



Linking community culture and sustainability of community based social interventions: The mediating role of social entrepreneurship

Alice Njeri Nderi¹, Manjit Singh²

¹ Ph. D Research Candidate, Applied Management -Project Planning and Management, University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

² Professor (Accounting & Finance), University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

Abstract

Governments, non-governmental organizations and groups across the world especially in the developing nations are facing a burden of taking development through community based social interventions to the grassroot level while at the same time grappling with the challenge of sustaining the interventions. Despite these challenges, there remains a significant need to understand how or under what conditions community based social interventions can be sustained through blending community culture and social entrepreneurship. The purpose of this study was to conduct a systematic review of empirical literature to explore how community driven social interventions can be sustained through cultural and social entrepreneurship consideration. We searched for knowledge syntheses of community culture, social entrepreneurship and sustainability. An abstraction of the concepts of community based social interventions, community culture, social entrepreneurship, and sustainability from the articles were identified through relevant systematic and scoping reviews. A comprehensive linkage of community culture and social entrepreneurship towards sustainability of community based social interventions was identified. The paper concluded that to achieve sustainable community based social interventions though social entrepreneurship, social business models which cumulatively puts an emphasis on community culture should be adopted.

Keywords: community based social interventions, sustainability, culture, social entrepreneurship

Introduction

Well thought out and effective community based social interventions (CBSIs) empower the marginalized, powerless and underprivileged in the community to improve their wellbeing and achieve better life outcomes. This requires identifying individual and group needs as well as opportunities in the communities and taking action to alter the needy situations through social interventions, implying combining local resources, abilities and knowledge in order to address local social, economic and environmental issues (Mansuri and Rao, 2004; Meyer, 2002; Ostrom, 1990) [49, 54]. Community-led approaches to development in the form of social interventions have been found by many stakeholders to be effective forms of community empowerment and mitigation against neediness (Ware, 2014) [83]. However, such interventions have been grappling with the challenge of sustainability (Cavaye, 2015; Draper *et al.*, 2010) [13, 23]. Sustainability of CBSIs remains one of the most important areas of concern for both theorists and practitioners (Barasa & Jelagat, 2013; Bredillet, 2008; Olsson *et al.*, 2008) [7, 9, 63]. While literature indicate that community culture (Moller *et al.*, 2012; Opare, 2011; Dixon, 2005) [55, 65, 20] have a positive correlation with sustainability of CBSIs, sustainability of many CBSIs at the grassroots level remains a challenge (Mansuri & Rao, 2004; Olukotun, 2008) [49, 64].

This study will introduce the intermediary role of social entrepreneurship (SE) in terms of its effect on the relationship between community culture and CBSI sustainability in the need's assessment, local resources identification, and utilization of local abilities. In other words, the study will explore the relationship between

community culture, social entrepreneurship, and sustainability of CBSIs.

SE according to Gandhi and Raina (2018) [30], incorporates the passion of a society common cause with business model and is notable and different from other types of entrepreneurship models due to its quest for meeting a society need while simultaneously undertaking profit making ventures. The concept of social entrepreneurship catalysis social change and addresses important social needs in a way that is not dominated by direct financial benefit for an entrepreneur (Ney and Beckmann, 2014; Dees, 2007; Mair and Mati, 2006) [58, 19, 58].

Though there is a rich literature on hybridity, dynamism and change-making aspects of SE, there is little work on the role of SE in sustainability of CBSI context (Bansal *et al.*, 2018; Ney *et al.* 2014; Doherty *et al.*, 2014; Welsh and Krueger, 2013; Dees, 2007) [6, 58, 19]. This study attempts to extend the concept of SE to the context of sustainability of CBSI and to theoretically gauge its mediating effect on the relationship between community culture and CBSI sustainability in a meta-analysis study. Therefore, the purpose of this article is one-fold. The objective is to investigate the mediating role of SE in the relationship between community culture and CBSI sustainability.

Methodology

In this paper, we provide a conceptual explanation of relationship between community culture and sustainability of CBSI as mediated by social entrepreneurship. We rely on analysis of secondary evidence.

Theoretical Framework: A literature review

This section presents the theoretical framework of the study by offering an analysis of the constructs employed: CBSI sustainability, community culture, and SE.

Sustainability of Community Based Social Interventions (CBSI)

From a sociological stance, CBSIs within a given social system are projects or programmes stirring social processes which alter at least to some extent the social structures and institutions of the community and the social behavior of its members (Meyer, 2002) ^[54]. Therefore, for a social intervention to have a long-lasting impact, CBSI practitioners should ensure that the CBSIs adjust to the changing social trends and needs in the community and in the environment in which they are implemented. Accordingly, Ingle (2005) ^[38] observed that for an CBSI to achieve sustainability, it needs to be planned, designed and implemented through social-cultural fabric of the community in which it is intended to exist. The social-cultural fabric is a CBSI strategic approach that merges four main elements, future orientation, external emphasis, environmental fit, and CBSI process orientation (Bansal *et al.*, 2019; Oino *et al.*, 2015; Grassl, 2012) ^[6].

In this article, the meaning of sustainability of CBSI is in two folds. The first, it implies continuous flow of benefits, support and maintenance of the CBSI by the end users toward sustaining its operations (Wood, 1994; Shediak-Rizkallah and Bone, 1998;) ^[83, 78]. Secondly, CBSI sustainability means building the capacity of the communities' in which the CBSIs are implemented through community empowerment and imparting CBSI-related knowledge and skills (Proctor *et al.*, 2015; Scheirer and Dearing, 2011; Altman, 1995) ^[71, 77].

