EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURS IN THE NEW ZEALAND SCHOOL SYSTEM

Thesis Proposal

November 2013

Crawford School of Public Policy
College of Asia and the Pacific
The Australian National University
Canberra, ACT 0200
Australia

ABSTRACT

Where governments, the private sector and non-profits may see barriers, social entrepreneurs see opportunities to provide goods or services to under-served, needy communities in innovative ways using a business model. This proposed research picks up on growing interest in the potential of social entrepreneurship to achieve this goal. It will evaluate whether educational entrepreneurs—as a kind of social entrepreneur—can help to improve the education of the 14 per cent of pupils who persistently under-achieve in the New Zealand school system. The basic question which underpins this research is whether educational entrepreneurs, who run alternative, and potentially innovative, forms of schooling can improve the education of these pupils better than regular state schooling. This will be observed by whether schooling run by educational entrepreneurs can meet the unmet needs of those whom they serve, educational or otherwise.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship is an emerging, inter-disciplinary research area that studies innovative ventures whose primary purpose is to create value for communities by improving their welfare using some form of business model to target an unmet need (Short et al. 2009, p. 161ff). Social entrepreneurs may diffuse their ventures by reproducing and/or scaling them up (Nicholls & Cho 2006). It includes a variety of different kinds of ventures operating in different areas of the world, depending on the emphasis placed upon income-generating activity and the role of this activity in supporting a venture's social mission. Thus, the context in which social entrepreneurs operate matters for understanding the range of opportunities which may be open to them, as well as how they set their priorities and make decisions. Social entrepreneurs' capacity to solve difficult social problems has attracted the attention of academics and decision-makers who are interested in how social entrepreneurs might be able to solve persistent social problems. Social entrepreneurs can fill a niche left by government organisations, firms or non-profits because they see an opportunity that other organisations from these sectors either cannot or will not. This increasing interest—which spiked during the first decade of the 21st century—has contributed to social entrepreneurship becoming a fast-growing area of research in the social and policy sciences. But does the hype match reality? Does social entrepreneurship deliver what it promises?

This proposed research picks up on the growing wave of interest in the potential—and the pitfalls—of social entrepreneurship to provide public goods and services for local communities. It will do so by evaluating the effectiveness of New Zealand educational entrepreneurs at providing alternative, and potentially innovative, forms of schooling for local communities. The basic question which underpins this research is what the value is, if any, that educational entrepreneurs create above that of conventional forms of schooling.

Educational entrepreneurship is a particular kind of social entrepreneurship in which an individual or an association identifies, evaluates and exploits opportunities to run ventures whose purpose is primarily to meet an unmet educational need. Educational entrepreneurs do so by providing a new or different, and potentially innovative, form of education to an under-served community or group that is supported by a revenue-generating model. In New Zealand, educational entrepreneurs might run a low-cost independent school (private schools which charge lower fees than the market rate), a Partnership School (a public-private partnership form of charter school) or an innovative form of regular state schooling that does not conform to the typical model. The social entrepreneurship literature hypothesises that innovative, socially-motivated educational entrepreneurs are likely to have the inclination, local know-how and resources to tackle persistent social problems. This is because educational entrepreneurs are more likely to be aware of the educational needs of local communities (Stuart 2011, pp. 107-8, 112).

Investigating the effectiveness of educational entrepreneurs in the school system matters because New Zealand has a problem with the persistent educational under-achievement of the bottom 14 per cent of pupils in the school system (Gordon 2013, pp. 48-9; Chamberlin & Caygill 2012; Ministry of Education 2011, p. 8; Telford & May 2010, pp. 14, 26, 36). Maori and Pasifika children are over-represented among those who under-achieve (Gordon 2013, pp. 48-9; Ministry of Education 2011, p. 15; Telford & May 2010, pp. 12, 28, 38; OECD 2010, pp. 9-10). This educational dysfunction could become social dysfunction and manifest itself in lower returns from earnings, or higher rates of illiteracy, unemployment or crime among a section of New Zealand's population (Ministry of Education 2011; Bhuller et al. 2011; Machin et al. 2010; Wolfe & Haveman 2002). New Zealand's regular state school system has struggled with solving the problem of persistent educational under-achievement. It is important to learn whether alternative forms of education, such as schools run by educational entrepreneurs, can better attend to the particular learning needs of these educationally disadvantaged pupils. If schools run by educational entrepreneurs are sustainable, effective ventures then it might be worthwhile to replicate and expand them to help these pupils from communities at the margins of society.

This research is likely to make at least four distinct contributions. First, the research will help to better understand social entrepreneurship in New Zealand by applying some of the analytical frameworks that have been developed in this field, as it has been acknowledged that its development—and study—there is still in its infancy (Grant 2008, p. 11). Second, it will extend the blossoming social entrepreneurship literature to the study of educational entrepreneurship, enabling different perspectives to be brought to bear on evaluating educational entrepreneurs. Third, it should provide more information about New Zealand's under-studied independent and partially-private schools. Fourth, it will answer the growing call from some social entrepreneurship scholars to shift the focus of research away from exploring definitions and towards more rigorous empirical evaluations based on theory. In particular, this will include the valid and reliable measurement of value creation and social impact by generating testable propositions from case study research and the development of better metrics. This will help to determine whether and to what extent educational entrepreneurs—and social entrepreneurs—can fulfil their promise to help local communities to flourish. These efforts will contribute to the development of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of social entrepreneurship. Overall, the proposed research should make a number of interesting contributions both to the study of the New Zealand school system and areas of social entrepreneurship research that some scholars argue deserve more serious study.

THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

The study of social entrepreneurship is highly affected by context (Douglas 2013, p. 7). The context may affect the motives and ease with which social entrepreneurs can start a venture and whether it may endure. What follows is a short description of the cultural, political and institutional environment in New Zealand that may affect educational entrepreneurs. Particular attention is paid to the nature of the New Zealand education system as it influences the opportunities and constraints experienced by educational entrepreneurs.

New Zealand is a small island nation in the South Pacific with a population of about 4.4 million people. Most of the population lives in the main urban areas of which Auckland is the largest city, with about 1.4 million people. Maori are New Zealand's tangata whenua (indigenous people of the land). In 2006, Maori represented about 15 per cent of New Zealand's population. Pacific Islanders and Asians comprised about nine per cent of the population and are contributing to the increasing multiculturalism of New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand 2013). Population projections show that within the next five years over half of school-aged children will identify with multiple, non-European ethnicities (Nusche 2012, p. 14). New Zealand endured the Global Financial Crisis relatively well, but poverty among a section of the population is a problem (Perry 2013, pp. 14-21). The country's finances and resilience were tested by a prolonged series of damaging earthquakes in Christchurch between 2010 and 2012 (Treasury 2013).

New Zealand is a Commonwealth country with a Westminster system of government (Palmer & Palmer 2004). The founding document of New Zealand is the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840. It established obligations between the British Crown and Maori for the use of resources and land. During the past two decades, principles have been derived from the Treaty and applied throughout the public sector. There is only one house of parliament whose members are elected by a proportional voting system, known as Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) representation. While MMP has made coalition governments more likely, New Zealand's unicameral parliament still makes it relatively easy for a government to pass legislation quickly (Aroney & Thomas 2012; Malone 2009).

It was hoped that MMP would remedy this problem, as it was experienced with significant consequences in the 1980s and 1990s, when successive governments elected under the old First-Past-the-Post voting system instituted 'neoliberal' reforms. These reforms, among other things: abolished exchange rate controls; removed import tariffs and farming subsidies; privatised national utilities, including transport, energy and forestry; put employment contracts on an individualised basis; and scaled-back New Zealand's long-standing welfare state by cutting welfare benefit rates and tightening eligibility (Evans et al. 1996). The principal-agent theory of New Public Management underpinned changes to the way the public sector worked, with ministries and their contractors providing services on a contract basis (Boston et al. 1996). The scale and speed of these changes dislocated local communities and strained the social fabric (Kelsey 1995; 1993). They also challenged the highly valued notion of an egalitarian society, protected by an inclusive welfare state (Gustafson 2006; Moloney 2006).

In 1989, the education system was rationalised as part of the reforms with the passage of the Education Act 1989. Local education boards were abolished and the leadership and governance of schools was devolved to school principals and boards, respectively (Langley 2009, p. 8). This created a system of self-governing state schools. A measure of centralised administration and monitoring remained, however. Besides oversight from a streamlined Ministry of Education, an Education Review Office (ERO) was given responsibility for inspecting schools. A national curriculum was introduced during the 1990s to provide a common framework for learning and achievement. Since then, in 2009, national standards in literacy and numeracy were introduced at Years 1 to 8 which schools are required to report against to central government and families (Nusche 2012, pp. 18-9). Families are free to send their child to whichever school they want; provided it is not over-subscribed, in which case entry for children of families who live outside of a geographic zone is subject to a ballot (*Education Act 1989*, ss 11B, 11F, 11G).

The Education Act 1989 provides for four basic types of schools, namely: regular state schools;

designated special character schools, including private religious schools that have integrated into the state system; kura kaupapa Maori schools, which teach Maori worldview, values and language; and, from 2013, Partnership Schools (kura hourua) (*Education Act 1989*, ss 146, 155, 156, 158D). These schools operate at the primary, intermediate and secondary school levels. Composite and middle years schools also exist. There are a range of small-scale alternative education schools which operate within the state education system to provide special education, such as for children with acute learning difficulties. A small independent schools sector exists, which represents four per cent of enrolments and receives a capped amount of NZ$45 million in funding per year from the government (Nusche 2012, p. 16). The Education Act 1989 makes the Minister of Education responsible for decisions regarding establishing, re-designating and monitoring of all schools.

While schools have freedom over much of their day-to-day operations, most schooling in New Zealand is provided or regulated to some degree by the state. Consistent with the value New Zealanders generally place upon the welfare state, the primary and secondary teacher unions, and certain quarters of academia, strongly advocate for the state education system to be protected (Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) 2013; O'Connor 2013; Thrupp 1999; Wylie 1999; Gordon 1996). Those who want to operate a school different to a regular state school are constrained by the types of schools that are permitted by legislation, ministerial approval and the suspicion which can greet alternative providers.

The performance of the New Zealand school system is regarded as generally high. In a 2011 evaluation, the OECD reported that, ‘Average student learning outcomes are very good by international comparison, even though there are concerns about the proportion of students that are not performing well’ (Nusche 2012, p. 13). One of the Government’s priorities is to lift the educational achievement of these pupils. Its goals are by 2017 to have 85 per cent of: 18 year olds achieving Level 2 or equivalent qualification in the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), New Zealand’s main school exit qualification; and achieving at or above national standards in Years 1 to 8. Maori and Pasifika pupils are lagging behind in these statistics, with the proportion of pupils attaining NCEA Level 2 or the benchmark in national standards both sitting at about 60 per cent (Ministry of Education 2013). Much energy has been expended on developing strategies to address educational underachievement. Although there is a concern that schools and teachers are being made to solve a problem that schools cannot accomplish alone, since it is partly caused by material and relational poverty among a section of New Zealand’s population (Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) 2013).

From this brief description of New Zealand’s cultural, political, institutional and educational environment, it can be seen that educational entrepreneurs have opportunities to serve diverse communities and meet some pressing needs. The causes of educational underachievement, in particular, are complex and require whole-of-community solutions to properly address. Educational entrepreneurs may be well-placed to bridge the gap between schooling, families and communities. However, the institutional environment may make it difficult for educational entrepreneurs to set up or expand schooling to take advantage of these opportunities. The New Zealand setting is likely to have particular implications for whether and what kind of schooling ventures educational entrepreneurs might start and the extent to which they may have a social impact. With this background established, it is important to define what social and educational entrepreneurship are and why these ventures may create value for marginalised communities.

WHAT IS SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP?

What social entrepreneurship is and why it is distinctive from other forms of welfare provision are questions that have frustrated practioners, policy makers and academics. It is difficult to understand what social entrepreneurship is, not only because of the tension between its social and the entrepreneurial dimensions, but also whether or not it is an individual, an institution, an activity or a process that is the object of study. A further complication is that a diverse range of ventures exists which each have slightly different purposes.

A broad church: social entrepreneurship, enterprise and innovation

Social entrepreneurship is a broad church, as it can refer to social entrepreneurs as well as social enterprises and social innovation. While it has taken time, some definitional consensus is emerging about what these phenomena are. Social entrepreneurship is a general term which refers to entrepreneurial activity that is directed towards solving social problems (Corner & Ho 2010, p. 635). Social entrepreneurship fills the neglected space among commercial enterprises, whose purpose is to produce financial returns, the government, which solves large-scale social problems through regulation and/or wealth redistribution, and non-profit organisations, which provide relational support and financial aid that is first given through philanthropy and charity (Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship & World Economic Forum 2013, p. 5). Social entrepreneurship is therefore a hybrid of for-profit ventures and traditional non-profits.

Social entrepreneurs are individuals who tackle difficult social problems by providing opportunities and support for the most vulnerable. But they do so by embracing the financial discipline of the free market to support their mission, or to deliver goods and services at affordable prices (Seelos & Mair 2005, pp. 241-2). They create ‘new models for the provision of products and services that cater directly to basic human needs that remain unsatisfied by current economic or social institutions’ (Seelos & Mair 2005, p. 243). High-profile examples include Victoria Hale’s OneWorld Health, a non-profit pharmaceutical firm whose mission is to supply drugs that can cure infectious diseases in developing countries, irrespective of patients’ ability to pay (Martin & Osberg 2007, p. 36), or Ibrahim Abouleish’s Sekem, an Egyptian agricultural business whose profits fund schools, an adult education centre and a medical centre which provides means for escaping poverty that had not existed before (Seelos & Mair 2005, p. 243).

Social enterprises also aim to respond to social problems and needs but they use business solutions to solve social problems. Surpluses produced are reinvested in the enterprise or in the community rather than being retained as profit for shareholders (Chell et al. 2010, p. 486). Social innovations focus on providing solutions which are new, and/or more effective, efficient or sustainable than existing ones (Phills et al. 2008, p. 36). Thus, social innovation is primarily concerned with developing innovative strategies to meet social needs through the provision of goods or services. It could also be that the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than to individuals or an individual social entrepreneur’s private wealth. A major difficulty for definition is that the boundaries between what social entrepreneurs, enterprise and innovation do is blurry.

