also served on an overall management council of eight leaders to share reports and status updates, address problems and challenges, and generally oversee the entire project. The course instructor served as a facilitator during management council meetings, and outside experts were sometimes invited to participate to provide insight.

The initial plan was to send a team of 50 students to Thailand for a month or more each

(students from the class, as well as students recruited from other universities).¹ To this end, students conducted four, out-of-class, Wave of Hope meetings: a forum experience with guest speakers from Thailand, a new volunteer orientation and training session, a Thailand logistics briefing session, and a final send-off meeting at the end of April.²

Allowing students to take initiative in developing the Wave of Hope strategy provided them with opportunities to begin seeing themselves as social entrepreneurs, because they were proactively engaging in social entrepreneurship. With the support, donations, and mobilization efforts of many, Wave of Hope was officially organized as an NGO and resulted in tremendous success. Approximately 90 dedicated volunteers traveled to Thailand in 10 teams to carry out reconstruction efforts in behalf of those devastated by the coastal tsunami. By extending volunteer recruitment beyond BYU, Wave of Hope ultimately mobilized volunteers from 7 countries and 14 different universities. Ultimately, more than \$200,000 (cash and in-kind donations) was raised, and 143 committed individuals were recruited to participate in some way.

Over a five-month period, during the summer and fall of 2005, teams served in the humid Khao Lak region of the Pang-Na province of Thailand—an area where entire villages had been devastated by the tsunami. Wave of Hope gave more than 14,000 hours of service to many different projects. For example, Wave of Hope volunteers helped establish a worker-owned cooperative designed to build furniture and household items for new homes that were being constructed. They trained Thai villagers to use donated power tools to construct and paint new tables, chairs, beds, shelving units, and even play sets for schools. This group named the

¹ It is important to note that students' grades and course credit were in no way contingent upon their willingness or ability to travel to Thailand with Wave of Hope; rather, they were graded according to rigorous academic requirements (e.g., heavy reading; quizzes and tests; papers on self-reliance, social entrepreneurship, project design and implementation, OB team skills, etc.; and in-class presentations).

² For more information regarding the logistics of sending large student teams on international projects, or for any other inquiries related to teaching social entrepreneurship in a university setting, please contact the authors directly.

cooperative “Thaikea,” creatively combining the word “Thai” with “IKEA,” the international Swedish furniture company. Other volunteers trained a group of men and women to make pearl jewelry. The effort, called Tsunami Pearls, was officially launched as a worker-owned cooperative.

In addition to income-generating projects, many Wave of Hope social entrepreneurs also worked with local Thais on house rebuilding efforts in the villages of Thap Tawan, Laem Pom, and Bang Sak: helping construct more than 120 houses. Others worked in a boatyard, applying waterproofing caulk and paint to newly constructed boats for fishermen who had lost their livelihoods. Over 100 new boats were constructed in partnership with a U.S. NGO that donated money for the motors so that local families could restart their family fishing businesses. Student fundraisers from BYU also raised thousands of dollars to purchase clothing, quilts, and supplies for school and hygiene kits. Over 700 kits were delivered to impoverished families suffering in survivor camps. Student social entrepreneurs also shared their skills by teaching English to children at school and to adults looking to improve their language skills.

The post-tsunami experience of Wave of Hope provided students with a real-life opportunity to identify with the social entrepreneurship community (by encouraging active engagement) and develop social entrepreneurially self-efficacy (by providing mastery experiences: practice). The instructor used course readings, lectures, and other assignments to help students begin to become social entrepreneurs (by defining social entrepreneurship as a social category, identifying prototypical members and their characteristics, providing models of successful social entrepreneurship, and offering encouragement), but it was participation in the group crisis-response project that likely had the greatest effect.

Students *actively engaged* as social entrepreneurs by taking initiative in forming self-

organized teams, identifying which of the numerous social needs to collectively try to meet, and raising funds and acquiring resources. In addition, students were personally involved in implementing action plans by conducting a series of volunteer preparation meetings, as well as participating in on-the-ground efforts in Thailand, such as building houses, constructing boats, teaching children, and creating social enterprises (e.g., “Thaikea” and “Tsunami Pearls”). As students actively engaged in each of these activities, they began to see themselves as social entrepreneurs (i.e., identity), because they were actually doing social entrepreneurship. Moreover, students engaged in *mastery experiences* as they developed and utilized their skills and witnessed the social impact of their efforts. Students learned to conduct research, identify social needs, and develop potential solutions. They actively mobilized and acquired resources (e.g., volunteers, money, in-kind donations), and many students gained experience in organizing NGOs and starting social enterprises. As they witnessed the social impact of these efforts, students began to gain confidence in their ability to make a difference (i.e., self-efficacy).

Case 2: Instructor-Initiated Project (Enterprise Mentors International)

Enterprise Mentors International is a microcredit NGO that was co-founded in 1990 by students and their BYU professor. The previous year, the professor had been visiting Hawaii to teach a course on international development. While there, he was urged by Filipino students to help them establish several rural worker cooperatives on the island of Oahu. When it was time for the professor to return to Utah, the Filipino students committed him to do some type of economic development project back in the Philippines where their families struggled to survive. This commitment, in part, led to the founding of a new NGO in the Philippines that would eventually spread to Central and South America.

