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Abstract- Social entrepreneurship is considered an important tool in enabling the nation development and poverty alleviation. The main purpose of this paper is to justify the linkage between social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation based on empirical reviews. In this study, we conducted the general search to collect empirical literatures by the name of entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation in different online database sources such as Google Scholars, Springer Link, Wiley, Science Direct, JSTOR, Emerald full text, Scopus, and EBSCO HOST etc. We found that social entrepreneurship development is a key tool for poverty reduction; stimulating employment as well as fast-tracking realization of universal prime education and promoting gender equality. It is hoped that it would be useful to fellow researchers who are undertaking studies in this area. In the light of recent world events, this has become a crucial area to study and understand.
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I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major challenges facing developing and underdeveloped countries of the world is poverty [1], [2]. It has been so common problem for all is that the high rate of unemployment and that has become the major obstacle of the developing and underdeveloped countries of the world. Although the level and extent of poverty and unemployment have been observed to be different within and across the nations and it still remains the major obstacle to the optimum utilization of human resources for both social and economic development of the nation [1]–[3].

Poverty is one of the most pressing social problems of the 21st century. That is why, the world’s leaders, who gathered at the millennium Summit of the 2000, declared a war against poverty through the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) derived from the Declaration of the summit, where member states of the United Nations (UN) agreed to achieve this by 2015 [4]. The first goal was geared at eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, with a target to reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day and who suffer from hunger UNDP, 2003 in [5].
The World Bank indicates that poverty is categorized as both absolute and relative [1]–[3]. When poverty is said to be absolute, it describes as a lack of resources to meet the physical needs for survival, a lack of basic security, the absence of one or more factors that enable individuals and families to assume basic responsibilities and to enjoy fundamental rights [3]. On the other hand, relative poverty can be categorized in relation to particular groups or areas in relation to the economic status of other members of the society which is interpreted as a lack of resources to achieve a standard of living that allows people to play roles, participate in relationships, and live a life that is deemed normative of the society to which they belong [2], [3]. Poverty results from and even consists of a lack of basic securities, which is not only comprise financial resource, but also education, employment, housing, health care and other related aspects leading to deprivation [2], [3]. The World Bank also believes that political instability, lack of improvement in infrastructure, inadequacy of national policy and structural adjustment, lack of investment are among the main causes of poverty [3].

Moreover, the persistence of poverty and other social ills are a result of evolving life styles, social institutions and structures capable of affecting the human social wellbeing [6] that calls for special strategies and tools to overcome the situation. In this case, the goal of reducing poverty cannot be achieved unless proper strategies and tools are put in place. Creative and innovative approaches are required in order to overcome these pressures and challenges and in turn make this world a good place to live [4].

Entrepreneurship encompasses the identification, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities [7]. In this sense, opportunities represent circumstances to bring new products or services into existence such that individuals or organizations are able to sell new outputs at prices higher than their cost of production. The fundamental mission of entrepreneurial activities involves profit generation, and these profits help entrepreneurs to build personal wealth[8]. Entrepreneurship is the functions of an entrepreneur’s where a person or persons organize resources for generating profits which provide them consecutive development and growth through innovation.

In recent years social entrepreneurship, a sub-discipline within the field of entrepreneurship, has gained increasing attention from entrepreneurship scholars [1]. Social entrepreneurship involves the recognition, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities that result in social value — the basic and long-standing needs of society — as opposed to personal or shareholder wealth. Social value has little to do with profits but instead involves the fulfillment of basic and long-standing needs such as providing food, water, shelter, education, and medical services to those members of society who are in need [4], [9]. So, Social entrepreneurship refers to the identification, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities that result in a social value. Opportunity awareness and recognition reflect an entrepreneur’s ability to detect when either supply or demand for a value-creating product or service exists. Social entrepreneurs have an acute understanding of social needs, and then fulfill these needs through creative organization.

