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Abstract

Funding strategy has often been the determinant factor in the level of success for social entrepreneurships. The strategy could be a preference for internally generated revenue, externally generated revenue or a combination of the two. Interestingly, scarcity of resources has always been ‘a clog in the wheel’ of meaningful execution of projects irrespective of the funding model a social entrepreneur chooses. Through a review of existing literatures, this paper weighs the implications of choosing either externally generated revenue or internally generated revenue; specifically contextualizing the study to US. More so, it attempts to find out which of the two models would ensure optimum productivity, given that scarcity of resources would hamper the chances of effectively running the two models simultaneously. To arrive at a ‘plausible’ response, principles of resource valuation become vital in determining the costs and benefits associated with each model of funding. Consequently, the findings show that though both internally and externally generated revenue are *sine qua non* to an effective and efficient production of social values, internally generated revenue ensures better optimum production than externally generated revenue.
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Introduction

A lot has been written about revenue sources, not only as the backbone of social entrepreneurship but also from a variety of channels through which it could be generated. Some scholars have approached it as funds generated from within the organization (Perrini 2006; Fowler 2000); some would approach it as funds generated from without (Anderson et al 2006; Leadbeater 2007; Thomson et al 2000); others would approach it as a combination of the two perspectives (Mair and Marti: 2006; Martin and Osberg: 2007; McLeod: 1997). Apparently, there are so many avenues to approach or study funding in social entrepreneurship. However, this study would compartmentalize them into two major models: external and internal sources of revenue.

On one hand, external sources of revenue are those avenues and sources that are outside the jurisdiction of a given social entrepreneurial organization; through which money is generated. This could come in the form of grant and loan. On the other hand, internal revenue sources are all the means of generating fund which fall within the ambits of the social entrepreneurship jurisdiction. Prominent among this group is social enterprise; there are also inter/intra organizational partnerships which fall within this category.

Interestingly, there is a general concession among the above scholars that neither externally, nor internally generated revenue can independently ensure smooth running of social entrepreneurship. One of the reviewed papers puts it this way in quote:

We are not proposing that business methods are the ultimate solution for addressing some of the shortcomings already inherent in the nonprofit structure, and we recognize that the adoption of business techniques will cause additional complications and implementation issues. But we are not convinced that sector-bending activities significantly increase the risks of poor performance, declining societal benefits or further class division. We embrace transparency and evaluation as tools to help us assess these experiments, but we do not see a case for inhibiting activities that further blur the lines between nonprofit and for-profit (Dees and Anderson 2003: 25).

The authors would argue in a latter work that, “starkly contrasting different sources of funding in terms of dependency and self sufficiency is seriously misleading: A financially self-sufficient organization, like perpetual motion- machine, is a myth” (B. Anderson and G. Dees 2006: 147). Thus, the two models are both *sine qua non* to the survival and effective productivity in social entrepreneurship. Though externally generated revenue may be channeled to create internally generated revenue, so could internally generated revenue be
channeled towards fundraising from ‘outside’. However, scarce resources and time channeled towards external sources of revenue, automatically reduces the resources for internally generated revenue and vice versa (Edgcomb et al 2007: 10).

Hence, the theoretical framework on resource valuation equips this paper with the experimental tools which would ensure a transparent evaluation of each model vis a vis their optimum production with scarce resources. On that note, the concept of economic sustainability through resource valuation (Rao 2000: 113-160) becomes vital as the theoretical bedrock which would guide the analysis of the findings within the literature review.

That would not go without noting that the classical theorization about economic sustainability had often been associated with commercial entrepreneurship or the private sector. However, the emergence of social entrepreneurship which often cuts across sectors: private, public and civil society extends the conceptual scope of economic sustainability especially in relation to resource acquisition and utilization (Nicholls 2005: 1). Accordingly, social entrepreneurship organizations are “increasingly being asked to conform to the ‘discipline’ of business-like accountability. Whether it is social enterprises delivering public services, private sector organizations partnering with government, or social entrepreneurs challenging the conventional separation between social and economic value creation, new organizational forms are competing for resources and legitimacy” (Ibid).

Notwithstanding the complexities and overlapping scopes in epistemology of sustainable development, the general definition would encompass three basic dimensions: Economic sustainability, environmental sustainability and social sustainability (Jeroem et al 1998: 12-13). Hence, there is literally no restriction to the scope of sustainable development concept (Ibid: 1), which is due to lack of “a single comprehensive overview” (Ibid: 12). However, some scholars would argue that the concept has to be used to reflect the utilization of production capital in a manner that is environmentally non-degenerating, procedurally suitable, economically feasible and socially tolerable (Ibid: 272). Hence, this paper would focus on economic sustainability which requires that material cost of satisfying human want or need does not impede on future cost of consumption (Jeroem et al 1998: 12-13; Pittel 2002: 22).

The point of departure in this paper therefore is that resources spent on one model of revenue generation would positively or negatively affect the other. This is a precarious situation and
dilemma for scholars and indeed social entrepreneurs with regards to how a social entrepreneurship can ensure a sustainable funding strategy. On one hand, scholars are faced with the task of determining how useful and to what extent each model is able to affect the social entrepreneurship vis a vis the model’s effect on the other model. In other words, scholars are faced with the task to determine the optimal level of each model. On the other hand, social entrepreneurs are confronted with the odious task of discerning which model receives more of the scarce resources. Accordingly, this paper intends to lend a hand to the ‘two sides of the coin’ by formulating a comprehensive question which would provide contributions to both the academic world and the practitioners of social entrepreneurship at large.

For further disposition, this introductory chapter would end with the posed research questions, its aim and purpose. Chapter two outlines the methodology of the study. It explains the choices of material and sources; the limitations of the study, sources’ credibility and reliability. Chapter three contains the theoretical framework. This is followed up by a review of the literatures in chapter four. The literature review is mostly based on Dees and Anderson 2003, since the latter paper basically covers the factors that are of interest in this paper. However, since there is no case study from the article, other literatures (though incomprehensive of the reviewed factors) have corroborated Dees and Anderson 2003. In chapter five, general discussion from the findings in the literature is presented which precipitates into some propositions. Finally, a conclusive discussion is presented which gives way to some unresolved issues in this paper for possible future research. More dispositions would be presented before each chapter to enable free and coherent flow with trends in this paper. But first, one needs to take a look at social entrepreneurship as a concept and the varying lenses through which it has been viewed.