What began as a professor-guided, student group project gradually transformed into an

international social enterprise providing thousands of poverty-stricken individuals with access to start-up capital for microenterprises. The roots of the now global organization were formed during the winter semester of 1989 (January to April), when the professor and a team of students learned as much as they could about the Philippines. As part of a course, the instructor introduced a team of approximately 12 students to the pressing realities of poverty in the Philippines. Under the instructor's direction, the students actively engaged in conducting research about Filipino culture and the Philippine economy. They collected relevant information from embassies, U.S. government reports, the World Bank, and other sources to better understand why the Philippines went from having the second largest economy in Asia to the second worst. Through debate, dialogue, and research, the students and instructor worked toward developing a strategy for creating a number of income-generating projects for impoverished Filipinos.

That summer, three of the students traveled to Manila to learn more about the Filipino culture, meet with government officials, interview NGO managers, and conduct a more targeted needs analysis of the Filipino poor. Through their active engagement, the student team concluded that a combination of microenterprise training, mentoring, and microcredit might be an effective poverty-alleviation strategy. At the end of the summer, the professor and student team presented their findings and recommendations for starting a new NGO to Filipino leaders and a few potential U.S. donors. The students actively participated in discussions until it was negotiated that, consistent with the team's original recommendations, the NGO would be privately funded by U.S. donors but run by Filipinos on the ground. The following year—in partnership with some humanitarian business leaders that the professor had connected with—the student team and professor co-founded a new NGO called Enterprise Mentors International (EMI), which has now

been providing loans, business training, development services, and free consulting for 22 years.

The initial efforts in the Philippines spread quickly to Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Peru, and Honduras. A board of directors of highly-qualified business professionals was formed, and EMI was eventually able to hire a fulltime staff, including a development director who solicited donations from private donors, as well as large corporations such as Jet Blue, Kellogg, Levi Strauss, and Walmart. By recognizing a social need, developing a potential solution, and partnering with humanitarian-minded business professionals, a professor-initiated student project developed into a thriving NGO. As of June, 2011, EMI (now known simply as Mentors International) had channeled a total of \$42,129,787 in micro-loans and other aid to over 2.4 million individuals who were struggling to work their way out of poverty through microenterprise (Mentors International, 2011a).

For example, in the Philippines, a woman named Grecilda received her first microloan of \$65 from Mentors International in 2009. Having grown up in poverty herself, she was motivated to earn sufficient income to provide her seven children with not only food, but educational opportunities as well. Before receiving the loan, she made a meager income selling rice cakes and fried cheese sticks. The microloan, however, allowed Grecilda to purchase raw materials at a greater scale. Her business rapidly grew to the point of quadrupling her daily income, and allowing her to employ 50 additional people from her community. She recently received a larger loan from Mentors International of \$2,500 (Mentors International, 2011b).

The instructor-initiated EMI project encouraged students to actively engage as social entrepreneurs by identifying the social needs in the Philippines and developing tractable solutions. As the students conducted research, they became familiar with prototypical entrepreneurs and identified strategies that could be replicated. As the students helped develop

microenterprise training and a microcredit program, they began to more closely identify with the social entrepreneurship community. Similarly, based on interviews with social entrepreneurs and NGO managers, the students were able to learn vicariously and model their proposed strategy after previously successful endeavors. As they helped found a new NGO and see the results of their efforts begin to come to fruition, their social entrepreneurially self-efficacy increased as well.

Case 3: Student-Initiated Project (MicroBusiness Mentors)

Not all group projects need to respond to natural disasters or be conducted internationally to have an impact on both students and those they strive to serve. For example, in 2002, one student team approached their BYU professor with a desire to make a difference in their local community of Provo, Utah. The class project led to the eventual founding of an organization called MicroBusiness Mentors (MBM), which is still in operation today.

The student-initiated efforts began with a social venture business plan based on surveys of the communities and subcultures in Provo whose needs were not sufficiently being met. The team utilized several studies that had been conducted at BYU in previous years and discovered that Provo's minority population—Hispanics in particular—suffered from extremely high levels of unemployment. Due to perceptions of high risk, many of those who were entrepreneurial were unable to acquire loans from banks to start their own businesses. Disadvantaged in terms of English language ability and education, many of Provo's Latino population struggled to feed their families and obtain proper medical assistance.

To address some of these concerns, the student team decided to fulfill their course project assignment by launching a program to generate economic sustainability within the local Hispanic community. The first step was training. The team designed and provided a series of training

programs to help low-income individuals learn small business skills. Arrangements were made for all training to be offered in Spanish. Training participants were organized into groups that would work together and share business plan ideas, with the primary goal of helping them design new business start-ups in their local communities.

After graduating from the training course—having a business plan and a peer support group—participants were given access to small loans of \$500 (originally, the seed capital for these loans was donated personally by the course instructor). They were also assigned a mentor from the community—an entrepreneur who spoke Spanish, owned a business in Utah, and could offer real-world experience to help with the implementation of a small start-up enterprise.

Throughout both the design and initial implementation phases of the project, students continually demonstrated enthusiasm and commitment—likely due, in part, to the fact that the project was the result of their own early initiative. Moreover, these students were actively involved in the primary execution of the new social venture. This experience gave them opportunities to directly observe the impact they were having on people’s lives as they participated in social value creation.