More formally, social entrepreneurship as innovative, social value creating an activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors [4], [10]. There are two important points worth noting about this definition. First, the definition explicitly notes the role of innovation. Social entrepreneurship presumably involves applying a new technology or approach in an effort to create social value. This focus on innovation is consistent with the Schumpeterian view of entrepreneurship which emphasizes the role of innovation in entrepreneurship; social entrepreneurs, then, may be viewed as social innovators [11].
Second, the definition highlights the various contexts in which social entrepreneurship may take place. Social entrepreneurship might involve individual entrepreneurs, new or existing organizations (both non-profit or for profit), or governments [12].

Social entrepreneurship is now creating the new business model. It also bridges an important gap between business and social action. Social entrepreneurship, commonly defined as “entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose” [13]. Social entrepreneurship is perceived to be about applying the expertise, talents and resources of entrepreneurs to the variety of problems developing countries face, such as education, health, personal safety and security, poverty alleviation, social advancement, environmental sustainability, and so forth [14]–[16]. Social entrepreneurship has developed a global phenomenon that influences the society by using innovative approaches to elucidate social problems [16]. Therefore, Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business, the Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE) writes, Social entrepreneurship is the process of recognizing and resourcefully pursuing opportunities to create social value with the innovative method. Social entrepreneurs are innovative, resourceful, and result-oriented, who draw upon the best thinking in both the business and nonprofit worlds to develop strategies that maximize social impact. These entrepreneurial leaders operate in all kinds of organizations: large and small; new and old; religious and secular; non-profit, for-profit, and hybrid [17].

The term “social entrepreneurship” is used to refer to the rapidly growing number of organizations that have created models for efficiently catering to basic human needs that existing markets and institutions have failed to satisfy [18]. Social entrepreneurship combines the resourcefulness of traditional entrepreneurship with a mission to change society [16]. Social entrepreneurship offers insights that may stimulate ideas for more socially acceptable and sustainable business strategies and organizational forms, because, it contributes directly to internationally recognized sustainable development goals, social entrepreneurship may also encourage established corporations to take on greater social responsibility [15].

Social entrepreneurs are important as they generate significant and diverse contributions to their communities and societies. “They create social value of adopting business models to offer creative solutions to complex and persistent social problems” and emerged as a response to the result of globalization and liberalization where governments as a major provider of social services, left this in the hands of the market [19]. Social entrepreneurs are viewed as agents of social change by tackling the root causes of social challenges and problems rather than the resulting consequences [6].

Finally, Social entrepreneurship paves the way to a future that may allow coming generations to satisfy their needs better than we are able to satisfy even the basic needs of today’s population [1]. Social entrepreneurship is thus having profound implications in the economic system: creating new industries, validating new business models, and re-directing resources to neglected societal problems [13]. The World Bank brings social entrepreneurs with poverty-fighting ideas into contact with partners that have the resources to help them implement their vision [16]. In 2003, World Bank President James Wolfensohn awarded more than US$6 million in seed money to be shared among 47 small-scale, innovative development projects in 27 countries [1].
The main objective of this paper is justifying the linkage between social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation. This paper is divided into five sections. Section one is the introductory part of the paper. It provides a concise overview on the paper. Section two highlights the methods and materials used for the research with justification for its adoption. Section three presents the empirical findings and outcomes of the study. Finally, section four concludes the effective utilization of social entrepreneurship development as tools for poverty reduction.

II. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This is the review study, which has examined the determinants of social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation from the flow of existing literature. In this study, we conducted a general search by the name of social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation in different online database sources such as Google Scholars, JSTOR, Wiley, Springer Link, Science Direct, Emerald full text, UniMAP Library WorldCat, Scopus and EBSCO HOST etc. From this search, it has been that a number of journal articles, conference and other types of work. Considering said issues it has been declaiming to determine which articles need to be included in the review of this paper. After reading thoroughly most relevant articles have collected those were found as the best fit within objectives of the present issues about social entrepreneurship development as well as poverty alleviation. The reviews have examined on the basis of objectives, methods and findings accordingly of the all collected empirical studies.

III. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

Social entrepreneurship is viewed as a way of combating poverty, with the pursuit of an entrepreneurial strategy [20]. “Many studies indicated that opening up of trade has a positive impact on poverty reduction” [21]. Social entrepreneurship has a promising approach to eliminate the causes of poverty, which helps in boosting the economy. Social entrepreneurship makes ventures that may be for benefits or nonprofit, yet the need is frequently on utilizing market oriented exercises to create framework change that enhances the lives of individuals. Social entrepreneurship has a specific capacity in the financial ecosystem [15]. According to Mead and Lieholm (1998), social entrepreneurship is a successful means of financial advancement and poverty alleviation in bankrupted and lower income areas of the world. The consequences of social entrepreneurship on eradication of poverty and increases income for the beneficiaries of microfinance are at best inconclusive [15].

On the other hand, several past studies undertakes an analytical, critical and synthetic examination of ‘‘social entrepreneurship’’ in its common use, considering both the ‘‘social’’ and the ‘‘entrepreneurship’’ elements in the concept [22]. On both points, there is a range of use with significant differences marked by such things as the prominence of social goals and what are thought of as the salient features of entrepreneurship. They found social entrepreneurship is exercised where some person or persons aim either exclusively or in some prominent way to create social value of some kind, and pursue that goal through some combination of recognizing and exploiting opportunities to create this value, employing innovation, tolerating risk and declining to accept limitations in available resources [4], [23].
However, Simpson in 2013 attempt to provide an answer, what role does social enterprise play, if any, in reducing the persistent, overtly stubborn problem of poverty? The study applies Stakeholder Model, through an analysis of the Top 100 Non-profits list and a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews with non-profit leaders in Fort Worth, Texas. The study found that the stabilizing services like housing, healthcare, and temporary assistance are foundational to all individuals. Once these stabilizing services are provided, education and wealth creation can be pursued as propelling forces. Taken together, stabilizing services and propelling forces lead to economic independence and self-sufficiency. Social enterprises best serve the role of propelling services, particularly by educating and employing workers [12].

Meanwhile, Choi and Majumdar in 2013 analyzed social entrepreneurship on the basis of the theory of essentially contested concepts, which was proposed by Walter Bryce Gallie in 1956. Building upon this theory they shows that social entrepreneurship can be regarded as an essentially contested concept and that a universal definition that would be accepted among contestant parties is hardly possible. Responding to this recognition, they proposes the conceptualization of social entrepreneurship as a cluster concept, which can serve as a conceptual tool to help advancing social entrepreneurship as a coherent field of research despite its contested nature [24].

Mamashalane (2014) studied the attitudes of urban youth toward social entrepreneurship and the constraints that the youth perceive as barriers to engaging in social entrepreneurship. The data was conducted a survey in Diepsloot, North of Johannesburg involving 153 young people. Data was collected using two self-rating questionnaires. The study produced three main findings. Firstly, the majority of respondents had positive attitudes towards starting and engaging in social enterprises. Secondly, the research identified three main constraints that discourage the youth from starting or engaging in social enterprise, namely “lack of access to finance”, “lack of savings to start”, and “weak economic environment”. Thirdly, the research also identified an overall limitation to social entrepreneurship, namely; lack of support [25].

R. D. F. Connor in 2014 explored the social entrepreneurial work of local women in Zanzibar, Tanzania and how their social innovations address social problems and influence community sustainability. The study applies qualitative interview and participant observation approach. He found that the increase in government initiatives to promote entrepreneurship, as a means of improving the global economic climate, encourages inquiry into understanding entrepreneurial motivations. By offering implications for social work practice and research in addition to public policy implications for local development in the area of community sustainability and poverty alleviation [26].

