

Chapter 8.

Assessing the impacts of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in tourism¹

Karla A. Boluk^a & Richard S. Aquino^b

^a University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

^b University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

¹ **Note:** This is a pre-publication copy. The final version of this chapter is published in the *Handbook of Tourism Impacts: Social and Environmental Perspectives* and can be downloaded from <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800377684.00018>

To cite: Boluk, K. A., & Aquino, R. S. (2022). Assessing the impacts of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in tourism. In A. Stofellen & D. Ioannides (Eds.), *Handbook of tourism impacts: Social and environmental perspectives* (pp. 117–133). Edward Elgar.

Assessing the impacts of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in tourism

Introduction

The current state of the world which is confronted by the equity crisis (e.g., black and Indigenous lives matter protests), COVID-19 pandemic, populist movement, and climate emergency, requires creative responses to garner positive transformations. The many pressing and grand contemporary issues draw attention to a structure which no longer works. The dysfunctional capitalist structure, which centre profit-generation at all costs also applies to tourism and is recognized in its current form. Prioritizing profit at all costs acts as an impediment to progressing sustainability (Fletcher et al., 2019). The primary emphasis on production and distribution reflects a sector that does not care about the needs of our tourism hosts or their environments, cultures, or homes (Carnicelli & Boluk, 2021). Indeed, supporting “business as usual” capitalism and individual self-interest” could lead to “catastrophic environmental and social consequences” (Dredge, 2017a, p.v).

A response to the sustainability concerns we have outlined has been the calls for new tourism models and practices to support clear, sustainable, and responsible tourism outcomes (Dredge, 2017), which aim at re-centring human well-being (Boluk, Cavaliere & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2019). One of these alternative tourism development models is Tourism Social Entrepreneurship, conceptualized as a market-based activity that utilizes tourism to address social issues and create sustainable outcomes in/for destinations and communities (Aquino et al., 2017; Sheldon et al., 2017). Sheldon et al., (2017, p. 7) define Tourism Social Entrepreneurship as the “process that uses tourism to create innovative solutions to immediate social, environmental and economic problems in destinations by mobilizing the ideas, capacities, resources and social agreements, from within or outside the destination, required for its sustainable social transformation”. Inherent in this call is an emphasis placed on the importance of caring for others. Our analysis in this chapter builds on the tourism social entrepreneurship branch in the tourism scholarship, specifically centring on the impacts of social enterprises and social entrepreneurs.

A defining feature of the key organizations in the social entrepreneurship development model namely, Tourism Social Enterprises, defined as “organizations created by the entrepreneurs as private, semi-private organizations or foundations dedicated to solving

the social problems in the destination” (Sheldon et al., 2017, p.7), is that they show care for their social environment. This means social enterprises and those who lead them, are driven by creating positive social impacts of their activities, instead of solely focusing on profit maximization. Crucial in our understanding of the individuals driving social entrepreneurial work is their talent in identifying market failures and implementing solutions satisfying social values (Austin et al., 2006). Furthermore, social entrepreneurs reinvest generated profits into the social organization (Bacq & Janssen, 2011), marking a shift away from business-as-usual economics (Sheldon & Daniele, 2017; Higgins-Desbiolles & Monga, 2020).

Juxtaposing the laissez-faire approach to tourism management, which is not conducive to securing long-term sustainability (Boluk & Carnicelli, 2019; Carnicelli & Boluk, 2021; Fletcher et al., 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2019) is a caring role, evidenced by tourism social enterprises serving interests within communities. Such tourism social enterprises present pathways to challenge the unjust systems of capitalism (Boluk, 2011a; Dredge, 2017b; Sheldon et al., 2017). Furthermore, the study of such individuals, processes and organizations may enhance social justice goals and contribute to the growing body of critical tourism scholarship.

Traditional entrepreneurship has been defined as the dynamic process of creating incremental wealth by individuals who assume major risks in terms of equity, time and/or career commitment and providing product or service value (Kuratko & Hodgetts, 1998). Such individuals and processes have been recognized as having an important role in mobilizing the tourism industry (Johns & Mattson, 2005; Koh & Hatten, 2002); specifically, in implementing activities to support social and environmental sustainability through CSR (Margaryan, this volume). However, since social advocacies are not usually the main driving force of traditional profit-driven tourism entrepreneurs, this necessitates an improved understanding of tourism social entrepreneurs. The crucial roles of social entrepreneurs in tourism are beginning to be realized in the literature specifically in terms of contributing to community sustainability (Aquino et al., 2018; Boluk, 2011a; 2011b; Dredge, 2017b), formulating networks and catalyzing change (Higgins-Desbiolles & Monga, 2020; Mottiar et al., 2018), and spearheading sustainable and inclusive destination development (Kimbu & Ngoasong, 2016; Mottiar & Boluk, 2017; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013).

The tourism industry presents plenty of opportunities for social entrepreneurs to positively impact destinations and improve the sector overall considering its many negative impacts (Dredge, 2017b; Sheldon et al., 2017). However, tourism scholars do not adequately

reveal the role tourism social entrepreneurs play in demonstrating care, and advocating for, and leading change to improve the impacts of tourism. In this chapter, we assess the impacts of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in tourism, by reviewing and reflecting on the literature on tourism social entrepreneurship. To reveal the social nature of this entrepreneurial phenomenon in tourism, our analysis was guided by Gartner's (1985) framework for describing new venture creation. By applying Gartner's (1985) framework, we hope to shine a light on where the current scholarship is emphasized before we lead into a discussion on the impacts of tourism, social entrepreneurs, and opportunities for future scholarship.