For example, Maria graduated from the course in 2004. Originally from Guatemala, Maria had come to Utah with her husband and three children in search of a better life. A few years after arriving, she and her husband divorced, leaving her alone to provide for her children. While back in Guatemala, she had taken cosmetology courses, and after enrolling in the MBM program, she saw the possibility of now using those skills to start her own little business in Utah. After she graduated from the course, MBM provided her with a \$500 loan.

Maria used the loan to buy scissors and clippers, electrical equipment, hair gels, lotions, aprons, combs, and other materials. She started off, essentially, as a walking barbershop,

travelling door-to-door in the low-income neighborhoods of her community providing haircuts in her customers' homes. With a loan as small as \$500, Maria was able to start her own micro-business that helped her become economically self-reliant and better able to provide for her children. Later, she employed several other women as her business expanded.

In the nine years since its founding, MBM has continued to provide small business training and financial services to the low-income Hispanic communities of Provo and surrounding areas. The organization has operated as a kind of classroom laboratory for many students who choose to become involved in MBM to not only fulfill course requirements, but to make a difference in their local community. Students continue to design and translate training materials, serve as mentors, help raise money, and recruit clients. Slowly, the effort has grown, and services have been provided to immigrants from Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Spain, El Salvador, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and to some from the southern U.S. who grew up in Hispanic communities. MBM has since been invited to operate under the umbrella of Centro Hispano and the United Way—two non-profit organizations with operations in or near Provo. Ultimately, the credibility of MBM expanded, leading to a cooperative agreement with the Utah Banker's Association to begin funding some of MBM's programs.

The student-initiated efforts that led to MBM's founding began with a group of students who took initiative in wanting to make a difference in their local community. Through readings, lectures, and cases, the instructor began providing students with the foundation for developing a social entrepreneurial identity and related self-efficacy (via the corresponding mechanisms outlined in Table 1), but the active engagement and mastery experiences associated with the group project likely had the greatest effect. Students actively engaged as social entrepreneurs as they researched the needs of the local minority population, identified a particular need, and

proposed a solution (i.e., business training, mentoring, and financing). They began to see themselves more as social entrepreneurs as they directly implemented solutions themselves: creating training materials, conducting training sessions, and finding volunteer mentors. These efforts and the successful launch of MBM (i.e., mastery experiences) helped students develop greater self-efficacy.

Case 4: Student Consulting Project (Foster Care)

Traditional student-consulting projects—a type of service learning with which many instructors already have experience—can also be a source of social entrepreneurial identity and self-efficacy development for students. Consistent with the broad definition of social entrepreneurship we presented earlier, student consulting teams can be tasked with helping organizations “combine resources in new ways” to “explore and exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change or meeting social needs” (Mair & Marti, 2006: 37).

For example, in 2006, as part of a course assignment, students were required to take initiative in selecting a non-profit organization of their choice and offer consulting services with the goal of increasing and/or creating social value. One team of MBA students, after some very personal discussions with a friend who grew up in foster care, selected a small organization that strives to create opportunities for youth in foster care to reach their potential and succeed in life. Foster care is 24-hour substitute parental care for children who have been removed from or abandoned by their parents or permanent guardians. Many children in foster care have suffered serious abuse and neglect, and many have severe emotional, behavioral, and developmental problems. The non-profit organization selected by the student team aimed to educate and motivate foster-care professionals, engage current and former foster-care youth to help improve child welfare, and advocate for foster-care issues.

The student team sent a letter of intent to a representative of the organization explaining their desire to help. The letter included a brief summary of each team member's skills and relevant experience, and it mentioned that the team would have access to a local business school faculty member as a resource on the project. The organization agreed to accept the student team's help, and together they began to diagnose areas for organizational improvement. After meeting with the board and interviewing others involved with the organization, the students determined that there was a disconnect between the goals and resources of the organization—either the organization's focus needed to be narrowed, or its capabilities needed to be increased.

As an initial intervention, the students scheduled a time to meet with the board to facilitate a process of identifying current organizational limitations and aligning organizational goals with capabilities. To help narrow the organization's focus, the student team asked the board members to discuss and rank the organization's current activities in order of importance and effectiveness. They then helped the board identify success metrics (i.e., what would success look like?) for each of the top five activities. The students then led a discussion regarding what resources (in terms of time and money) were needed to achieve success in each activity. The goal was to help the organization combine and allocate its resources in new and possibly innovative ways to create and increase social value. Following the meeting, the students created a written report based on the input received from board members, including recommendations for accomplishing the organization's goals. A written description of the students' overall experience was also given to their course instructor as a part of the consulting project assignment.

As with the other types of group projects described earlier, the foster-care-related consulting project provided students with an opportunity to further identify with social entrepreneurship, as well as develop greater social entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Working closely

with an existing organization—and meeting with its founders and the board—gave students an opportunity to vicariously learn from the social entrepreneurial experiences of others. Moreover, in a small way, the students actively engaged as social entrepreneurs themselves (by helping the organization combine resources in new ways to create more social value) and engaged in mastery experiences (by facilitating a meeting with the organization’s board and formulating strategic recommendations). However, as compared to the other types of group projects, student consulting projects may have a more moderate effect on students’ identities and self-efficacy, because the degree of active engagement and mastery experiences may be lower. The students consulting the foster-care-related organization, for example, did not have continued involvement beyond delivering the written report of strategic recommendations to the board. It was then up to the organization whether to implement the suggestions or not.

