Heroic Messiahs or Everyday Businessmen? The Rhetoric and the Reality of Social Entrepreneurship in India

Makarand Mody and Jonathon Day

Abstract While the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship is not new, there remain several ambiguities associated with its definition and theoretical formulation. To understand how social entrepreneurs create value in their quest to resolve social issues, it is important to appreciate the motivations that underlie their behavior. This chapter uses the cases of two social entrepreneurs in responsible tourism in India to identify a range of value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motivations. It further identifies how these motivations are intricately woven into a process of identify creation that illuminates the performative aspects of social entrepreneurship. Through their association and dissociation with a host of entities in the ecosystem, the social entrepreneurs tend to maintain their organizations' legitimacy as *heroes*, thus adhering to the popular social discourse surrounding social entrepreneurship. While such conformity, validated by the entrepreneurs' life stories, is beneficial in shaping the social entrepreneurial narrative, we argue that the need to further the social entrepreneurship agenda must incorporate alternative forms of thinking and talking about the phenomenon. These alternative discourses illuminate the duality of social entrepreneurship—its rhetoric as a grand, Schumpeterian style innovation and its reality as *bricolage*.

Keywords Motivation • Values • Identity • Narratives • Bricolage • India

1 Introduction

Social entrepreneurs are described as "a rare breed" (Dees, 2001) who create "social value and initiate social change through commitment, innovation, vision and change leadership" (Abu-Saifan, 2012). Clearly, social entrepreneurs are creating value in new ways and changing the status quo to solve social issues. To

M. Mody (✉)
School of Hospitality Administration, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA
e-mail: mmody@bu.edu

J. Day
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN, USA
e-mail: gjday@purdue.edu

P.J. Sheldon, R. Daniele (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Tourism*,
Tourism on the Verge, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-46518-0_12

understand how they create value, one must identify the key motivations underlying their behavior i.e. the why of social entrepreneurship. Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, and Shulman (2009) suggested that clarifying the ambiguities associated with the definitions and theoretical formulations of social entrepreneurship requires "appreciating the motivations of individuals who take the risks associated with conceiving, building, launching and sustaining new organizations and business models" (p. 529).

Interestingly, the motivations of these change agents cannot be viewed in isolation from the contextual rhetoric surrounding social entrepreneurship. This rhetoric manifests itself in two key ways: the microstructures of *identity creation* that reside in the social entrepreneurial narrative and the alignment (or lack thereof) of these microstructures to the wider *social discourse* surrounding the phenomenon. Both these issues allow further leverage of the potency of understanding motivations to explain the true nature of social entrepreneurial behavior. The chapter examines two social entrepreneurs in India and explores why and how they are using social entrepreneurship to meet significant social needs.

2 Motivations of Social Entrepreneurs

Study of social entrepreneurship from the psychological perspective views the creation of ventures as stemming from individual characteristics, motivations, and enterprise (i.e. Baum & Locke, 2004; Beugre, 2011; Brandstatter, 2011; Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003; Tan, Williams, & Tan, 2005). Consistent with this perspective, the fundamental difference between conventional and social entrepreneurship is that while exploiting opportunities for profit maximization is the main objective of conventional entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs attempt to maximize the social wealth created by their ventures. However, such a perspective is simplified and fails to capture the continuum of entrepreneurial motives that comprise social entrepreneurial activity. Nonetheless, the psychological perspective indicates the importance of the role of entrepreneurs themselves in effecting the phenomenon.

Muhammad Yunus, who is the founder of Grameen Bank and perhaps the most famous protagonist in the realm of social enterprise, provides support for such an argument. A field trip to a poor village in 1974 led this Bangladeshi economist from Chittagong University to question the economics he was teaching when he realized how existing institutional frameworks consistently marginalized those at the bottom of the social pyramid. From his own resources, he lent the equivalent of $27 to a group of women who made bamboo furniture, a step that would eventually culminate in the creation of The Grameen Bank in 1983 (Concordia College, n. d.). According to Yunus and Weber (2011), "the main difference between starting a social business and starting a regular business is the core motivation of the entrepreneur" (p. 57). "It begins with the idealism and hope that are deeply ingrained in all human beings" (p. 27). Dann and Cohen's (1991) seminal work