It does not help that social entrepreneurship comes in different forms in different places. Scholars argue that it is important to differentiate between the ways social entrepreneurship is defined and practiced in different places to understand how the environment affects opportunities for social entrepreneurship (Defourny & Nyssens 2008, p. 33). Chell et al. (2010, p. 486) have noted several factors that can explain the variation. These include: the level of development in economic and social systems; the characteristics of welfare systems and of the traditional third sector; and the nature of the underpinning legal systems.

In Europe, governments encouraged social entrepreneurship from the 1990s by devolving the delivery of social welfare programmes to social enterprises. In 1991, for example, the Italian parliament passed legislation that created ‘social cooperatives’ (Defourny & Nyssens 2008, p. 37). Throughout Europe, ‘Work Integration Social Enterprises’ (WISES) have helped low-qualified, long-term unemployed people to join the workforce and participate in society (Defourny & Nyssens 2008,

p. 37). In 2005, the United Kingdom legislated for Community Interest Companies (CIC) which provides a legal form for social enterprises there. To register as a CIC, a limited company is required to have a social purpose and limit the money that can be paid to shareholders.

The stimulation of entrepreneurship within the European non-profit sector in such ways has created a 'social economy' or 'solidarity economy' (*économie solidaire*) (Defourny & Nyssens 2008, pp. 35, 37), in which the government and the social sector partner to address social problems. This means that in Europe, social entrepreneurs focus more on social innovation. Governance arrangements can also provide an opportunity for beneficiaries, employees, volunteers, or donors to participate directly in the management of an enterprise. Thus, the European approach is more cooperative, prioritising the participation of beneficiaries in the enterprise and the reinvestment of surpluses in the social mission.

By contrast, in the United States, social entrepreneurship began as the commercial activities that supported the missions of non-for-profit organisations. Kerlin (2006) has traced this approach as far back as the foundation of the United States, when community or religious groups sold homemade goods or held bazaars to supplement charitable donations. The activity became more important from the late 1960s when government funds were channelled through non-profits to invest in education, healthcare, community development and poverty-alleviation programmes. When the economy declined in the late 1970s and 1980s, and welfare spending was cutback, non-profits expanded their commercial activities to balance their budgets by selling goods or services that were not directly related to their mission. Another major influence on the development of social entrepreneurship in this way was the creation of major organisations that provide financial support, including Ashoka, and the Schwab and Skoll Foundations. Ashoka's vision, for example, is to identify and financially support outstanding individuals to solve complex social problems (Ashoka 2013).

Thus, United States social entrepreneurs have to rely more on income-generating activities or funding from major foundations to pursue their social mission because they receive little support from the government. The concept of the social economy does not exist. In this 'earned-income' approach to social entrepreneurship, what matters is how social entrepreneurs generate their income and reinvest it in their venture and/or its mission to help solve social problems (Defourny & Nyssens 2008, pp. 38-9). While the earned-income approach lacks the cooperative elements of the European social innovation approach, an advantage is that United States ventures have experimented with a broader variety of income-generating activities to support their social missions. These have included mission-related products, partnerships with for-profit firms, the co-branding of for-profit products, and the formation of for-profit subsidiaries by non-profits. The priority given to income-generating activities helps to explain the heavy emphasis in the United States on individual social entrepreneurs, their potential to introduce social innovations in various fields, and the delivery of products and services through market activities.

Social entrepreneurship in New Zealand

When comparing social entrepreneurship in the United States with Europe, there is a distinction between those ventures that have a mission-driven business approach and those which blend commercial and non-profit activities for the purpose of social change or transformation. The situation could be different again in New Zealand. Less is known about the nature of New Zealand social entrepreneurship, however. Corner and Ho (2010), for example, have analysed how social entrepreneurs identify opportunities by examining Trade Aid in New Zealand. However, the purpose of this study was to make a contribution to theory of opportunity recognition in management rather than to understand New Zealand social entrepreneurship better. A 2006 paper (Jeffs 2006) indicated that New Zealand social entrepreneurs and social enterprises have struggled for recognition as a means of tackling persistent social problems compared to in Europe or the United States. This means that New Zealand lacks an enabling environment which would help small to medium-sized ventures to operate and grow to their full potential.

Grant (2008, p. 11) has echoed this sentiment, observing that 'social entrepreneurship is still in its infancy' in New Zealand. She observed that there are a broad range of activities that could be described as social enterprises operating in the non-profit sector, but are not called this, such as employment schemes, families' services, or church or community-run cooperatives. In an exploratory paper, she considered four cultural and historical influences on the nature and scope of the social enterprises which have developed in New Zealand. These were: socio-cultural norms, such as ‘Kiwi ingenuity’; the neoliberal reforms initiated by successive governments during the 1980s and 1990s; Crown settlements with Maori tribes, with respect to breaches of the principles of 1840 Treaty of Waitangi; and a growing identity among New Zealanders as international citizens. Grant identified some trends which might make social enterprise an attractive alternative for the provision of public goods and services. These included a ‘culture of contracts’, influenced by the neoliberal reforms and Treaty settlements, as well as community groups’ desire to maintain a measure of independence from government, influenced by New Zealanders’ desire for freedom. Despite these influences, the fact remains that New Zealand lacks a recognisable framework which can inform the future development of social enterprises or entrepreneurship. There is a clear opportunity for research which can shape the knowledge and future practice of New Zealand social entrepreneurship (Grant 2008, p. 9).

But what is it that distinguishes social entrepreneurship from other kinds of collective and market activity for improving welfare? In other words, what makes social entrepreneurship distinctive?

What is distinctive about social entrepreneurship?

Knowing what distinguishes social entrepreneurship from others working to solve social problems is important for proving that it is a legitimate field of study and a phenomenon whose impact can be evaluated. A typical approach has been to study who social entrepreneurs are. Attention first turned towards the actions of individual social entrepreneurs, such as telling the stories of the Ashoka Foundation’s Fellows, or the Nobel Prize-winning efforts of Muhammad Yunus, who founded the Grameen Bank which introduced micro-credit loans for the poor. They have been portrayed as ‘totally possessed’, path-breaking, visionary, altruistic individuals, with powerful new ideas and the relentless passion, creativity and ingenuity to introduce social innovations that will either renew or transform the world (Nicholls 2006, p. 20; Bornstein 1998, p. 37).

Undoubtedly, individual social entrepreneurs are important because they can identify a problem and marshal the resources and people to found a venture (Catford 1998, pp. 95-7). However, some scholars have argued that our understanding of social entrepreneurship will be limited if all that is studied are the traits of successful social entrepreneurs (Dacin et al. 2010, p. 42). Scholars would endlessly debate what those traits should be rather than examining the activities of individuals and organisations.

Besides individuals, scholars have shown that social entrepreneurs can use institutions or practices to produce and sustain social benefits (Mair & Noboa 2006). For example, Mair and Marti (2009, pp. 11, 14-5) have studied how social entrepreneurs in Bangladesh have helped to develop democratic institutions, such as village councils, and the transfer of resources, such as livestock, so that the ultra-poor can have the means to participate in society. The study of such cases has popularised the idea that social entrepreneurship is an activity or a process involving ‘the innovative use and combination of resources to explore and exploit opportunities’ to catalyse social change by meeting basic human needs in a sustainable way (Nicholls 2006, p. 23; also see Mair & Marti 2004, p. 3).

These cases indicate how social entrepreneurship can be a collective activity. Social entrepreneurs from outside of local communities can tap into local resources and networks which can help them to find sustainable solutions to the social problems that those communities face. Equally so, a venture might emerge from local associations when members of communities, business owners and managers, for instance, collaborate to respond to an opportunity (Peredo & Chrisman 2006, p. 315). For example, in New Zealand, the C-Me Mentoring Trust, operating under the name ‘Trades@school’, co-ordinates apprenticeships for Year 12 and 13 Pasifika school pupils in one of eight different trades industries (ASB Community Trust 2013). The Trust, managed by the man who was inspired to start the venture, John Kotoisuva, brings together schools, the Manukau Institute of Technology and industry. The value which this initiative creates is to make Pasifika youth more employable through the provision of training in skills-based industries. This will hopefully lead to better living standards and reduce social welfare dependency among a section of this community.

The issue of resources indicates how even the financing of social entrepreneurship can be a distinctive venture all on its own. Some social entrepreneurs have made it their mission to enable other ventures to start by establishing financing institutions. This kind of social entrepreneurship began in the 1990s as entrepreneurs who had made their fortune in banking, venture capital or IT began to use new and innovative arrangements for their philanthropic activity (Spiess-Knaft & Achleitner 2013, p. 166). Thus, capital markets for social ventures have developed. These range from value banks, such as the Charity Bank, which caters to the social sector and issue loans to individuals or ventures, to venture philanthropy funds, such as the Acumen Fund, which provides wrap around support for social ventures by providing not only equity and debt financing and help with operational financing, but also access to professional networks and management consulting. Social investment funds, such as ResponsAbility, are another variety in which the fund brings together capital from different investors to invest in ventures like microfinance institutions and ventures that have a sustainable income-generating model (Spiess-Knaft & Achleitner 2013, p. 169).

A further variation on the advice and investment models of philanthropic financing has been the development of social impact bond delivery agencies, such as the United Kingdom's Social Finance or Social Ventures Australia. The twist with this approach is that it involves the public sector. Under this model, a delivery agency raises capital from social investors with which it funds ventures that address a difficult social problem with early intervention programmes. The hope is that these programmes will reduce the long-term costs for society caused by these social problems, which are currently borne by the government. The government commits to rewarding investors with a portion of the savings that result from reductions in government spending (Bolton & Savell 2013, pp. 17-22; Social Finance 2009, pp. 2-3). In the United Kingdom, Social Finance has used social impact bonds to finance programmes whose aim is to reduce recidivism, such as the West Midlands Region Connect Project. In Australia, the New South Wales government has raised A$7 million from social investors for the Newpin Social Benefit Bond to help combat child abuse and neglect (NSW Government 2013; Social Ventures Australia 2013). Social impact bonds can help to align the interests of social entrepreneurs, the government and philanthropists around common social goals (Spiess-Knaft & Achleitner 2013, p. 168). Moreover, the development of social capital markets indicates how social entrepreneurship can be an activity which is not restricted to the direct delivery of a product or service—it may have a distinctive impact by providing the means for those who do.

A definition of social entrepreneurship

It can be seen then that social entrepreneurship includes the processes, practices and activities of individual social entrepreneurs, associations, or institutions. All of these are important for distinguishing social entrepreneurship from others providing welfare in the commercial, non-profit or government sectors. In light of this discussion, a definition of social entrepreneurship is proposed that explains what social entrepreneurship is and why it is distinctive. Social entrepreneurship is the process of identifying, evaluating and exploiting opportunities aimed at creating value to meet unmet social needs, and bring about social renewal, by means of a social innovation that is supported by market-based activities (Bacq & Janssen 2011, p. 376; Pierre et al. 2011; Mair & Marti 2006). Social entrepreneurship can be a collective activity, as well as an individual one, as ventures can emerge from local communities in response to a need. It is also a collective activity because social entrepreneurs rely on networks of people who can help their venture to succeed, such as those which exist in local communities (Spear 2006; Granovetter 1985). In other words, social entrepreneurs are embedded in the relationships of the communities or groups whom they serve (Rothbard 2008, pp. 200-1; Polanyi 1968). Social entrepreneurs may stand a better chance at creating value in multiple ways because they come alongside local communities or groups to provide beneficial goods or services that others would not. It is proposed that educational entrepreneurs can do this very thing, too, because educational entrepreneurship is a kind of social entrepreneurship.

WHAT IS EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP?

Educational entrepreneurship refers to individuals or associations who create and run educational organisations that use a model of social entrepreneurship to provide some sort of innovation which can meet an unmet educational need. Educational entrepreneurship is not a synonym for alternative or designated special character education. It encompasses a wide-range of activities whose purpose is to create value by filling a niche left open by the regular school system. That value will be the improvement of educational outcomes for children. But it can also include improving school productivity or the quality of education, such as through the development of school teachers and leaders, providing schooling that is more appropriate to the values and expectations of local communities (Hess 2006, p. 2), or perhaps even providing a good or service that indirectly contributes to improved educational outcomes (Chand & Amin-Choudhury 2006). The innovative practices of educational entrepreneurs might also have the potential to cause disruptive, positive transformational change to the education system (Hess 2006, p. 46). The ventures of educational entrepreneurs may be driven by individuals, who act as a catalyst, but they are also likely to be collective endeavours in practice, as they are developed in response to the educational needs of particular communities.

Educational entrepreneurship has emerged as a distinctive topic because some social entrepreneurs have started educational ventures with social missions. The relative fall in the quality of educational achievement experienced by some pupils in advanced countries, such as the United States or the United Kingdom, or New Zealand's problem with underachievement among educationally disadvantaged pupils, has provided a compelling reason for social entrepreneurs to do something. For example, Wendy Kopp founded Teach for America (TFA)—a fast-track alternative teacher training programme that enables top graduate students to teach in schools in disadvantaged areas—to improve the quality of teaching in these areas and to expose top graduates to education and the needs of disadvantaged communities (Hess 2006, p. 56). The passage of laws to permit private providers to operate alternative state schools, such as charter schools (publicly-funded independent schools) in the United States, or Academies and Free Schools in the United Kingdom, has created another opportunity for social entrepreneurs (Hess 2007). Thus, the growing need to improve state education systems, and the general importance of education to countries' futures, has made education a worthy social justice cause.

What are some examples of educational entrepreneurship?

How then have educational entrepreneurs in New Zealand taken the opportunity to provide education that can meet unmet needs and, more importantly, what distinguishes them from regular education providers?