1. Social Entrepreneurship: Conceptual Understanding

A coherent definition and conceptual understanding of social entrepreneurship has so far eluded scholars. One may attribute this to the newness of the concept in the academic world. Nevertheless, the marriage of a contestable and vague word ‘social’ to entrepreneurship has not made the definition of social entrepreneurship any easier and coherent. Of course, one could also argue that these conceptual differences are fueled by differences in funding strategy. As a result, social entrepreneurship has been greeted with polarized scholarly
definitions. Its definitions have ranged from perspectives on philanthropy, social values and others would see it as enterprise with embedded social values (Mari and Marti 2006: 37-38). This paper would therefore review these perspectives and determine the features that might be associated with each. More so, it would evaluate possible connection line among these definitional perspectives.

1.1 The Philanthropic perspective

The philanthropic school of thought would define social entrepreneurship as a not-for-profit organization with a new way of solving social un-met needs. This school of thought would argue that social entrepreneurship is cross-sector collaboration. The definitions put more emphasis on the entrepreneurial composition of an organization and their capacity to create new ideas. As a result, social problems are solved in a unique and unconventional way. Hence, their emphasis is not just on social values created, instead, the procedure and organizational process of creating those values. More so, these authors argue that social entrepreneurship implies the pursuit of social goal with social organizations whose motive is not for profit maximization (Thomson et al 2000; leadbeater 2007). In that vein, Anderson et al would define social entrepreneurship as “private and government and non government public organizations combining resources towards delivery of goods and services that provide social improvement and change” (Anderson et al 2006: 76).

Similarly, Thompson et al would maintain that social entrepreneurship is an organization which is founded by “…people who realize where there is an opportunity to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet, and who gather together the necessary resources (generally people, often volunteers, money and premises) and use these to ‘make a difference’” (Thompson et al 2000: 328). However, the authors would explain further that not every nonprofit organization fits into the definition of social entrepreneurship. According to them, “In some cases the idea will be completely new and innovative and associated with the founder - in essence, truly entrepreneurial. In other cases the initiative will be variant on a theme - sometimes a close copy, sometimes genuinely different - but real enterprise will be required to make things happen” (Ibid: 330).

As a follow up, Leadbeater would define social entrepreneurship based on his case studies. Hence, social entrepreneurship involves innovative ways of tackling social issues which recurrently have assailed the welfare system (Leadbeater 2007: 14-20). He would further
argue that there would not be shareholders for an organization to be a social entrepreneurship. More so, the fundamental capital for the organization emanates from social capital which in turn, provides the human and material capital (Ibid: 11). Nevertheless, he maintains that social entrepreneurship needs the combination of resources from among the three sectors of the society—the public sector, private sector and the voluntary sector (Ibid: 10). Apparently, he sees social entrepreneurship as a remedy to the ever decreasing role and sustainability of the welfare system. Hence, inter-sector collaboration would provide a leeway to some social lapses which the decline in welfare system has provided.

1.2 Social enterprise

Social enterprise is considered by some authors to be coterminous with social entrepreneurship. According to Franchesco Perrini, “Social entrepreneurship represents a totally, new approach towards business and society” (perrini 2006: 29). Alan Fowler leads the school of thought who defines social entrepreneurship as social enterprise. In his article “NGDOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation?” he identifies some categorical features that make social enterprise tantamount to social entrepreneurship. However, such business enterprise is established for profit making but along the line, creates social values (Fowler 2000: 645).

The first of these features is what he terms “integrated social entrepreneurship”. “Integrated social entrepreneurship is characterized when surplus-generating activities simultaneously create social benefits. An integrated approach to social entrepreneurship typically selects and introduces enterprises or commercial practices which create reinforcing horizontal, vertical, backward and/or forward linkages to produce additional development and economic benefits for both existing and a wider array of people” (Ibid). He consequently, sighted the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh as an example of social enterprise (Ibid: 645-646). Fowler also refers to social entrepreneurship as an organization which “builds on and creatively applies NGDOS’ existing activities in ways that reduce costs and/or increase and diversify incomes. One example is a non-profit organization in the USA supplying meals to the medically infirm on a contract with the municipal government. Recognizing that there was a busy middle class with elderly parents, the organization started to advertise this service for the elderly, but not necessarily infirm” (Ibid: 646). He would further define social entrepreneurship as a continuum or “complimentary social entrepreneurship” with social purpose which has a totally profit making venture through which it funds its social goals. In his words, “This type
of entrepreneurship seeks to diversify clients and income streams by adding an enterprise dimension that does not necessarily engender a social benefit. The enterprise generates a surplus that can cross-subsidize development activities that are in themselves not economically viable” (Fowler 2000: 647). Fowler would further distinguish the disparity between ‘traditional’ business venture which offer social remunerations and profit concurrently and economic ventures that are stringently meant to maximize profit. Hence, he maintains that the former is implicitly more demanding than the latter (Ibid).

1.3 Social value creation
There are quite a number of scholars in this school of thought. Though similar to the philanthropic perspective, the exponents of social value creation define social entrepreneurship as a social venture which is created to solve social problem. However, the latter maintain that it is not only a merger among the three sector of the society that can facilitate social entrepreneurship. More so, an individual with strong motivation to achieve social goals by creating social wealth could also create social entrepreneurship. (Mair and Marti: 2006; Martin and Osberg: 2007). Some would also define social entrepreneurship as an introduction of business know-how and market-based expertise within the non-profit sector—thereby, making the non-profit sector more effective and innovative in providing and delivering social services. Accordingly, McLeod would define social entrepreneurship as not-for-profit organizations and for-profit enterprises, which devote their profits to addressing social problems (McLeod 1997:2).

1.4 Bridging the conceptual divide
Notwithstanding the divergent angles through which scholars have sort to conceptualize social entrepreneurship, all the perspectives make reference to a unique way of responding to social issue through creative, proactive or reactive measures.