on the sociology of tourism also articulates that meaning, hence motivations, lies at the core of all sociological understanding. In that sense, the roots of exploring social entrepreneurial motivation to better comprehend the phenomenon had been laid long ago even in the field of tourism. The present chapter builds on these suggestions by exploring the case of two tourism social entrepreneurs in India—Gopinath Parayil of The Blue Yonder and Inir Pinheiro of Grassroutes. Given that the continuum of entrepreneurial motivations ranges from wealth creation to the altruistic objectives of socially-oriented entrepreneurship, the authors discuss Gopi and Inir's motivations under two categories: traditional entrepreneurial motivations and value-oriented motivations.

3 Case Description and Methods of Study

Gopinath Parayil (Gopi) is the founder of The Blue Yonder (hereafter referred to as TBY), a social enterprise which operates primarily in India, but which recently expanded its operations to include tours in South Africa, Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan, and Sri Lanka. Consistent with the *2002 Cape Town Declaration on Responsible Tourism*, the company aims to "create better places for people to live in and for people to visit" (The Blue Yonder Associates, n.d.). The second social enterprise, Grassroutes, was founded by Inir Pinheiro. Grassroutes is an organization "committed to helping the urban world meet and discover rural India" (Grassroutes, n.d.). It is much narrower in its geographical scope than TBY, with operations currently spanning primarily weekend trips to three villages in the Ahmednagar district of the state of Maharashtra in India: Purushwadi, Valvanda and Dehna.

Both Gopi and Inir identify themselves as social entrepreneurs in responsible tourism, which in the context of this research, is identified as the practice of tourism based on the underlying principles of the 2002 Cape Town Declaration on Responsible Tourism. While they work in the same domain, the business models established by these entrepreneurs are different. TBY functions as a more conventional tour operator, whereby it does not get actively involved in the operation of the services it provides. Its mandate is to provide a platform for the various services to be combined into package tour products. It does so by working with existing suppliers of accommodation, transportation, activity partners, distributors, etc. in its various locations. For example, in the state of Kerala, TBY's homeland, one of the tours is called *Malabar Holidays*: a 14 day trip through the region of Malabar, which includes spice tours, tea and coffee plantation visits, rainforest trek, camping, country boat cruise, and folk art forms, among other activities. Relatedly, its trips are typically much longer in duration than those offered by Grassroutes. TBY also functions as a ground handling agent for various outbound operators in its source markets: The Netherlands, Germany, France, Austria, and Norway, among others. In such a partnership, tourists perceive that they are traveling with the source

outbound operator, but TBY actually handles the on-ground arrangements for the operator and charges it a commission.

An example of a Grassroutes tour is *The Story of Rice*, which allows adventure-oriented tourists to partake in the ancient art of growing rice at Dehna and Purushwadi villages. The trip is offered over 2 days, and includes accommodation, authentic village cooked meals, rural activities and a Grassroutes tour guide. The localized nature of the Grassroutes experience has resulted from the company getting involved in much of the hands-on development and operation of its products. The villagers at the three locations were provided extensive training by Grassroutes prior to their inclusion into tourism. Also, much of the initial financial investment in developing the required infrastructure at the villages (accommodation, restrooms, activities, etc.) was provided by Grassroutes. The two companies also differ in the profiles of the incoming travelers; between 90 and 95% of TBY's tourists to India are international, while the same percentage of Grassroutes travelers is domestic. One would expect, as a corollary, and given the number of products it offers and its geographical scope, that TBY's annual revenues are higher than those of Grassroutes.

To understand Gopi and Inir's personal motivations for establishing their businesses, a narrative inquiry approach was adopted. As Mckenzie (2007) notes, narrative enquiry is an appropriate method of collecting data as "entrepreneurs are generally keen to share their experiences and love to tell stories about themselves" (p. 310) The narratives were collected using a modified three interview process (Seidman, 2006) and analyzed using a hybrid thematic coding process (Boyatzis, 1998; Muir-Cochrane & Fereday, 2006). Such an approach combines both theory-driven a priori coding with data-driven inductive coding. Thus, while the literature on social entrepreneurial motivations, identity creation, and the narratives of social entrepreneurship provided the theoretical coding framework, the various sub-themes within these areas were induced directly from the data. Given the constructionist approach of narrative inquiry whereby meaning is co-created by the participant and the researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), the authors utilized member checking to ensure interpretation validity. The result is a deep insight into the social entrepreneur's mindset.