Fotheringham et al. in 2014 investigated the potential of social enterprise as a strategy for poverty reduction for women. They using the literature synthesis method and found that, in terms of specific factors contributing to women’s poverty and hypothesizes mechanisms through which social enterprises can mitigate or address these factors in practice. In their study also highlights that the need to ensure a solid policy foundation is in place before a number of key support mechanisms are enabled, which then facilitate specific types of work that can then grow in a sustainable manner [27].
Bento and Muzanenhamo (2014) demonstrated, linking their analysis to the Millennium Development Goals 2015, how social entrepreneurship has a pivotal role in facilitating Africans as brand Africa, to be the principle drivers of their own sustainable development, through knowledge and skills development. The study provides evidences from the field based on case study approach and semi-structured interviews. They found that is an important aspect of reducing poverty through social entrepreneurship is that participants in the communities are also involved in the solution for their problems, to achieve the objective of poverty reduction of the Millennium Development Goals and to create more sustainable future for all humanity. They also highlighted therefore imply that both people within a given place and their social initiatives are crucial actors in poverty reduction. More remarkably, social entrepreneurship and place branding, which are seldom analysed in synthesis, if at all, have a common dimension in the sense that they are people centric concepts and practices [28].

Daniel in 2014 studied on the role of social entrepreneurship in the fight against poverty, exclusion and marginalization in Haiti. The study focuses on another approach, social entrepreneurship, as a development tool coming from the private sector to fight poverty, exclusion and marginalization. He conducted the survey, consisting of interviews with eight social entrepreneurs and three nongovernmental organizations and found that social entrepreneurship seems to be a promising way to exploit poverty-reduction opportunities, while applying business practices in a sustainable manner [23].

Zainol et al. (2014) propose a conceptual framework to study the relationship between social entrepreneurship and organizational effectiveness. They also explained various theories of change that social entrepreneurs have pursued in overcoming urban poverty. The study will utilize qualitative methods to collect primary data from social entrepreneurship organization in the main cities in Malaysia. The study found that no single social entrepreneurial venture had put a huge dent in poverty, there certainly have been many initiatives that have notable stories to tell about how they have helps poor people [29].

Fotheringham and Saunders (2014) investigated the potential of social enterprise as a strategy for poverty reduction for women. A literature synthesis on the topic was conducted and patterns, linkages and gaps were examined among key themes to identify how social enterprise can potentially serve as a poverty reduction strategy for women. The findings are organized around three themes that emerged from the analysis: (i) the context for social enterprise; (ii) women and social enterprise; and (iii) WISE. The study concludes that social enterprise might be the next great poverty-reduction movement. As such, there is a need to understand the full potential of this strategy to help women successfully and permanently exit poverty [27].

Moreover, Bulsara et. al. (2015) studied the growing trends of social entrepreneurship in India and the new initiatives taken by various social entrepreneurs. The study found that social entrepreneurship in India has taken a new concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The Indian entrepreneurs are made aware of their social responsibility as an important business segment but CSR in India has yet to receive widespread recognition. The researchers recommended that this study can be further used for future empirical study for the purpose of a detailed hypothesis formulation. In the light of the new initiative by the private sector and the pure investor sector, towards philanthropic activities with a social cause, the resources and skills are available for harnessing [30].
Zaefarian et al. (2015) conceptualized a market-based approach toward poverty reduction from a corporate social entrepreneurship (CSE) perspective. He reviews related literature on social entrepreneurship and CSE. They found that, it is enables managers to implement their social responsibility through a CSE approach. It also illuminates how corporations can implement market-based solutions for poverty reduction by developing corporate entrepreneurship (innovativeness, proactiveness, new business venturing and self-renewal) in their organization and creating social value (social added value, empowerment, systemic change and social innovation) [16].

Kang in 2015 attempts to find out what has the current research found out about SE and its definition and how it has been developing in China. The study adopts primarily a qualitative analysis approach and the data was collected through direct observation, done through a personal site visit and in-depth interviews done to two social entrepreneurs of the company. This study found that the domestic environment in China is not well established for social entrepreneurship development, and initiatives such as the social entrepreneurship incubators are offering a great deal of assistance to social entrepreneurs. The lesson for Chinese social entrepreneurs to learn here is that they should try to attain a deep understanding of every single one of the five environment factors, analyzing the interacting dynamics between the environment factors and their own resources and capabilities and asking for help when necessary [31].