The first perspective sees it from organizational structure and source of charity; the second perspective sees it as a business measure which also has social impact; and the third sees it not just from its organizational structure but also from the actual production of social value irrespective of the source. These conceptual perspectives are relatively, replication of different countries-one world. Apparently, most of the definition depends on the context/countries in which their studied cases operate.
Attempts though has been made by Yohanan Stryjan 2006 and Zahra et al 2008 to harness these varying perspectives into a unified outlook as they would not restrict their definitions to any of these perspectives. According to the former, “social entrepreneurship is here not defined by its ‘usefulness’ to others, nor constrained to any one particular ‘social’ form of enterprise (such as non-profits, charities or social enterprises). Nor is it restricted to a narrow range of activities. Any undertaken called into an act of being social entrepreneurship has to meet the key requirements of: (a) being core activity for target populations; (b) maintaining finance/resource mobilization over time (sustainability); (c) mustering the support of a community, however defined” (Stryjan 2006: 35). Zahra et al would follow a similar part as they conclude from a review of some scholarly definitions of social entrepreneurship that “Social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner” (Zahra et al 2008:118; Zahra et al 2009: 520-521). From which ever angle one may wish to view social entrepreneurship, it would still embody the production of social output in an unconventional manner. Perhaps, this should be the basis for its conceptual understanding.

1.6 Aim

The objective of the study is to evaluate and unveil the two paradigms of funding social entrepreneurship particularly in the US. More so, to provide a paradigm that could mediate between diverse perspectives on various models of funding in social entrepreneurship which could provide a critical ground for theorizing on a more optimal model of revenue generation.

1.7 Purpose

It is perhaps established that neither internally generated revenue nor externally generated revenue can independently provide ‘adequate’ fund for projects executed by social entrepreneurs in the US context. However, the far reaching effect is to unveil the pros and cons associated with each model of revenue generation. Hence, to determine on one hand, where emphasis and more attention should be laid among/between the models of funding for social entrepreneurship and on the other hand, to ascertain the constraints facing social entrepreneurs in sourcing funds for projects.

1.5 Research Question
Which sources of funding Best ensures optimum results for projects in social entrepreneurship in the U.S.A: Externally or internally generated revenue?

2. Methodology

Reflexive methodology (as a benchmark for the conduct of a critical literature review) plays a prominent part in the ‘operationalization’ of this paper. As a follow-up, some empirical data analysis from each model of revenue generation in social entrepreneurship would be looked at from the reviewed literatures. In other not to make over-generalization, this paper notes the US as the contexts under which the literatures are based.

Accordingly, it will evaluate or take into account the methodologies used in each literature. To unsure an objective research, this paper adopts critical and perhaps, postmodern interpretations of the materials which paves way for a reflexive outcome. Hence, inter-subjectivism plays important role in giving credibility to opinions and views.

Analytically, this paper evaluates some indicators within the literatures which give a contextual and perhaps, general understanding of externally and internally generated revenue. More so, the indicators are further subjected to optimality scrutiny through the theoretical framework on resource valuation.

2.1 Sources and Materials

Though the research would have produced a more concretized result had an empirical study through interviews been conducted, hence it would depend largely on past research. However, effort is made to ensure that credible articles and books from credible journals and sources are used. Consequently, most of the materials used for literature review are drawn to reflect some general issues on either internally generated or externally generated revenue.

2.2 Credibility and Reliability

The issue of credibility and reliability are also taken into consideration while sources and materials are chosen for this study. The literature review is predominantly based on Gregory Dees and Beth Battle Anderson 2003, which evaluates the implications of merging profit maximization and the production of social value which social enterprise stands for. More so, the article relates it to the conventional social entrepreneurship organization. Though some of their arguments are reflective of generality of social entrepreneurship, it refers mostly to cases
within the United States to concretize its points. The credibility and reliability of the article is based on two premises: (A) Gregory Dees and Beth Battle Anderson are renowned professors of social entrepreneurship and non-profit management and Senior Research Associate respectively, at Fuqua Business School, Duke University. As at the production of this work, Dees had been working with Kauffman Foundation’s Centre for Entrepreneurial leadership as Entrepreneur-in-residence. He has also worked at Stanford University’s Graduate Business school, Harvard University Business School and Yale University School of management, to mention but a few (Dees et al 2002: xvii-xviii). (B) Their references to hypothetical phenomena are corroborated by other chosen authors in this literature review.

2.3 Limitations
The initial plan for this essay was to conduct a case study of projects funded by a social entrepreneurship. However, some factors such as time, distance and availability of materials would not allow this to materialize.

As an effort to conduct a case study on a social entrepreneurship, I had contacted some (via phone and email) some distinguished social entrepreneurships in Nigeria for Instance. Nevertheless, none of them has been able to provide any publication on projects executed by their organizations. More so, it would have been a lot easier had distance not been a militant factor to an alternative approach: interview. That notwithstanding, had distance not been a stumbling block, they would still need more time than this paper would allow to gather information and respond to questions.

Alternatively, one would have expected that most of these social entrepreneurships project would be conveniently accessible online. Unfortunately, very few online materials exist on social entrepreneurship. Where there is online material on social entrepreneurship organizations, focus is rarely on detailed issues and practicality of funding. Interestingly, some social entrepreneurs are not even aware of the term as it is still a relatively new concept.

3. Theoretical Framework
Having identified the three basic dimensions through which one may approach sustainable development and due to the nature of the topic, this paper would concentrate on economic sustainability. Though economic sustainability might have a peculiar scope of theorization, it still remains difficult to delineate its indicators and determinant factors for sustainability
(Giddings et al 2002: 187; Ekins 2000: 106), which requires that material cost of satisfying human want or need does not impede on future cost of consumption (Jeroem et al 1998: 12-13; Pittel 2002: 22). Hence, one could still approach the concept from a generalized theorization. Similarly, though the operationalization of social entrepreneurship is relatively distinct from commercial entrepreneurship, both use the market system in achieving their objectives. Hence, there is perhaps need to subject funding of social entrepreneurship to the traditional economic theorization.

As an economic model of sustainable development, Neo-classical economic systems theory has predominantly focused on using scarce resources to achieve maximum output/optimum production and the processes involved in the economic production (Rao 2000: 124). Therefore, it is imperative to approach funding in social entrepreneurship from Neo-classical systems perspective. Hence, the imperative of fiscal issues as *sine qua non* to optimum production for an organization may not be overemphasized. Consequently, this paper would look at Pinninti K Rao and other Neo-classical economic system scholars with regards to resource valuation principles as the framework which could be used to determine the implications of organizational fiscal policies and actions.