Social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs in tourism

There are overlapping definitions and interpretations of social entrepreneurship. Central to these conceptualizations are the key actors who initiate social entrepreneurial activities, referred to as *social entrepreneurs*. Dees (1998) describes social entrepreneurs as “one species in the genus entrepreneur” (p. 2) who assumes the role of society's change agents by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value);
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission;
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning;
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and;
- Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. (Dees, 1998, p. 4)

Social entrepreneurs aim to address social problems, create social value, and positively transform society (Dacin et al., 2010). Through commercial activities and efficient use of resources, social entrepreneurship provides innovative solutions for unmet societal needs (Alvord et al., 2004; Mair & Martí, 2006; Zahra et al., 2009), for example, in the areas of education, health, welfare reform, human rights, workers' rights, environment, economic development, and agriculture. Such social problems and needs affecting marginalized sectors of society serve as ‘opportunities’ that need to be identified, assessed, exploited, and addressed through social enterprise activities (Bacq & Janssen, 2011; Shaw & Carter, 2007).

While aiming to balance the delivery of social and economic values for target beneficiaries (e.g., local communities), social entrepreneurship also aims to reduce the

undesirable costs or negative externalities commercial business activities may unintentionally produce (Newbert & Hill, 2014). Such negative externalities or production-incurred costs may include environmental impacts (e.g., pollution or impacts on public health) or social impacts (e.g., unfair, or unsafe working conditions). Social entrepreneurship's agenda includes creating positive impacts (e.g., poverty alleviation, community empowerment, and sustainable development outcomes) on individuals involved in social enterprise activities and society at large. In so doing, social enterprises present promising solutions (such as fair trade, youth outreach programming, micro-enterprise training, resources such as schools/books or school uniforms, and community facilities to support community interests) to improve the quality of life of the most disadvantaged sectors of society.

Social entrepreneurs are often differentiated from traditional entrepreneurs (i.e., commercial/mainly profit-oriented; Austin et al., 2006). However, social entrepreneurs and traditional entrepreneurs share some characteristics, evidenced in how they are referred to: visionaries, change-makers, creative, innovative, resourceful, networkers, and charismatic leaders (Bornstein & Davis, 2010; Dees, 1998; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Seelos & Mair, 2005). An important distinction is that social entrepreneurs are mainly driven to generate social outcomes for others rather than to increase their personal wealth (Roberts & Woods, 2005). Additionally, what sets social entrepreneurs apart, is the hybrid nature of their business models, which are re-invested in their social enterprises (Bacq & Janssen, 2011). As such, there is a heightened sense of altruism in the work of social entrepreneurs.

Moreover, social entrepreneurs are considered private sector individuals who can deliver long-term catalytic changes in the work of the public sector and raise awareness of local social issues (Waddock & Post, 1991). By applying their entrepreneurial talents and through their innovative business models, social entrepreneurs are able to recognize and propose solutions for issues not satisfied by government institutions or the market economy (Bacq & Janssen, 2011; Seelos & Mair, 2005). In exploiting such opportunities, social entrepreneurs defy and transform the current economic order by foregrounding social justice and the generation of social impacts (Mueller et al., 2011).

Social entrepreneurs exist in different industries including tourism. While tourism has long been regarded as an economic strategy for development (Messerli, 2011), some observers have also highlighted its importance as a social force and a tool for achieving sustainable development goals (Boluk et al., 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). Recognizing tourism's social role, we argue that the tourism sector is a viable conductor for social

entrepreneurs to create positive social impacts in their local communities and in society at large. Given social entrepreneurs may operate in different scales (e.g., destination communities, regional, national, or international) and sectors of the tourism industry (e.g., hospitality, travel trade, education and training), there is a need to land on a common definition of tourism social entrepreneurs to better understand the opportunities and impacts on host communities.

Tourism social entrepreneurs have been regarded as “the change agents in a destination’s social entrepreneurship system; the people who bring their vision, characteristics and ideas to solve the social problem and bring about the transformation of the tourist destination” (Sheldon et al., 2017, p. 7). This definition implies the scope of tourism social entrepreneurs’ work and advocacies may vary. Ultimately, tourism social entrepreneurs aim to increase their net impact within host communities, for example, through providing fair and meaningful employment, adopting sustainable business operations, designing niche yet inclusive tourism products, and supporting local ownership in destinations (Pollock, 2015; Sheldon et al., 2017). However, the tourism system is complex and the interrelationships of actors in destination systems are dynamic. Tourism social entrepreneurs need to navigate dynamic tourism and destination systems in creating positive social impact. To reveal the social nature of social entrepreneurs and the organizations (i.e., social enterprises) they operate in tourism, we discuss conceptualizations of tourism social entrepreneurship dimensions following Gartner’s (1985) framework for new venture creation.

Conceptualizing tourism social entrepreneurship

Gartner (1985) has conceptualized entrepreneurship as being closely aligned with four specific dimensions including the: 1. individual (social entrepreneur); 2. organization (social enterprise); 3. process (actions undertaken by individuals to establish the social venture); and 4. environment (encompassing the firm’s characteristics, strategy and the environment). While Gartner’s (1985) framework was initially applied to the context of traditional entrepreneurship, Bacq and Janssen (2011) signal the framework may also be helpful as a way to more closely discern the literature on the social nature of entrepreneurship. Following on from Bacq and Janssen’s (2011) organization of the mainstream social entrepreneurship literature, our analysis here will endeavour to organize the current scholarship on tourism social entrepreneurship considering Gartner’s (1985) framework as a way to identify the

impacts created (see Figure 8.1). Our discussion begins with the individual social entrepreneur.

[insert figure 8.1 about here]

Figure 8.1. Dimensions in the creation of tourism social enterprises. Adapted from Gartner (1985).