Sustainability of CBSI is vital for the long-term impact of a CBSI to the community and is an imperative component of a community-based venture. Nonetheless, in practice sustainability of CBSIs is often lacking and remains a major challenge in the world especially in many developing nations (Okland, 2015; Nkonya *et al.*, 2012; Mansuri and Rao, 2004; Akerlund, 2000) ^[61, 59, 50, 1]. Most CBSIs implemented having consumed substantial amounts of resources often tend to experience difficulties with sustainability. Stakeholders for instance donors such as the World Bank, DFID, USAID, IFAD, bilateral aid agencies and governments have been expressing concerns on CBSIs sustainability (Komoves *et al.*, 2008; Savaya *et al.*, 2008; Akinbile *et al.*, 2006) ^[74, 2]. Statistics show that while the trend of inception and implementation of the CBSIs have been growing, durability of the CBSIs is on the decline with very few such interventions being sustained. Despite huge amounts of resources spent on initiation and execution of CBSIs, poor sustainability is depriving beneficiaries and initiators returns expected on the investments in CBSIs (Lungo *et al.*, 2017; Padawangi, 2010; Harvey and Reed, 2007; Fonjong *et al.*, 2005) ^[45, 67, 36, 29].

Community Culture and CBSI Sustainability

In this study community culture is considered as the patterned way community members think and go about fulfilling their individual and group needs, the way they identify and use resources and abilities around them as well as the way they interact with one another (Kamoche *et al.*, 2015; Jabareen and Carmon, 2010) ^[42, 39]. Community

culture is a dynamic process by which community individuals and groups think, believe, value, and how local resources influence the direction and implementation of a social interventions with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance, empowerment or other values community treasure (Riofrío, 2014) ^[73].

Studies show that integrating community culture during the life cycle of CBSI have an impact on effectiveness of outcome and positively influences overall intervention success and subsequent sustainability (Muñoz-Goy, 2013; Eketone *et al.*, 2006; Burnell, 2012) ^[57, 26, 12]. Through community cultural process, a community pursues identification of its needs, makes decisions and establishes resources and methods to have these needs met (Eseonu and Egbue, 2014; Moller *et al.*, 2012; Matarasso, 2007) ^[28, 55]. Referring to CBSI and community culture, Riofrío (2014) ^[73] indicates that communities' positive culture should be considered in all the interventions phases that entail assessing the local settings, defining the local needs, setting community priorities, making decisions, planning action programmes to meet the needs, sharing responsibility in CBSI execution, and evaluating and modifying the CBSIs. Additionally, Mansuri and Rao (2004) ^[49] opined that the success of CBSIs are affected by how well community multiplicity is managed, by what resources and strategies along with how effectively differences are handled.

In the context of CBSIs, Yue *et al.* (2011) opines that community culture can be both empowering and disempowering. This implies that community culture can act out as a driver and enabler or deterrent of CBSI sustainability. On one hand, as a driver and enabler of CBSI processes, culture enables community members in partnership with each other and those willing as well as able to assist them, identify community needs, mobilize resources, and assume responsibility to plan, manage, control and assess the individual and collective actions that they themselves decide upon (Dixon, 2005; Moller *et al.*, 2012) ^[55, 20]. On the other hand, as a deterrent of CBSI processes, if deep-rooted traditions, cultural patterns or ways of thinking deter change or adjustment to new innovations or ways of life, it is possible in some contexts to query how far every aspect of a particular culture can be valued or assimilated in a community venture (Oino *et al.*, 2015; Christou and Fowles, 2015). Moreover, Cimadamore *et al.* (2005) postulates that sustainable development in which CBSIs are anchored is being seen by post-development scholars as a preface for Western-style development, leading to the loss of target communities' own cultural identity consequently, resulting to CBSI beneficiaries' twisted perception of themselves, their needs and ways of life.

Community culture is considered a useful tool in enhancing the impact of CBSI benefits. Throughout the past decades, research, indicators, statistics and data on the sustainable community development, as well as operational activities of CBSIs have underscored culture as a powerful driver for development, with community-wide social, economic and environmental outcome (Eseonu and Egbue, 2014; Moller *et al.*, 2012; Opore, 2011; Dixon, 2005) ^[28, 55, 65, 20]. Community culture is very important in CBSIs because it dictates whether to accept the inception and implementation of a CBSI, as well as to continue or stop using the products created by the CBSI programme (Olayide *et al.*, 2013;

Muñoz-Goy, 2013; Jabeen, 2013)^[57]. Studies indicate that it is plausible that culture integration in the conception and implementation of CBSI influences the outcomes such as the sustainability of the venture (Opoku, 2015; Hawkes, 2001; Khwaja, 2004; Mansuri & Rao, 2004)^[49]. In line with this, Mansuri & Rao (2013)^[50] emphasize that community culture consideration in CBSI could produce programmes that are not only better aligned with the values, preferences and needs of the intended communities, but are also of higher quality and more likely to be sustainable. Culture thus becomes part of the matrix for particular ways of managing and maintaining CBSI activities.