Discussion

Although just four of literally dozens of examples, the cases presented above help demonstrate the potential impact of social entrepreneurship education. Each case exemplifies a different type of group project, which vary in ease of implementation and potential impact on students. In Table 2, we draw from previous course experience in general, and the cases presented above specifically, to depict the varying degrees of effectiveness that the four types of group projects can have on students’ social-entrepreneurship-related identity and self-efficacy.

Insert Table 2 about here

Based on social identity theory—as presented earlier—encouraging active engagement in the social entrepreneurship community is key to helping students identify themselves as part of that community. As we compare the effectiveness of the four types of group projects in

encouraging active student engagement, two dimensions emerge: (1) the student *initiative* required, and (2) the student *involvement in solution implementation*. Group projects that require more student initiative and that give students more opportunities to be involved in implementing project solutions will encourage more active engagement, thereby having a greater potential impact on students' identities. Similarly, we identify two dimensions for differentiating among the four types of group projects with respect to their potential effect on students' self-efficacy through mastery experiences: (1) the *likelihood of project success* and (2) the observable *social impact* of the project. One of the risks of attempting to provide students with mastery experiences is that projects have the potential to fail. The likelihood of project success thus becomes an important consideration for instructors when selecting the type of group project to incorporate in a course.³ Assuming a project succeeds (or at least partially succeeds), a student's social entrepreneurial self-efficacy is likely to increase even more when the project's social impact is readily observable—instilling a confidence that one's efforts truly can make a difference.

Identity through Active Engagement

As reflected in Table 2, there are two facets of group projects that are particularly important for increasing the potential impact on students' identities through active engagement: the amount of student initiative required and the level of student involvement in solution implementation. First, as students take initiative and develop a stronger sense of ownership over their efforts, their active engagement in social entrepreneurial activities will be more reflective of whom they see themselves as a person (i.e., identity), since their actions are more volitional.

³ By succeed, we do not mean to imply that every facet of every project needs to be a flawless success; rather, students need to be able to feel that their efforts are not in vain. Learning from past mistakes and failures can also increase self-efficacy if a path for a successful future can be envisioned.

Second, as students are involved in the actual implementation of the solutions they help develop, they actively engage in social entrepreneurship activities, not just the planning of such activities. Doing so increases the potential effect of a group project on students' identities.

Crisis-response and student-initiated projects are thus likely to have the greatest potential effect on identity, because both types of group projects entail high levels of student initiative and student involvement in solution implementation. For example, the students involved in the creation and implementation of MBM, a student-initiated project, were proactive in the development of their strategic vision and personally involved in carrying out their strategic plan. Conversely, the potential effect of instructor-initiated projects and student consulting projects on identity is more moderate. For example, only a moderate level of student initiative was required from students on the EMI project team, in that the instructor was more involved and had already defined a problem area and setting (i.e., poverty in the Philippines) for the group project. Similarly, although student consulting projects can require high levels of student initiative (as they select potential clients and work to identify needs and possible solutions), they are less likely to provide students with opportunities to implement solutions themselves, often concluding with a set of recommendations delivered to the client organization.

Self-Efficacy through Mastery Experiences

There are also two important facets of group projects that help increase the potential impact on students' self-efficacy through mastery experiences: the likelihood of project success and the observable social impact of the project. First, the development of confidence in one's ability to succeed in the future is greatly affected by experiences from the past. As students utilize social entrepreneurial skills as part of a successful project, their self-efficacy related to future social entrepreneurial success will increase. Second, the degree to which mastery

experiences increase students' self-efficacy will likely be positively related to the magnitude of the observable social impact of the project. Other things equal, the greater the impact that students feel they have made through a given project, the stronger their belief will be that they can make a significant difference in the world through future social entrepreneurship.

Crisis-response and instructor-initiated projects are likely to have the strongest potential impact on students' self-efficacy. For crisis-response projects, the likelihood of successfully completing a project is high, largely due to the many *basic* needs that can be met (e.g., access to food, water, clothing, etc.). Rather than seeking to provide solutions to chronic or systemic social problems, many simple but urgent needs can be addressed directly (e.g., assembling hygiene kits, rebuilding houses, building boats, etc.—in the case of Wave of Hope). Moreover, through crisis-response projects, the positive impact of meeting basic human needs is often readily observable, measured by mouths fed, bodies clothed, or houses built. Similarly, instructor-initiated projects have a very high likelihood of success, because the initial idea generation and subsequent design of the group project will benefit from the instructor's greater perspective, experience, expertise, and connections. The founding of EMI, for example, was largely made possible by relationships the instructor had made with philanthropic business professionals. In contrast, student-initiated projects are less likely to succeed—due to students' inexperience—which, in turn, decreases the likelihood of observing a strong social impact. Student consulting projects, on the other hand, have a higher chance of succeeding—due to the partnership with and expertise of the client organization—but students are less likely to observe the social impact of the project, often discontinuing contact with the organization after delivering a written report.