### 3.1 Optimum productivity through resource valuation

To understand the optimum level of productivity within an organization, it is imperative to evaluate the implications of fiscal policies and actions within the given organization. According to Rao, it is necessary to understand methods involved in evaluating varying sources of revenue (Rao 2000: 113). In the chapter titled “valuing resources and the future” in his book *Sustainable development: economics and policy*, the author maintains that financial sustainability of an organization is dependent on these evaluation principles which are prerequisites in addressing any conflicting ideas about resource acquisition and utilization. Some other notable scholars of social entrepreneurship have started applying these resource valuation principles with Zietlow referencing Dennis Young to have prescribed “that the nonprofit decision maker should seriously consider a venture if: $B + P > C$ (where $B$ represents direct mission-related benefits, $P$ is the opportunity value of the net profit or loss from activity—in terms of mission-related benefits—and $C$ is the total of costs and mission-related losses associated with the activity)” (Zietlow 2001: 30). Suffice it to say that Dennis R. Young ‘brings home’ these normative financial theorization in social entrepreneurship when
he prescribes in his *Financing nonprofits: putting theory into practice*, that resource valuation principles in nonprofit organization should encompass conventional organizational finance paraphernalia such as “financial solvency, interactions among income sources, the challenges (feasibility) of accessing and administering particular source of income, risk management and long term mission achievement” (Young 2007: 343). More so, these principles: Human resource valuation, exhaustible resources and cost benefit analysis (Rao 2000: 114), are vital as they take into consideration, the contemporary systemic issues and the probability of future changes.

Some contemporary economic system might undergo some metamorphosis over a period of time. Hence, Rao would question the rationale behind assessing “the value of a resource based on the information available at one point of time and then to use that yardstick for several hundred years to come” (Ibid: 133). One would therefore assume that these principles are not just subjective; rather, they unveil the pragmatic decorum of the contemporary economic system which apparently is necessary for social entrepreneurship. Sequel to this, more detailed analysis on these resource valuation principles would be discussed below.

### 3.2 Human Resource Valuation

Evaluating tangible assets had been the only method of ascertaining the economic worth of organizational resources. However, during the past four decades, the method of resource evaluation started looking at the worth of human capital as part of organizational resources. Hence, human resource valuation in an organization considers and measures the economic worth of its human resources (Lev and Schwartz 1971; Flamholtz 1971; Jaggi and Shaing Lau 1974; Peutt and Roma 1976: 656). These authors demonstrate the imperative of human resource valuation, of which organizational deficiency “to account for its human resources can have several adverse consequences on over-all organizational effectiveness as well as on the effectiveness of human resource management itself” (Flamholtz 1971: 253).

However, various models have been espoused by various authors over the years. The first model was espoused by Baruch Lev and Aba Schwartz 1971, "On the Use of the Economic Concept of Human Capital in Financial Statements". In the article, the authors maintain that the value of an employee to the employer is the economic value of an employee’s age, skills
over a period of time. A five year worth of an employee to an employer would require the latter to consider the former’s age and aggregate it to what a person (five years older) with the same skills earn at the moment. According to the authors, “We can, therefore, estimate next year’s earnings of our 25 year old engineer on the basis of current earnings of an equivalent engineer 26 years of age, the estimate of earnings two years hence will be based on current average earnings of 27 year old engineers, and so on” (Lev and Schwartz 1971: 105).

Apparently, the authors might not have a provision for skill improvement on the part of the employee. If one is to use this model to measure the value of an employer, it means that the employee is not likely to leave the position talk more of leaving the organization, given a hypothetical situation where he/she decides in future to upgrade or diversify her/his skills and qualification. More so, there is every tendency that the economic asymmetries could occur over a period of time which would often reflect in an increase or decrease in demand and supply of labour and a resultant effect of increase or decrease in wages.

Shortly after Lev and Schwartz came out with their model of human resource valuation, Eric Flamholtz proposed a “normative” method through which an organization should measure the present value of its employees which is quite similar but different from Lev and Schwartz model. Flamholtz maintains that the method of valuing human resources is by measuring the cumulative of an employee’s monetary value for her/his future services for an organization (Flamholtz 1971: 260). In his clarification of accounting theory which measures an employee’s value to an organization by “the present worth of his expected services” (Flamholtz 1971: 259), without specifying the methodology of such measurement (Ibid), the author proposes some guidelines through which it can be measured.

Consequently, he proposes the valuation of time frame as the first parameter for measuring the value of human resources. According to him, the worth of an employee to an organization should be measured by the employee’s expected years of service which is contingent to the contextual life expectancy, “health and emotional state, organizational retirement policies, and his inter-organizational mobility” (Ibid: 259-260). Interestingly, he concedes that a great deal of uncertainty comes along in measuring these variables (Ibid: 260). Furthermore, the author proposes that an employee’s value should be measured with monetary parameter. He maintains that the monetary equivalent of an employee can be determined by the either the price value of the quantity of products produced by the latter or the expected profit accruing from the sale of the produced goods or services (Ibid).
Perhaps Flamholtz offers a partial redress to the seeming floors in Lev and Schwartz’s model as he introduces the probabilistic state to address the possibility of an employee moving “through a set of mutually exclusive organizational roles or "service states" during a time interval that can be estimated probabilistically” (Flamholtz 1971: 256). Nevertheless, the author would also be criticized for being unrealistic. According to Bikki Jaggi and Hon-Shiang Lau 1974, the probability state has to be exclusive to all employees and all positions within an organization for a specific time frame (Jaggi and Shiang Lau 1974: 322). Hence, if there is probability that an employee would move from position A to position B, there should also be the probability that an employee occupying position B could move to another position. Jaggi and Shiang Lau would berate this model as “a tremendously expensive way to measure the value of human resources” (Ibid: 322-323). In modification of Flamholtz’s model, Jaggi and Shiang Lau would propose a “Markovian” model for the valuation of human resources. This model maintains that the value of human resources can be measured by a combination of time factors (as espoused by Flamholtz above) and the productivity level of an employee (Ibid. 325-329). According to the authors, promotion can be used to checkmate the probability of a valuable employee moving out of an organization. More so, though ‘position’ in an organization could say a lot about an employee’s organizational worth, one may be at a high position, yet less productive than a lower placed employee (Ibid: 328). Hence, the application of this model would work perfectly only in an organization where promotion merit is due to the level of one’s productivity. To put human resource valuation (at least the pragmatic model) into the perspective of social entrepreneurship, professionalism/specialization becomes imperative in ensuring the efficient and effective revenue generation for its financial sustainability.