The individual

The scholarship on tourism social entrepreneurship overwhelmingly focuses on Gartner's (1985) initial dimension, the individual social entrepreneur. The literature reviewed here showcases various classifications and typologies informing our understandings of tourism social entrepreneurs, their motivations, ways they have supported sustainability, cultural preservation, and inclusivity. Importantly, Koh and Hatten (2002) initially recognized tourism entrepreneurs as an overlooked player in tourism development studies. The authors present three basic types of entrepreneurs in tourism including the inventive tourism entrepreneur, the innovative tourism entrepreneur, and the imitative tourism entrepreneur. The authors' analysis then draws attention to six behavioural approaches categorizing tourism entrepreneurs, and they specifically capture the importance of the "social tourism entrepreneur" (Koh & Hatten, 2002, p.36). Bridging from this discussion the authors underscore several programmes, which policy makers could support fostering a more careful approach to tourism development, including the promotion of Indigenous tourism entrepreneurs to ensure that local communities benefit from tourism. Notably, the important role of tourism social entrepreneurs, particularly in rural destination development, has been signalled and scholars have called for their inclusion as key destination stakeholders (Mottiar et al., 2019).

The literature reveals that tourism social entrepreneurs have an important impact on tourism destinations either as part of their mission or through their activities. Importantly, and similarly noted in the mainstream literature on social entrepreneurs, tourism social entrepreneurs have not always been classified this way. Sometimes, they are referred to as community leaders, ambassadors, or volunteers (Boluk & Mottiar, 2014). Thus, tourism social entrepreneurs are not necessarily new to destinations. However, as noted by Mottiar and Boluk (2017), characterizing individuals this way may be helpful in streamlining the language and capturing the various ways such individuals contribute to social value creation.

Congruent with the traditional entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship literature in the fields of Business and Management, researchers in tourism have explored motivations. For example, based on interviews carried out in South Africa and Ireland, Boluk and Mottiar (2014) discovered motivations beyond emphasizing value creation in their communities including lifestyle interests, receiving acknowledgement, and accessing established networks leading to a murkier understanding of tourism social entrepreneurs. Nonetheless, pro-social and pro-environmental interests were strong and clear in tourism social entrepreneurs' motivations (Boluk & Mottiar, 2014).

Boluk's (2011a) critical discourse analysis of three white tourism social entrepreneurs respectively operating two rural backpacker hostels and a township tour company along the Eastern Cape, South Africa drew attention to individuals who were social visionaries, focused on community equity and empowerment. The critical analysis revealed interests in helping, advising, and protecting. However, important to an exploration on impacts are the actions, behaviours and motivations drawing attention to the very complicated and stratified context of South Africa, a country still recovering from the legacy of apartheid. While Boluk (2011b) fails to reflect on herself as an outsider to the community and culture where the study takes place, her analysis certainly signals the situational and contextual differences to the study of tourism social entrepreneurs and the various motivations, which could be considered in propelling social engagement. As such, what this research (Boluk 2011a; 2011b) perhaps draws our attention to, is the importance of reflexivity and the role of the researcher in examining tourism social entrepreneurs (Aquino, 2020). This is particularly important given the lack of attention on Indigenous tourism social entrepreneurs, despite Koh and Hatten's (2002) typology nearly two decades ago calling for educational opportunities and programming supported by Indigenous tourism entrepreneurs.

Mutually leveraging social and environmental objectives to support sustainability was found in Mottiar's (2009) case study exploring the Greenbox, a cross border initiative between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland including 120 ecotourism businesses. A key finding of this study noted that the Greenbox improved the attractiveness and sustainability of rural tourism destinations and stimulated growth supported by small rural tourism businesses (Mottiar, 2009). A similar emphasis on tourism development resulting in contributing social value via sustainable regional development rather than negative economic, social or environmental impacts was determined to be a key vision of tourism social entrepreneurs as highlighted by Kline et al. (2014). This led Mottiar and Boluk (2017) to

reflect on how improved understandings of tourism social entrepreneurs could benefit our thinking on their role in destination development, specifically in informing tourism policy makers, academics, and broader society. Building on the aforementioned studies a cross-case study in rural areas (in Ireland, South Africa, USA) identified three key roles of tourism social entrepreneurs namely opportunists, catalysts and network architects (Mottiar et al., 2018). This theoretical framework offers a way to examine the tourism social entrepreneur.

Certain scholars have noted the important contributions of food tourism social entrepreneurs and their role as community activists. Specifically, Higgins-Desbiolles and Wijesinghe (2019) reflect on how sustainability and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals featured in their analysis of 20 case studies on entrepreneurs in Adelaide, Goolwa, and Melbourne, Australia, some of whom were tourism social entrepreneurs (also see next section). Notably, the authors recognized that the social and ecological value restaurants and cafes serve as a third space, and tool for inspiring critical reflection on food consumption choices. In another qualitative analysis carried out with food entrepreneurs in North Carolina, Kline et al., (2017) presented four tourism social entrepreneurs at different stages of the food supply chain. Corresponding with Higgins-Desbiolles and Wijesinghe's (2019) findings, Kline et al.'s (2017) analysis revealed providing healthy alternatives, centring sustainability interests, and providing education were at the forefront of their social goals. Additionally, their analysis revealed the importance in giving voice to farmers. Attending to different voices was also importantly centred in Kimbu and Ngoasong's (2016) research as the authors specifically attended to the importance of including women in our analysis of tourism social entrepreneurs

Recognizing the importance of cultural preservation, McCarthy (2012) noted the role of social entrepreneurs in promoting Gaeltacht (a minority language), developing and popularizing traditional Irish music, and mobilizing resources in a case study in County Kerry, Ireland. Noting ideological tensions regarding tourism development (lending to commodifying Irish culture) versus language development (and preservation of the Gaeltacht culture), McCarthy's (2012) analysis revealed the role of social entrepreneurs in lobbying for the protection of Gaeltacht traditions. In the context of supporting cultural tourism, the author illustrated the decisive role of the social entrepreneurs in shielding the Irish language, influencing policy makers in supporting learning opportunities, and reducing uncertainty regarding the economic viability of cultural and language-based tourism (McCarthy, 2012).

As such, in this instance tourism social entrepreneurs cast a light on the socio-economic role of culture in regional development and significantly impacted policy makers.