- **School principals and teachers**

Educational entrepreneurs can be spotted relatively easily in schools systems. For example, educational entrepreneurs might be principals or experienced teachers who have decided to establish an independent school that is targeted at meeting a particular educational need. The opportunity exists because independent school systems grant proprietors more freedom from national curricula and government regulation. In New Zealand, an example of an educational entrepreneur who has taken advantage of the freedom and flexibilities provided by the independent school system is Alwyn Poole. With his wife Karen, Alwyn established Mt Hobson Middle School in Remuera, Auckland, governed by the charitable Villa Education Trust. The Poole's use a class size ratio of 12 pupils to one teacher, an individualised project-based curriculum and a split day to help boost the confidence and achievement of Year 7 to 10 pupils who have fallen behind in their learning (Mt Hobson Middle School 2013). The need that the Poole's identified was the lack of schooling which could address the plateau of educational achievement among New Zealand's middle years' school pupils (New Zealand Ministry of Education 2008, p. 11). The school is funded by fees paid by families and the annual $1,500 per pupil government subsidy to independent schools. Mt Hobson Middle School restricts its fees to about NZ$12,000 per year, which reduces the financial barrier to enrolment. The Pooles' goal is to prepare the pupils who they teach for transition to senior secondary school so that ultimately they can 'fully and effectively participate in their future academic, cultural, sporting, social and working lives' (Mt Hobson Middle School 2013). It would not have been possible to open a school which used this alternative schooling model in the regular state system.

- **Community-based models**

Ventures can also emerge from the collaboration of local communities and associations. A good case is New Zealand's TU TOA-Tai Wananga (TU TOA) academy at Massey University in Palmerston North. It is a joint venture between the TU TOA Trust, Te Wananga o Aotearoa (a public Maori university) and the Ministry of Education whose mission is to develop excellence in academic achievement using sport and a strong Maori identity to encourage pupils from low socio-economic backgrounds to remain in secondary school (TU-TOA 2013). While the academy charges annual fees of between NZ$2,500 to NZ$3,500 per pupil, it is also resourced through the partnership between the TU TOA Trust, Te Wananga o Aotearoa and the Ministry of Education.

Besides setting high expectations for educational achievement, TU TOA creates value for a section of the Maori community by promoting healthy living through sport, encouraging proficiency in basic te reo Maori language and enticing low socio-economic status pupils to stay in secondary school and further education for as long as possible. While other schools may promote some or all of these activities to encourage Maori pupils, TU TOA does them all by bringing together sport and education to develop the wellbeing of Maori children. This is what makes its educational venture both distinctive and innovative. TU TOA shows what can be accomplished by an entrepreneurial partnership between local associations and, in this case, some support from central government.

- **Public-private partnerships**

This indicates how public-private partnerships can be another form of educational entrepreneurship. Under this model, the state partners with a private sponsor to provide schooling within the state system; often with a focus on targeting educational underachievement. The idea is to give operators the freedom to innovate with a particular pedagogy, curriculum or specialist focus to improve achievement outcomes and enhance the quality of the education.

This kind of public-private partnership is being established in a small way in New Zealand. As mentioned before, New Zealand is introducing a kind of charter school model known as Partnership Schools. The Partnership School model grants licences to operators from outside of the regular state system and gives them operational freedoms (Partnership Schools Working Group 2012). In return for these freedoms, operators will have to meet strict performance requirements. These are based upon the Government's objectives to lift the educational achievement of disadvantaged pupils, especially among Maori and Pasifika pupils. As such, the schools are deliberately targeted at solving New Zealand's persistent problem with the educational underachievement. They may succeed at this mission if they can use their freedoms to provide an education that is better targeted at what the children in these communities need than what regular state schools can provide.

In September 2013, five licences were issued to the first operators to start new schools at the beginning of the 2014 school year (New Zealand Ministry of Education 2013). Advance Training Centres Limited will run Vanguard Military School, a co-educational senior secondary school in Albany, Auckland for Year 11 to 13 pupils. It will use the ethos of military training to help pupils to transition into further training or employment. He Puna Marama Charitable Trust will operate Te Kura Hourua O Whangarei Terenga Paraoa in Whangarei for Years 7 to 13 pupils. It will be a co-educational secondary school whose mission is to improve Maori pupils' achievement by reconnecting them with an ethos of leadership and pride. Nga Parirau Matauranga Trust will sponsor Te Kura Hourua ki Whangaruru. It will be a bilingual co-educational secondary school in Whangaruru, Northland for Years 9 to 13 pupils. It will offer Maori pupils additional learning opportunities, such as farming and outdoor education. The Rise UP Trust will open a Rise UP Academy for Years 1 to 6 pupils in Mangere, South Auckland. Rise UP will use inquiry-based learning and engage whanau to encourage higher achievement. Lastly, the Villa Education Trust will start South Auckland Middle School for Years 7 to 10 pupils. It will use the model of project-based learning and an education based on Christian worldview which is offered at Mt Hobson Middle School.

These operators are all existing educational providers. This means that, for now, the initiative has given existing educational entrepreneurs the opportunity to diffuse their schooling models to new areas. Thus, the Partnership Schools initiative has given New Zealand educational entrepreneurs the chance to tap into public funds that will enable them to provide schooling innovations to communities that have had little or no opportunity to access them before. This may be a key way in which New Zealand's Partnership Schools will innovate and meet unmet educational needs in the communities that they will serve.

- **Facilitators of resources and access to schooling**

An educational entrepreneur does not have to be an individual principal or a teacher who runs a school. For example, an educational entrepreneur could be one of the businesses, universities or charities which sponsor England's Academy Schools, a non-profit school management organisation, such as the United States Green Dot Public Schools, Aspire Schools or KIPP charter school management organisations, or an education company, such as Edison Learning (United Kingdom Department for Education 2013; United Kingdom Department for Education 2013, pp. 21-2; Miron et al. 2012, pp. 25, 29).

Educational entrepreneurship might also take the form of facilitating access to resources or existing schools. The NewSchools Venture Fund in the United States, for example, raises philanthropic capital from individual and institutional investors, and then uses those funds to seed educational entrepreneurs who have the capacity to help disadvantaged children to attend and complete college (NewSchools Venture Fund 2013). NewSchools supports educational entrepreneurs as they develop and implement their ideas. It also offers practical support, such as guidance to school boards and facilitating connections between schools to inform its future investments and public policy. Unlike a commercial venture fund, success is defined by schools' social impact, such as college completion rates, rather than financial return.

A New Zealand educational entrepreneur who helps educationally disadvantaged pupils to access a high quality regular state school is Chicago-born Terrance Wallace. He started, and now directs, the 'In Zone' project, a boarding hostel owned by the United Maori Mission which is located in the enrolment zone of the oversubscribed boys' Auckland Grammar School (United Maori Mission 2013; ASB Community Trust 2013). Boys from families who live outside of Auckland apply to live in the hostel to attend Auckland Grammar. The hostel is financed by a combination of private donations and revenue from Wallace's business initiatives. Wallace's inspiration for starting the hostel was to do something within the constraints of the current state school system to improve opportunities for under-achieving Maori and Pasifika pupils. Their plight is similar to that of the ethnic minority pupils who lived where he grew up. While the In Zone project prioritises high educational achievement, it offers a residential environment for the formation of character according to Christian values, too. The goal is to help the boys to become leaders who will return to sow into their home communities. Wallace is not an educator, but he is nonetheless an educational entrepreneur because his venture has used an innovation to enable boys to attend a top regular state school which normally they could not have. The In Zone project provides an opportunity to improve the educational outcomes and the character of these boys that the regular state school system does not.

A definition of educational entrepreneurship

The foregoing discussion provides the basis for a definition of educational entrepreneurship. Educational entrepreneurship is a particular kind of social entrepreneurship in which an individual or an association identifies, evaluates and exploits opportunities to ventures whose purpose is primarily to meet an unmet educational need. Educational entrepreneurs do so by providing a new or different, and potentially innovative, form of education to an under-served community or group that is supported by a revenue-generating model.

Educational entrepreneurs therefore serve educational needs at the margins of the regular system, which suggests that their ventures might be local in scale. If they succeed at improving education at the margins then they could improve the welfare of communities and groups, and help to bring about social renewal, by improving educational outcomes in ways which are appropriate to the needs of the communities or groups whom they serve. At the very, least they might facilitate access to existing forms of education which under-served communities have not enjoyed before. However, they may also pioneer innovations that have the potential to adapt and incorporate new developments in knowledge, learning or technology (Smith et al. 2006, pp. 21-5, 42-4). The degree to which educational entrepreneurs can disrupt the existing education system and introduce changes which have a positive impact is how they can improve welfare and create value.

Educational entrepreneurship is not only about improving education systems, however, it represents a more human, grassroots response to educational problems because it is often a community-driven enterprise. This is perhaps one of the most important ways that it is different to the regular state school system which uses centralised, planned approaches to solve educational problems. This is how educational entrepreneurs might be able to make a difference to the pupils who persistently under-achieve in New Zealand's state school system. Educational entrepreneurs, acting as catalysts for change in local communities, might make a difference where centralised approaches have fallen short.

Research on social and educational entrepreneurship lags behind its practice, however. Theories and frameworks for understanding and evaluating the ways in which social and educational entrepreneurship might create social and educational value are still being developed and refined.

THE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP LITERATURE

The growing interest in social entrepreneurship discussed earlier has led to a corresponding flurry of academic publications since the mid-2000s (Lehner & Kansikas 2013; Pierre et al. 2011; Cukier et al. 2011). This should not be mistaken for the maturity of a research field, however. The development of the literature is a lot further behind the developments in practice described before. It is eclectic, and lacks boundaries and direction. Moreover, some scholars have yet to fully accept it as a legitimate field. This review briefly charts the somewhat fragmented development of the social entrepreneurship research area, to help better see the wood from the trees, if not the perimeter of the forest. While social entrepreneurship is an emerging interdisciplinary research field it is nonetheless a legitimate one in its own right. Several current research frameworks are identified and discussed. This section also describes the small and fragmented literature on educational entrepreneurship of which there have been few direct academic studies.

The development of the social entrepreneurship literature

Social entrepreneurship research began in earnest in the late 1990s when scholars studying entrepreneurship identified it as a topic (Bacq & Janssen 2011, p. 375; Dacin et al. 2010; Short et al. 2009). It then moved to examine social entrepreneurs' characteristics, functions, support systems and how individual social entrepreneurs have had an impact in ad hoc, localised ways. Only since the mid to late 2000s have scholars begun to examine the processes by which social entrepreneurs may produce value and work towards social change.

The variety of angles from which social entrepreneurship can be approached has tempted academics from across a range of disciplines to study it. This is what has given the field such an eclectic nature. The disciplines represented in the literature include ethics, anthropology, economics, the management and organisation sciences, political science, education, psychology, and sociology. Scholars from these disciplines have brought their own distinct concepts, theories and methods to bear on the subject. It is no wonder then that most published works have been concerned with definitional and conceptual debates (Lehner & Kansikas 2013, p. 2) and that the research literature is still swimming in a 'pre-paradigmatic state' (Nicholls 2010, p. 611ff). Zahra et al. (2009) reported 20 definitions of social entrepreneurship, while Dacin et al. (2010) noted 37. Even though some definitional clarity has been achieved, as noted earlier, the debate about what social entrepreneurship is continues today.

Some scholars argue that the continuing definitional and conceptual debate is preventing social entrepreneurship research from maturing (Short et al. 2009, p. 166). Notwithstanding the exponential growth in the number of published articles since the mid to late 2000s, the empirical literature is mainly comprised of small-scale case studies of individual social entrepreneurs and their organisations, examining their characteristics, motivations, practices and their anecdotal effectiveness (Bacq & Janssen 2011, p. 376). Cukier et al. (2011, p. 102) lament the paucity of empirical research which directly links social entrepreneurship with social improvements. They argue that 'current success stories, while powerful and moving, lack hard data or proven measures of success, scalability, and sustainability. Otherwise, this could look like a field with lots of little ventures that are admirable but almost never come close to the espoused goal of widespread, lasting impact, and that never match up to the problems they are designed to solve'. This assessment is not surprising. Many of the empirical studies conducted to date use descriptive phenomenological methods which generate hypotheses but offer little help with making better generalisations about the nature of social entrepreneurs and their effectiveness (Huybrechts & Nicholls 2012; Mair & Marti 2006; Nicholls & Cho 2006).

While it has limitations, exploratory research is necessary—and legitimate—in a new, emerging field like social entrepreneurship where theories are perhaps best built-up rather than applied from other disciplines or perspectives. Alongside high quality case study research there is a need, however, for quantitative hypothesis-testing studies about the impact of social entrepreneurs, preferably at a larger-scale than individual case-studies and/or using comparative case study methods. Only a few high quality empirical hypothesis-testing studies have been published (Mair & Marti 2006). Until more of this kind of research is produced, social entrepreneurship research runs the risk of being like an adolescent child—not fully mature and trying to find its identity.

This is why some scholars have not accepted social entrepreneurship as a legitimate research field (Cummings 2007). For example, Battle Anderson and Dees have argued that social entrepreneurship suffers from a lack of systematic research from which scholars can 'reliably and responsibly identify cross-cutting patterns, formulate principles, and structure frameworks that can help guide social entrepreneurs operating in a variety of settings with different purposes' (2006, pp. 144-5). As a consequence of this, they have also argued that the social entrepreneurship literature is skewed toward value-laden rhetorical works which, while making the case for the benefits of social entrepreneurship, do not provide empirical evidence upon which to evaluate these claims. This deficit leaves the social entrepreneurship field with a fragile knowledge base which is open to attack from sceptics and critics. Scholars argue that social entrepreneurship research could become more rigorous by adopting a clearer set of theories and methodological approaches for understanding and evaluating social entrepreneurship (Dacin et al. 2011; Dacin et al. 2010; Short et al. 2009).

The fact that there is a need to develop better theory and methods for studying social entrepreneurship creates a rich opportunity. One of the objectives of this research is to address this need. But the presence of so many competing approaches makes it difficult to decide how to trace the academic dialogue; and which approaches might be most helpful for evaluating the impact of social—and educational—entrepreneurs.

A brief survey of alternative social entrepreneurship frameworks

Some argue that the idea of social entrepreneurship is not new at all (Volkmann et al. 2012, p. 4). The idea that businesses can create value besides economic value has been discussed at various times throughout the twentieth century (Davis 1973). Interest was sparked too when non-profits adopted managerial structures once governments began contracting-out social services to the private and voluntary sectors (Defourny & Nyssens 2010). But for-profit businesses which have engaged in social issues or non-profits that have adopted business models are not the same as social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship research emerged from the study of distinctive ventures that have blended economic and social value creation.

- **Social entrepreneurship as a species of entrepreneurship**

An obvious early source of inspiration—and frameworks—for research was the entrepreneurship literature. Gregory J. Dees' 1998 article, 'The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship' defined social entrepreneurship as 'one species in the genus entrepreneur' (p. 2). Dees also proposed the idea that social entrepreneurs are social change makers because they adopt 'a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value)' (1998, p. 3).