Culture in this approach refers to a community view, a cultural system guided by intentions, motivations, ethical and moral choices, rooted in values that drive individual and collective actions (Hawkes, 2001; Scammon, 2012; Ware, 2014)^[83]. Therefore, integrating culture in the sustainability debate imply making connections between communities, CBSI exogenous stakeholders and the environment in which communities exist and interact with. Consequently, sustainability exists therefore as a process of community-based thinking that is pluralistic where culture represents both needs and possibility, form and process, and concerns those issues, values and means whereby a society or community may continue to exist (Thomas, 2010; Opoku, 2015; Lewis, 2003). This makes it possible to think of sustainability of CBSIs and sustainable community development as processes, ongoing and in the- making, not as static state. Though the literature reviewed above indicates the potential importance of community culture for sustainability of CBSIs, there is observable and empirical data indicating unsustainable CBSIs (Yue *et al.*, 2011; Dixon, 2005; Moller *et al.*, 2012; Oino *et al.*, 2015)^[55, 20]. The present study aims to answer calls for more rigorous empirical analysis and testing of propositions about the effect of social entrepreneurship on community culture in promoting CBSIs sustainability.

Social Entrepreneurship and CBSI Sustainability

Practitioners, scholars and researchers are approaching the subject of sustainable development from various contexts. In the context of CBSIs, the concepts of social entrepreneurship and sustainability are also crossing paths (Picciotti, 2017)^[70]. As seen earlier in the current study, literature indicate that sustainability is lacking in some CBSI. With increasingly prevailing unsustainable CBSIs, social entrepreneurship comes to the rescue. In times when many governmental, non-governmental organizations, and community groups are specifically facing the dilemma of unsustainable CBSIs and are searching for ways to cope up with the burdens from both economic, ecological, and social community needs, it is meaningful to examine how social entrepreneurship is budding and spreading globally and how its theory, practice and procedure could be defined, explained, and applied (Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011)^[68].

There is no agreed definition of the social entrepreneurship, it means different things to different people. For instance, (Mair and Martí, 2006) associate social entrepreneurship exclusively with non-profit organizations embarking into earned-income ventures. Gordon & Peter (2011) while applying Schumpeter's and Kirzner's classical theories of entrepreneurship describe social entrepreneurs as innovation and change agents who adopt a mission to create and sustain social value. Drucker (1985) use it to refer to pursuit of

opportunity, in this case, social entrepreneurs are seen to not only being simply driven by the awareness of a social need or by their benevolence, rather they are seen to have a vision of how to solve a social need and they are determined to make their vision work through the pursuit of the opportunity. Stevenson (1983) associate social entrepreneurship with resourcefulness, implying acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand while exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the target stakeholders and for the outcomes created. Additionally, Dees (2001)^[18] indicates that social entrepreneurs fill the gap that has been left void by the ineffectiveness, and inefficiency of governments and other CBSIs initiators that leads to the lack of sustainability. From the definitions, the meaning of social entrepreneurship surpasses the phenomenon of popularity and profit maximization. Rather, social entrepreneurship navigates the essence to push for a social change and it is that potential impact with its lasting, long term transformational benefit to society that sets social entrepreneurship apart.

According to Gandhi & Raina (2018)^[30] the concept of social entrepreneurship is double sided. On one hand, it implies distinctive ability to perceive and exploit an opportunity, merging a creative thinking with a unique insight of determination to create or bring about necessary environmental, social or economic changes in the world (Gandhi & Raina, 2018)^[30]. On the other hand, social entrepreneurship is an ex-post occurrence because social entrepreneurial activities need a passage of time before their impact is felt or becomes observable (Gandhi & Raina, 2018)^[30]. This implies that under the two faces of social entrepreneurship and in the context of CBSIs, the future details of CBSIs outcome can be settled only when community needs are resolved by passage of time. Therefore, Bielefeld (2009) opines that social entrepreneurs are leaders who need to possess two types of skills namely, the ability to channelize varied communities' stakeholder and have abiding adaptive skills that allows them respond to changing community and business needs as well as changing environmental factors over time.

From the literature reviewed, social entrepreneurship can be understood as the process in which social entrepreneurs as change agents employ entrepreneurial skills and knowledge for providing systemic solutions to economic, social and ecological community needs through social interventions while also ensuring venture survival and subsequent sustainability (Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011; Mair & Martí, 2006)^[68].

Community Culture, CBSI Sustainability and Social Entrepreneurship: A Linking Mechanism

Several empirical studies show that when community culture is included in CBSIs life cycle, it has a positive impact on CBSI sustainability (Eseonu & Egbue, 2014; Muñoz-Goy, 2013; Burnell, 2012; Moller *et al.*, 2012; Eketone *et al.*, 2006)^[28, 55, 57, 26, 12]. However, studies of the relationships between community culture, social change and CBSI sustainability have failed to specify the mechanism underlying this relationship. The paper proposes that PE acts as a mediator for the effect of community culture on sustainability of CBSIs since PE enhances the sense of meeting the needs of the community through innovation and creativity in the use of community resources, community

values, cohesion, and resilience (Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011; Olukotun, 2008; Mair & Martí, 2006; Mansuri & Rao, 2004) ^[68, 49, 64]. In line with this, other studies indicate that a social entrepreneurial spirit can be invoked when community cultural values and resources influence the conception, design and mode of implementation of CBSIs (Angrisano *et al.*, 2016; Yildirim & Turan, 2012; Certo & Miller, 2008) ^[5, 89]. Therefore, social entrepreneurship can be argued as the innovative use of social-cultural resources to explore and exploit opportunities that meet community social needs in a sustainable manner.