Another way scholars have casted tourism social entrepreneurs is as promoters of inclusivity. However, this topic has not been explored in great depth. The presentation of two case studies in rural Taiwanese destinations investigates the inherent opportunities in constructing an integrated social entrepreneur system generating benefits for tourists, businesses, communities, and the government (Peng & Lin, 2016). Specifically, the tourism social entrepreneurs in this study intervened on structural unemployment concerns. Their response was to foster employment opportunities for both young people and senior citizens, mutually resulting in retaining young human capital in rural settings, reinvigorating innovative mindsets to rural tourism spaces, and bringing service science activism. Other scholars have also recognized the various ways tourism social entrepreneurs have created meaningful employment opportunities directly reducing poverty in rural communities. For example, Boluk's (2011b) research highlighted specific micro-enterprise training supporting community members in recognizing their entrepreneurial potential. This support led to a number of community-initiated micro-businesses including a horseback riding business, fishing and canoe guides, and women's empowerment business (Boluk, 2011b).

Two other contributions highlight alternative ways tourism social entrepreneurs meaningfully and inclusively foster employment opportunities. Kimbu and Ngosong's (2016) mixed method approach examining tourism social entrepreneurs operating small tourism firms in Cameroon recognizes how social transformation goals are incorporated into their business strategies. The authors' analysis specifically revealed the role of women tourism social entrepreneurs drawing attention to women as being respected contributing members of Cameroon society (confronting previous held views of the role of women) and importantly serving key community needs (Kimbu & Ngosong, 2016). This contribution attends to the important role of women tourism social entrepreneurs and explicitly recognizes the lack of research focused on women.

An additional example reflecting the importance of women tourism social entrepreneurs is presented in Higgins-Desbiolles and Monga's (2020) analysis. The authors focus on an Australian tourism social entrepreneur, Sara Gun and her business called GOGO Events. Sarah's vision was to use her events business as a transformative mechanism, specifically providing opportunities for disadvantaged and homeless people to change their circumstances. This contribution is particularly important given their philosophical

orientation and theoretical framing drawing on Gilligan's (1993) ethic of care, considering connection, and the costs of carelessness. Such framing is underutilized in the current tourism scholarship and imperative in helping us improve our understandings of social entrepreneurs as caring agents and capable of generating value. Also, it is imperative to note here, ignoring the role of women entrepreneurs reflects Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2020), Cole (2018) and Ahl and Marlow's (2012) concerns regarding reinforcing the dominant masculine and economically informed understandings of entrepreneurship in the literature. This is problematic given women are recognized as essential change agents in communities and place a high importance on community well-being (Tajeddini et al., 2017). As such, this important scholarly work unequivocally signals the significance for contextualizing the role of gender in tourism social entrepreneurship.

Contemporaneously, some scholars foreshadow tourism social entrepreneurs as a key stakeholder to drive change in tourism in a post-capitalistic world, prioritizing the Earth and its peoples over profits. Certainly, several authors seem hopeful (Boluk et al., 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2019; Sheldon & Daniele, 2017) that tourism social entrepreneurs could support the needed changes required by the industry. Specifically, Higgins-Desbiolles et al. (2019) argue that the tourism industry absolutely must "re-conceptualize entrenched capitalist concepts" (p. 1928) re-centring the needs of host communities who are too often left out of the decision-making equation. As such, the authors argue governments could "review the structures of their tourism industries encouraging, if not enforcing organizations to follow sustainable social enterprise models" (p.1939) as a way to shift from the exploitative approaches performed by multinational corporations. Stemming from the individual entrepreneur, Gartner's (1985) next dimension is the organization, which we discuss below.

Organization

A growing number of case studies focus on the specific organizations, which tourism social entrepreneurs establish and manage, namely *tourism social enterprises*. While these organizations are commonly not-for-profit and are driven by social causes, social enterprises are different from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and traditional enterprises' corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives. Specifically, NGOs normally rely on funding and donations from the public and are confronted with lower economic risks (Defourny & Nyssens, 2006). Traditional enterprises, such as large tourism corporations, may intentionally produce positive outcomes in host communities through CSR initiatives

(Margaryan, this volume; Hughes & Scheyvens, 2018). For example, case studies in Zambia and Fiji show hotel corporations' CSR activities benefit communities by supporting local schools' infrastructure development, scholarships, educational materials (e.g., books) and facilities (e.g., computer labs), and donation drives to fund educational programs (Chilufya et al., 2019). However, these CSR activities are primarily initiated by tourists, signalling a disconnect between CSR programme goals and host community priorities and systems (Chilufya et al., 2019; Hughes & Scheyvens, 2018). Moreover, unlike social enterprises, these traditional enterprises do not mainly exist because of the social or environmental causes that their CSR activities support (Austin et al., 2006). In the context of tourism, social enterprises aim to balance the creation of economic and social goals, embed social enterprise programmes in community economies, and centre community development goals in their activities (Aquino et al., 2018; Dahles et al., 2020).

Tourism social enterprises exist in the various sectors of the tourism economy, including but not limited to tour operations, travel trade, accommodation, transportation, attractions, events, food and beverage, shopping and retail, and training and education (Sheldon et al., 2017; Sigala, 2016). One of the first investigations of tourism social enterprises reveals the types of tourism business social entrepreneurs establish operate as ecotourism, adventure tourism, community-based tourism, and volunteer tourism enterprises (von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). Based on the latter study, it can be proposed that the product offerings of tourism social enterprises are small-scale and niche. Alternative to the mass tourism forms, which are often deemed destructive, niche tourism products are aimed at sustainable tourism development (Novelli, 2005). In this regard, Boukas and Chourides (2016) suggest niche tourism can work well with social entrepreneurship. In their study of tourism social enterprises in Cyprus, it was proposed that combining niche tourism products (e.g., volunteer tours with cultural tours) offers innovative tourism experiences that can support sustainable development (Boukas & Chourides, 2016).