Summary of Project Type Comparisons

Overall, comparing the four types of group projects⁴ exemplified in the cases across the dimensions described above, as shown in Table 2, crisis-response projects (e.g., Wave of Hope) seem to have the highest potential for influencing both student identity and self-efficacy. However, crisis-response projects can be more difficult for instructors to implement than other types of projects. Due to the urgent and often expansive social needs that arise after natural disasters and other such crises, more direct involvement and preparation from the instructor is likely required to manage a class-wide project and help students focus their efforts. Also, crises often occur in distant locations, which can complicate logistics and planning.

Instructor-initiated projects seem to have moderate potential to affect identity but high potential to affect self-efficacy. However, they too may require more effort and preparation on the instructor's part, compared with other types of group projects. Before the course begins, the instructor will likely have already identified a specific social problem and thought through possible solutions, which are later presented to students. While doing so likely decreases the initiative required by students, it increases the likelihood of project success. In contrast, student-initiated projects exhibit high potential to affect identity and more moderate potential to affect self-efficacy. However, possibly balancing out the disadvantages of student-initiated projects is their greater ease of implementation for instructors. Of all the group projects, student-initiated projects probably require the least amount of instructor preparation.

Finally, typical student consulting projects likely have the most moderate influence on both outcomes, but they too are relatively easier to implement for instructors. Instructor

⁴ It is important to clarify that our list of four types of group projects is in no way exhaustive. Neither is our categorization of each type of project's effect on student identity and self-efficacy. It is possible for proactive instructors to tailor *any* type of project assignment to effectively encourage active engagement in social entrepreneurship-related activities and provide mastery experiences.

preparation is especially light if students are required to identify and engage with a non-profit organization of their choosing. Thus, while student consulting projects may not be the most effective type of group project for increasing identity and self-efficacy, they can be a great place to start for instructors just beginning to engage in social entrepreneurship education.

General Summary and Results

The effective use of group projects—in conjunction with relevant course content—has immense potential to help students develop into social entrepreneurs and innovators. As students participate in successful projects that require initiative, provide opportunities to implement solutions, and have observable social impacts, they will begin to better identify with the social entrepreneurship community and develop social entrepreneurial self-efficacy. A course can serve as an incubator of sorts—as a resource; a catalyst; and a place of idea generation, learning, and planning. Its primary impact is to help students see themselves as social entrepreneurs and innovators (identity) and give them the confidence in their abilities to go out and make a difference (self-efficacy). A course merely provides students with the tools, opportunity, and guidance necessary to unleash their latent social entrepreneurial potential.

Importantly, an effective course seems to be able to affect students independent of the actual implementation of large projects outside of class. While actually implementing project solutions and observing their social impact can greatly increase the potential effect of a group project on students' identities and self-efficacy (as discussed earlier), course content and active student engagement in the planning of group projects can have a significant effect as well. Regarding the Wave of Hope project in Thailand, for example, there is evidence that the course had a significant effect on the students even before the project implementation phase in Thailand began. At the conclusion of the formal course in early 2005—before travelling to Thailand—

many students made identity- and efficacy-related comments in their course evaluations: “[*This course*] has caused me to vow that I will do this my whole life long. My husband and I have already determined we will establish a family foundation that gives grants to social entrepreneurs. I also know that my family will frequent third world countries in social entrepreneurial efforts.” Another student said, “How can you leave [*a course like this*] not wanting to change the world?” A third student wrote, “My life has forever changed and [*I*] am now motivated to have a more service-centered lifestyle.” Many students also emphasized the importance of the opportunity to put their learning into practice: “*I think the practicality of this class is the KEY,*” and “*the project provides [an] opportunity to get some hands-on experience, which is great.*”

The impact that the course and group projects can have on a student’s identity and self-efficacy is also reflected in more recent statements from 2010 and 2011 course evaluations, such as “[*the course*] inspires you to help others and become a social entrepreneur,” and “[*the course*] helped me...to really understand the power of individuals and groups to change the world for the better.” Table 3 lists a number of identity- and efficacy-related statements submitted by recent students regarding their course experience. While the comments likely do not reflect the sentiments of every single student who takes the course, they do demonstrate the transformational power that the course approach is capable of having on many students.

Insert Table 3 about here

At the end of each semester, one of the real measures of the course’s effectiveness in developing student identity and self-efficacy is whether students actually engage in social ventures themselves, beyond the confines of the course. For example, as evidence that many

students truly internalize a social entrepreneurship identity, the year after the project in Thailand, six students from the Wave of Hope team utilized their newly acquired skills and experience to organize and lead a group in northern Ghana—focusing on village development through microenterprise education and healthcare training. In the past two decades, the professor, former students, and other partners have jointly established 43 start-up programs in over 30 nations—22 of which are currently registered 501(c)3 organizations. Many income-generating ventures have been established, such as the pearl jewelry cooperative in Thailand (mentioned above), the PRINCE Cooperative Bakery in Kenya, and the Musana Jewelry Women’s Cooperative in villages of Uganda. Table 4 provides a list of some of the many other social ventures of past students—most of which initially began (or were refined) as course projects.