Manyaka (2015) investigated the concept, social entrepreneurship, as a potential lever in economic and social transformation of the poorest-of-the-poor community of Nellmapius Township, east of Pretoria, South Africa. The study applies Schumpeter’s theory, and found that the poorest-of-the-poor community of Nellmapius needs social entrepreneurs who will work in the community and with them to develop models that can add value to their lives. These would be the kinds of people who would use their innovative thinking to be alert to the opportunities in the middle of the hopelessness found within this environment [32].

Deplautt (2015) attempted to serves better understand the organizations of social businesses and give an idea of what motivates companies to follow a social mission and why many companies are successful in doing so. She applied the methodologies of both Toms, one-for-one, and Danimal. The study found that the bottom of the pyramid, the unifying concern was companies that somehow were perpetuating poverty through their structure or not having the most ethical intent in their practices and methodologies. Governing structures such as B Lab can help in this process once hybrid business models become used more frequently and accepted. She also recommended that the entrepreneur should select the organizational structure that will allow for maximization of achievement for their mission [33].

Sijabat (2015) attempted to better understand the role of social entrepreneurship in enabling economic opportunities for the poor. The study developed based on a survey of the literature. She found that social entrepreneurship has broadened access to financial sources, promoted the use of social innovations in reducing social problems, granted people empowerment and social inclusion, and created jobs. The first three factors create income for the poor, thereby enabling economic opportunities, whereas the latter eliminates the deprivation of capabilities that allow the poor to involved and act in economic activities [34].
Additionally, Nasike in 2016 investigated the effects of social entrepreneurship practices by microfinance institutions on poverty reduction. The study beneficiaries of 7 microfinance institutions were involved. 100 questionnaires were distributed and collected for analysis. He found that there is a strong relationship between the products and services offered by MFIs and the level of poverty eradication through income generation. It’s also been observed by offering services and products, MFIs have enabled many people start business, improve their saving knowledge, purchase new farming machinery and build modern homes [35].

Kazmi et al., (2016) explored that what are the basic challenges faced by Social Entrepreneurship in the boundaries of Pakistan and how social entrepreneurship can contribute in developing the economy of Pakistan. In the study, his highlighted that Social entrepreneurship has a promising approach to eliminate the causes of poverty, which helps in boosting the economy. Social entrepreneurship makes ventures that may be for benefits or nonprofit, yet the need is frequently on utilizing market oriented exercises to create framework change that enhances the lives of individuals. Social entrepreneurship has a specific capacity in the financial ecosystem. The consequences of social entrepreneurship on eradication of poverty and increases income for the beneficiaries of microfinance are at best inconclusive [15].

R. F. Connor and Bent in 2016 studied on Zanzibari social entrepreneurs and poverty alleviation strategies, by understanding efforts to build local community sustainability. The study consider strategically about methods of human capital development, promoting economic sustainability and asset building. In the study, they found that these Zanzibar women are influencing major aspects of society and promoting the development of individuals in order to combat a state of hardship. They represent a good example of how a few individuals in a small community or island can have large effects on growth and development. They are also empowering those around them through sharing their practical knowledge and skills with others. In both urban and rural areas, social entrepreneurs are empowering groups of individuals to learn the skills or trade that they are using in their social ventures. These individuals are then able to apply this newfound knowledge in a business to provide family income, or simply as a source of economic empowerment; creating personal and public value in their lives. Many may feel a sense of having control over their immediate destiny, changing the mind set to allow for new attitudes to be implemented toward community growth and poverty alleviation [14].

Maji and Adejoh (2016) examined a perplexing contrast between Africa’s immense wealth statistics and high poverty rate for majority of population in Nigeria and Cameroon in the 21st century. They found that the persistence of poverty in Africa demonstrate that the traditional government and international organizations development’s initiatives to alleviate poverty have failed and the consequence of this scenario on the economy of Africa, most especially in Nigeria and Cameroon is very grievous. They also recommended that the exploration of the new emerging Social Entrepreneurship Organizations (SEOs) as an effective alternative and complementary measure to curb poverty in the region in the 21st century [36].