In an often-cited article (Pierre et al. 2011, p. 43), Austin et al. (2006), investigated whether and to what extent commercial and social entrepreneurs operate according to the same principles. Austin et al. proposed that how social entrepreneurs work is not reflected in frameworks of commercial entrepreneurship. They believed that the mission of social entrepreneurs needs to be at the heart of a framework because it defines the value proposition of the venture. Nicholls (2006, p. 20) also holds this view. He has stated that for 'social entrepreneurs there is always a 'socio-moral motivation' or social mission focus to their entrepreneurial activity and ambition'.

A related subject is how scholars have devised typologies for distinguishing between social entrepreneurship, social businesses and non-profits (Neck et al. 2009; Alter 2007). In other words, where a venture's activities can be placed on a continuum of social commerce whose poles range from purely philanthropic to purely commercial activity (2008, p. 4). Social entrepreneurship is what falls in between these two poles.

Because social entrepreneurship blends value creation and value capture together, scholars have found it necessary to construct typologies for telling the difference between these 'hybrid' forms. At one end of the spectrum are those non-profits whose business activities generate income to fund their social mission and that report to their stakeholders. At the other end are for-profit enterprises that create social value but whose primary goal is to generate profits which are returned to their shareholders. These hybrids include socially responsible businesses and corporations practicing social responsibility. Different social entrepreneurs, social enterprises and social innovations are located somewhere in between these two types.

Organisational typologies can be helpful for identifying the range of different ventures that can broadly be categorised as social entrepreneurship. However, in practice it may still be difficult to disentangle the degree to which for-profit or social concerns motivate social entrepreneurs. One might be primary, but both objectives can also be pursued simultaneously (Volkmann et al. 2012, p. 22).

Thanks to these sorts of contributions, defining social entrepreneurship as a special type of entrepreneurship has become a standard, if non-exhaustive, approach to understanding what it is (Dacin et al. 2010; Mair & Marti 2006; Mort et al. 2003). Dees' and Austin et al.'s contributions perhaps pioneered the idea that social entrepreneurs may have similar motivations to commercial entrepreneurs in establishing an enterprise. But social entrepreneurs face a different set of market conditions because the free market does not necessarily place a high value on social justice activities. In other words, social entrepreneurship is premised on a blended social and economic value proposition. Identifying how educational entrepreneurs frame and execute their value proposition is a question that is relevant to this research.

- **The heroic social entrepreneur**

The discussion of social entrepreneurs' characteristics was another early approach to studying social entrepreneurship. It has become known as the study of the individual or 'heroic social entrepreneur'. As referred to earlier, it focuses on telling the stories of successful social entrepreneurs, and is where accounts of the social entrepreneurship literature often begin.

Today, however, many scholars tend to define their contributions in reaction against the heroic social entrepreneur literature rather than support for it. This is because they see this literature's contribution as little more than a series of anecdotal case studies. While it describes the characteristics, and struggles, of social entrepreneurs who have succeeded in making a difference, scholars criticise it for not having done much to advance the development of theory or concepts for comparing, contrasting or evaluating social entrepreneurship. Dacin et al. (2011, p. 1205), for example, notes three critical biases in this research (which he also levels at most other social entrepreneurship research); namely, (1) a bias against learning from failure; (2) a biased focus on the individual level of analysis; and (3) a bias in terms of the idealistic presentation of the motives and mission of social entrepreneurs.

The conception of the heroic social entrepreneur is considered unhelpful by those who think that this literature needs to be counterbalanced by other perspectives which take context and social dynamics into account (Dacin et al. 2011, pp. 1205-6). As Bacq and Jansen (2011, p. 381) have explained, the focus on 'hero entrepreneurs' is 'the tip of a socially entrepreneurial iceberg' as 'most social entrepreneurship is in reality the product of groups, networks, and formal and informal organizations'. This observation seems self-evident. Social entrepreneurship research will be one-dimensional if it only focuses on analysing cases of individual social entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, analysing the part that leaders play in the life of a venture can, to a degree, be valuable. The heroic social entrepreneurship literature perhaps has something to offer here. Having a leader who can, for example, craft a vision, communicate with stakeholders and obtain resources is likely to be vital for its success {Pearce, 2005 3294 /id}. Understanding the qualities and contribution of different educational entrepreneurs will be important for evaluating whether some ventures are more effective than others.

- **Expanding the tent: the development of organising frameworks**

The next wave of social entrepreneurship research expanded the tent by looking beyond the stories of individual social entrepreneurs. This has included investigating the context in which social entrepreneurs operate, how social entrepreneurs identify opportunities and make decisions, and the legitimacy of social entrepreneurship as an activity. The expansion of the range of approaches has introduced new organising frameworks to the study of social entrepreneurship. However, the field is perhaps at risk of becoming bogged down by scholars debating alternatives. A challenge is to identify which, if any, of these competing organising frameworks can help to evaluate the effectiveness of educational entrepreneurs, and thereby contribute to the testing and refinement of theory.

Social entrepreneurship typologies

One significant advance has been the development of more sophisticated typologies for classifying different kinds of social entrepreneurs. Zahra et al. (2009) proposed that defining social entrepreneurship requires an appreciation of the particular values, motivations, capabilities and skills of social entrepreneurs. Some will be visionaries who identify and tackle large-scale social causes (Zahra et al. 2008). Others will be talented at creating organisations that tackle these causes. A third set will focus more on smaller-scale local issues. From these distinctions, Zahra et al. created a threefold typology of social entrepreneurs; that is, social entrepreneurs as: (1) social engineers; (2) social constructionists; and (3) social bricoleurs. This typology drew upon Schumpeter (1942), Kirzner (1973) and Hayek's (1945) respective alternative conceptualisations of entrepreneurship.

The activities of social bricoleurs and social constructivist categories are most relevant to this research as globally-orientated social entrepreneurs are outside of the scope of this study. A bricoleur is one who uses the process of bricolage; that is—a little like the TV hero MacGyver—using whatever resources are to hand to create something new (Zahra et al. 2009, p. 524). Social bricoleurs are suited to working among local communities because they can exploit their tacit local knowledge and networks to tap into communities' scarce resources and use them to address local needs. Without them, unmet social needs might go unrecognised and unaddressed. A New Zealand social bricoleur is Julie Arnott of Christchurch who founded Rekindle after the 2010-11 earthquakes (de Bruin & Stangl 2013, pp. 11-2). The venture's purpose is to provide an opportunity for unemployed youth, or those in need of occupational rehabilitation, to transform waste-wood from demolished buildings into new furniture. Arnott is literally a social bricoleur as the venture pieces together whatever waste materials are available to build something new. The venture therefore relies on strong networks with demolition firms to access recyclable materials quickly after buildings have been demolished. While Rekindle's activities are confined to the local level, the model could be replicated elsewhere.

By contrast, social constructionists are interested in solving systemic-level social problems by planning and developing scalable solutions, which could be replicated in different situations (Grant 1996). Social constructivism taps into the idea that entrepreneurs introduce innovative goods and services that address needs which current providers have not (Kirzner 1973, p. 71). Unlike social bricoleurs, these social entrepreneurs create opportunities, rather than discover them, and plan to operate at a larger scale. Medicine Mondiale is a good case of a social constructionist venture (de Bruin & Stangl 2013, pp. 12-3). It was founded in 2003 by New Zealander Sir Ray Avery. Its purpose is to improve health in developing countries by overcoming the problem of poor quality information and advice. It does so by managing a global network of scientific, clinical and business experts, who have donated their skills and time, to develop affordable medical solutions that can be used in developing countries. One of these is the Liferaft Infant Incubator, which costs much less than other incubators and can be easily maintained with the available local technical skills and resources.

The contrast between these two types of social entrepreneurs raises some interesting research questions. First, can a social bricoleur become a social constructionist? In other words, are small-scale social entrepreneurs successful only because of the opportunity and resources at their disposal in one location or can they scale-up their ventures by replicating them elsewhere? If so, how might they do so? Critical theorists have also asked ethical questions about the activities of social bricoleurs and social constructivists. Critical theorists believe that social researchers and practioners have idealised social entrepreneurship by over-stating the power of free markets to improve the delivery of public goods and services, and so wellbeing (Dey & Steyaert 2010). This worldview is held to clash with the ideals of community, participation, transparency, due process and stewardship that the public sector and non-profits hold (Eikenberry & Kluver 2004).

This clash might affect whether educational entrepreneurs have a positive or negative impact on those whom they serve. For example, the charge has been levelled that social bricoleurs do not distribute the wealth which they generate equally among their beneficiaries. As for social constructionists, because their aim is to change how wealth is created and distributed throughout the economy, they might be tempted to manipulate others to gain their support, compliance or acquiescence. This kind of opportunistic or coercive behaviour might be more likely when there are few formal checks and balances, and would be ethically wrong even if the venture created value (Kant 2002). Other questions are related to how social entrepreneurs sometimes need to under-price their products or services because their beneficiaries cannot afford them. If the venture cannot earn enough revenue to support itself then how will social entrepreneurs resource their venture? Further, does providing goods or services at or below cost affect their quality, availability and delivery? Could this harm beneficiaries? The questions asked of social bricoleurs and social constructivists are pertinent to the study of small-scale or fledgling forms of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs as they probe the kinds of costs or risks which may be associated with social entrepreneurship.

Behavioural frameworks

Questions about what motivates social entrepreneurs has prompted behavioural science scholars to examine how social entrepreneurs are different from non-profits and their commercial counterparts. In a now often cited study (Pierre et al. 2011, p. 43), Weerawardena et al. (2006) examined the difference between non-profits and social entrepreneurship. They found that social entrepreneurship is a multidimensional construct which is rooted in a venture's social mission, its drive for sustainability and is highly influenced by environmental dynamics. Social entrepreneurs display the characteristics of innovativeness, pro-activeness and risk management (Weerawardena & Mort 2006, p. 33). Contrary to what had been theorised before, they discovered that social entrepreneurs were risk averse since their objective was to build a sustainable venture.

Other behavioural researchers have examined the different ways that social entrepreneurs recognise opportunities by looking at the degree to which they use causal or effectual decision-making processes (Whittall 2012; 2011). The causal, or opportunity discovery approach assumes that opportunities are independent of entrepreneurs; the entrepreneur merely discovers these opportunities. Entrepreneurs then collect information about the risks associated with exploiting a new opportunity, rationally weigh the costs and benefits, and anticipate the outcomes that could happen from the decision to proceed. By contrast, the effectual, or opportunity creation, approach assumes that entrepreneurs create new opportunities through their exploration of ways to produce new goods or services. Entrepreneurs who create opportunities operate in an iterative and inductive way, using incremental decision making, and assess their impact on consumers, markets and communities after they have acted.

Entrepreneurial decision making processes differ systematically depending on whether a discovery or creation approach is used. The two approaches are not mutually exclusive, however. Sarasvathy (2011; 2001) identified that entrepreneurs use both, but that they tend to display effectual logic while they are founding their ventures and at key points in its life.

Social entrepreneurs are likely to use effectual logic to justify their venture because they often feel an obligation or responsibility 'to do something'. Social entrepreneurs also display effectual logic when they decide what they will do based on what they think is the most they can afford to lose (Weerawardena & Mort 2006). Research on expert entrepreneurs has found that interacting with stakeholders was part of their effectual logic process, something which should also be important for social entrepreneurs. For example, consulting with stakeholders and beneficiaries is important for obtaining commitments for the provision of initial and ongoing resources, like start-up funding or technical expertise, and determining whether the venture has had an impact.

An interesting question is to what extent social entrepreneurs rely on both causal and effectual decision-making processes (Short et al. 2009; Sarasvathy & Kotha 2001). This is important because the balance may affect how well a venture is run, its durability and the capacity of social entrepreneurs to relate well to those whom they serve. A question is whether educational entrepreneurs display any of these behaviours and, if so, whether this might have an impact on the effectiveness of their schooling ventures.

Holistic frameworks

The quality of social entrepreneurs' relationships with members of the community illustrates how important it is to consider the holistic impact that social entrepreneurship may have, and how this could be conceptualised and measured. Social entrepreneurship researchers are only just beginning to turn their minds to this subject so more work is needed in this area.

Out of dissatisfaction with mixed definitions' lack of capacity to evaluate blended social and economic value-creating opportunities and ventures, Zahra et al. (2009, p. 522) devised a new framework for this purpose. They recommended that ventures should be evaluated against a 'total wealth' standard. This comprises tangible outcomes, like products produced or clients served, and non-material outcomes, like happiness and wellbeing. The final amount of total wealth (TW) is determined by the combined level of economic (EW) and social wealth (SW) less the economic (EC), social (SC) and opportunity costs (OC) of generating that wealth. That is, $TW=EV+SV-(EC+OC+SC)$. Provided the costs and benefits can be estimated, Zahra et al. argue that total wealth is a concept with which can be used to assess the different economic and social opportunities available to social entrepreneurs as well as the gradation or combinations of economic and social value that they may produce. The framework also illustrates the trade-off that social entrepreneurs face when they strike a balance between social and revenue-generating activities. It can show what happens when social entrepreneurs shift resources to increase wealth in one area at the expense of another.

From a philosophical perspective, Yujuico (2008) has proposed an approach that adapts Nussbaum's (2000) human capabilities framework. Nussbaum's framework draws upon the Aristotelian idea that political societies which prioritise material wealth see people as means rather than ends. In response, she devised a set of central human capabilities whose satisfaction can provide for the totality of functions that constitute a good life. These are the internal capabilities of life, bodily health and integrity, and the external capabilities of the senses, emotions, use of practical reason, affiliation with others, a concern for the world, play and the capacity to participate in politics and to have property rights.

Following Nussbaum's understanding of what it means to be fully human, Yujuico argued that models of welfare which are based on the classical economic view of man—as a rational, utility-maximising individual—offer a narrow understanding of human flourishing. He made the case that social entrepreneurs help people to achieve more of their potential capabilities through the creative transformation of natural, human, social, physical and financial capital. Yujuico therefore emphasised the role of social bricoleurs and the comparative advantage that social entrepreneurs have at providing sustainable solutions for local communities. His capabilities approach also illustrates how social entrepreneurs can help to strengthen community cohesion by promoting community solidarity. Yujuico believed the multiple ways in which social entrepreneurs can have a positive impact on deprived communities is vital for maintaining the integrity of the social fabric when neither the state nor the market can.