Insert Table 4 about here

Furthermore, student identity and self-efficacy is also reflected in the number of former students who have gone on to work with social-entrepreneurship-related enterprises. After completing the course at BYU, dozens of students kept in touch with their former professor to report working for and with organizations including Ashoka, Grameen Bank, ACCION, Unitus, USAID, the Foreign Service, FINCA International, Rising Star Outreach in India, Fundacion Paraguaya, World Education Inc., MicroDreams, the United Way, Surgir in Peru, Care for Life in Africa, Mona Vie Operation Rescue in Brazil, South Pacific Business Development, the World Bank, Interweave, and many more. While there is most likely a selection effect involved (i.e., students with a proclivity toward pursuing a social entrepreneurship-related career are more likely to enroll in a social entrepreneurship course in the first place), discussions with former students and comments from their course evaluations indicate that many students do, indeed,

have transformational experiences in the course that affect both their social identity and self-efficacy. In short, the impact of social entrepreneurship education begins with providing a platform from which students can further develop into social entrepreneurs and innovators and ends with students taking their passion and skills into the world to make a difference—one project, initiative, and life at a time.

OVERCOMING CHALLENGES

While social entrepreneurship education has the potential to greatly impact students, there are many challenges—some institutional, some logistical, and some strategic—that can stand as unwelcome roadblocks. Below, we address and discuss recommendations for five specific challenges instructors might face, related to (1) institutional support, (2) student project failure, (3) accessing capital (e.g., fundraising), (4) public relations, and (5) safety/security.

At times, especially when international travel is involved, it can be difficult to gain the institutional support of faculty peers, department chairs, deans, and even university legal teams. This lack of institutional support can quickly become a roadblock, especially where funding and legal liability are concerned. First, it can be helpful to solicit support from departments beyond the business school. Many other departments want their students to have global learning experiences but do not have the innovative ideas, systems, or funds to provide them. Broadening the reach of social entrepreneurship education to students outside the business school will not only add to the diversity of ideas in the classroom, but it can help expand institutional support for the course as well. Second, acquiring sources of outside funding (from donors, centers and institutes, grants, etc.) can reduce dependence on institutional forces, while simultaneously increase institutional support—as the viability of the effort becomes increasingly legitimized (sources of funding are discussed in more detail below). And third, ensuring that proper legal

safeguards are in place regarding projects and initiatives can help reduce opposition to student involvement in social entrepreneurial efforts. Information regarding legal requirements might be obtained from a university's general counsel or legal office. Additionally, representatives from a school's internship, study-abroad, or international studies program office might be helpful in providing information regarding any legal issues associated with student travel and/or off-campus projects.

A second major challenge for social entrepreneurship educators is the fact that not all projects will be successful. Considering the high rates of failure for traditional entrepreneurial ventures, many social entrepreneurial ventures are likely to fail as well. For example, several years ago, a group of current and former BYU students planned to launch a new NGO in Somalia. A needs analysis was conducted, and it was determined that the first phase of the project would be to build two schools in rural villages. Just before making the final arrangements, the project was canceled due to the political instability and violence in the country. The project was ultimately abandoned completely. Another project failure was Lifework International, an NGO started by a student who spoke Spanish fluently and dreamed of establishing a social entrepreneurial program in Central America. She designed a start-up organization in Ciudadela, Nicaragua, that would focus on building a health clinic and community elementary school for an impoverished rural area. Midway through the project, her mother became very ill in the United States, and she left the project in the hands of local leadership while she returned to care for her ailing mother. She ultimately stayed for several years until her mother passed away. By that time, funding for the project had dried up and the local leaders in Nicaragua had abandoned the projects altogether.

In addition to failure due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g., political instability or family

emergencies), ventures can also fail due to poor planning, poor implementation, and unrealistic expectations. When teaching students various social entrepreneurial tools and strategies that increase self-efficacy, it is also important for instructors to appropriately set expectations and warn against overconfidence. Rather than simply motivating students to indiscriminately chase their dreams to save the world, educators should appropriately inform students about the challenges, risks, and potential of failure associated with each and every project. Incorporating examples of *learning from failure* into course material (e.g., the student project experiences in Somalia and Nicaragua described above) can help students better prepare for, avoid, and even cope with their own failures that will inevitably come in one form or another.

A third challenge to social entrepreneurship education is the need to raise capital and funds for projects and initiatives. Throughout the years, sources of funding for projects have varied from corporate sponsorships to grants from university centers and institutes. For example, requests made to the philanthropic arm of large companies have resulted in numerous donations. Levi Strauss donated money for microfinance efforts in the Philippines, Kellogg helped fund village banks in Guatemala, Jet Blue supported projects in Belize, and Pinnacle Securities recently provided funds for an earthquake-relief project in Haiti. Internally, many universities also have some limited resources available via centers and institutes for research initiatives. Instructors can help students incorporate research components to their projects, thus being a way to possibly generate funds, in addition to providing invaluable information that can increase the chances of project success and impact.

In addition, instructors can encourage students to raise a portion of the funds themselves. Past students have solicited donations from local companies, family foundations, and even friends and relatives. They have also conducted numerous fundraisers, such as benefit concerts,

bake sales, yard sales, car washes, dances, etc. Student involvement not only broadens the reach of fundraising efforts, but it helps students develop a stronger sense of commitment to projects. It allows them to demonstrate to themselves that they are actively engaged and not just “along for the ride.” It is important to note that all fundraising—and most other involvement in actual project implementation—is done voluntarily, independent of course requirements and grading.