3.3 Exhaustible resources

The meaning of exhaustible resources transcends any physical capital which could be used in maximization of output. It also includes renewability of resources such as human capital, finance, social capital and so on. According to Pinninti K. Rao, resource utility results to amplification of relative scarce value of the equivalent resources which often manifest itself “in increasing the market prices if the resources or its products are channeled into the marketplace via the market institutions” ((Rao 2000: 124-125). Hence, the more limited resources are utilized, the more increase in the price of the production unit. Accordingly, the more social entrepreneurship organization utilizes its limited resources, the more it is likely to
incure more cost in the production of a particular unit of social value. Interestingly, just as cost affects exhaustible resources, so does it also affect fixed resources (Ibid: 125). Fixed resources here refer to variables such as buildings and land (Dasgupta and Heal 1979: 194).

The deduction here is that if the cost of producing a particular social value is high, there is tendency that the quality and/or quantity of such social value would be negatively affected. In the case of externally generated revenue, the capital/money spent in sourcing for funds would most likely be reimbursed from the remuneration accruing from the fundraising. Hence, the more the cost of raising the funds for social projects, the more the social entrepreneurship is likely to pay for such capital, which would in turn limit the amount of fund/capital that would be available for the production of the intended social value. Similarly, the more increase in the cost of running a social enterprise, the more likely there would be a decrease in the resources meant for execution of social projects.

More so, the extent to which the production of goods and services (be it social values or profit making) depend on exhaustible resources determine the extent of financial sustainability to which an organization is exposed to. According to Dasgupta and Heal 1979, “an exhaustible resource would pose a ‘problem’ if it is, in some sense, essential in the production of final consumption goods” (Dasgupta and Heal 1979: 193). To put this into perspective in social entrepreneurship, fixed assets such as building would prove to be more reliable than money and some social capital in the production of social values. A change in government policies could result to resource exhaustion, given that the new government might be less receptive to social entrepreneurship ideologies. Though the uncertainty of labour makes it difficult to either locate or exempt it from exhaustible resources (Ibid: 194), lack/adequate remuneration for workers in internally funded social entrepreneurship and lack of socially motivated people in externally funded social entrepreneurship could affect the work force needed to run a social entrepreneurship. In the case of externally generated revenue, one may lose social capital at one point or the other. More so, non-compromise on mission and social product may derail potential funders to provide finance for a social entrepreneurship. On the other hand, a social enterprise would have to contend with changes in prices of goods and services which could sometimes, be negative.
3.4 Cost- benefit analysis (CBA)

Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) is the measurement and approximation of money value to output in relation to time and resources spent on such output, which provides justification or otherwise, to a given project (Rao 2000: 129-130; Kornhauser 2000: 1039). According to Rao, though (CBA) is often applied to measure material input, it can also be applied to measure social input. He maintains that in this sense, social cost-benefit analysis (SCBA) can be applied in organizations whose “main objective or frame of reference for the analysis is that of maximizing social welfare or an equivalent social objective (Rao 2000: 129).

Cost –benefit analysis could be a valuable policy for social entrepreneurs. The cost of generating funds can be measured through valuation of money and time spent and forgone alternative in relation to the accruing revenue. More so, one interesting aspect of cost-benefit analysis is that it takes into account the forgone alternative which is usually associated with opportunity cost. Forgone alternative here refer to the preference of a particular policy over another which comes with some level of uncertainty and risks (Kornhauser 2000: 1039-1040). This is what Richard Layard and Stephen Glaister would refer to as “consumption generated and consumption displaced” (Layard and Glaister 1994: 37). Furthermore, Rao maintains that the measurement of opportunity cost in the production of social value is the benefit of the social input which is its total social contribution to the consumption/and or production function, including the linkages of this input to the rest of the relevant system (Rao 2000: 130). The consumption measurement thus can be determined by the influence or contribution of the project to improving people’s well being. Of course, well being is a subjective and contextual notion which depends on what one views as a standard of measurement. Nonetheless, what is relevant for the valuation of resources is that “cost-benefit analyst measure subjective benefits in monetary terms” ( Kornhauser 2000: 1039).

This valuable piece of strategic policy principle will not go without some criticisms. According to Kornhauser, one of the critiques of cost-benefit analysis (by Elisabeth Anderson) is that social relations and “irreplaceable goods” are measured in a quantifiable manner. The critique here posits that products like social value are not easily measured due to their subjective nature (Ibid: 1038-1039). Another critique is that there is no stable parameter for measuring resources as they often change from time to time due to influential factors such as inflation, loss of social capital and so on (Ibid). Though these critiques might not
necessarily be vague, (CBA) posits a strategic effect to understanding the aggregate cost of the various factors which social entrepreneurship organization would encounter while generating revenue; be it in internally or externally generated model as they are made evident in the literature review below.

4. Literature Review

It is perhaps, imperative to refresh the purpose and problem area of this paper before presenting a review of the literatures on internally and externally generated revenue in social entrepreneurship. Consequently, it is widely accepted that neither internally nor externally generated revenue can ensure efficient running of social entrepreneurship. However, scarcity trails the capital and resources often required to run both models simultaneously. It is on this premise that this paper intends to find out which model of funding deserves more attention, given that resources available to run the two models are relatively scarce. Sequel to this, the literature review here is geared towards an evaluation and possibly, critique of some selected literature. Some factors (which are discussed below) therefore become important in addressing the issue of effective use of scarce resources.

4.1 Model of funding and its effect on mission

There is a tendency that attention given to the organization’s social mission may be hampered or reduced due to market forces such as competition, profit maximization and funder’s interest. Perhaps the utmost apprehension about internally and externally funded social entrepreneurship is that despite their financial potentials, their operationalization can militate or reduce social value creation. In their analysis of internally generated revenues as a source of funding for social entrepreneurship, Gregory Dees and Beth Battle Anderson 2003, maintain that there are three factors associated with revenue generation that could work against the realization of the organization’s social mission.

4.1. A More emphasis on profit maximization

Dees and Anderson argue that social enterprise is prone to providing goods and services to people who can pay for such products and services. This provides a potential constraint to social value creation. Hence, “this inherent value is challenged when nonprofit organizations adopt the tools and values of the market” (Eikenberry and Kluver 2004: 136). As a result, more emphasis is laid on the possibility of realizing income instead of the social value creation which are most often associated with the poor –that are less able to pay for the goods and
services (Dees and Anderson 2003: 21), which implies that commercialization of social entrepreneurship may lead to mission drift (Zietlow 2001: 32).