4 Two Types of Motivations: Value-Oriented and Traditional Entrepreneurial

4.1 Value-Oriented Motivations

For both Gopi and Inir, the desire to "make a difference" was strongly present throughout their narratives. The themes were heavily steeped in their early life experiences. For Gopi, it was his early participation in and commitment to the ideals of the socially-oriented Communist movement in his home state of Kerala.

For Inir, his participation in several youth-driven programs offered by his Church inculcated in him the "passion to promote social change" and an early impulse towards social entrepreneurial activism. For both entrepreneurs, such motivations manifested in their respective ventures that aim towards local ownership, a sense of pride and the need to make people work with dignity.

Other value-oriented motivations that emerged from the narratives included *integrity*, *humility*, *benevolence*, *responsibility*, *spirituality*, *humanism*, and the Gandhian virtue of *Swavalamban* (self-reliance), and relatedly, *self-determination* (Bonney, 2004). As testimony to the values of benevolence and humility, Gopi stated:

> We all come from a culture of giving. I grew up seeing my grandmother giving, even though she was poor. She would collect fresh clothes, keep it so that she could hand it over to the government coming over, hand it over to the saints who come over, and help a poor person. Even though she is poor she will always keep things aside, so maybe it was kind of [her] influence. But for me, the biggest influence is the palliative care, where I saw that just by listening, we can make a difference.

In the case of TBY, these value-oriented motivations of benevolence and humility translate into opportunities for voluntourism. As part of their itineraries, tourists can spend time working with palliative care patients, an enriching experience for both parties that is consistent with the tenets of responsible tourism development. As another example, Inir discussed his efforts to encourage self-determination through his work at Grassroutes:

> So we've got to see that culture is preserved with a softer approach.... So in Valvada, we've got the youth asking the Warli artisans to teach them to paint. It is not [only] the fact that they want to learn about how to talk English [by participating in tourism], they also want to learn their Warli art. Why? Because they see money in actually selling the art. So it's a win-win.

4.2 Traditional Entrepreneurial Motivations

Social entrepreneurs often experience several tensions as they balance their social, value-oriented goals with the need to operate profitable businesses. For example, when talking about the work of the *Pulluvar* community to revive a dying folk culture, which now serves as a tourism attraction for his company, Gopi said:

> I went back thinking that this [conservation] is great, all this talking and all this singing about the river, but what the heck are you really doing? Are you really making a difference? This poetry and these songs can be told to let people know about the situation, but that's not gonna bring you a solution.

In addition to this need to "use business as a solution to social problems", both Gopi and Inir highlighted other practical, business-oriented motivations behind their social entrepreneurial ventures: access to *cheaper capital* owing to the financial incentives associated with being identified and officially registered as a social enterprise, *publicity*—to generate market demand for their products by promoting

the notions of responsibility and social entrepreneurship, establish a *successful business model for future expansion* (franchising in the case of TBY), *financial independence* and *independence from authority*. In general, the implicit desire to appease their *need for achievement* (n-Ach), a traditional entrepreneurial motive, strongly peppered their narratives.

5 Motivations for Social Entrepreneurship and Identity Creation

While understanding motivations for social entrepreneurship is a worthwhile endeavor in itself, the contextual rhetoric surrounding these motivations cannot be ignored. Issues of identity creation are intricately woven into the representation of any phenomenon; the highly altruistic value-laden connotation of social entrepreneurship is no exception. The manner in which social entrepreneurs use their stated motivations to generate their identities helps one understand the performative aspects of their discourses.