Yujuico's framework linked the possible motivations and social mission aspects of social entrepreneurship with a broad and deep understanding of the desired outcomes. Moreover, Yujuico's framework suggests that a human capabilities approach could be useful for devising broader metrics of social impact. A key question is whether and to what extent social entrepreneurs can create an enabling environment that can help members of disadvantaged communities to participate in society.

Given its strong philosophical and theoretical foundations, such frameworks can provide broad indicators for evaluating what kinds of value educational entrepreneurs create besides achievement outcomes and whether this reflects the values and expectations of local communities. A difficulty, however, is defining the capabilities in measurable terms as in these frameworks they are abstract concepts. As indicated by Zahra's total wealth framework, an important variable will be the trade-off that educational entrepreneurs may make between value creation and value capture. Integrating both of these approaches might provide a robust framework with which to assess the holistic impact of educational entrepreneurs.

A complex systems framework

Working from a realist perspective, Goldstein et al. (2008) proposed a functional, complex systems framework as an organising perspective. They argued that an explicit general understanding of the dynamic connections between a venture and the providers, funders, and beneficiaries who have an interest in it was missing from the literature. Complexity theory fills this gap because it draws attention to the dynamics of social entrepreneurs' social networks and organisational partnerships.

These relationships are the grease that oils social entrepreneurship because they connect actors, and enable ideas and resources to flow among them to add social value. Resonance and synchronisation can take place between a venture and its stakeholders if it has vibrant networks. Goldstein et al. held that if success factors can be clearly identified then they could be amplified.

Classical economic theory has shied away from studying the value that can be created from the cooperative and collective action that animates social networks. By contrast, a complex systems approach can help to evaluate the nature and quality of the cooperative interactions between social entrepreneurs and those with whom they interact. For example, Tapsell and Woods (Overall et al. 2010; Tapsell & Woods 2010; Tapsell & Woods 2008) have examined an enterprise known as Maori Maps, which has helped to better connect younger Maori, who are less knowledgeable about their heritage, with older Maori who can impart knowledge, language and customs. This social innovation has created value for a section of the Maori community through the complexity inherent in the interaction between older and younger generations.

Thus, complex systems theory can help to understand to what extent social entrepreneurs and those with whom they interact need to share values and expectations to create value. Formal models, like game theory, and data from empirical studies can also be combined to help understand how changes to an independent variable might ripple through a system of interacting variables to affect desired outcomes. A complex systems framework can assist with understanding whether the nature and quality of educational entrepreneurs' social networks has any impact on their effectiveness. Indeed, there is some evidence of this in the educational entrepreneurship literature.

The educational entrepreneurship literature

If the social entrepreneurship literature is emerging from its infancy, then the educational entrepreneurship literature is embryonic. While a number of works exist that have analysed the policy barriers which can prevent educational entrepreneurs from starting and replicating ventures (Henig & Hess 2010; Hess & Perkins-Gough 2010; Hess 2010; Hess 2009; Hess 2008; Hess 2008; Hess 2007; Hess 2006), education or schooling has not captured the attention of many social entrepreneurship scholars. Only a small number of scholars have published on the subject, let alone conducted an impact evaluation of whether educational entrepreneurs have created value. The little that has been published about educational entrepreneurship is confined to localised case studies.

Boyett and Finlay's 1993 study appears to be the first that used the phrase 'educational entrepreneur'. It examined the impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act on how head teachers in the United Kingdom perceived their role. It did not, however, seek to understand the particular impact of educational entrepreneurs as a kind of social entrepreneur. It took until the late 2000's for scholars to start to study the practice of educational entrepreneurship. Eyal (2008), for example, examined how parents, teachers and school leaders used their networks to help establish a new independent school. Eyal explored whether this entrepreneurial community used 'bonding' and 'bridging' strategies of building social capital to help start the school. Eyal defined social capital 'as an actor's ability to use its social position to gain preferred access to scarce resources'. Bonding social capital is built when trust and reciprocity produce goodwill and cooperation among members of a network, for example among family and friends. Bridging social capital, by contrast, grows when acquaintances or business partners build structural bridges among disparate social groups. From 20 in-depth interviews, Eyal found that bonding strategies were used to take advantage of existing opportunities in the community, while bridging strategies were used to explore new opportunities for educational entrepreneurship. For example, the principal's acquaintance with municipal officials helped to overcome bureaucratic barriers when starting the school. Community members supplied the raw materials, products, and labour needed to renovate the school building. Eyal concluded that bonding and bridging social capital strategies complemented each other while the school was being started and suggested that those with the strongest networks and access to resources have the capacity to ‘go-it-alone’. The study offers some insights into how educators, families and communities might display socially entrepreneurial behaviour when starting alternative forms of schooling.

Besides Eyal’s work, Chand has published two stand out contributions which have explored educational entrepreneurship as a kind of social entrepreneurship (Chand & Misra 2009; Chand & Amin-Choudhury 2006). In these articles, he examined how Indian teachers working in rural areas that suffer from socio-economic and educational disadvantage redefined their roles by developing innovative practices to improve educational outcomes. Chand argued that these teachers took on ‘extra-school roles’ in which they developed local community networks to address social problems facing the pupils whom they taught, including a lack of motivation to attend school, taking down social barriers to families enrolling their children at school and obtaining resources for poor schools. This encouraged teachers to see themselves as competent educational and social leaders, for which they received the appreciation, respect and moral authority to lead from the communities in which they taught. Chand argued that these teachers were social entrepreneurs because they did not confine their concerns to the classroom and administrative functions of teaching; they expanded their horizons by creating a social mission for themselves.

Chand’s two contributions highlight some key themes that the broader social entrepreneurship literature hypothesises is important for social entrepreneurs to have a social impact. The teachers which she studied were able to capitalise on their local networks and knowledge of families’ circumstances to motivate families to enrol their children at school and improve access to education for more children. They also worked hard to transform the resources before them in new and different ways to improve upon what would have been provided if they had maintained the status quo. Moreover, these teachers did not simply see their roles as educators but as people with a responsibility to the wider community. Their efforts to improve education were not limited to what happened in schools—they also included involvement in non-educational activities, such as helping to run cooperatives or running local social services, to improve the welfare of their communities. Their efforts also helped to build trust for what they wanted to do at school. Although Chand focused only on classroom teachers, his descriptive research provides insights which are helpful for research on schooling. His studies have highlighted the importance of what educational entrepreneurs do, why they do it and the way in which they do it for making a difference to the community around them. Like Eyal’s study, Chand’s studies also suggest that attention should be paid to the relationships which educational entrepreneurs have with those whom they serve and the influence of the operating environment upon which opportunities might present themselves.

Summary: the social and educational entrepreneurship literature

After an initial period of focus on the activities of individual social entrepreneurs and their activities, there are now many strands of investigation developing in the social entrepreneurship literature, reflecting a range of case study work being conducted from multiple perspectives. The key to its further development as a distinctive body of literature will be to consolidate some of the work occurring in these strands, such as to achieve a better measure of definitional consensus, and to pursue even more rigorous empirical research. This should include further case study research to learn more about the different cases of social entrepreneurship. In time, it would also be good to extend research to replicable hypothesis-testing studies.

While the social entrepreneurship research is starting to mature, there is a stark contrast between the number and variety of cases of educational entrepreneurship, which were profiled earlier, and the very limited number and range of academic studies. It indicates that educational entrepreneurship research is lagging behind practice in this field, as studies have not progressed from a handful of isolated case studies. More and better studies are needed to demonstrate what the distinct contribution is that educational entrepreneurs can make, if any, to creating value. The educational entrepreneurship literature is therefore in a similar state to where the social entrepreneurship literature was in its initial infancy. The progress that has been made in social entrepreneurship research can be harnessed to test whether educational entrepreneurs are as effective as their advocates claim. These challenges will be addressed by the conceptual framework and methods used in this research. This exercise will help to address the gaps in the evaluation of educational entrepreneurs and why they may or may not be effective.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The literature review has canvassed a cross-section of different, sometimes complementary, conceptual and analytical frameworks for the study of social entrepreneurship. While these studies have begun to give researchers more hypotheses to test, no particular approach has gained more favour than any of the others. A well-defined theory should be able to clarify what social entrepreneurship is, explain its distinctive role in the economy, inform research and practice and compete with other theories for validation and relevance (Haugh 2012, p. 8; Pfeffer 1993). As yet, it is hard to say whether some frameworks are more valid than others according to this standard. Social entrepreneurship researchers are still left with the question of how to take the next step towards legitimising the field by building more robust explanatory theories. One way forward could be to develop a general theory of social entrepreneurship. This might provide the backbone of a more robust conceptual framework for both hypothesis-generating and testing research.

Growing up: maturation by adopting a well-bounded theory of social entrepreneurship

The conceptual framework of this research draws upon work which is helping the field to mature by tackling these challenges. Santos (2012), in particular, has developed an approach which offers promise. He has proposed a positive theory which posits that social entrepreneurship is an activity distributed throughout society, in which social entrepreneurs internalise neglected positive externalities for the production of goods and services in a sustainable way. Social entrepreneurs bring about social change by empowering those to whom they provide goods and services. This more often than not takes them into working with disadvantaged sections of society, including the poor, the socially excluded, the disabled, the unemployed and more, and suggests that social entrepreneurs will operate in areas with localised positive externalities that benefit a disadvantaged section of the community. This is because highly-targeted responses are needed to deal with the severest, most neglected problems.

Santos' approach could help social entrepreneurship research to mature because it clearly conceptualises social entrepreneurship as an activity that fills a gap in the three-sector economy. It also articulates a sharper, well-bounded theory that describes propositions which can be empirically tested and compete for attention and validation (Santos 2012, p. 336).

- **Defining the domain of social entrepreneurship**

Santos' approach has appeal because it pinpoints the distinctive domain in which social entrepreneurs operate. That is, social entrepreneurs ensure that difficult-to-solve social problems are addressed because they see an opportunity to solve positive externalities where others do not. In other words, Santos' theory explains how social entrepreneurship is a way for concerned individuals or associations to respond to difficult social problems experienced by under-served communities (2012, p. 341). de Bruin and Stangl (de Bruin & Stangl 2013) have also discussed this in terms of how social entrepreneurs solve coordination problems in the economy to ensure that goods and services can reach those who may need them. As Dacin, Dacin and Tracey (2011, p. 1204) have argued, in the quest to improve conceptual clarity, conceiving of social entrepreneurship as an approach to collective problem-solving may also help to bring the various kinds of social entrepreneurship ventures and social innovations together under one roof.

Besides this, Santos has argued that social entrepreneurship can be thought of as 'the second invisible hand' in free market economies, since social entrepreneurs' capacity to identify positive externalities and regard for others at the local level can produce socially-optimal levels of goods and services. Indeed he sees social entrepreneurship as an 'other-regarding' activity, in which social entrepreneurs help wider society to recognise and respond to social ills. In this way, he has even suggested that social entrepreneurship might help economic theory to better capture the 'essence of what it means to be human' (2012, pp. 349-50), since social entrepreneurship encourages market activity that is not driven by responses to changes in prices or motivation for profit. Thus, while his framework uses an economic framework, Santos sees social entrepreneurship as a paradigm in which economic welfare can be improved and, like Yujuico (2008) has argued, a more human face put upon market activity.

- **A holistic theory of value creation**

Santos' approach is also appealing because it is a positive theory. Santos has done this by collapsing the distinction which is usually made in the social entrepreneurship literature between economic and social value creation (see, for example, Santos 2012, p. 337; Mair & Marti 2006, p. 39). This dichotomy is unhelpful because it assumes that only certain kinds of value creation can be considered 'social'. This view is incorrect, however, when it is considered that economic value creation can add to the welfare of society through, for example, the creation of wealth and jobs and the security which they can bring to people's lives. That is, profits ultimately 'profit' everyone.

Further, Santos argues that his theory means that social entrepreneurs do not have to be conceptualised as altruistic agents, since their primary role is to create value without concern for the amount that they capture. This means that Santos' theory does not make normative distinctions between which activities have a moral purpose and those which do not.

It is hard to develop a positive, testable theory of social entrepreneurship when distinctions between what are 'social', 'moral' or 'entrepreneurial' activities have to be made on subjective grounds. To do so implies that there are clear metrics or a shared set of values that can distinguish between social and non-social forms of value creation. By contrast, propositions can be drawn from Santos' positive theory that can be tested and used to inform the further development of research and practice. This boils down to whether or not a venture has created some kind of value beyond what was there before. This holistic approach to conceptualising value clearly establishes what the goal of social entrepreneurship is, and can help with evaluation, because it side-steps the tautological issues with defining what social entrepreneurs are trying to achieve.

- **The value proposition of a social entrepreneur**

This means that social entrepreneurs have a distinctive value proposition—a way of thinking about the difference that they may make which, as discussed before, influences their behaviour and decisions. They see opportunities in meeting neglected social needs that would improve the overall welfare of society and prioritise value creation over value capture (Santos 2012, pp. 337-40, 342-3). To put it another way, the distinction between the for-profit and non-profit activities of social entrepreneurs should not be dichotomous but continuous, as different social entrepreneurs will balance the priorities of value creation and capture differently depending on the nature of their venture and the good or service that they provide (Austin et al. 2006).

A social entrepreneur's value proposition is different to a commercial entrepreneur's, for example, because he or she does not expect to extract a financial profit from a market which can afford his or her product or service (Bacq & Janssen 2011, pp. 377-9; Martin & Osberg 2007, pp. 34-5). A social entrepreneur's value proposition is different to the government's, too, because it does not have to demonstrate that the benefit of solving a persistent, perhaps localised, social problem outweighs the costs of regulation or wealth redistribution. Unlike non-profits, a social entrepreneur's value proposition deliberately includes economic value creation, which may help to make the venture sustainable.

The value that social entrepreneurs may create

The value which social entrepreneurs may create, above what other forms of welfare provision can, is the improvement in welfare of an under-served community or group through the provision of a neglected good or service in innovative ways that are tailored to their needs. The idea of empowerment, where empowerment is defined as the process by which individuals or groups' assets and capabilities are increased so that they can take actions to change their lives, may also be helpful for conceptualising how social entrepreneurs may have an impact. Empowerment draws attention to the broader aspects of wellbeing that should be taken into account. The multiple ways in which social entrepreneurs may create value to improve welfare, and how they might be measured, are discussed below.