Social entrepreneurship is a multidimensional concept which when critically studied and analyzed can be used as an intermediary towards attainment of CBSI sustainability. Sud *et al.* (2009) ^[80] for example, presents a more culturally oriented variant of entrepreneurial activity, with an explicit social change agenda. Sud *et al.* (2009) ^[80] further claims that blending social entrepreneurship with community culture provides a community with a degree of control, and when participating in the CBSIs activities, community members inevitably invest their abilities, resources, time and effort and become more likely to contribute to the sustainability of the intervention. Therefore, social entrepreneurship in the context CBSIs can be thought to be innovative business processes that facilitates communities' social, environmental and economic activities and at the same time complies with local social and cultural norms that enable, drive or constraint the community in changing the social order.

Further, studies indicate that positive community culture may lead to increased urge to solve a community need in an innovative way and commitment to a CBSI on the part of beneficiaries and the social entrepreneur (Vealey & Gerding, 2016; Yildirim & Turan, 2012; Mair & Martí, 2006). According to Olukotun (2008) ^[64, 89], when communities culture is considered in a CBSI's life cycle, community members will have an interest in managing, maintaining and protecting the venture. This would in turn increase the likelihood of CBSI sustainability. Hence, the creativity and innovativeness spirit of social entrepreneurship would serve as an intermediate variable that contributes to the positive cultural intentions of the community members to sustain the CBSI. In this way, SE carries over the effect of community culture to the sense of cultural ownership and responsibility to the CBSI (to nurture, provide for, protect and maintain the CBSI).

Additionally, Olckers and Du Plessis (2012) postulates that the more individuals feel they are culturally connected to a part of the CBSI through SE, the more likely they are to have intentions to sustain the CBSI. This implies that feelings of cultural connection would create a sense of responsibility and ownership that influences CBSI acceptance. Therefore, social entrepreneurship can be seen as processes that empower the community (Picciotti, 2017) ^[70], contribute to changing the social order in which communities are embedded (Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011), and sustain the positive impact of the changed social order (Mair & Martí, 2006) ^[68].

Social entrepreneurship can be mapped to community culture in a way which allows for community needs and opportunity identification (Granovetter, 1985). This implies that social entrepreneurial activities should take place within a social-cultural context and consequently the activities are affected by the cultural environment in which a CBSI is

rooted. In the same line of thought, Weerawardena & Mort (2006) infer that social entrepreneurship can benefit on diverse forms depending on socio-economic and cultural circumstances. This indicates the importance of embeddedness into community cultural fabric to the study of social entrepreneurship and sustainability studies.

Mediating Role Social Entrepreneurship in the Sustainability of CBSIs

Social entrepreneurship is emerging as a present-day subject in the ecological, economic and social sustainability arena. Dees (2001) ^[18] makes a case for social entrepreneurs by pin pointing that they fill the gap that has been left void by the lack of sustainability for CBSIs due to governments and other related organizations ineffectiveness. Though there is a rich literature on the sustainability of CBSI as well as SE in different contexts and different factors have been considered, there is little work on the mediating role of SE in CBSI sustainability contexts (Vealey & Gerding, 2016; Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011; Sud *et al.*, 2009; Olukotun, 2008; Mair & Martí, 2006; Mansuri & Rao, 2004) ^[68, 49, 80]. The mediating role of SE in the relationship between sustainability of CBSIs and community culture can therefore be debated upon based on the perceived nature of SE.

As an altruistic form of entrepreneurship, SE Social entrepreneurs combine business model and social needs in a way that improves the lives of people connected to the cause and people connected through a cultural fabric (Malunga *et al.*, 2014; Wee-Liang & Tan, 2005; Thompson, 2002). This implies that SE outcome is not measured in terms of profit alone, rather, success to social entrepreneurs means that they have improved the communities through solving a social or economic problem, whichever way they define the social or economic problem. Therefore, according to Gilliss (2011), Jafta (2013) and Dhesi (2010) CBSIs require the involvement of social entrepreneurs who are able to mobilize community-based assets for the purpose of attaining a social mission such as inception and sustainability of CBSI. Altruism in SE entails the social impact the CBSI will have on the beneficiaries and it measures whether the CBSI idea itself will be able to trigger and maintain change long after the CBSI initiator or donor is gone (Elkington & Hartigan, 2008; Bornstein, 2007).

SE in the context of CBSI, community culture and sustainability calls for creativity in dealing with diverse groups of CBSI stakeholders and utilization of community resources in meeting community needs. Creativity in this case has two folds: CBSI goal-setting and solving a community problem. Therefore, social entrepreneurs are considered creative enough to have a vision of what they want to happen in meeting a community need and how to make that vision come to realization (Rai, 2008; Bornstein, 2007; Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2006). On a contrary view, Elkington & Hartigan (2008) claim that social entrepreneurial creativity is unreasonable arguing that social entrepreneurs ignore evidence that their social ventures will fail and that they attempt to measure venture outcome which no one is prepared to quantify. To counter this argument, the Schwab Foundation (2016) maintain that social entrepreneurs have enthusiasm to track, gauge and monitor their economic and social impact. The innovative and creativity nature of social entrepreneurship motivates change in communities by creating a paradigm shift in the communities and impacting many CBSI stakeholders

through innovative ideas in addressing social and economic issues. Sud *et al.* (2009) ^[80] argue that the emergence of social entrepreneurship has its focus on the innovative use of community-based assets to explore and exploit opportunities that meet communities social and economic needs in a sustainable manner.