Individuals create their identities by classifying their actions and cognitions as similar to or different from some reference entity (Jones, Latham, & Betta, 2008). This process results in the generation of a divisive identity anchored by "What I am" and "What I am not". While their motivations allude to their associations with traditional business entrepreneurship, Gopi and Inir chose to express their work as that of storytellers, trendsetters, resource-garnerers, inspirational leaders, fieldworkers, and social problem-solvers ("What I am"):

> So that's one joy of being a social entrepreneur is being able to have a social impact. So my friend Ryan [pseudonym] used to be this project manager looking after search engine optimization. He said, "for 5 years all I did was tweaking a system here and there to generate a 30 % increase on hit on a website". He's left it all right now, and he's setup an organic T-shirt company.

Actually both Gopi and Inir distinguished themselves quite sharply from traditional entrepreneurs and social workers ("What I am not"):

> It was not a tourism initiative where you keep a part of a certain amount of money for charity, and all that nonsense. It was never like that.... The whole idea of The Blue Yonder Associates is mainstreaming responsibility, to say that responsibility is not CSR, it's not a charity, and it's not philanthropy (Gopi).
>
> Social workers tell people: stop doing this, stop doing that. The people say why should I? My stomach is getting affected.... So in the end, I started realizing that you can't stop people from doing something, you gotta work towards solutions (Inir).

Moreover, the extent of this oppositional identity creation ("What I am not") was much greater than the authors originally anticipated, even more so for Gopi than for Inir. They dissociated themselves from social entrepreneurship researchers and academics, religious workers/social entrepreneurs, non-responsible tourism operators and social development policy consultants. Much of this dissociation was

created through reference to the moral and ethical superiority of their value-oriented motivations. They tended to craft a distinct social entrepreneurial identity, building their own and their organizations' legitimacy as *heroes*, challenging the position of the others as *villains* or *antagonists* (Ruebottom, 2013). In so doing, they maintained their adherence to the popular social discourse of social entrepreneurship.

6 Social Discourse of Social Entrepreneurship

The popular social discourse surrounding social entrepreneurship confirms to what has been identified as the *grand narrative* of social entrepreneurship: "an individualized, messianistic script that incorporates a model of harmonious social change" (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, p. 87). It stresses how the social entrepreneur, relying on his value-oriented motivations, takes calculated business decisions to single-handedly provide hundreds of people with opportunities that they would otherwise not have. However, such portrayal "poses a limit to alternative forms of thinking and talking" about social entrepreneurship (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, p. 85). Froggett and Chamberlayne (2004) found that the "unspectacular" of the changemaker's biography often gets excluded or merely serves as a prelude to heroic self-actualization. Similarly, when addressing issues of identity creation, Jones et al. (2008) identified what they called the *Suppressed Me*—the elements of his identity that the social entrepreneur appeared to downplay in his narrative or discussed outside the purview of the grand narrative.

Alternative discourses are important in that they extend a coherent and closed narration of social entrepreneurship. Two alternative genres are pertinent for the present context. The first genre includes the *little narratives*—forms of narration that support re-imagining of "the social in social entrepreneurship" (Steyaert & Hjorth, 2006) and that recognize issues pertaining to the entrepreneurial struggle. The second genre comprises the *counter narratives*—forms of critical narration skeptical about the over-optimistic utopia of social entrepreneurship and which destabilize the specific set of repertoires it draws upon to establish the effect (Dey & Steyaert, 2010).

6.1 Little Narratives of Social Entrepreneurship

In their narrative, Gopi and Inir recalled several personal adversities which highlighted their entrepreneurial struggles—tenuous relationships with family, lack of stable intimate relationships, social condemnation, loneliness associated with "being different", and many financial hardships associated with the subjugation of the formal rationalities of the entrepreneur to the substantive rationalities of the social entrepreneur. The following quotes demonstrate these tensions:

> You think can you survive? You talk about sustainability? You talk about responsibility? But if your own organization is not sustainable financially, then what's the point in talking about it? So there were moments 3 years ago, 4 years ago for me when I did seriously think about shutting this down and figuring out how to pay off all those loans.