- **Improvements in material welfare**

According to Santos, the primary value that social entrepreneurs create is the increase in welfare of a section of society's members, defined in terms of aggregate utility—however that is determined—above what they had before, after taking away the opportunity cost of the resources invested in providing that product or service. For example, an increase in utility can be measured in terms of an improvement in income, wealth or qualification levels after taking into account the costs of achieving the improvements. This is similar to the total wealth calculation proposed by Zahra et al (2009). Whether or not the utility of a community or group has been increased is a proposition that may be empirically tested (Santos 2012, p. 337).

For example, Santos has suggested that actuarial tables, like those used in the insurance industry, could be created that estimate the benefits of value creation for addressing a given positive externality, such as curing blindness or eradicating a contagious disease (Santos 2012, pp. 348-9). It might also be possible to estimate the savings from reduced government expenditure on the social problems which social entrepreneurs have addressed, as governments are doing where social impact bonds have been introduced. However, these kinds of approaches require accurate measures of the additional benefit. This may limit this approach to use in health, crime prevention or employment where the estimates may be more certain (Spiess-Knaft & Achleitner 2013, p. 168).

- **Improvements in non-material welfare**

While the creation of value can be measured in terms of material welfare, social entrepreneurs can also produce intangible forms of value to improve non-material welfare. For example, the founders of Wikipedia have created value by improving access to knowledge across the globe, Rekindle has created value by integrating non-workers into the workforce, while OneWorld Health has created value by alleviating the debilitating effects of disease. This is an aspect of value creation which Santos' account has not fully taken into account. Santos' value creation framework will be extended to include the non-material ways in which social entrepreneurs may improve outcomes for communities or groups.

Social entrepreneurs may also improve non-material welfare in ways besides improving outcomes. As social entrepreneurship can be a collective activity which springs up to meet the needs of specific communities or groups, there is a relational dimension to what social entrepreneurs do (Santos 2012). The improvement in non-material welfare which they create may be seen in the empathy, care and compassion which they display towards their beneficiaries (cf. Sirico 2007, pp. 56-7). Social entrepreneurs can do this better than a government agency or large firm, for instance, because they are often embedded in communities. They ought to know the needs of their beneficiaries better since they work closely with them (cf. Booth 2007, pp. 122-3). This research will endeavour to show how social entrepreneurs might improve non-material welfare by providing a good or a service which communities or groups need in ways that are more appropriate to their values and expectations.

- **Creating value through innovation**

Santos' theory of value creation can also be extended to take into account social entrepreneurs' distinctive capacity to innovate. This is another way that social entrepreneurs may create value above what other forms of welfare provision can and perhaps even bring about social transformation. If it can be demonstrated that social entrepreneurs can disrupt existing markets or systems with an innovation that can move them to a new, better equilibrium, then it strengthens the case that social entrepreneurship is an effective alternative way of improving welfare.

This view is based upon how commercial entrepreneurs are thought to create value. The 19th century French economist Jean-Baptiste Say first articulated this when he described the entrepreneur as one who 'shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and greater yield' (cited in Drucker 1985, p. 21). This is the literal French translation of entrepreneur as the 'one who undertakes' the creation of value (Martin & Osberg 2007, p. 31). Schumpeter expanded

Say's concept of the entrepreneur by identifying him or her as a dynamic change agent of economic development, without whom economies would become static. He argued that entrepreneurial activity builds upon itself, whereby other entrepreneurs propagate the innovation to the point of 'creative destruction', a state in which new related ventures render existing products, services and business models obsolete. More recently, from the opposite end of the spectrum, Drucker (1985) and Kirzner (1973) have argued that entrepreneurs innovate by exploiting change, such as the development of new knowledge and technology.

Whether or not entrepreneurs innovate by being change agents or early exploiters is not as important as how this behaviour distinguishes them from those who stick with the status quo. Just like commercial entrepreneurs have the ability to seize upon new opportunities in the business world, so too do social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurs may question assumptions about what is possible to harness a new innovation or employ overlooked or under-used tools, ideas or approaches (Hess 2007). As indicated before, they are also the ones who display the initiative, commitment and drive that is required to improve the lives of those who, by themselves, lack the political clout or resources to better their circumstances (Martin & Osberg 2007, p. 35). This may require reconfiguring institutions and markets, or even creating new ones, to bring about change (de Bruin & Stangl 2013, p. 4). While social entrepreneurs bear the risk of failure, the reward for introducing a new social innovation could be to give members of disadvantaged communities or groups a measure of control over their lives which they might never have experienced before. This may be a circuit breaker for reducing poverty or exclusion for marginalised communities or groups.

A test of this is whether an innovation has had a dynamic impact on the market for a good or service. For example, evidence of a dynamic impact might be whether or not a venture has created a new area of activity to address needs not met by existing services or social missions (Sharir & Lerner 2006, p. 8), or, per Schumpter's theory, whether or not the innovation has spread and perhaps begun to replace existing goods or services. In short, lots of social entrepreneurs, working at particular problems and trying out different innovations, may stand a better chance of devising breakthrough solutions that might transform a market (Hess 2008, pp. 5-6). The diffusion of an innovation may not necessarily be because of the impact of a single idea, however. It could be a product of the cumulative impact sharing and learning from many local innovations (Chand & Misra 2009, p. 220).

In research noted earlier, Chand and Misra (2009, pp. 224-7) have discussed what successful educational innovations look like in their research of socially entrepreneurial teachers in India. They defined an innovative educational practice as a method, learning tool or aid, or set of actions that represented a novel and/or unique response to a problem or need which has achieved certain educational goals that the teacher had set in his or her specific socio-economic context. They also established criteria to rate the innovations against, namely: their novelty and uniqueness; the community or school background context in which the innovation was used; the scope of the innovation, such as the number of educational aspects affected or the number of children who benefited; and the diffusion of the innovation.

Chand and Misra also categorised educational innovations into two categories which are helpful for thinking about how educational entrepreneurs may create value in different ways. The first referred to how teachers shaped the contexts in which schools and schooling were located. By this, they meant how teachers developed strategies, which went beyond their teacher training, to deal better with complex social problems, such as those experienced in rural areas which affected the relationship between schools and deprived communities. For instance, perceiving problems with enrolment and retention in school, Chand and Misra observed that many teachers took it upon themselves to organise mothers to send their children to school, conduct adult education classes and form social service associations to create a more supportive environment. Teachers also drew upon their local cultural experiences as cultural traditions were strong in most villages. For example, teachers used folk drama extensively or set culturally significant days as school enrolment dates. Teachers also drew upon the local culture to mobilise resources to help shape schooling. This involved such activities as: using auspicious occasions for fundraising; honouring donors; or drawing upon community skills, like carpentry and masonry to improve school buildings or produce educational aids or models.

These efforts spurred community interest and participation in schooling. In turn, participation in school activities helped with mobilising resources from communities. Working with the communities to achieve educational goals was an important aspect of shaping schools and village communities in which parents had low education levels and which were often alienated from schools. While community activities were not part of teachers' formal duties, in practice, they mattered for creating a more supportive educational environment where pupils would have the opportunity to attend school and receive a good standard of education.

The second way that Chand and Misra categorised educational innovations was by how they shaped educational practice. Teachers acted somewhat like social bricoleurs in this respect, by combining their own skills, initiative and the available resources to shape their educational practice in response to pupils' needs. This ranged, for example, from: altering the school calendar to fit better with the agricultural year; setting projects that built upon children's skills at hand crafts; developing educational aids, like low-cost projectors or laboratory models; or adopting approaches to make learning more interesting, such as using children's voices to record lessons for reading improvement, using stamp collections to explore history or using music and establishing children's bands. All of these innovations went beyond what was used or provided by the state school system. Conceivably, these innovations could be adopted and adapted by other teachers.

A key conceptual insight of Chand and Misra's research is that to create value teachers had to develop tangible and intangible assets for schooling and schools, while ensuring that their own credibility within the community went up (2006, pp. 104-5). This meant that teachers became more alert to opportunities in their environment that could improve educational outcomes and proactive at exploiting them. Their perspective broadened to include not only the classroom but also the local environment and the constraints within it that had to be overcome to achieve educational goals. Chand and Misra's research illustrates that what conceptually distinguishes educational entrepreneurship from other kinds of schooling is how educational entrepreneurs recognise opportunities in educational problems and develop strategies for exploiting them with some kind of innovation to create value. Importantly, it also suggests that educational entrepreneurship may include activities which are not strictly educational but nonetheless contribute to providing a better schooling environment and better outcomes for pupils. Here, educational entrepreneurs' willingness to work with communities in capacities beyond their roles as educators appeared to be vital for building participation in schooling and the legitimacy of their ventures.

Summary and application to educational entrepreneurship

Santos' theory will form the core of the conceptual framework for this research because it provides a theory of social entrepreneurship that sees it as a distinctive part of the economy rather than a subset of the free market or non-profit sector. It also incorporates social entrepreneurship's dual purposes of value creation and value capture in a holistic way. Moreover, by approaching the question of whether value has been created through the lens of whether a positive externality has been addressed, it provides a clear framework for measuring the effectiveness of social entrepreneurs. Hypotheses can be tested that will aid the development of better theories, or perhaps even a general theory, of social entrepreneurship.

A complicating factor is that social entrepreneurs can produce value in multiple ways. These can range from improving material to non-material outcomes, providing a good or service which may build identity, or improving levels of trust or cohesion. Value could also be created by introducing a social innovation that can make a good or service accessible to those in need, thereby shifting the market to a new equilibrium and perhaps bringing about social transformation.

As indicated earlier, it is proposed that educational entrepreneurship can be conceptualised as a kind of social entrepreneurship. Educational entrepreneurs address an under-supply of education that could better meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged pupils. The solution which they provide is alternative forms of schooling that use a form of income-generating activity to support it and which may also draw upon the know-how and resources of local communities to establish and run them.

The innovations which educational entrepreneurs use could be, for example, a particular pedagogy or curriculum that is more tailored or appropriate to a community or group, the involvement of family and community more in education or improving access to schooling that educationally disadvantaged pupils had not been able to access before. If these innovations are different to what has been done before, then they might bring about positive transformational change.

The value which educational entrepreneurs create is educational attainment, and the opportunities that this gives to pupils to go on to further study, training or work, and improvements to the prosperity and functioning of communities. If an educational entrepreneur provides more culturally appropriate forms of education, such as in Maori worldview or language, then they may create value in intangible ways, too that make sense to those cultures, such as by building identity or preserving heritage. The teachers in Chand and Misra’s research went even further than this by taking on social entrepreneurship roles in their communities, thereby broadening the scope of educational entrepreneurship beyond school walls. How well different educational entrepreneurs achieve these objectives, and how much they might be better at this than regular state schools, can confirm these propositions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Two primary research questions emerge from the review of the social and educational entrepreneurship literatures. As the literature suggests that the difference which social entrepreneurs make will be seen in the value that they create above other forms of welfare provision, it is important to establish what the value is that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs claim they will create and whether and to what extent they are effective at doing so.

The first question examines New Zealand educational entrepreneurs' value proposition. That is,

1. **What motivates New Zealand educational entrepreneurs and what is the value which they think they will create?**

This will involve asking New Zealand educational entrepreneurs some specific questions such as:

- a. **why they chose to start their school;**
- b. **what they think the purpose of their school is;**
- c. **what their business model is;**
- d. **how much planning was done before the school started;**
- e. **what their goals were, how they have gone about achieving them and how they will know if they have been achieved;**
- f. **why they chose a particular curriculum, learning approach or specialism; and**
- g. **on what grounds they would consider using a for-profit model, if they have not already decided to use one?**

These questions are important because the opportunity recognition research argues that the balance of effectual or causal decision-making processes displayed by social entrepreneurs can affect how they recognise and respond to opportunities. For example, an educational entrepreneur who devises an innovation and applies it to a problem affecting a community may not address that problem as well as one who consults, builds networks and then responds to a need. Examining opportunities and decision-making processes is also likely to indicate how much rules and regulations may constrain what educational entrepreneurs can do in response to a problem—that is, to what extent the political, cultural and institutional environment enables or constrains educational entrepreneurs' opportunities. The balance struck between these opportunity recognition and decision-making processes may in turn affect whether or not a venture is effective at meeting a need over time. The role of income-generating activities in their venture is likely to reveal the priority which educational entrepreneurs give to value creation over value capture—and perhaps the potential for income-generating activity to be prioritised ahead of achieving the venture's social mission. The answers to these questions should also help to clarify what is special about the innovation which educational entrepreneurs have introduced and on what grounds it could be judged as effective.

The second question follows from the first. It is focused on the need to evaluate, and demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt, what the impact of New Zealand educational entrepreneurs is and whether they can create value above what regular schooling can. That is,

2. **Do schools run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs have a positive impact, if any, on the educational outcomes of concern for their pupils and the local communities whom they serve compared to regular state schooling?**

This question can be split into two sub-questions which address the non-material and material ways in which New Zealand educational entrepreneurs might create value and improve the welfare of the communities or groups whom they serve.

a. **What is the value that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs create, if any, which is different to what regular state schooling may create?**

This question is important for demonstrating how New Zealand educational entrepreneurs might be able to address unmet educational needs in the communities whom they serve, such as providing a better holistic education than regular state schooling can. If this cannot be shown then it means that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs might be no different, and no more effective, than regular state schooling.

Answering this question will involve evaluating how the innovations which New Zealand educational entrepreneurs have developed might create value and whether and to what extent the value created is different to what families and communities can receive in regular schooling.

b. **What is the impact, if any, of schooling run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs on the educational achievement outcomes of their pupils compared to regular state schooling?**

This question matters because addressing poor educational outcomes is likely to explain many of the reasons why New Zealand educational entrepreneurs established their schools in the first place and should form a major part of their value proposition. It can be answered by examining the educational progress that pupils make over time at schools run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs compared to those at regular state schools. The answer will reveal the degree of variation, or not, among New Zealand educational entrepreneurs and their regular state school counterparts. It will also help to determine whether schooling offered by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs may be better than the regular state schools that educationally disadvantaged children would have otherwise attended.