To validate their argument, Dees and Anderson give some hypothetical instances where monetization of social value could reduce the target group. For instance, a social enterprise who provide shelter and starts a training and employment opportunity for “shelter residents” could realize how difficult and expensive it could be to provide such services to the homeless that most often do not respond positively to training. It is a logical inference to say that a nonprofit with for profit model of funding is likely to behave in a commercial manner to remain competitive, which undermines “the fundamental justification for the special social and economic role they have played” (Weisbrod 1997: 548). Another scenario is that an environmental social enterprise which produces products “using nuts from a rain forest cooperative” could realize that the cooperative would not be able to produce sufficient high-quality nuts to sustain the demand and change to other suppliers (Ibid). Hence, the authors main that in theory, internally generated revenue might be of significant financial boost for a social entrepreneurship, nonetheless, “the relative ease of bringing in commercial fees or the market pressures exerted on earned income activities may slowly draw an organization away from its mission” (Ibid).

However, the authors may not have taken into consideration that there are two models of social enterprise: integrated social enterprise which simultaneously creates economic and social values (Fowler 2000: 645) and complimentary social enterprise- a totally profit making venture through which the social entrepreneurship funds its social goals. In his words, “This type of entrepreneurship seeks to diversify clients and income streams by adding an enterprise dimension that does not necessarily engender a social benefit. The enterprise generates a surplus that can cross-subsidize development activities that are in themselves not economically viable” (Fowler 2000: 647). In effect, Dees and Anderson’s argument may only be associated with an integrated social enterprise.

On the other hand, there is significant possibility too that externally generated revenue could have adverse effect on the organization’s social mission. Dees and Anderson would argue that funder’s interest may also result to a shift in mission for social entrepreneurship. According to them, social entrepreneurship that depend on external sources for funding is prone to decline or shift in social mission (Dees and Anderson 2003: 21).
4.1. B Quality of service

There is a growing concern among scholars and social entrepreneurs in United States that the existence of a profit purpose or a strong prominence towards effectiveness in social entrepreneurship could result to service providers cutting corners by reducing the quality and cost of their goods and services. According to Dees and Anderson, some studies have found out that social enterprise especially in the United States have the tendency to produce less quality goods and services than not-for-profit organizations. These cases are predominant in such sectors as health care and social services. However, the authors would quickly add that it might be erroneous to “conclude that having for-profit players is a bad thing unless the industry has excess capacity or the service quality has fallen below some morally acceptable minimum” (Dees and Anderson 2003: 21). However, the rationale for lowering cost and quality could be attributed to the need by social enterprise to cover as many recipients and costumers as possibly (Ibid), which in itself could be viewed as intended social outcome.

Though lower quality is relatively associated with internally generated revenue, the externally funded social entrepreneurship would be criticized for its small and limited scope within a social problem area. While referring to a social entrepreneurship that cater for people with AIDS in a US community, Dees and Anderson maintains that externally funded social entrepreneurship may produce high quality but can only reach out to a few. Hence, they would question whether it is “better to maintain very high quality and stay small, or would it be more socially desirable to lower quality but expand capacity to serve more of the people in need?” (Ibid: 21). Accordingly, Dees and Anderson would argue that there is nothing inherently, wrong should a for-profit reduce cost which in turn reduces quality in order to respond to a wider populace in need of a particular social value. However, they would argue that it is only irrational if the intended recipients are better off without the product or service (Ibid: 22). The choice between quality and quantity in the production of social value is based on subjective discretion of a social entrepreneur.

Generally, the quality level of products and services from not-for- profits may or may not be high. Since there are little or no standard form of measurement and accountability most often in not-for- profit social entrepreneurship, one would only rely on the social entrepreneurship motivation and available resources to determine the quality of their product and to what extent they can cover a particular social problem. Most often, they are handicapped to reach a wide
number of people especially the ones that need urgent attention, given that their source of income is often seasonal.

4.1. C Advocacy

Social entrepreneurship plays an important role as an advocate group check-mating the excesses of corporate companies. In the United States, studies have shown that there is wider organizational participation in advocacy, which had often been championed by not-for-profit charitable organization (Flynn and Hodgkinson 2001:109-116). Never the less, Profit-making and collaboration with other profit-making companies could therefore constitute a stumbling block for social entrepreneurship since they would be found wanting for the same reasons they are expected to criticize (Eikenberry and Kluver 2004: 136). However, according to Dees and Anderson, successful social enterprise which does not fall guilty of corporate social responsibility can generate resources which could be used to further the course of advocacy (Ibid:22).

The situation is somewhat different for a not-for-profit social entrepreneurship. According to Dees and Anderson, since they depend on donations and gifts from corporations and rich people whom also have their interest to protect, not-for-profit social enterpreneurships tend to tone down their critique in order to attract these donors. The grants, contracts and funds from government do not make matters any easier for them either: not-for-profit social entrepreneurship tend to avoid criticizing government policies in order not to run out of funds (Ibid).

4.2 Human capital for revenue generation

The necessary human resources needed in generating funds for social entrepreneurship are more available in for-profit organizations with social value than in organizations with only social value creation mission. According to Sharon M. Oster, one fundamental reason behind this trend especially in the US is due to better salary which is more in social enterprise than in solely not-for-profit organization (Oster 1995: 66). In reference to some earlier case study by some authors, Oster finds out that in United States, professionals such as Lawyers, Doctors, Teachers and so on who work in for-profit firms are paid 20% more than their counterparts who work in charitable not-for-profit firms(Ibid).
Nevertheless, Oster would maintain that one of his case studies shows that the balance (if any) between the availability of quality labour force in internally and externally funded social entrepreneurship is still possible given “that nonprofits offer significantly more task independence and sick leave flexibility than their for-profit counterparts” (Ibid). More so, the author acknowledges the presence of competent and quality labour force within social entrepreneurship whose source of income is external. He maintains that the urge to address social problems can also influence high profile labour force to join solely not-for-profit social entrepreneurship, regardless of the payment package (Ibid). However, this does not in any way, suggest that quality professionals necessary for the proper operation of an organization are attracted more (or even equally) to charitable not-for-profit organizations.