CBSIs quality in terms of their outcome in meeting the needs of a community, as and when required develops from innovative and creativity nature of social entrepreneurship. Not only do social entrepreneurs have an idea and vision of a community project that they must implement, they as well know how to implement it and are realistic in the vision, goal and plan of implementing it (Bornstein, 2007; Drayton, 2006; Peredo & McLean, 2006). This according to Drayton (2006) and Mehta & Ashok (2012) manifests through a clear idea of what social entrepreneurs believe the future will look like and a passion to make this come true. Additionally, social entrepreneurs are not only happy with healthy community social and economic change but are displeased with the status quo (Elkington & Hartigan, 2008; Dees, 2001) ^[18]. According to Haugh & Talwar (2016) the trust among CBSI stakeholders aims to professionalize the community venture, by monitoring and controlling the quality of the venture outcome and implementing venture management processes to ensure the venture long term survival.

Community cultural values and believe systems are firmly tied to ethics. Ethical fiber in CBSI is important since social entrepreneurs who are willing, driven and about to change the social and economic status of a community must be trustworthy (Clarke & Holt, 2010; Sud *et al.*, 2009) ^[80]. Drayton (2006) observes that social entrepreneurs rarely take credit for making a change in the world. Rather, they insist that the change they have brought about through a community venture is a contribution by everyone around them. Muhammad *et al.* (2010) observes that social entrepreneurs are likely to be driven by emotion. This implies that they are not trying largely to make a profit but to address an economic and social need inspired by a set of social objectives. Short term and long term social and economic impact of a community social entrepreneurship venture assessment is possible (Madan 2007) ^[46]. The possibility of this lies in ethical consideration in that it makes the social entrepreneurs operations more transparent to diverse CBSI stakeholders therefore encouraging more participation in the CBSI as the stakeholders are aware of their contributions to the social intervention (Haugh & Talwar, 2016; Gilliss, 2011). Moreover, transparency improves the social cohesion and interactions in the community as community members would be aware of how genuine the social entrepreneurs' social mission is (Madan, 2007) ^[46]. Social entrepreneurship according to Branzei (2012) presents a more ethical alternative to conventional entrepreneurial activities, with an unambiguous and long-lasting social change agenda.

Consequently, from the literature reviewed and in the context of SE mediating role, Elkington and Hartigan (2008) describe three different social entrepreneurship models, applicable in different social situations and economic climates: One, *leveraged non-profit model*, which controls community financial and other resources in an innovative way to respond to social and economic needs. Two, *Hybrid non-profit model*, that take a variety of forms, but is distinctive because the social entrepreneur is willing to use

profit from some other activities to sustain a CBSI which have a social or community purpose. Hybrid non-profits according to Elkington and Hartigan (2008) are often created to deal with government ineffectiveness and inefficiency in meeting community needs, as they generate revenue to sustain the CBSIs operation without requiring loans, grants, and other forms of traditional funding. Three, *social business venture models*, that are set up as businesses designed to create community change through social means. Elkington and Hartigan (2008) indicate that social business ventures models evolved through a lack of funding. This situation forces social entrepreneurial ventures to become for-profit ventures, because other forms of financing are hard to get for social mission.

Discussion

Our study investigated whether SE affects the relationship between community culture and the sustainability of CBSI. The study employed a systematic review of literature. In line with the objective of the study, the result showed that social entrepreneurship strengthens community culture in ensuring sustainability of CBSIs. There is no doubt, given the review espoused in this article, that social entrepreneurship has an important role to play in the sustainability of CBSI debate. The finding of the literature review indicated that SE mediates the relationship between community culture and project sustainability.

This study corroborated the findings of a study Wolfgang (2012) undertook to determine the hybridity of social entrepreneurship by using a linking mechanism of traditional practices and contemporary entrepreneurship goals. The findings of the current study indicated that the amount to which a particular area of non-profit activity is affected by social enterprise and the outcomes can be studied with the help of structuration of community organisation, culture and systems. The study opined that, first, a CBSI is an ecosystem, a give and take kind of a relationship. Consequently, a social initiative must be built as a vigorous, merged network of nodes and connections with the knowledge of who the venture stakeholders are and where they can find value individually, group and together as a whole. Second, if a CBSI, rely on community culture and SE, this would translate into intensified stakeholder contacts, the resulting model would be that of a hive mind. In this case, the venture stakeholders become aware of their commonality, accordingly, they think and act as a community, sharing their knowledge, needs, thoughts, and resources. Lastly, CBSIs differ as to the objectives, nature of activities, strength of the relationship between CBSI stakeholders and how community needs change. These differences result to dynamic signal, in which case there is need for continual communication and feedback between CBSI stakeholders. For a CBSI to be sustained therefore, social entrepreneurs must pick up community need indicators, study the community cultural system and process community information efficiently and effectively so that it leads to the required social action. Consequently, to achieve sustainable CBSIs through social entrepreneurship, social business models which cumulatively puts an emphasis on community culture should be embraced.