Moreover, Gopi and Inir's emphasis on "the social in social entrepreneurship" is evident from the sheer number of *characters* in their stories and the *parts* they assigned to these characters in their construction of social entrepreneurship (Downing, 2005). It is further highlighted by their reference to responsible tourism as a *movement*. For example, Inir identified the catalytic potential of his efforts as a social entrepreneur in responsible tourism: "So we may not reach, in terms of Grassroutes [by itself] may not reach 200 villages... We may influence other people to go about the entire thing or figure out someway else to go".

6.2 Counter Narratives of Social Entrepreneurship

Interestingly, there was a sharp contrast between Gopi and Inir in their expression of the counter narratives of social entrepreneurship. While Inir was more explicit in addressing situations representative of the paradoxes and negatives of tourism development, Gopi tended to suppress the counter narratives with the value-based orientation of his discourse. However, this does not mean that the counter narratives did not exist—they exist in the context of any social phenomenon. They had to be extracted by the authors. For example, during the interviews, Gopi repeatedly referenced TBY's consumers as "our kind of travelers", to point to sensitive individuals from around the world who travel to have meaningful connections with their hosts. There was no mention of any of the negative impacts commonly associated with host-guest interactions in tourism. However, in previous informal conversations with the authors, he had discussed several stories that highlighted some of the problems TBY had faced with some of its not-so-sensitive travelers.

Inir was more open in his discussion of the counter narratives. He freely spoke about instances of disputes with/within the communities pertaining to their participation in tourism. For example, when referring to the empowerment of communities through tourism, including their improved financial situation, he also indicated a potential increase in "unnecessary aspirations" and "consumerism" among the communities. In addition, he highlighted a fundamental paradox in using tourism as a tool for development; a theme that was persistent in many of the host-guest interactions that he described:

> Tourism is about getting away, so tourism at the end of a getaway in a very crude form is about drugs, sex and booze. Now how do you use tourism as an instrument, which is predominantly drugs, sex, and booze, to create responsibility? That's been a challenge. I mean, if you look at say 100 clients, people basically come and say hey, I'm beginning responsible tourism, but I like my drink at the end of the day. So a challenge is an instrument like tourism being about development.

Regardless how they are induced, both the little and counter narratives highlight the vulnerabilities of the social entrepreneur and those pertaining to the development of their social enterprises. They reveal the non-heroic aspects of the practice of social entrepreneurship through Derrida's (1997, as cited in Dey & Steyaert, 2010) notion of "messianism without a messiah". In fact, these alternative narratives serve to show the key myths about the fundamental nature of social entrepreneurship. While social entrepreneurs may use their value-oriented motivations to determine distinct entrepreneurial identities and socially accepted grand narratives that legitimize their organizations and their ability to create sustainable institutional change (Ruebottom, 2013), the *reality* of the practice of social entrepreneurship remains deeply entrenched in its kaleidic, idiosyncratic, embedded, episodic and fragmented character. Social entrepreneurship is neither the culmination of a grand Schumpeterian-style innovation, nor the outcome of the entrepreneurs' alertness to opportunities to address unmet customer needs, nor the consequence of the entrepreneurs' uncertainty reducing capacities (Brouwer, 2002; Zahra et al., 2009). Instead, the foundations of social entrepreneurial action lie in the concept of *bricolage*, defined "as the use of whatever resources and repertoires one has to perform whatever tasks one faces" (Weick 1993, as cited in Zahra et al., 2009, p. 353).

7 Social Entrepreneurship Bricolage

Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey (2010) have identified the key constructs of social entrepreneurship bricolage as *making do, a refusal to be constrained by limitations, improvisation, social value creation, stakeholder participation*, and *persuasion*. These constructs were interspersed through Gopi and Inir's narratives, especially in their identification of their value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motivations. As an example of *a refusal to be constrained by limitations* and of *improvisation*, Gopi stated:

> That gave me a business model [franchising in responsible tourism] to think about where we are very clear: we are very small, we don't have much of capital, and at the same time, we don't want to go on this borrowing spree. And I was already like up to my neck on loan. Those loans of those years are still there, because it was unaccounted, it was taken on personal stuff, I could never show it in accounting. Financial management was such a mess, my god. I struggle out of that, what I did in the first 2 years. But that's all helping me setup new companies, and in a structured way whose foundation was solid.