Focusing on the interrelatedness of tourism social enterprises, Day and Mody's (2017) work examines the mainstream literature on the individual and Socially-Entrepreneurial Organizations (SEO) offering a starting point for understanding the scholarly literature and contributing towards a typology in tourism social enterprises. Day and Mody's (2017) analysis is one of the limited contributions emphasizing the importance of social entrepreneurship with a specific interest in the work, leadership style, and activities undertaken. In understanding tourism SEOs, Day and Mody (2017) propose a supply chain typology,

categorizing these organizations as suppliers (e.g., local artisans, souvenir makers), providers (e.g., community-based tourism operators), and intermediaries (e.g., travel agencies/wholesalers) of the tourism experience. This typology suggests that the creation and bundling of social ventures across the tourism supply chain could better meet social missions for host communities and destinations.

Based on our preliminary analysis, it appears that tourism social enterprises in the hospitality sector are commonly explored in the tourism social enterprise literature (Sigala, 2019; Sloan et al., 2014; Stenvall et al., 2017). In conceptualizing how tourism social entrepreneurs build new markets for co-creating social value and change, Sigala (2019) examines the social restaurant named “Mageires” in Greece, which promotes farm to table initiatives, healthy lifestyles, and healthy communities. On a similar note, Higgins-Desbiolles and Wijesinghe’s (2018) work reflects the critical capacities of 20 Australian restaurants and cafes. Specifically, the authors signal the role restaurant operators play in educating consumers concerning sustainability, promoting sustainably conscious consumers who support the United Nations 17 Sustainable Development Goals. Carter-James and Dowling’s (2017) case study of the Guludo Beach Lodge and Nema Foundation in Mozambique illustrates how philanthropic goals can be integrated into accommodation-related social enterprises to address poverty at the community level. Reducing poverty in three rural South African communities was also understood as the primary goal behind the three social enterprises (Calabash Tours, Bulungula Lodge and Coffee Shack) presented by Boluk (2011b). Similarly, Aquino’s (2020) research examines the role of The Circle Hostel in the development of livelihoods and community-based surfing tourism in the Philippines. Through eliciting the founders’ perspectives, Stenvall et al., (2017) uncover how Juha’s Guesthouse located in Jisr az-Zarqa, an Arab village in Israel, can promote peace between Arab and Jewish residents.

The extant literature demonstrates tourism social enterprises can produce various impacts on individuals, communities, and society. As shown above, there is an interest in examining the role of social enterprises in supporting social value creation, sustainable tourism development, and sustainable community development. For example, Altinay et al.’s (2016) study of the Guludo Beach Lodge/Nema Foundation in Mozambique reveals social capital, specifically the importance of relationships in tourism social enterprises, fostered community empowerment and the co-creation of social value. In addition, since most tourism activities occur in the natural environment, the creation of value for the environment is

increasingly becoming embedded in tourism social enterprises' missions (Aquino, *in press*; Porter et al., 2018). Nonetheless, scholarly works on tourism social enterprises indicate the dynamic nature and mechanisms of the tourism system provide an array of opportunities for tourism social entrepreneurs to craft and achieve their individual social missions (see linkage between "Environment" and "Organization" shown in Figure 8.1), and subsequently produce positive impacts. Yet it is vital to note that the achievement of these goals is likewise dependent on the processes that tourism social entrepreneurs adopt and implement.

Process

Limited research in the tourism scholarship refers to the making of tourism social entrepreneurs and enterprises. The traditional entrepreneurship literature signals research on problem identification is limited, notwithstanding Zahra et al. (2009) and Levie and Hart (2011) who note entrepreneurs often recognize problems based on their own life circumstances. Responding to lived experiences is explicitly supported by evidence regarding individuals who have experienced trauma marked in the mainstream social entrepreneurship literature (Roberts & Woods, 2005) and in the field of Sport Management (Cohen & Peachey, 2015). Roberts and Woods (2005) reflect on the experience of *George* whose life was ripped apart by a gambling addiction. His experiences led to the development of *The Oasis Centre* in Auckland, New Zealand with the guiding mission "to save good people from a bad path" (p.50). Cohen and Peachy (2015) use a sport-for-development lens to shed light on *Lisa's* experiences moving from a star college soccer athlete to being homeless as a consequence of a drug and alcohol addiction, to a community activist with Street Soccer USA and the Homeless World Cup in Brazil. While Boluk's (2011a; 2011b) research does not focus on the black experience, the participating tourism social entrepreneurs' work, missions, and responses are based on their observation of trauma during the period of Apartheid - that is the state of living apart - that prevailed in South Africa from 1948-1994. Essentially, the social enterprises established reflect a commitment to ensure South African society would never return to the unjust system supporting segregationist policies to non-white citizens. Boluk (2011b) relays this when highlighting that "the specific locations in which the tourism social entrepreneurs established their businesses were a direct result of recognizing their colonial privilege" (p. 209). Another piece worthy of noting is that many of the white South African tourism social entrepreneurs interviewed identified themselves as benefiting from the state of Apartheid. Instead of reinforcing feelings of guilt, they used the experience to ignite a fire,

remain in South Africa when it may have been easier to start a life elsewhere, and contribute in a way that created shared opportunities, and benefits from those previously oppressed.

The identification of local problems and system failures present in society constitutes one of the core processes of TSE, namely opportunity-seeking (Aquino et al., 2018; Austin, et al., 2006; Mottiar et al., 2018). As highlighted earlier, societal problems and market failures are opportunities for social entrepreneurs to address. Tourism social entrepreneurs constantly seek and recognize these opportunities that shape the development of their social business models and tourism product offerings. The process performed by social enterprises manifests in their operational models. Adopting Alter's (2006) social enterprise typology, von der Weppen and Cochrane (2012) explore operational models applied by tourism social enterprises by examining 11 diverse tourism social enterprises. These authors found that the service subsidization, employment, and market intermediary models are the most adopted approaches to tourism social entrepreneurship (von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). Service subsidization means that tourism social enterprises expand by supporting social programs other than their original social missions, while the employment model refers to the provision of employment and human capital development opportunities for residents (Alter, 2006). The product distribution system of the tourism industry makes the market intermediary model popular, wherein some social enterprises operate as travel agencies and serve as intermediaries between tourists and host communities (Day & Mody, 2017), and sell socially-responsible tour packages (von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012).