The findings of the study underscore the relevance of SE in explaining the strong positive effect of community culture on passion, innovation and creativity in solving a societal need thus promoting CBSI sustainability. A clear-cut

practical implication of this paper is that the initiators and management of CBSI programmes should consider the blending community culture and social entrepreneurship skills and knowledge in the lifecycle of a CBSI. SE can instil a sense of innovation, creativity, mission and quest to solve a community need that further ensures the sustainability of a CBSI, in doubling up social solution and monetary gain. In CBSI programmes, the feelings of community cohesion, consideration for common values and believe system toward the programme are necessary conditions to improve the sense of control and ownership by the target community thus promoting CBSI sustainability. Existing literature suggests that community culture and social entrepreneurship independently to some extent can result to sustainable CBSIs. Nevertheless, social entrepreneurship stimulates creativity and innovation hidden in the believes, values, local resources and abilities of communities. Consequently, this relationship leads to sustainability of CBSIs thus resolving the community economic, ecological and social needs.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This paper aimed at reviewing and consolidating the extant literature studying the effect of social entrepreneurship in the relationship between community culture and sustainability of CBSIs. For this purpose, relevant papers were studied, analyzed and discussed in a systematic way. Since social entrepreneurship has largely been practiced in the commercial business enterprises in the form of corporate social responsibility (CSR), there is a need to increase its focus and application to community-based ventures. Certo & Miller (2008) recommends a comprehensive empirical study to add to a deeper understanding of the important outcomes of social entrepreneurship in community based social intervention programmes. Since social entrepreneurial ventures in communities need a passage of time before their impact is felt, there is a need for an empirical longitudinal research on effect of social entrepreneurship on sustainable community-based ventures (Angelidou & Psaltoglou, 2017).

Declarations

Author contribution statement

The authors Conceived and designed the study; Performed the study; Analyzed and interpreted the literature reviewed; Contributed materials, analysis tools or data; Wrote the paper.

Funding statement

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interest statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Akerlund KM. Prevention Program Sustainability: The State's Perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 2000; 28:353-362.
2. Akinbile LA, Oladoja MA, Awoniyi FM, Adisa BO. Effects of community participation on perception of sustainability of rural water projects in Oyun local government area of Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment*. 2006; 4(3&4):257-261.
3. Altman DC. Sustaining interventions in community systems: On the relationship between researchers and communities. *Health Psychol*. 1995; 14(6):526-36. [PubMed: 8565927].
4. Angelidou M, Psaltoglou A. An empirical investigation of social innovation initiatives for sustainable urban development. *Sustain. Cities Soc*, 2017; 33:113-125.
5. Angrisano M, Biancamano PF, Bosone M, Carone P, Daldanise G, De Rosa F, et al. Towards operationalizing UNESCO Recommendations on "Historic Urban Landscape": A position paper. *Aestimum*, 2016, 165-210.
6. Bansal S, Garg I, Sharma GD. Social Entrepreneurship as a Path for Social Change and Driver of Sustainable Development: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Sustainability*. MDPI Journal, 2019, 11:1091.
7. Barasa F, Jelagat T. Community participation in project planning, management and implementation: Building the foundation for sustainable development. *International Journal of Current Research*, 2013; 5:398-401.
8. Bielefeld W. Issues in Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. 2009; 15(1):69-86.
9. Bredillet C. Exploring research in project management: Nine schools of project management research (part 4). *Project Management Journal*. 2008; 39(1):2-6.
10. Bornstein D. *How to Change the World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 121-122.
11. Branzei O. Social change agency under adversity: How relational processes (re)produce hope in hopeless settings. In K. Golden-Biddle & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Using a positive lens to explore social change in organizations: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 21–47). London: Routledge, 2012.
12. Burnell J. *Small Change: understanding cultural action as a resource for unlocking assets and building resilience in communities*. Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal, 2012.
13. Cavaye J. *The role of government in community Capacity building*. Brisbane: Department of Primary Industries, 2015.
14. Certo ST, Miller T. Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Bus. Horiz*, 2008; 51:267-271.
15. Christou TA, Fowles S. Failure to protect girls from female genital mutilation. *Journal of Criminal Law*. 2015; 79(5):344-357.
16. Cimadamore AD, Robyn E, McNeish J. *Indigenous Peoples and Poverty: An International Perspective*, Development and Sustainability, 2013, pp.1-23
17. Clarke J, Holt R. Reflective judgement: Understanding entrepreneurship as ethical practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2010; 94(3):317-331.
18. Dees JG. The meanings of 'social entrepreneurship', working paper. Stanford University: Stanford, CA, 2001.
19. Dees JG. Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*. 2007; 44(3):24-31.
20. Dixon AB. Wetland sustainability and the evolution of indigenous knowledge in Ethiopia. *Geographical Journal*. 2005; 171(4):306-323.
21. Dhesi AS. Diaspora, social entrepreneurs and community development. *International Journal of*