However, given the evidence from charter school studies (Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2013; 2009; Betts & Tang 2011; 2008), it is likely that the impact of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs will have a minimal impact on the growth in pupils' achievement outcomes compared to other types of schooling. The analysis may show, for example, that there is no significant difference. While this would suggest that schooling run by educational entrepreneurs may not harm pupils' progress at school it would not prove that it is decidedly better, either.

This is a reason why the question of the difference in academic achievement is not at the forefront of the second study. While it is an important indicator, and can help to predict how opportune pupils' chances will be in later life, it may not be the clearest impact indicator for evaluating the difference which educational entrepreneurs can make. Depending on what each educational entrepreneur's value proposition is, improvements in educational achievement may not be the most important processes or outcomes that they, and their beneficiaries, are hoping to improve. They may, for example, have prioritised building identity or community cohesion as primary goals, with improvements in educational attainment as secondary goals.

Working out what the distinctive impact is, if any, of New Zealand educational entrepreneurs is important for thinking about whether educational entrepreneurship should be encouraged through replication. The answer to this question is beyond the scope of this research, however, given the years of data that would be needed to demonstrate whether educational entrepreneurs have had a positive impact. Nonetheless, it is a question which lies behind the two primary research questions. Some tentative suggestions may be made about the potential for replication, if any, revealed by this study of New Zealand educational entrepreneurs.

METHODS

This research asks some empirical questions about whether and to what extent New Zealand educational entrepreneurs can create value and improve the educational outcomes and welfare of certain communities. Different empirical methods will be required to answer these questions. It is proposed that the research will be divided into two studies according to the two primary research questions. The first study will be a piece of exploratory research. It will mainly use qualitative methods to help understand what the impact is that educational entrepreneurs intend to have. Given the paucity of literature on educational entrepreneurship as a kind of social entrepreneurship—and how to evaluate the impact of social entrepreneurship—an exploratory approach is also appropriate for generating testable propositions which might make a contribution to the development of theory (Haugh 2012, p. 11; Chand & Amin-Choudhury 2006, p. 103). The intended impact will be measured in the second study, which will use a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods. A range of approaches is proposed at this stage given that data limitations are likely to restrict what kind of research is possible.

For convenience, the research questions and the methods for collecting the data required to answer them are summarised in table 1, below.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Table 1. Summary of research questions and methods for collecting required data</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Research question 1
What motivates New Zealand educational entrepreneurs and what is the value which they think they will create?</td></tr>
<tr><td>Required data</td><td>Data collection methods</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Testimonies of Partnership School operators who have just started their schools or whose application was rejected.
• Operators' education proposals or plans.
• Operators' contracts with the Crown.</td><td>• Semi-structured interviews.
• Analysis of primary source documents.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Research question 2
Do schools run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs have a positive impact, if any, on the educational outcomes of concern for their pupils and the local communities whom they serve compared to regular state schooling?
a. What is the value that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs create, if any, which is different to what regular state schooling may create?</td></tr>
<tr><td>Required data</td><td>Data collection methods</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Survey questionnaire responses of parents of children who attend schooling run by educational entrepreneurs
• Interview responses from community leaders and educational entrepreneurs.
• Data for impact indicators including: school exclusions, stand-downs or expulsions; retention rates; parental satisfaction with schooling; graduation rates; and/or tertiary completion rates.</td><td>• A case study of each of the four kind of schooling ventures run by educational entrepreneurs;
• Semi-structured interviews;
• Parental questionnaire; and/or
• Obtain data held by the Ministry of Education</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">b. What is the impact, if any, of schooling run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs on the educational achievement outcomes of their pupils compared to regular state schooling?</td></tr>
<tr><td>Required data</td><td>Data collection methods</td></tr>
<tr><td>• Achievement data at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs and regular state schools, including baseline data and data for at the end of one school year.
• Data for pupils background characteristics at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs and regular state schools.
• School destinations of Aspire Scholarship recipients and non-recipients.</td><td>• Data collected from regular state schools and at least one of four kinds of schooling ventures run by educational entrepreneurs, namely—
o low-cost independent schools, state schools that do not fit the regular model but which use an educational innovation, a non-school venture and a Partnership School;
• Collected from schools;
• Collected by a parental questionnaire; or
• Obtained from the Ministry of Education.</td></tr>
</table>

How can impact be evaluated?

The basic question which this research asks, about the value which schooling run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs may create above what regular state schooling can, takes it into the vexed issue of how the impact of social ventures can be measured (Mair & Sharma 2012, p. 182); or, to put it more simply, what success means in social entrepreneurship. This is a tricky area because improvements in social outcomes or social change are harder to measure than a firm's bottom line or survival rates, especially in the short-term. Moreover, the variety of social entrepreneurship ventures, not to mention the range of non-profit and voluntary organisations, means that each venture has a different vision and mission for how it will create value and have an impact—and therefore standards against which its effectiveness should be measured.

- **Approaches to evaluating value creation and social impact**

Scholarship on this subject, however, has tended to assume that standard models, such as balanced scorecards or dashboards of multiple indicators, can be applied to measure performance in all of these kinds of organisations (Osborne 2003, pp. 333-4). Scholarship also tends to assume that performance management is an objective exercise rather than one which is subject to values judgements. Further, performance measurement models for social ventures usually measure outcomes in relation to what executives and managers think are important (Frumkin 2011; Frumkin et al. 2011, pp. 45-9, 63-70).

Ruebottom (2011), for instance argues that goal or outcomes-focused approaches for evaluating the success of social ventures are inadequate because they are defined as easily quantifiable indicators which are related to financial performance or productivity. Such approaches also assume that ventures will act in a uniform, rational and linear way towards achieving their goals. This would be reasonable if it were not for the fact that ventures are subject to internal politics and disagreements about what their goals should be and how to achieve them. Further, social ventures' goals will rarely be targets that can be ticked-off once and for all because of the complexity of social problems and how to bring about social renewal. A venture's goals are highly likely to change over its life as the priorities of those who run it, or the needs those who are served by it, change.

Ruebottom has proposed an alternative, social constructivist approach for evaluating the impact of social ventures, like social entrepreneurship. This approach involves defining success and failure 'based on assumptions about the value of social enterprise and the nature of social change' (2011, p. 174). This means that all those who are involved in or who are affected by a social venture should, in some way, influence what defines effectiveness. Moreover, this approach does not limit who gets to define success to those who run or manage social ventures. This can shift the definition of success measures away from easily quantifiable outcomes while also perhaps improving the legitimacy of social ventures among their beneficiaries.

Ruebottom proposed that because the success factors of social ventures are not well known, evaluators need to experiment with a range of different measures. These measures ought to take into account the goals of the venture and each party to it, in both objective and subjective terms, to determine patterns of expected performance. The different outcome patterns could then be related to various strategies and operations of the venture. This approach would enable inputs, structures, processes and outcomes to be evaluated, providing a richer account of success. Since it is also difficult to measure the degree to which ventures have a direct impact on social change, as opposed to exogenous factors which may also have an effect, social impact evaluations might focus on the connection between certain inputs or processes and social change. Use of time lags between the introduction of an innovation and its effects on the outcome variables of interest could also help to establish the likely direct impact of a social venture.

Ruebottom therefore proposed that evaluators should ask the following questions when deciding how to measure the success of a social venture: (1) should outcomes, processes or inputs be used as criteria; (2) should the criteria be evaluated at the individual, organisation or community level; and (3) over what timeframe should the criteria be evaluated?

Sharir and Lerner (2006) used a similar approach to what Ruebottom has proposed. They used multiple measures to classify 33 Israeli social ventures into three categories of varying success. The success criteria that they identified were: (1) the degree to which social ventures achieved their declared goals; (2) the ability of ventures to ensure programme or service continuity and sustainability by acquiring the resources necessary to maintain current operations; and (3) the measure of resources available for the venture's growth and development. Evaluating the ventures at the end of a four year period verified their initial classification, since by the end of this time weaker ventures had tended to fail. Based on these patterns of performance, they then identified eight variables that contributed to the ventures' success. Arranged in the order of their value these were: (1) the entrepreneur's social network; (2) total dedication to the venture's success; (3) the capital base at the establishment stage; (4) the acceptance of the venture idea in the mind of the public; (5) the composition of staff, including the ratio of volunteers to salaried employees; (6) cooperation between the public and non-profit sectors in the long-term; (7) the quality of service; and (8) the entrepreneurs' previous managerial experience. Resources, or networks that provided access to resources, were critical to ventures' organisational success. However, Sharir and Lehner's study suffered from the limitation that success was defined entirely at the organisational level. It did not investigate ventures' success at the constituent level, for example, which would have perhaps enabled the views of beneficiaries to be included.

Despite Ruebottom's contribution, and Sharir and Lehner's before that, there is no consensus yet among scholars about what methods should be used to evaluate whether ventures run by social entrepreneurs are successful at creating value and which ones might be relatively more successful than others. The latter point is a serious weakness of many of the assessments that have been conducted to date, as too many case studies have focused on successful ventures without measuring success, such as those run by heroic social entrepreneurs, for example (Mair & Marti 2009; Bornstein 2007; Alvord et al. 2004). Nonetheless, the literature is beginning to suggest that it is just as if not more important to measure the impact of ventures on their beneficiaries, with respect to beneficiaries' values and expectations. Moreover, the evaluation debate indicates that measures should take into account how value creation could occur through the practices or processes that social entrepreneurs use. That is, social impact cannot be sufficiently measured by observed outcomes alone and more nuanced approaches to understanding success are required using multiple measures at different levels of analysis.

- **Measuring improvements in non-material welfare**

Completing this kind of evaluation will require counting improvements in non-material welfare. A problem with this approach is that valid and reliable indicators, or at least good proxies, will be needed to measure them. This can be hard, as has been seen, for example, in the debate about whether broader measures of wellbeing to GDP, such as those produced by the 'Sarkozy' Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress, use accurate and meaningful metrics in the absence of information about prices (Stiglitz et al. 2009; Bate 2009). It is easier to prove empirically whether or not some forms of value have been created compared to others. Improvements in non-material outcomes, such as in wellbeing or knowledge, may only show up later indirectly in material indicators, such as an increase in GDP. This is a limitation, but it is a challenge that will be addressed in devising metrics for evaluating the impact of educational entrepreneurs.

Here, analytical frameworks informed by human capabilities approaches to welfare and wellbeing will be helpful, as—per Santos' theory—they can articulate how communities or groups may be empowered. Again, a difficulty is defining the capabilities in measurable terms as in these frameworks they are abstract concepts. The New Zealand Treasury has recently done some work in this area, with the publication of a living standards framework that draws upon human capabilities frameworks and a capital stocks and flows approach to help identify the factors that are important for producing higher living standards (Treasury 2011). A capital stocks approach is the idea that there are different kinds of capital which can enhance human capabilities and be accumulated for future use. Similar to the forms of capital which Yujuico identified, the Treasury has identified four types of capital, namely: (1) financial and physical capital, which includes infrastructure, housing and wealth; (2) human capital, which includes health and skills; (3) social capital, which includes institutions and trust; and

(4) natural capital, which includes the stability of the climate, quality of water and biodiversity (2011, p. 17). These forms of capital can contribute to material living standards but they also have an intrinsic value independent of their material value.

For example, in this research it could be observed whether or not educational entrepreneurs have improved the stock of human capital, by increasing education and skills levels in a community. This could be seen in increases in time spent at school, graduation rates or admission to a tertiary institution. It could also be observed whether or not educational entrepreneurs had helped to build the stock of social capital in a community as indicated by levels of trust, participation, community cohesion and the quality of institutions, such as the rule of law and transparency of political processes.

The New Zealand Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs has devised a similar framework to the Treasury's which articulates the social outcomes which Pacific Island communities value for their people. In a 2010 report, the Ministry noted that Pacific Islanders are heavily represented in low-skilled, low-paid work, which has reduced their chances of realising their aspirations and potential. These aspirations and potential were highlighted in a 'Pacific Outcomes Framework' (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs 2012, p. 5). The Framework separated them into enabling and core outcome areas. The enabling areas were influenced by capabilities frameworks, as they describe improved outcomes in the areas of health, education and skills, and employment and business. The core outcomes reflect improved material and non-material outcomes in income and living standards, and in family and community strength. The Ministry's Framework is another approach to measuring the sorts of impacts defined in Treasury's living standards framework, but from the perspective of one of the communities with whom educational entrepreneurs are likely to work. Moreover, it identifies concrete outcomes which are likely to be good proxies for social impact and transformative change which can be measured.

When it comes to developing indicators for whether social entrepreneurs have improved the non-material welfare of Maori communities, the kura kaupapa Maori framework—the Maori way of doing things—is likely to illustrate about what good outcomes for Maori could be. Kura kaupapa Maori theory began in the 1970s as a critique of colonialism and was linked to a sense of cultural (if not physical) dislocation and impoverishment (Smith 2012). Today, it is used more as a framework in which Maori can think about how they can get the best possible outcomes for their people, given the environment in which they live (Durie 2012, p. 22). It can refer to the revitalisation of the Maori language, customs and worldview, and also about what is needed for Maori to better make their way in the world. Thinking about health, the kura kaupapa Maori framework might prompt questions about whether an intervention has led to a gain in mental, spiritual, and social/whanau well-being as well as reducing ill-health. In education, schooling might be framed as an activity in which the whanau has a primary interest, and so the role of an educator is to work with whanau instead of relying on conventional classroom-based approaches to teaching and learning. Thus, a kura kaupapa Maori framework can help to take account of a Maori worldview and frame outcomes in terms that make sense to Maori. In evaluating whether educational entrepreneurs have improved schooling for Maori communities, the kura kaupapa framework is likely to be helpful for defining what kind of education is relevant and useful to Maori (Durie 2012, pp. 25-6). This does not mean that predefined outcomes exist, but that it provides concepts and language in which to define what these could be.

- **Summary: how can impact be evaluated?**

These frameworks suggest that measuring how social entrepreneurs have created value will require multiple indicators. They also suggest that they will need to be framed in terms that make sense to the communities or groups whom educational entrepreneurs are trying to reach. Material indicators may still be required as proxies to measure how they improve material and non-material welfare. Nevertheless, the approaches described here offer a starting point for developing an analytical framework that can capture the variety of ways that educational entrepreneurs may create value and have an impact.