A fourth challenge—but major opportunity—related to social entrepreneurship education is public relations (PR). In the early 1990’s at BYU, PR methods were relatively low-tech and simple. Volunteer recruitment entailed posting flyers around BYU and other campuses such as the University of Utah, UCLA, Portland State, etc. Occasionally there would be minimal newspaper coverage as innovative programs were launched like microfinance, worker cooperatives, or the installation of new wells or water purification systems in rural villages. Recently, however, with the proliferation of the internet and social media, almost all new student projects and NGO start-ups now have a website or a blog. Email lists for volunteer recruitment and fundraising have been created. Facebook and Twitter are increasingly used to increase exposure. Presentations are given at other universities and to business associations, church groups, and community organizations such as the Rotary Club. And, finally, proactively collaborating with local news media can still be a powerful PR strategy for increasing community involvement.

At the classroom level, it may be advantageous for instructors to actively recruit students to take social-entrepreneurship-related courses. Many, if not most, students have never heard of or thought about social entrepreneurship and innovation. Consequently, they may be less likely to seek out and register for a course on the subject. Posting flyers around campus, making announcements before or after colleagues’ courses, and asking former students to refer their

friends and acquaintances to the course can all be effective means of increasing enrollment.

Finally, a fifth—and extremely important—challenge of social entrepreneurship education concerns safety and security. Ensuring the safety of all participants involved in any project should be an instructor’s first priority. For international projects, it can be very helpful to work with a campus security office that oversees study abroad programs, if one exists. Government resources—such as CIA and State Department reports in the U.S.—can also be very helpful. Training of all project participants should always include safety and security issues (e.g., never go anywhere alone, be in the house by dark, use safe cooking practices, drink filtered water, hiring security guards if applicable, etc.). Proper safeguards regarding vaccinations and other health-related issues should also be attended to with care.

CONCLUSION

Our goal has not been to provide a “one-best-way” method for social entrepreneurship education; rather, it is our hope that by sharing just one perspective—which has led to considerable positive results—we can spark educators and institutions to use the same innovation and ingenuity characteristic of social entrepreneurs and innovators to continuously improve the student experience. Although we have provided multiple examples of specific course content and group projects that have led to active student engagement in social entrepreneurial endeavors, the social identity and self-efficacy approach we have presented can be utilized more generally. Structuring course content, assignments, and activities in ways that urge students to personally identify with social entrepreneurship and develop a corresponding sense of self-efficacy can help them to actually become social entrepreneurs themselves. Educators, thus, have an opportunity to help a rising generation of social entrepreneurs learn the skills and gain the confidence necessary to combat the growing pervasiveness of the world’s social ills.

REFERENCES

- BarNir, A., Watson, W. E., & Hutchins, H. M. 2011. Mediation and moderated mediation in the relationship among role models, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial career intention, and gender. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41: 270-297.
- Bornstein, D. 2004, *How to change the world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brower, H. H. 2011. Sustainable development through service learning: A pedagogical framework and case example in a third world context. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1): 58-76.
- Dees, J. G. 1998. *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Kaufman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, Graduate School of Business, Stanford: Stanford University.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. 2000. Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 121-140.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. 1995. A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58: 255-269.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. 1992. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2): 103-123.
- Mair J., & Marti I. 2006. Social entrepreneurship research: a source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business* 41(1): 36-44.
- Mentors International (2011a). Company History. <http://www.mentorsinternational.org/history.php>, accessed Aug, 25, 2011.
- Mentors International (2011b). Grecilda Lumbay. <http://www.mentorsinternational.org/grecilda>, accessed Mar, 28, 2012.
- Rhodes, R. A. 1997. *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Short, J. C., Moss, T., Lumpkin, G., 2009. Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3: 161-194.
- Svinicki, M., & McKeachie, W. J. 2011. *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*, 13th ed. Florence, KY: Cengage Learning.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*: 33-47. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.

- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. 2007. The Distinctive Challenge of Educating Social Entrepreneurs: A Postscript and Rejoinder to the Special Issue on Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 6(2): 264-271.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. 1987. *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. 2007. Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications of entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 31(3): 387-406.
- Wood, R. E., & Bandura, A. 1989. Social cognitive theory in organizational management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 361-384.
- Yorio, P. L., & Ye, F. 2012. A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 11, 9-27.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. 2005. The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 1265-1272.

TABLE 1
Mechanisms for Developing Social Identity and Self-Efficacy by Pedagogical Device

Pedagogical Device	Identity as Social Entrepreneur	Self-efficacy
<i>Readings</i>	Defining the social category Identifying prototypical members and characteristics	Modeling: vicarious learning
<i>Lectures</i>	Defining the social category Identifying prototypical members and characteristics	Modeling: vicarious learning Using social persuasion: encouragement
<i>Cases</i>	Identifying prototypical members and characteristics	Modeling: vicarious learning Simulating mastery experiences: practice
<i>Biography Assignment</i>	Identifying prototypical members and characteristics	Modeling: vicarious learning
<i>Group Projects</i>	Encouraging active engagement	Providing mastery experiences: practice

TABLE 2
Potential Effect of Group Projects on Students' Social Identity and Self-Efficacy by Type of Project