4.3 Accountability

Internally generated revenue through sales and market principles, help social entrepreneurship to be more accountable. Since the organization is regularly being checked by the customers’ opinion, they tend to respond in a responsible manner in order to remain in business. Hence, all the public complaints are better adhered to and taken into account. Dees and Anderson would argue that “even third-party payers can provide greater market discipline than most donors. They have greater legal standing to complain and often have greater incentives to hold providers accountable and better information on performance” (Dees and Anderson 2003:24-25). Accordingly, social enterprise has a propensity to have a more responsibility and commitment to rapport with the recipients of their goods and services. The customers on the other hand, have a sense of prerogative given that the goods or service was paid for. Consequently, employers would be able to take action based on contribution emanating from their employees with regards to the quality of the goods or services provided. This systemic interaction among customers, employers and employees is what Dees and Anderson would refer to as “Market discipline” which gives each constituent its own rights and responsibility. This market discipline gives for profit social ventures an added advantage over nonprofit social entrepreneurship as the latter is often “slower to meet increases in demand and less efficient in their use of inputs than for-profit concerns, due to the lack of market discipline and of a profit motive” (Zietlow 2001: 29). This market dynamics which gives room for accountability lacks in charitable social entrepreneurship. More so, the importance of market discipline brings forth accountability to social enterprise which “is only beneficial if the earned income strategies are aligned with effectively serving the organization's mission” (Ibid).
4.4 Efficiency and effectiveness

Efficiency and effectiveness is mostly associated with internally funded social entrepreneurship through division of labour. In social entrepreneurship, the motive for profit making, necessities specialization and compartmentalization of labour force which are often congested in not for profit social entrepreneurship. Consequently, by-product of division of labour, manifests through better goods and service delivery. A lot of research (especially in health and public service industries) have shown that for-profits out-perform not-for-profits in terms of meeting the demand of social goods and services (Zietlow 2001: 29; Dees and Anderson 2003: 19). This goes to show how crucial the formal organizational structures in business sector are also in social entrepreneurship which ensures efficient utilization of resources and delivery of social benefits. To buttress this point, the latter authors maintain, in quote:

The discipline of identifying customers; defining how you will create value for them; developing strategies that reflect the organization's competencies and the competitive environment in which it operates; and pushing for more careful tracking of impact can have a very healthy impact on organizational performance even in philanthropic organizations…. In these cases, it may make sense for the leaders to consider hybrid structures, such as a for-profit hospital with an affiliated nonprofit clinic, to attract the necessary resources and meet the full spectrum of community needs. At the organizational level, for nonprofits earning more commercial revenues, the revenues can serve as a source of leverage for philanthropic donations. Not only should donors not want to subsidize customers who can pay (either directly or through an interested third party), but they also should be attracted to the possibility of their dollars having greater social impact when combined with the revenues from earned income activities. Ideally, a greater pool of funds will be available to provide social goods and services for which nobody is able or willing to pay, either because these are true public goods or the clients are economically disadvantaged (Ibid).

The rationale behind the authors’ above proposition is that it is accepted that internally funded social entrepreneurship ensures more efficient service delivery than externally funded social enterprise. However, since social entrepreneurship is meant to respond to unmet social needs, wouldn’t the quest for profit making exclude those who are unable to afford the cost of social products and services from social enterprise? To address this question, they would argue that there might be need for the two models of social entrepreneurship in charitable industry. Perhaps, one model would be meant for the people that can afford to pay for goods or services; the other; for the people that may not be able to pay. The effect however, could be undesirable- some people would get better quality of goods or services than others. Given this
hypothetical situation, the authors would argue that perhaps, the best option is to have a social enterprise with a not for profit outfit serving its social goals.

4.5 Government fiscal policy, Subsidy and Taxation

The government fiscal policies for organizations in the US are designed to favour both internally and externally funded social entrepreneurship. Both the federal and state governments have tax exemptions for non profits in so far as the organization’s mission is for social purpose. More so, for-profit organization which has social mission embedded in its mission also enjoys government tax exemption. Nevertheless, the dilemma facing government with regards to not-for-profit tax exemption is the basis and criteria for defining not-for-profit organizations with embedded social goal. In other words, how could the government determine the social product level of an organization vis a vis its profit level? Dees and Anderson would argue that this might necessarily be a dilemma given that mainstream for-profit organizations significantly outnumber that of not-for-profits-including social enterprises. (Dees and Anderson 2003: 27).

It is however, beyond the scope of this paper to wade deeply into the dilemma associated with government’s tax policies for not-for profits in the US. However, the some would argue that the tax exemption for nonprofits is quite unfair to organization with social value creation as its sole purpose. According to Dees and Anderson, it is an undue alarm to “complaint that tax exemptions and ease of avoiding UBIT give nonprofits engaging in business activities an unfair competitive advantage” (Ibid). However, to buttress the unfair competitive advantage argument, Burton A. Weisbrod maintains that there is an increasing rate of government’s disaffection towards nonprofits in the US due to perceived undulating and unholy self aggrandizement associated with executives of nonprofits especially the internally funded organizations (Weisbrod 1997: 546). Of course this could be a setback for internally funded social entrepreneurship in the long run. Until then, the situation remains even for both internally and externally funded social entrepreneurship.

On the other hand, several scholars have studied the relationship between not for profit philanthropic organizations and the funding they get from the government especially in the United States (Heimovics et al 1993: 419) According to the latter, these studies illustrate and argue that the dependency of nonprofit philanthropic organizations on government funding
expose them to a great deal of vulnerability such as changes in government Regime/ideology (Ibid). In the United States, there has been an alternation of power between the Democratic and Republican parties. The Democrats are said to be more favourable to providing funding for non profits than the Republicans. Therefore, it is expected that there would be inconsistency with the availability of funds from government from regime to regime.

Perhaps it is not only ideological differences in the two major political parties’ regimes that are considered a treat to the availability of funds for social entrepreneurship. Over the past four decades, there is a considerable decline in government’s funding programmes for not-for-profit organizations. According to Angela Eikenberry and Drapal Kluver 2004, numerous authors have shown that though there has been significant retrenchment in governments’ funding for not-for-profits, the demand for social value creation has been on the increase (Eikenberry and Kluver 2004: 133-134). It is on this backdrop that social enterprise has been on a steady increase in the United States and indeed the world at large.