As an example of *making do*, Inir identified the happenstance nature of his social entrepreneurial endeavors:

> Today on hindsight I can justify exactly why tourism? It's a great economic multiplier. It's easier to setup as compared to any other industry. Agriculture requires expertise, requires time and resources. Industry requires a lot of infrastructure. A service sector industry doesn't require that much amount of infrastructure to setup. So in hindsight I can tell you what were the justifications. But we selected tourism [pauses] because it just happened.

Gopi addressed the notion of *stakeholder participation* through storytelling:

> This is madness. I haven't heard any such stories anywhere else in my country. And I was like, wow, this is it. So identify that storytelling is gonna drive the company. But then the other one was how do I engage the people, the public, was always the question. There what I did was started looking at what is it that is driving you in the sense of what does this river mean to you.

As an example of *persuasion*, Inir identified travelers' desire to create meaningful stories in their lives, and his ability to deliver these stories, as the fundamental premise of all Grassroutes travel. An examination of the company's promotions on its website corroborates this claim. Additionally, Gopi cited several examples of persuasion through storytelling; most notably, how he convinced a leading French boutique travel company to send its travelers to TBY through the story of the river Nila, a key tourism attraction in his home state of Kerala.

In this context, both Gopi and Inir explicitly highlighted a need to adhere to the grand narrative as part of their social entrepreneurial identities. Both accepted the heroic portrayal of social entrepreneurship as "good for business" (a traditional entrepreneurial inclination), in terms of the access it allows to cheaper capital, publicity and social entrepreneurial ecosystems/incubators that would otherwise be inaccessible. Inir even mentioned that "the hype" is beneficial in encouraging other individuals to engage in social entrepreneurial causes. Such observations further emphasize the relevance of the notion of bricolage to social entrepreneurship—the assemblage of actions that constitute this mosaic (Hockerts, 2006) derives from the value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motivations of social entrepreneurs. Building entrepreneurial network portfolios through narrative identity work, a process called *strategic homophily*, is critical to venture creation and early growth (Phillips, Tracey, & Karra, 2013).

The idea of social entrepreneurship as bricolage remains within the psychological perspective of the field of study. While bricolage is closely associated with the notion of *innovation ecology*—the set of institutional and structural supports that can facilitate or impede innovation for social impact (Gundry, Kickul, & Griffiths, 2011), it is important to note that the focus remains on the entrepreneur himself. The institutional restraints and conditions of the innovation ecology provide the framework within which the volitional nature of the entrepreneur's actions is evaluated. Zahra et al. (2009) adopted a similar perspective in their offering of a typology of entrepreneurs' search processes that leads to the discovery of opportunities for creating social ventures. Thus, the concept of bricolage enhances one's understanding of the entrepreneur's motivations and identity construction to explain the process elements of social entrepreneurship. It provides a relevant conceptual framework to deconstruct the mythic social entrepreneurial figure.

8 Conclusion

The chapter discusses four key themes associated with social entrepreneurship. The first theme deals with the motivations for social entrepreneurial behavior. Rather than focusing on the differences between conventional and social entrepreneurs, the chapter suggests the need to consider the multitude of motivations underlying social entrepreneurial behavior. These encompass the continuum of value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motives, highlighting that the difference between conventional enterprises, social enterprises and purely social organizations is a matter of degree rather than rigid definitional criteria (Beckmann, Zeyen, & Krzeminska, 2014). Moreover, these motivations are contextual (even country-specific) and are likely to evolve over the life cycle of the enterprise, indicating the need for longitudinal monitoring to develop a process-oriented understanding of the phenomenon.