Resource outsourcing and mobilization are essential pre-requisites to any business venture, whether social or traditional. However, securing financial capital to start tourism social enterprises is challenging. Tourism social entrepreneurs often initiate crowdfunding activities to generate start-up resources (Stenvall et al., 2017). Conversely, Sheldon et al. (2017) suggest that the resources needed by tourism social enterprises are not just monetary, but also include talents within and outside of host communities. Aquino et al. (2018) build on the latter argument and conceptualize that the regenerative utilization of inherent community capitals could potentially assist tourism social entrepreneurs in delivering sustainable community development. Like in any other tourism development model, Altinay et al. (2016) stress that tourism social entrepreneurs should cultivate meaningful stakeholder engagement and involvement to successfully mobilize resources and produce social impact. While utilizing a number of community capitals has been deemed necessary, further nuanced

explorations of resources required to support processes and social goals, are needed to support tourism social entrepreneurship.

Since host communities are at the forefront of tourism activities, the processes implemented by tourism social entrepreneurs to foster collaboration with host communities should be given more attention by tourism scholars. However, few studies explicitly explore how tourism social entrepreneurs engage with local communities aside from a few recent studies. Conceptually, Aquino et al. (2018) propose tourism social entrepreneurs can serve as community development workers by valuing community solidarity and agency building in their activities. Dahles et al. (2020) explore the community engagement approaches facilitated by tourism social enterprises in Cambodia. These authors' case study methodology contributes a typology based on three distinct features illustrating varying levels of engagement including the cash cow, community empowerment, and inclusive business model. Importantly, Dahles et al.'s (2020) typology portrays the ways in which such enterprises in the poorest communities in Cambodia receive a fair share of benefits. While there are overlaps between the three models in the typology, the "inclusive business" model appears to be an ideal approach. In the latter model, host communities are not mainly treated as recipients of benefits. Rather they are "groomed as participants and partners in tourism-based business ventures and are encouraged to engage in entrepreneurship and business ownership and take an active part in tourism planning" (Dahles et al., 2020, p. 829).

Such care reflects Higgins-Desbiolles et al.'s (2019) ideas supporting a restructure of tourism. The authors' community-centred framework advocates and centres on local communities illustrating how they may directly benefit from hosting tourism activities, while also necessitating governments support tourism social enterprises to realize a more sustainable industry. The emergence and applicability of any tourism social enterprise models depend on the environmental factors that shape a host community's situation. As depicted in the next dimension of Gartner's (1985) framework, the environment directly impacts tourism social entrepreneurs, their social ventures, and the processes they implement.

Environment

In the social entrepreneurship scholarship, the environment pertains to the local contexts that give rise to the social issues and market failures that social entrepreneurs seek to combat (Austin et al., 2006). In the context of tourism, some scholars observe that a majority of the scholarship on social entrepreneurs and social enterprises focuses on communities in

developing countries (Aquino et al., 2018; Jørgensen et al., 2021). Some studies show that tourism social enterprises may operate in Indigenous communities (Sloan et al., 2014), localities deficient in livelihood opportunities (Carter-James & Dowling, 2017; Dahles et al., 2020), and racially and culturally marginalized communities (Boluk, 2011a; 2011b; Stenvall et al., 2017). The local contexts that need to be assessed by tourism social entrepreneurs can be shaped by social, economic, cultural, and political factors present within and outside of host communities (Aquino et al., 2018). In most instances, the local contexts influence the social goals and missions of tourism social entrepreneurs, that is McCarthy's (2012) exploration of tourism social entrepreneurs advocating for cultural preservation in Ireland (see above). While most case studies narrate how tourism social enterprises were founded (Carter-James & Dowling, 2017; Daniele et al., 2017; Stenvall et al., 2017), there is a lack of critical examination of how tourism social entrepreneurs negotiate and operate in local social entrepreneurship environments and traditional business ecosystems.

The explicit impacts caused by the packaging and consumption of tourism have generated interest in social entrepreneurship. Specifically, critical tourism scholars have noted that social entrepreneurship as a business approach is crucial in an industry operating under capitalistic aims, prioritizing profit over peoples, cultures, and environments (Dredge, 2017). Boluk's (2011a) empirical data of Fair Trade Tourism social entrepreneurs in South Africa explicitly highlighted the efforts members made in creating benevolent businesses, with an emphasis on community equity and empowerment, mutually challenging the structures of capitalism, and the unjust practices of the Apartheid system. As such, the businesses were created to shift the power dynamic and create opportunities that did not previously exist in South Africa. Ultimately the enterprises became vehicles in which they could contribute to the change they wanted for post-Apartheid South Africa. Limited reflection in the current scholarship reveals the resources required to support tourism social entrepreneurs in their development of social enterprises. This is an important understanding to help us better determine how current social entrepreneurs may be supported, as well as pave the way for others to similarly engage.

Reflections on impacts and final thoughts

The aim of this chapter was to distil the scholarly contributions investigating tourism social entrepreneurs/entrepreneurship and tourism social enterprises and examine the impacts of these (socially) enterprising individuals and social organizations. We achieved this by

charting the literature to each of Gartner's (1985) dimensions including the: 1. individual; 2. organization; 3. process; and 4. environment. Our discussion above highlights that the study of tourism social entrepreneurship is still developing and requires further examination to really understand its potential and impacts as a model aimed at addressing social problems and countering externalities produced by neoliberal tourism development approaches. Discussions in the scholarly literature have revolved around the various motivations propelling individuals to engage, enact and/or respond to pressing social problems, the various roles tourism social entrepreneurs play in their communities, the opportunities for policy makers, and the need for governments to intervene in support of local community decision-making, and implementation to maximize tourism impacts. Furthermore, the discussion highlights how tourism social entrepreneurs inspire community change and how their models of business practice challenge the current capitalist system.