5 General discussion and propositions
The reviewed literatures have shown some significant pros and cons associated with each model of funding for social entrepreneurship. This confirms the earlier assumption that neither internally nor externally source of funding can ensure an effective running of a social entrepreneurship. Interestingly, some inherent risks have been identified with both models of funding: risk of losing focus on mission; potential side effect on social value creation; and the risk of drawing the line between social products for the haves and have-nots.

Nonetheless, there are still some significant indicators of optimum productivity within each model. Sequel to this, it becomes imperative to implore the resource valuation theory in order to understand the optimum level of each model, given that scarcity trials the resources needed to run both models concurrently. Hence, some of these indicators would guide the reflexivity of the ensuing analysis, which would be made manifest in propositional presentations. It is also imperative to reiterate that the following propositions are based on the studied literatures and context. Already, the literature review contains some critical analysis which would have lessened the volume of the ensuing propositions. Consequently, the following propositions are delineated in line with the research question with due application of the theoretical framework.
Proposition 1: *It is costlier to run internally funded social entrepreneurship than externally funded social entrepreneurship.*

There is relativity in the cost of running each model of funding for social entrepreneurship. However, given equal amount of capital (money), it is ‘costlier’ to run an internally funded social entrepreneurship than its external counterpart. The theorization about exhaustible resources above by Rao 2000 and Dasgupta and Heal 1979 make it clear that an increase in prices of fixed capitals would negatively affect the price unit of social benefit. Some of these costs include the financial burden needed to erect/acquire fixed assets such as land and buildings. In extreme cases, internally funded social entrepreneurship would require such costly fixed assets in order to produce goods or services. On the contrary, externally funded social entrepreneurship can afford to provide social values without much need for fixed assets. They often make use of public abandoned properties by renovating them.

Furthermore, internally funded social entrepreneurship is faced with more labour cost by paying the professional workers’ salaries and remunerations. Conversely, not-for-profit social entrepreneurship often depend on voluntary workers. Hence, these workers are not always after money-making and are generally less paid than their counterparts in for-profit social entrepreneurship.

Proposition 2: *Externally funded social entrepreneurship is more prone to risk than internally funded social entrepreneurship.*

Interestingly, these cost variations in both models of funding social entrepreneurship do come with some proportionate risks. According to the literature review, there are significant amount of risks involved in each model of funding for social entrepreneurship. On one hand, internally funded social entrepreneurship is faced with the risk of losing out on its social mission due to its commercialization activities. On the other hand, externally funded social entrepreneurship is faced with the same risk of mission adrift. However, in this case, the risk is mostly associated with the funders’ interest. Perhaps the greatest risk associated with externally funded model is governments’ lackluster attitude in providing funds for not-for-profit social entrepreneurship.

It is accepted that more and more profit maximization could lead to loss of social mission in internally funded model; however, the organization is at least able to regulate, determine and delineate the boundary between its profit making and social mission. On the contrary, the
externally funded model is largely at the mercy of the government in place and its fiscal policies for not-for-profits. More so, the model is further hampered by interests from corporate donors and private individuals. Apparently, the organization is prone to dance to ‘their’ tune to ensure its existence. Hence, while internally funded social entrepreneurship is battling with potential reduction in social mission, the externally funded social entrepreneurship would battle with not just reduction or potential drift in social mission but also potential extinction due to lack of funds.

Proposition 3: *Internally funded social entrepreneurship ensures greater marginal return on investments than externally funded social entrepreneurship.*

Perhaps this is the climax of this research. Using the resource valuation principles especially the Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA), the findings in the reviewed literature show that though the cost of running externally funded social entrepreneurship is lower, efficiency and effectiveness in internally funded social entrepreneurship results into greater proportion of benefits, in relation to the cost inputs. Accordingly, in a hypothetical situation where an internally and an externally funded social entrepreneurship are required to solve a particular social need for a group of people, it is expected that the internally funded social entrepreneurship could use $5000 for total operational costs while the externally funded social entrepreneurship would perhaps use $4000 in the same respect. However, if the number of recipients from internally funded social entrepreneurship is 100, the recipients from externally funded social entrepreneurship would be 60 or 70.

Perhaps one may see in Dasgupta and Heal 1979 the rationale behind less efficiency and effectiveness in externally funded social entrepreneurship. In the theoretical framework, the authors maintain that the more an organization depends on exhaustible resources such as human capital, determines its vulnerability to less productivity. Accordingly, since externally funded social entrepreneurship depends largely on volunteers and very much less on fixed assets, it becomes a treat given that human beings would often change allegiance depending on his or her interest. On the contrary, internally funded social entrepreneurship depends both on exhaustible and fixed resources and can always regulate the stability of its labour force as the theorization on human resource valuation shows through remunerations, commensurate salaries and promotions.
Conclusion

The propositions above portray internally generated revenue to ensure more optimum productivity in social entrepreneurship than externally generated revenue especially in the United States. Though both models of funding provide unique and peculiar pros and cons, they are both at the same time, *sine-qua-non* for utmost and efficient production of social output. Nevertheless, the better performance in marginal return sees internally generated revenue as a more optimum ensuring model, given that scarce resources would often not be enough to run both models simultaneously.

Apart from resource valuation principles that portray internally generated revenue to ensure optimum results than externally generated revenue, there is apparent focus-shift to the former due to the decline in externally generated revenue in the studied context especially from government funds. This alone threatens the very existence of externally funded social entrepreneurship. No wonder more and more internally generated revenue are springing up in the United States today (Zietlow, T. John: 2001).

Therefore, the underlying proposition in this study is that given a ‘two-way’ situation with scarcity of resources, it is optimally more beneficial to focus more on the internally generated revenue than externally generated revenue especially in the United States. Suffice it however to reiterate the importance of both models in a resource-permitted situation. Perhaps the result could be quite different had another country with a different political and economic system been the context of this study.

For further Research

If the socio-economic implications of different economic and political systems are anything to go by, then the result of this research would definitely be different should a more social system be the studied context. Accordingly, a Scandinavian context would most probably have a different result. Hence, future studies could look at the topic from a Scandinavian and other context. Furthermore, a similar study could be conducted on another context similar to US’s political and economic systems.

More so, though the study is a collection of literature which could be regarded as credible, it would be worthwhile to apply the propositions to an existing social entrepreneurship in US. This is of course to consolidate, corroborate or refute the propositions herein.
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