Project Type	Case Example	Ease of Implementation (For Instructor)	Encouraging Active Engagement			Providing Mastery Experiences: Practice		
			Student Initiative Required	Student Involvement in Solution Implementation	Potential Effect on Identity	Likelihood of Project Success	Observable Social Impact	Potential Effect on Self-Efficacy
<i>Crisis-Response</i>	Wave of Hope	Low	High	Very High	High to Very High	High	Very High	High to Very High
<i>Instructor-Initiated</i>	Enterprise Mentors International (EMI)	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate to High	Very High	High	High to Very High
<i>Student-Initiated</i>	MicroBusiness Mentors (MBM)	High	Very High	High	High to Very High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
<i>Student Consulting</i>	Foster Care	Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate to High	High	Moderate	Moderate to High

TABLE 3
Sample of Student Comments from 2010 and 2011 Course Evaluations

Identity-Related Comments	Self-Efficacy-Related Comments
The course “inspires you to help others and become a social entrepreneur”	The course “helped me...to really understand the power of individuals and groups to change the world for the better.”
“This has been life-changing.... I am new in the social entrepreneurship world, although I feel that I was born for it.”	Social Entrepreneurship “fulfills everything I have truly wanted to do with business and with my talents, and [the course] has helped [me] realize that I can do what I have always wanted to do.”
This course “inspires you to help others and become a social entrepreneur.” It “challenges you to find out what your mission is and then to go and do it.”	“[I] learn[ed] practical skills to make a difference in the world.”
The course “helped me to look at the world differently and look at myself differently.”	“This is a great class and gives you the resources to get involved.”
“I’m looking for my life’s mission and calling and [this course] really helped point the way there.”	“I’ve learned a great deal from the class that I know I will use every day, no matter what career I pursue.”
“I am definitely leaving the class with a stronger desire to serve in my community and do as much as I can to improve the world.”	“Having the opportunity to put our skills to practice by organizing our own project will be perpetually beneficial.... I will never forget the things I have learned.”

TABLE 4
Social Venture Examples of Former Students (listed alphabetically)

Social Venture	Description
<i>2ft Prosthetics</i>	NGO that designed an affordable prosthetic leg for individuals in developing countries
<i>Action Against Poverty</i>	Micro-Finance institution established in Honduras
<i>Boulders Health Clinic</i>	Organization that provides free primary care services to marginalized families in a poor neighborhood of Provo, Utah
<i>Care for Life's Family Preservation Program</i>	Program offering services to 15 villages in Mozambique
<i>Centro Hispano</i>	Non-profit organization created to provide Hispanics with community resources in Utah
<i>Eagle Condor</i>	NGO fighting poverty in Peru via micro-credit, health, infrastructure, & education
<i>eCommerce Platform</i>	Text-message-based eCommerce platform for rural micro-entrepreneurs in India
<i>Education Growth Unity Association</i>	NGO that trains, advises, and mentors Latino high school students to motivate them and prepare them for college
<i>Empower Playgrounds</i>	Project designed to provide electricity to schools in rural Ghana through electricity-generating playground equipment
<i>Empowering Nations</i>	NGO conducting humanitarian projects in Brazil, Thailand, Ghana, and Panama
<i>Enterprise Mentors International</i>	NGO established to provide mentoring, training, and capital to micro-entrepreneurs in the Philippines, Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Peru, and Honduras
<i>Family Finance Mentors</i>	Organization that offers training programs to be taught in public schools in Utah
<i>H2O for Humanity</i>	L3C firm providing clean water to tens of thousands of families in India
<i>HELP International</i>	NGO founded that offers a variety of student social entrepreneurial services in 9 countries
<i>Homework Lab</i>	Program for minority high school students in Utah to receive after-school mentoring
<i>Housing Program</i>	Program designed to provide housing for impoverished Kenyan families
<i>Humanitarian Link</i>	NGO created to provide individuals with service-related internships in foreign countries
<i>Kids Creating Art</i>	Organization created to raise funds for orphanages in developing countries
<i>Market Place Africa</i>	Organization that imports African crafts to U.S. markets; profits go to African NGOs
<i>MicroBusiness Mentors</i>	Program offering entrepreneurial education, mentoring, and microloans to poor Latinos in Utah
<i>Motu BioFuels</i>	Social enterprise in Tonga that produces products from coconuts
<i>Paramita Group</i>	Effort to assist Tibetan exiles in Thailand
<i>Posy-Posy</i>	Rickshaw rent-to-own business for poor Madagascar drivers
<i>SOAR China</i>	One of the first microfinance NGOs in China
<i>Sowers of Hope</i>	Organization that established and funds rural schools in the Congo
<i>Sustain Haiti</i>	Social enterprise offering services to survivors of the 2010 Haiti earthquake
<i>Tilapia</i>	Village fishing production franchise in Ghana
<i>Tipping Bucket</i>	NGO with unique, on-line platform that raises funds for other global NGOs
<i>The United Relief Network International</i>	Organization that assists street children in the Philippines
<i>Wave of Hope</i>	NGO established to provide services to survivors of the 2004 tsunami in Southeast Asia
<i>Zaytoon</i>	Social development NGO helping Palestinian refugees in Jordan become micro-entrepreneurs to raise funds for future schooling

FIGURE 1
The Social Identity and Self-Efficacy Approach to Social Entrepreneurship Education