Our analysis has also pointed out the important role of tourism social entrepreneurs in contributing to sustainability goals as they directly respond to contemporary challenges that are very much a concern to the tourism industry. Notably, we discussed several important impacts recognized in the scholarly literature on tourism social entrepreneurs. Specifically, these individuals' efforts in promoting community empowerment, sustainable livelihood development through the: reduction of poverty; promotion of sustainability and the UN SDGs; healthy lifestyles and healthy communities; promotion of peace and social justice; cultural heritage preservation; inclusivity through women empowerment and engaging youth and senior citizens; ethical consumption in tourism; and equitable tourism supply chains.

Our analysis highlighted the limited scholarly research exploring diversity. Specifically, there is an absence in the literature regarding the role of women tourism social entrepreneurs. This is important because we reviewed the lessons learned from the absence of women in the traditional entrepreneurship literature, which reinforces masculine understandings of success-solely emphasising profit. To avoid history repeating itself, it is imperative future research uncovers the specific impacts of women tourism social entrepreneurs. Building on Higgins-Desbiolles and Monga's (2020) analysis on women tourism social entrepreneurs we encourage others to use a feminist ethics of care lens to uncover women's agency and community impacts. We also noted few studies attending to Indigenous tourism social entrepreneurship despite Koh and Hatten's (2002) suggested strategy to increase the supply of Indigenous tourism entrepreneurs particularly in an educational capacity to support sustainability nearly two decades ago. Furthermore, diverse

sexual orientations and perspectives from the LGBTQIA+ community regarding their role as tourism social entrepreneurs or leading tourism social enterprises was absent in our review of the literature.

While we recognize there is a dearth of scholarship exploring the various impacts of tourism social entrepreneurs and tourism social enterprises, one notable finding in our analysis emphasizes tourism social entrepreneurs' work as extending *care for others* (Higgins-Desbiolles & Monga, 2020). The role of caring, propelling the work of tourism social entrepreneurs suggests these individuals are strongly motivated by altruistic goals, yet scholarly inquiries looking at tourism social entrepreneurs through the lens of altruism are scarce. We encourage future research to uncover the role altruism plays in tourism social entrepreneurs' pro-social behaviour and entrepreneurial strategies.

Lastly, we revealed examples of tourism social entrepreneurs intervening on structural unemployment that was problematic in various rural contexts. Given the contemporary challenges we face, it is imperative to include local, gendered, and Indigenous perspectives in tourism, and better understand their unique and valuable perspectives in designing and implementing social enterprises. Furthermore, while tourism social entrepreneurs' goals for their target beneficiaries and host communities are noble, it is imperative that social entrepreneurs' visions are aligned with the needs and aspirations of these key stakeholders. A better understanding of the key needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including the specific resources required in various contexts in creating tourism social enterprises, is required in the literature.

References

- Altinay, L., Sigala, M., & Waligo, V. (2016). Social value creation through tourism enterprise. *Tourism Management*, 54, 404-417.
- Alter, S. K. (2006). Social enterprise models and their mission and money relationships. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change* (pp. 205-232). Oxford University Press.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282.
- Aquino, R. S. (in press). Tourism social enterprises in the Philippines: Greening tourism value chains?, In M. C. L. Rodolfo, J. P. R. Rivera, F. M. Y. Roxas, & E. M

- Gutierrez, (Eds.), *People, planet, profit: Principles and practices of sustainable tourism*. De La Salle University Publishing House and Sussex Academic Press.
- Aquino, R. S. (2020). *Understanding community change through tourism social entrepreneurship in the Philippines: Host community perspectives* [Doctoral thesis, Auckland University of Technology]. Tuwhera. <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/13565>
- Aquino, R. S., Lück, M., & Schänzel, H. A. (2018). A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 37, 23-32.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 373-403.
- Boluk, K. (2011a). Revealing the discourses white entrepreneurial motivation in Black South Africa. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 8(2), 199-213.
- Boluk, K. (2011b). Fair Trade Tourism South Africa: A pragmatic poverty reduction mechanism? *Tourism Planning and Development*, 8(3), 237-251.
- Boluk, K. and Mottiar, Z. (2014). Motivations of social entrepreneurs: Blurring the social contribution and profits dichotomy. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 10(1), 53-68.
- Boluk, K., & Carnicelli, S. (2019). Tourism for the emancipation of the oppressed: Towards a critical tourism education drawing on Freirean philosophy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76, 168-179.
- Boukas, N., & Chourides, P. (2016). Niche tourism in Cyprus: Conceptualising the importance of social entrepreneurship for the sustainable development of islands. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 5(1), 26-43.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Carnicelli, S., & Boluk, K. (2021). A theory of care to socialise tourism. In F. Higgins-Desbiolles, A. Doering, & B. Bigby (Eds.), *Socialising tourism: Rethinking tourism for social & ecological justice*. Routledge.
- Carter-James, A., & Dowling, R. (2017). Guludo Beach Lodge and the Nema Foundation, Mozambique. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 221-235). Springer International Publishing.

- Cohen, A., & Peachey, J.W. (2015). The making of a social entrepreneur: From participant to cause champion within a sport-for-development context. *Sport Management Review*, 18, 111-125.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.
- Dahles, H., Khieng, S., Verver, M., & Manders, I. (2020). Social entrepreneurship and tourism in Cambodia: Advancing community engagement. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(6), 816-833.
- Daniele, R., Bate, G., & Quezada, I. (2017). Adventure Alternative and Moving Mountains Trust: A hybrid business model for social entrepreneurship in tourism. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 265-277). Springer International Publishing.
- Day, J. & Mody, M. (2017). Social entrepreneurship typologies and tourism: Conceptual frameworks. In P. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 155–172). Springer International Publishing.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2006). Defining social enterprise. In M. Nyssens (Ed.), *Social enterprise: At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society* (pp. 3-26). Routledge.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). *The meaning of "social entrepreneurship"*. Kauffman Foundation and Stanford University. <http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dees.pdf>
- Dredge, D. (2017a). Foreward. In P. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 155–172). Springer International Publishing.
- Dredge, D. (2017b). Institutional and policy support for tourism social entrepreneurship. In P. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 155–172). Springer International Publishing.
- Fletcher, R., Murray Mas, I., Blanco-Romero, A., & Blazquez-Salom, M. (2019). Tourism and degrowth: An emerging agenda for research and praxis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(12), 1745-1763.
- Gartner, W. B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 696-706.

- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192-1208.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. & Wijesinghe, G. (2018). The critical capacities of restaurants as facilitators for transformations to sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27, 1080-1105.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Carnicelli, S., Krolikowski, C., Wijesinghe, G., & Boluk, K. (2019). Degrowing tourism: Rethinking tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(12), 1926-1944.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. & Monga, M. (2020). Transformative change through events business: A feminist ethic of care analysis of building the purpose economy. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Advance online publication.
- Hughes, E., & Scheyvens, R. (2018). Development alternatives in the Pacific: How tourism corporates can work more effectively with local communities. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 15(5), 516-534.
- Johns, N. & Mattsson, J. (2005). Destination development through entrepreneurship: A comparison of two cases. *Tourism Management*, 26, 605-616.
- Jørgensen, M. T., Hansen, A. V., Sørensen, F., Fuglsang, L., Sundbo, J., & Jensen, J. F. (2021). Collective tourism social entrepreneurship: A means for community mobilization and social transformation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 88, Article 103171.
- Kimbu, A.N., & Ngoasong, M.Z. (2016). Women as vectors of social entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 60, 63-79.
- Kline, C., Shah, N., & Rubright, H. (2014). Applying the positive theory of social entrepreneurship to understand food entrepreneurs and their operations. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11, 330-342.
- Kline, C., Boluk, K., & Shah, N. (2017). Exploring social entrepreneurship in food tourism. In P. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.). *Social entrepreneurship and tourism*. Springer International Publishing.
- Koh, K.Y., & Hatten, T.S. (2002). The tourism entrepreneur the overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 3(1), 21-48.
- Kuratko, D.F. and Hodgetts (1998): *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach*, (4th Ed.). USA.

- Levie, J., & Hart, M. (2011). Business and social entrepreneurs in the UK: Gender, context and commitment. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 3(3), 200-217.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Messerli, H. R. (2011). Transformation through tourism: Harnessing tourism as a development tool for improved livelihoods. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(3), 335-337.
- McCarthy, B. (2012). From fishing and factories to cultural tourism: The role of social entrepreneurs in the construction of a new institutional field. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4), 259-282.
- McKercher, B. (1999). A chaos approach to tourism. *Tourism Management*, 20(4), 425-434.
- Mottiar, Z. (2009). *An alternative vista: Social entrepreneurs in tourism*. Paper presented at Critical Tourism Studies Conference. Croatia, June 2009.
- Mottiar, Z. & Boluk, K. (2017). Understanding how social entrepreneurs fit into the tourism discourse. In P. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.). *Social entrepreneurship and tourism*. Springer International Publishing.
- Mottiar, Z., Boluk, K., & Kline, C., (2018). The roles of social entrepreneurs in rural destination development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 68, 77-88.
- Mueller, S., Nazarkina, L., Volkmann, C., & Blank, C. (2011). Social entrepreneurship research as a means of transformation: A vision for the year 2028. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 112-120.
- Newbert, S. L., & Hill, R. P. (2014). Setting the stage for paradigm development: A 'small-tent' approach to social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(3), 243-269.
- Novelli, M. (2005). *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases*. Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Paddison, B., & Boluk, K. (2020). Five ways to make your holidays more sustainable. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/five-ways-to-make-your-holidays-more-sustainable-143379>
- Peng, K-L., & Lin, P.M.C. (2016). Social entrepreneurs: Innovating rural tourism through the activism of service science. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(6), 1225-1244.

- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Pollock, A. (2015). *Social entrepreneurship in tourism: The conscious travel approach*: Tourism Innovation Partnership for Social Entrepreneurship.
<http://www.tipse.org/conscious-tourism-pdf-download/>
- Porter, B. A., Orams, M. B., & Lück, M. (2018). Sustainable entrepreneurship tourism: An alternative development approach for remote coastal communities where awareness of tourism is low. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 15(2), 149-165.
- Roberts, D., & Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship. *The University of Auckland Business Review*, 11(1), 45-51.
- Sakata, H., & Prideaux, B. (2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: A bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 880-899.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 241-246.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), 418-434.
- Sheldon, P.J. & Daniele, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice*. Springer International Publishing.
- Sheldon, P., Pollock, A., & Daniele, R. (2017). Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Setting the stage. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 1-18). Springer International Publishing.
- Sigala, M. (2016). Learning with the market: A market approach and framework for developing social entrepreneurship in tourism and hospitality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(6), 1245-1286.
- Sigala, M. (2019). A market approach to social value co-creation: Findings and implications from “Mageires” the social restaurant. *Marketing Theory*, 19(1), 27-45.
- Sloan, P., Legrand, W., & Simons-Kaufmann, C. (2014). A survey of social entrepreneurial community-based hospitality and tourism initiatives in developing economies: A new business approach for industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 6(1), 51-61.
- Stenvall, A., Laven, D., & Gelbman, A. (2017). The influence of social entrepreneurship in tourism on an Arab village in Israel. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social*

- entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 279-293). Springer International Publishing.
- von der Weppen, J., & Cochrane, J. (2012). Social enterprises in tourism: An exploratory study of operational models and success factors. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 497-511.
- Waddock, S. A., & Post, J. E. (1991). Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change. *Public Administration Review*, 51(5), 393-401.
- Weeden, C. & Boluk, K. (Ed.). (2014). *Managing ethical consumption in tourism*. Routledge.
- Zahra, S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.