The second and third themes of the chapter discuss issues of identity creation and highlight that social entrepreneurs often reference their value-oriented motivations to craft distinct identities. These identities are somewhat consistent with the grand narrative of social entrepreneurship, suggesting the heroic, messianic nature of social entrepreneurial activity. One can argue that there is indeed some validity to such identity creation, supported by Gopi and Inir's narratives. Two characteristics of social enterprise test the perseverance of the entrepreneur's value-oriented motivations. First, both Gopi and Inir pointed to the gradual nature of tourism intervention, according to which the targeted beneficiaries must take the initiative and ownership of the intervention, after an initial period of experimentation. This process can be long and frustrating, whereby "building trust and demonstrating the value proposition to skeptical consumers [i.e. the community]" can be a significant challenge (Allen, Bhatt, Ganesh, & Kulkarni, 2012, p. 52). Second, and in contrast to the more traditional conceptualization of social enterprise that targets its beneficiaries as consumers, the beneficiaries in tourism social enterprises are actively involved in producing and delivering products and services to visiting tourists. Most often, their culture is on display; they are the products themselves. Such involvement indicates the need for a more delicate balance of the value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motivations of the social entrepreneur. Both of those characteristics of social enterprise necessitate a long-term, value-driven engagement that may not support the economics underlying purely profit-driven motives.

Adherence to the rhetoric legitimacy of the grand narrative of social entrepreneurship is also a calculative endeavor that "bodes well for business", as accepted by both Gopi and Inir. To identity and eventually look beyond some of the myths associated with social enterprise, one must examine the little narratives as well as the counter narratives that constitute the *reality* of social enterprise (Palmas, 2012), the fourth theme of the chapter. These alternative genres of discourse indicate the nature of social entrepreneurship as *bricolage*; successful social entrepreneurship is contingent on the capabilities of entrepreneurs to garner and share resources, including knowledge. The concept of bricolage moves one's understanding of

social entrepreneurship beyond that of Schumpeterian innovation to the mosaic of actions that derive from the value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial motivations of social entrepreneurs, within the context of institutional and structural supports and constraints. Yet innovation is important to social entrepreneurial organizations. However, the tendency to simply frame social enterprise as a grand innovation, as opposed to recognizing its emergent nature, is limiting.

Useful Websites

The Blue Yonder: http://theblueyonder.com/
Grassroutes: http://www.grassroutes.co.in/

Discussion Questions

1. The chapter discusses two types of motivations—value-oriented and traditional entrepreneurial. Do these motivations evolve over the lifecycle of the social enterprise? How would a potential evolution in these motivations impact their narration as well as the practice of social entrepreneurship at different stages of the enterprise?
2. Value-oriented motivations and traditional entrepreneurial motivations are often seen in conflict with each other. In what other ways can the two types of motivations interact to impact the practice of social entrepreneurship?
3. How does the expression of their motivations impact the identities that social entrepreneurs create for themselves? Is there a correlation between the types of identities entrepreneurs create and their reference to specific types of motivations?
4. How does the wider social entrepreneurial discourse impact the narration and the practice of social entrepreneurship? Discuss these impacts in the context of both the social entrepreneurs and the organizations that form part of the social entrepreneurial ecosystem, for example incubator organizations.
5. What types of problems can you foresee as a result of a potential dissonance between the narration of social entrepreneurship, its practice, and its popular social discourse?
6. How does the idea of social entrepreneurship as bricolage impact the manner in which social entrepreneurs express their motivations and create their identities? How does bricolage differ from the popular social discourse of the phenomenon?

References

Abu-Saifan, S. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Definition and boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 2*(2), 22–27.

Allen, S., Bhatt, A., Ganesh, U., & Kulkarni, N. (2012). *On the path to sustainability and scale: A study of India's social enterprise landscape*. Retrieved June 10, 2015, from, http://intellecap.com/publications/path-sustainability-and-scale-study-indias-social-enterprise-landscape

Baum, J., & Locke, E. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 587–598.

Beckmann, M., Zeyen, A., & Krzeminska, A. (2014). Mission, finance, and innovation: The similarities and differences between social entrepreneurship and social business. In A. Grove & G. Berg (Eds.), *Social business* (pp. 23–41). Berlin: Springer.

Beugre, C. (2011). Motivation to create social ventures: A theory of moral engagement. In *Entrepreneurship: Changing the present, creating the future*. Hilton Head Island: United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Bonney, R. (2004). *Three giants of South Asia: Gandhi, Ambedkar and Jinnah on self-determination*. Leicester: University of Leicester.