- Social Economics. 2010; 37(9):703-716.
22. Doherty B, Haugh H, Lyon F. Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2014; 16(4):417-436.
 23. Draper AK, Hewitt G, Rifkin S. Chasing the dragon: Developing indicators for the assessment of community participation in health programmes. *Social Science & Medicine*, 2010; 71:1102-1109.
 24. Drayton B. The citizen sector transformed. *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*, 2006, 45-55.
 25. Drucker P. Innovation and Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Review*. 1985; 12(1):172-175. (4 pages)
 26. Eketone A, Walker S, Gibbs A. An exploration of Kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications; *Int. J. Social Research Methodology*, 2006; 9(4).
 27. Elkington J, Hartigan P. *The Power of Unreasonable People*. Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2008, p. 21.
 28. Eseonu C, Egbue O. Socio-Cultural Influences on Technology Adoption and Sustainable Development. In *Proceedings of the Industrial and Systems Engineering Research Conference*, Montreal, QC, Canada, 2014, pp. 2711–2717.
 29. Fonjong LN, Emmanuel NN, Fonchingong CC. Rethinking the contribution of indigenous management in small-scale water provision among selected rural communities in Cameroon. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 2005.
 30. Gandhi T, Raina R. Social Entrepreneurship: The Need, Relevance, Facets and Constraints. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 2018, 8:9.
 31. Gilliss CL. The nurse as social entrepreneur: Revisiting our roots and raising our voices. *Nursing Outlook*. 2011; 59(5):256-257.
 32. Gordon ES, Peter MF. Schumpeter, Kirzner, and the Field of Social Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 2011; 2(1):6-26. DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2010.544924.
 33. Granovetter M. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American journal of sociology*. 1985; 91(3):481-510.
 34. Grassl W. Business Models of Social Enterprise: A Design Approach to Hybridity. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives*. 2012; 1(1):37-60.
 35. Haugh HM, Talwar A. Linking social entrepreneurship and social change: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2016; 133(4):643-658.
 36. Harvey PA, Reed RA. Community-managed water supplies in Africa: Sustainable or dispensable? *Community Development Journal*. 2007; 42(3):365-378.
 37. Hawkes J. *The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning*. Common Ground Press, Melbourne, 2001.
 38. Ingle MD. *Project sustainability manual, how to incorporate sustainability* Portland State University, 2005.
 39. Jabareen Y, Carmon N. Community of trust: A socio-cultural approach for community planning and the case of Gaza. *Habitat International*. 2010; 34(4):446-453.
 40. Jabeen S. Insignificant Inclusion and Tokenistic Participation of Women in Development: A case study from Pakistan. *Conference session*. 2013; 2(1)11.
 41. Jafta R. Social entrepreneurship can boost development in SA, 2013. [http://blogs.sun.ac.za/news/2013/02/07/socialentrepreneurship-can-boost-development-in-sa/\(12/12/2012\)](http://blogs.sun.ac.za/news/2013/02/07/socialentrepreneurship-can-boost-development-in-sa/(12/12/2012)).
 42. Kamoche K, Siebers LQ, Mamman A, Newenham-Kahindi A. The dynamics of managing people in the diverse cultural and institutional context of Africa. *Personnel Review*. 2015; 44(3):330.
 43. Khwaja AI. *Can Good Projects Succeed in Bad Communities? Collective Action in the Himalayas*. Harvard University, Department of Economics, Cambridge, Mass. Processed, 2001.
 44. Komives K, Akanbang B, Thorsten R, Tuffuor B, Wakeman W, Larbi E, et al. Post-construction support and the sustainability of rural water projects in Ghana. In *33rd WEDC International Conference*, 2008, 1-294).
 45. Lungo MP, Mavole J, Otieno M. Determinants of Project Sustainability beyond Donor Support: Case of Caritas Norway Supported Governance Project in Mansa Diocese, Zambia. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 2017, 8(3).
 46. Madan R. Demystifying outcome measurement in community development. *Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University; Neighbor Works America*, 2007.
 47. Mair J, Marti I. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 2006, 41:36-44.
 48. Malunga P, Iwu CG, Mugobo VV. Social entrepreneurs and community development. A literature analysis. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 2014; 5(16).
 49. Mansuri W, Rao V. Culture and Public Action: An Introduction. In V. Rao and M. Walton, eds., *Culture and Public Action: A Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on Development Policy*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004.
 50. Mansuri W, Rao V. Can Participation be Induced? Some evidence from developing countries. *Crit. Rev. Int. Soc. Polit. Philos.* 2013; 16(2):284-304.
 51. Mair J, Martí I. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *J. World Bus*, 2006; 41:36-44.
 52. Matarasso F. Common ground: cultural action as a route to community development. *Community Development Journal*. 2007; 42(4):449-458.
 53. Mehta V, Ashok A. Power of Ideas 2012: Five challenges for social entrepreneurs willing to create impact today, 2012. [http://articles.economicstimes.indiatimes.com/2012-09-21/news/34002453_1_social-enterprises-social-entrepreneurs-impact \(20/12/2012\)](http://articles.economicstimes.indiatimes.com/2012-09-21/news/34002453_1_social-enterprises-social-entrepreneurs-impact (20/12/2012))
 54. Meyer W. *Sociological Theory and Evaluation Research, an Application and Its Usability for Evaluating Sustainable Development*; Centrum for Evaluation: Saarbrücken, Germany, 2002.
 55. Moller KA, Fryd O, De Neergaard A, Magid J. Economic, environmental and socio-cultural sustainability of three constructed wetlands in Thailand. *Environment and Urbanization*. 2012; 24(1):305-323.
 56. Muhammad Y, Bertrand M, Laurence L. *Building Social Business Models: Lessons from the Grameen*