Jamadar (2016) examined the new trends of social business for improving the socioeconomic condition of poor people through direct involvement in social business activities at the grassroots level in developing countries. He found that in most development cases conventional ‘top-down’ approaches were adopted both by governments’ bi/multilateral development programs bypassing the poorest of the poor who are at the grassroots level. So many poor people are not receiving their basic needs. Nor can they afford to pay for alternative services offered by the business sector. This market failure leaves them marginalized and, unless a third party offers some alternative basic services, the prevailing inequalities and poverty will continue.
In the past, to some extent these kind of services provided by foundations and non-governmental organizations. In recent days, many companies have become significant and active partners in this endeavor through their social business commitments. Again, the government endeavors tend to use the welfare approach. In the long run, the welfare approach does not work because it does not foster new skills, nor empower the poor, but rather creates greater dependency on others and is not sustainable [37].

Furthermore, Najafizada and Cohen in 2017 presented a case of social entrepreneurship involving carpet weavers in Bamyan, an extremely rural and resource-constrained province in Afghanistan. They found that poor Afghans are embedded in stratified communities in which households at relatively higher levels are most able to break the cycle of poverty. The most capable individuals tend to be young and diligent members of slightly more prosperous families with motivation and talent for education and skill acquisition. Poverty alleviation programs based on social entrepreneurship have the potential to improve living conditions and to launch at least some people on a trajectory of gradual transformation, but the effects are unlikely to diffuse to entire communities [38].

Presently, Mutarubukwa and Mazana (2017) studied on the role and process of social entrepreneurship in a developing country, discussions in the area through the consideration of social entrepreneurship in Tanzania. The data was collected qualitatively through one email exchange and two face to face interviews. The sample was obtained purposefully from Dar-es-Salaam and Mwanza. The data were analysed qualitatively based on emerging themes. From their study found that the social entrepreneurship venture passes through two stages, idea creation and mission achievement and that social entrepreneurs are crucial in solving social problems poverty being one. The roles of social entrepreneurship in Tanzania include, reduction of unemployment, improving human rights, empowering vulnerable individuals, reduction of inequalities, and provision of knowledge and skills. Despite this, social entrepreneurs are faced with various challenges, the major ones being: poor infrastructure, getting funds and capital raising, poor support from stakeholders. Others are destruction and loss of books, recruiting workers and board members, promoting awareness and growth of the organization, leasing, lack of identity cards, the credit bureau not fully utilized by the social entrepreneurship sector, lack of customers and raising the cost of living [4].

Finally, Ndhlovu and Ndinda (2017) analyzed how far so-called “social impact investments” in Sub-Saharan Africa by the diaspora has contributed to poverty alleviation and a fundamental social transformation. The study found that very little attention has been paid to these concerns about the limitations of social entrepreneurship, that is, with regards to the agenda for social transformation. In other words, the more radical narrative places the diaspora within the processes of capitalist accumulation. This may lead to local enterprises being outcompeted by diaspora enterprises. Besides, there are limitations to their ability for triggering thorough-going social and political change. Indeed, diaspora resources can serve to strengthen weak and failing States [39].
IV. CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this paper is to justify the linkage between social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation based on empirical reviews. From the review of this study, we found that the most provocative and striking element of social entrepreneurship has been its ability to combine elements of the business and volunteer sectors, yet this combination may also represent the greatest obstacle to the definition of the field. With its roots in both entrepreneurship and public policy, researchers and practitioners must lay out the important questions and key defining elements of social entrepreneurship. Finally, social entrepreneurship is the new model for reducing world poverty by enriching social and environmental profits also. However, social entrepreneurship have an instinctive, natural desire to make life better for people would rather live in a world without poverty, disease, ignorance and needless suffering. These are the causse that lead people to donate billions of dollars to charity every year, to launch NGOs and non-profit organizations, to volunteer countless hours to community service, and (in some cases) to devote their careers to relatively low-paid work in the social sector. The same drivers will lead many to create social businesses, once this new path is widely recognized and understood.

REFERENCES