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brandstatter, H. (2011). Personality aspects of entrepreneurship: A look at five meta-analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(3), 222–230.

Brouwer, M. T. (2002). Weber, Schumpeter and Knight on entrepreneurship and economic development. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 12*(1-2), 83–105.

Concordia College. (n.d.). *Muhammad Yunus*. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from http://www.cord.edu

Dann, G., & Cohen, E. (1991). Sociology and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 18*(1), 155–169.

Dees, J. (2001). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Retrieved August 19, 2015, from https://entrepreneurship.duke.edu/news-item/the-meaning-of-social-entrepreneurship/

Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2010). The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 4*(1), 85–108.

Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 681–703.

Downing, S. (2005). The social construction of entrepreneurship: Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29*(2), 185–204.

Froggett, L., & Chamberlayne, P. (2004). Narratives of social enterprise: From biography to practice and policy critique. *Qualitative Social Work, 3*(1), 61–77.

Grassroutes. (n.d.). *About Us*. Retrieved September 26, 2015, from http://grassroutes.co.in

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gundry, L., Kickul, J., & Griffiths, M. (2011). Creating social change out of nothing: The role of entrepreneurial bricolage in social entrepreneurs' catalytic innovations. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, 13*(7), 1–24.

Hockerts, K. (2006). Entrepreneurial opportunity in social purpose business ventures. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 142–154). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, R., Latham, J., & Betta, M. (2008). Narrative construction of the social entrepreneurial identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research, 14*(5), 330–345.

Mckenzie, B. (2007). Techniques for collecting verbal histories. In H. Neergaard & J. Ulhøi (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship* (pp. 308–330). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Muir-Cochrane, E. C., & Fereday, J. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1), 1–11.

Palmas, K. (2012). Re-assessing Schumpeterian assumptions regarding entrepreneurship and the social. *Social Enterprise Journal, 8*(2), 141–155.
Phillips, N., Tracey, P., & Karra, N. (2013). Building entrepreneurial tie portfolios through strategic homophily: The role of narrative identity work in venture creation and early growth. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(1), 134–150.
Ruebottom, T. (2013). The microstructures of rhetorical strategy in social entrepreneurship: Building legitimacy through heroes and villains. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(1), 98–116.
Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in the education and social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
Shane, S., Locke, E., & Collins, C. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review, 13*(2), 257–279.
Steyaert, C., & Hjorth, D. (2006). Introduction: What is social in social entrepreneurship. In C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as social change: A third movements of entrepreneurship book* (pp. 1–18). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Tan, W.-L., Williams, J., & Tan, T.-M. (2005). Defining the "social" in "social entrepreneurship": Altruism and entrepreneurship. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 1*(3), 353–365.
The Blue Yonder Associates. (n.d.). *About Us*. Retrieved September 26, 2015, from http://theblueyonder.com/
Yunus, M., & Weber, K. (2011). *Building social business: The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs*. New York: Public Affairs.
Zahra, S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D., & Shulman, J. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing, 24*(5), 519–532.

Makarand Mody is Assistant Professor of Hospitality Marketing in Boston University's School of Hospitality Administration. He graduated with his Ph.D. from Purdue University. He received his M.Sc. in Human Resource Management for Tourism and Hospitality from the University of Strathclyde, and a Higher Diploma in Hospitality Management from IMI University Centre, Switzerland. Dr. Mody has worked in the hotel and airlines industries in the areas of learning and development and quality control. Most recently, he worked as Senior Research Manager for one India's largest market research firms. Makarand's research focuses on issues pertaining to the supply and demand of responsible tourism, tourism entrepreneurship and consumer behavior.

Jonathon Day is an Associate Professor in Purdue's School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, has over 20 years' experience in destination management. An award winning marketer, Dr. Day has worked with destinations marketing organizations in Australia, New Zealand and the United States. Dr. Day is committed to ensuring tourism is a force for good in the world. Dr. Day's research interests focus on sustainable tourism, responsible travel, and strategic destination governance within the tourism system. He is interested in the role of business in solving grand challenges through corporate social responsibility programs and social entrepreneurship.