- Experience. *Long Range Planning*. 2010; 43(2-3):308-325.
57. Muñoz-Goy C. Social capital in Spain: Are there gender inequalities? *European Journal of Government and Economics*, 2013, 2(1).
 58. Ney S, Beckmann M. Social Entrepreneurs and Social Change: Tracing Impacts of Social Entrepreneurship Through Ideas, Structures and Practices. *Int. J. Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 2014, 6(1).
 59. Nkonya E, Phillip D, Mogues T, Pender J, Kato E. Impacts of Community-driven Development Programs on Income and Asset Acquisition in Africa: The Case of Nigeria. *World Development*. 2012; 40(9):1824-1838.
 60. Oino PG, Towett G, Kirui KK, Luvega C. The Dilemma in Sustainability of Community-Based Projects in Kenya. *Glob. J Adv. Res*, 2015; 2:757-768.
 61. Okland A. Gap analysis for incorporating sustainability in project management. *Procedia Computer Science*, 2015; 64:103-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.469>.
 62. Olayide OE, Popoola L, Olaniyan O, Dapilah F, Abudulai IRY. Assessing the Transition from Survival to Sustainability: Case of Wechiau Community Hippo Sanctuary in Upper West Region of Ghana, West Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Development*. 2013; 6(10):47-56.
 63. Olsson N, Johansen A, Langlo A, Torp O. Project ownership: Implications on success measurement. *Measuring Business Excellence*. 2008; 12(1):39-46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13683040810864378>
 64. Olukotun GA. Achieving Project Sustainability Through Community Participation. *J Soc. Sci*. 2008; 17(1):21-29.
 65. Opare S. Strengthening community-based organizations for the challenges of rural development. *Community Development Journal*. 2007; 42(2):251-264.
 66. Ostrom E. *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
 67. Padawangi R. Community-driven development as a driver of change: Water supply and sanitation projects in rural Punjab, Pakistan. *Water Policy*. 2010; 12(SUPPL. 1):04-120.
 68. Partzsch L, Ziegler R. Social entrepreneurs as change agents: A case study on power and authority in the water sector. *Int. Environ. Agreem. Polit. Law Econ*, 2011; 11:63-83.
 69. Peredo AM, McLean M. Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept. *Journal of World Business*. 2006; 41(1):56-65.
 70. Picciotti A. Towards Sustainability: The Innovation Paths of Social Enterprise. *Ann. Public Coop. Econ*, 2017; 88:233-256.
 71. Proctor E, Luke D, Calhoun A, McMillen C, Brownson R, McCrary S, Padek M, et al. Sustainability of evidence-based healthcare: research agenda, methodological advances, and infrastructure support. *Implement Sci*, 2015; 10:88.
 72. Rai SK. Indian entrepreneurs: An empirical investigation of entrepreneur's age and firm entry, type of ownership and risk behavior. *Journal of Services Research*. 2008; 8(1):213-228.
 73. Riofrío MD. UNESCO's concept of Culture as a Driver of Sustainable Development, 2014.
 74. Savaya R, Spiro S, Elran-Barak R. Sustainability of social programs a comparative case study analysis. *Am. J Eval*, 2008; 29:478-493.
 75. Scammon D. Sustainability and culture: how do they work together? LCC 480 senior seminars, 2012.
 76. Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurs. *What is a Social Entrepreneur*, 2016. Retrieved May 2020.
 77. Scheirer MA, Dearing JW. An agenda for research on the sustainability of public health programs. *Am J Public Health*. 2011; 101(11):2059-2067.
 78. Shediak-Rizkallah M, Bone L. Planning for the sustainability of community-based health programs: Conceptual frameworks and future directions for research, practice and policy. *Health Education Research*, 1998; 13:87-108. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/13.1.87>.
 79. Stevenson HH. A perspective on entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business School Working Paper No. 9-384-131*, Harvard Business School, Boston, 1983.
 80. Sud M, VanSandt CV, Baugous AM. Social entrepreneurship: The role of institutions. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2009; 85(1):201-216.
 81. Thompson JL. The World of the Social Entrepreneur. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2002; 15(4/5):413.
 82. Vealey KP, Gerding JM. Rhetorical work in crowd-based entrepreneurship: Lessons learned from teaching crowdfunding as an emerging site of professional and technical communication. *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun*, 2016; 59:407-427.
 83. Ware A. Asset-Based Community Development in Myanmar: Theory, fit and practice. *Growing Sustainable Communities: A Development Guide for Southeast Asia* (pp. 126-141). Tilde University Press, 2014.
 84. Weerawardena J, Mort GS. Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*. 2006; 41(1):21-35.
 85. Welsh DHB, Krueger NF. The evolution of social entrepreneurship: What have we learned? *Journal of Technology Management in China*. 2013; 7(3):270-290.
 86. Wolfgang G. Business models of social enterprise: A design approach to hybridity. *Journal of entrepreneurship Perspectives*. 2012; 1(1):37-60.
 87. Wee-Liang WJ, Tan T. Defining the Social in Social Entrepreneurship: Altruism and Entrepreneurship. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 2005; 3:353-365.
 88. Wood M. Are hand pumps really affordable? Paper presented at the 20th WEDC Conference on Affordable Water Supply and Sanitation, Colombo, Sri Lanka, 1994. Retrieved from <http://www.watsan.org/docs/Wood—are-handpumps-affordable.pdf>.
 89. Yildirim M, Turan G. Sustainable development in historic areas: Adaptive re-use challenges in traditional houses in Sanliurfa, Turkey. *Habitat Int*, 2012; 36:493-503.
 90. Yue A, Khan R, Brook S. Developing a Local Cultural Indicator Framework in Australia: A Case Study of the City of Whittlesea. *Culture and Local*, 2011, 3(1-2). ISSN 1911-7469.
 91. Zampetakis LA, Moustakis V. Linking creativity with

entrepreneurial intentions: A structural approach. The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal. 2006; 2(3):413-428.