The lack of clarity about how to evaluate social entrepreneurship ventures strongly suggests that it would be prudent to clarify what practices, processes or outcomes should be evaluated; not only at the organisational level but at the community level as well. It is on these grounds that it is proposed the first stage of this research should be an exploratory study, to build a picture of what the value is which educational entrepreneurs intend to create and how they may have an impact. This will assist with the design and execution of the second study to follow.

Study 1: Evaluating how New Zealand educational entrepreneurs form their value proposition

The first stage of the research will investigate what the value is that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs claim to create. It will do so by evaluating how New Zealand educational entrepreneurs recognise and act on the opportunity to start a school. The introduction of New Zealand's Partnership Schools from the beginning of the 2014 school year (New Zealand Government 2012) provides a rare opportunity to examine how educational entrepreneurs who start new schools frame their vision and goals, and how they think they will be effective. As licences to start five of these schools were issued to operators in September 2013 (New Zealand Government 2013) it will be possible, assuming their consent, to conduct a quick and relatively simple analysis using semi-structured interviews with them between February and March 2014, at the beginning of the school year. To increase the number of educational entrepreneurs who can be included in this study, it is proposed that a number of those whose applications were rejected will be interviewed, too. These applicants will still have gone through many of the same opportunity recognition and decision-making processes as the successful applicants. This is because the Government ran a multi-stage selection process which required potential operators to assemble proposals that described the nature of their innovation and how they believed it could address educational underachievement. Thus, the first study will not be a hypothesis-testing study that relies on statistical sampling. Instead, it will be a piece of case study research which relies on theoretical sampling to help build theory (Eisenhardt 1989, p. 537).

The interview questions will be based on those listed in the previous section. That is:

a. why did Partnership School operators choose to start their school;
b. what does the operator think the purpose of their school is;
c. what is the operator's business model;
d. how much planning did the operator do before the school started;
e. what goals were defined for the school;
f. how will the operator go about achieving those goals;
g. how will the operator know if they have been achieved;
h. why did each operator choose a particular educational approach or specialism;
i. how much is the operator using the operational freedoms granted to Partnership Schools to provide a different form of schooling to regular state schooling;
j. what are the backgrounds of the families who are taking advantage of the opportunity to enrol at the operator's school;
k. are there any barriers that have constrained what operators have wanted to do; or
l. on what grounds they would consider using a for-profit model (as none of the initial Partnership School operators will use one)?

Conducting the interviews at this time will allow operators' immediate reflections about why they started their schools to be captured, what they believe their primary goals are, if any opportunities or constraints have been experienced, and how they intend to measure their impact—before the schools become well-established and operators face different concerns.

Operators were informally approached to ask for their permission to be included in this study during October 2013. Those whose applications were rejected will be informally approached in November 2013. The study will be submitted for ethics committee approval by no later than the end of November 2013 so that fieldwork can commence in February 2014.

- **Research design**

It is proposed that this initial evaluation will be conducted using Brinkerhoff's (2005; 2003) Success Case Method (SCM). The SCM is an approach to evaluating training and performance by examining successful and unsuccessful cases to improve organisational learning. The SCM can help to evaluate how well an innovation is used when its potential is unknown (Brinkerhoff 2003, pp. 50-1). This will be the case with New Zealand's Partnership Schools, as it is unknown exactly how the educational entrepreneurs who will run these schools might create value in ways that regular state schools may not.

The SCM works by gathering stories from those who have been most successful and unsuccessful at training schemes and verifying these stories with other forms of supporting evidence, such as usage records or skills assessments (Brinkerhoff 2005, p. 91). By concentrating on outlying observations (Brinkerhoff 2005, p. 92), the SCM aims to 'illustrate the nature and scope of the success the program helped to produce' and what might prevent success (Brinkerhoff 2005, p. 91). The SCM also identifies and explains the contextual factors that distinguish successful from unsuccessful adopters of new programmes or initiatives. It is a more direct, and time and resource efficient approach than methods which involve random sampling and the construction of control and treatment groups.

The SCM will be used to identify which Partnership School operators were effective at defining their vision and mission, and at starting a school, as well as those who may have struggled. The most important information to glean from the interviews with these operators will be what they learned about why they were successful or unsuccessful (cf. Brinkerhoff 2005, p. 88). Interviewing those applicants who were eliminated from the application process should help to define what the characteristics of an unsuccessful venture are. The forms of supporting evidence which might be used to verify what is discovered through interviews may include their licence applications, the education plans which they will have negotiated with the Government or records from financial or community sponsors. This analysis will help to define what a positive impact could be, which can be measured in the second study. It may also help to illustrate what kind of opportunities, mechanisms, practices or processes have helped operators to be successful.

To distinguish success from failure requires researchers to have a clear concept of what defines a successful venture. The conceptual framework outlined before suggests that having a distinctive domain, a problem to solve, an innovation, and the human and financial resources to address that problem are critical. Sharir and Lenner's approach to understanding why some social ventures are more successful than others can be used to see how the different variables which can affect entrepreneurs' success might interact (Sharir & Lerner 2006, p. 8). They conceptualised the success of a social venture as being contingent on the strength of four variables: (1) the individual (or social entrepreneur)—that is, the reciprocal relations among variables relating to an entrepreneur's personal characteristics, skills and background; (2) the process—the decisions and actions taken by the entrepreneur while they realise the venture; (3) the organisation—the nature and structure of the organisation or the service that the venture has developed; and (4) the environment—the enabling or constraining factors associated with operating environment in which the venture was started. Sharir and Lehner noted that the distinction between the variables is for analytical purposes only and was not meant to be absolute.

They examined the difference that social entrepreneurs made to success by analysing socio-demographic background data, previous managerial experience and motives for choosing to be a social entrepreneur. Under the process dimension, they took account of variables such as identifying need or opportunity, planning, network-building, creating partnerships, acquiring legitimacy and resources, and ability to survive in the market. In the organisational dimension, they counted the impact of such variables as the area of activity of the venture, the composition and structure of the founding team and the social entrepreneur's capital base at the various stages of the venture's life, from initiation, through establishment, to institutionalisation. Lastly, to measure the impact of the operating environment they included variables such as the venture's social networks, how much the venture was accepted in the public mind, and the existence or absence of support and infrastructure services. Sharir and Lehner's approach is likely to be helpful for understanding what combination of factors is important for defining organisational success and failure—in both the first and second studies.

Chand's research of teachers who became effective socio-entrepreneurial teachers in India, confirms that these sorts of factors are important to success in education (Chand & Misra 2009; Chand & Amin-Choudhury 2006). It also provides a framework which can focus attention on what success may mean for a new start-up (Chand & Amin-Choudhury 2006, p. 112). Of particular relevance is his proposition that successful educational entrepreneurs developed a ‘social leadership competence’ by taking on roles outside of their job as classroom teachers, including social service or developmental roles, to achieve formal educational goals. Realising opportunities to shape the educational environment in schools and communities created a virtuous spiral of credibility for successful teachers. This was how they were able to build respect, trust and moral authority and the support for what they want to achieve among communities. Building community support and participation in education in-turn encouraged teachers to use innovations to improve education in the classroom.

Chand’s propositions indicate that a successful start-up operator is likely to be one who has developed a keen social awareness and is willing to exploit opportunities presented by the contextual environment around them. This may include being proactive at becoming involved in activities outside of the classroom or the school. These activities may not even be educational at all, but build an educational entrepreneur’s credibility as one who is interested in the wellbeing of the community. This might be seen, for example, in their purposefulness of their response to an educational problem, the extent of the networks which they have developed around their venture, per complex systems theory, or the degree of demand and/or community involvement in the schooling which they provide. Whether and to what extent New Zealand’s first Partnership School operators display these kind of opportunity-creation behaviours may serve to illustrate which of these operators were more successful than others in starting a new school that has the capacity to create value.

In summary, the SCM will provide a framework in which to question and probe the reasons why educational entrepreneurs were motivated to start schools, what the value is which they hope to create and, critically, what can be learned about why they were successful or unsuccessful. It is hoped that this first study will generate propositions about what New Zealand educational entrepreneurs do, why they do it and what positive difference they may make to the education received by communities of educationally disadvantaged pupils. This will help to define the kinds of impact that will be measured in the following second study to determine whether educational entrepreneurs have had an impact.

Study 2: Evaluating the value which schooling run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs may create

If the first proposed study is concerned with determining how New Zealand’s educational entrepreneurs may be effective, the second is concerned with whether and to what extent they may be effective at achieving their goals. The second study will therefore evaluate what the value is that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs create, if any, which is different to what regular schooling may create. This is also likely to involve evaluating what the impact is, if any, of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs on the achievement outcomes of their pupils over time compared to those who attend regular state schools if this is an important aspect of their value proposition. It is possible, however, that improvements in achievement outcomes may not be the most important issue, depending on why an educational entrepreneur started his or her schooling venture and what the most pressing unmet needs are within a community.

The basic approach will be to use a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods to compare the impact of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs against comparable regular state schools. This study will include educational entrepreneurs besides those running Partnership Schools; namely those running low-cost independent schools and innovative forms of regular state schooling, whose purpose is to serve educationally disadvantaged pupils but which do not conform to the typical model. This will enable a number of different kinds of educational entrepreneurs to be evaluated who run different ventures. Thus, it is proposed that this study will include low-cost independent schools, state schools that do not fit the regular model but which use an educational innovation, ventures which are not schools and Partnership Schools. The goal is to, within reason, examine a diverse range of ventures to determine what the impact of educational entrepreneurs is rather than a particular kind of schooling. Ideally, as proposed by Ruebottom (2011), impact would be evaluated using time-lagged measures to isolate better its impact from other confounding influences on social change. This may be difficult to observe, however, given the likely cross-sectional nature of this research. Nevertheless, the proposed approach should still produce a study that could provide an interesting contribution to theory.

The precise design of the second study is provisional at this stage. This is partly because its design is to a degree contingent on the findings of the first study. That is, what is learnt about how educational entrepreneurs define their value proposition is likely to influence the kinds of practices, processes or outcomes that may be evaluated, and therefore the choice of metrics. It is also because the choice of research design may affect the kind and number of schooling ventures which can be included.

The choice of research design is subject to a number of constraints. For one, it may be difficult to find suitable control schools against which to compare schooling run by educational entrepreneurs. There are also a number of data issues which will influence what kind of analyses can be conducted. It is likely that only a small number of observations will be observed at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs because they tend to have small rolls. It is likely that some schools will keep patchy pupil records, and/or record data inconsistently, which could limited access to pupils' achievement data or background characteristics. Roll attrition could be a problem given that pupils can transfer back and forth between schools. Central government only holds limited data about schools because of New Zealand's system of self-governing schools. Lastly, the willingness of schools and families to participate could restrict the research. Low literacy levels among families in some communities could be a further barrier to participation. Given the need for more scoping work to determine a feasible research design, for now a range of possible approaches is proposed that may answer the research questions.

a. What is the value that New Zealand educational entrepreneurs create, if any, besides improvements in pupils' achievement outcomes, which is different to what regular schooling may create?

The purpose of the first part of this study is to determine what the value is that educational entrepreneurs may create, if any, which is different to what educationally disadvantaged pupils would benefit from in regular state schools. As discussed, it will be important to evaluate impact more broadly than just outcomes and at the community as well as the organisational level. This part of the study will therefore not only evaluate what families and communities think about whether educational entrepreneurs have had the impact that they intended, but also whether there was something different about how educational entrepreneurs provided schooling and whether the education met families' expectations and was appropriate to their community's needs.

It will do so by examining case studies of the four kinds of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs proposed before. The goal is to include a case of each of the four kinds of schooling ventures. Differences in practices, processes and outcomes will be compared against similar matched regular state schools, with respect to location and the composition of the school roll, to isolate the value which educational entrepreneurs might create that regular state schooling may not. As described earlier in the proposed conceptual framework for creating value, the key issue is whether and to what extent educational entrepreneurs have succeeded at creating non-material forms of value and outcomes that can improve living standards for educationally disadvantaged pupils and their communities which were not experienced before.

Proxy indicators will also be measured to indicate the impact which schooling run by educational entrepreneurs may have on improving education and aspects of human and social capital, per Yujuico's framework, as these can indicate whether beneficiaries have been empowered, per Santos' theory. These analyses will also be conducted at matched regular state schools. This will provide counterfactual cases against which to compare outcomes at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs.

As noted earlier, whether or not a schooling venture has had an impact can be determined by such criteria as whether it has achieved its declared goals and its ability to provide a continuous programme or service by acquiring resources. Any impact experienced is likely to be the product of the four variables that Sharir and Lehner identified: (1) an entrepreneur's personal characteristics, skills and background; (2) the decisions and actions taken by an entrepreneur; (3) the nature of the organisation or the service that has been developed; and (4) its operating environment. The instruments used to collect data from those with whom educational entrepreneurs serve and work will be designed to elicit responses about the strength of and interaction among these variables. Thus, this part of the study will involve collecting information about families and communities' experience and impressions of the impact which educational entrepreneurs may have had through a survey questionnaire issued to parents of children who attend those schooling ventures.

- **Analysis of proxy indicators**

There a number of different indicators for which data exists that can illustrate the impact which educational entrepreneurs may have had on education and human capital.

Pupils' engagement at school

One is pupils' engagement a school. Measuring pupils' levels of engagement at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs is important. Being interested and involved in school helps pupils to feel positive about school and increases the chances that they will succeed. By contrast, low levels of engagement are associated with lower achievement levels, and an increased risk of boredom at school, dropping out or delinquency (New Zealand Council for Educational Research 2009). Levels of pupil engagement may also indirectly communicate something about whether or not pupils feel comfortable in a school's environment and culture. Three aspects of pupil engagement are: behaviour, including positive conduct, persistence, and involvement in school life; emotional responses, to teachers, peers, learning, and school; and cognitive processes, which includes pupils' willingness to take on learning challenges and self-regulate their learning.

A survey designed by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER), called 'Me and My School', can measure engagement according to these aspects. It can be administered to Years 4 to 10 pupils as part of their regular classes. It is proposed that Me and My School surveys will be issued in schools run by educational entrepreneurs to determine levels of pupil engagement. Pupil engagement could also be measured by examining changes in truancy, suspensions, expulsions, exclusions or stand-down rates. This data can be obtained directly from information supplied by schools to the Ministry of Education. Changes in other indicators could be compared against similar regular state schools in the vicinity of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs.

Building human capital

Building human capital was noted earlier as an important outcome. This is because the more time pupils spend at school is associated with higher earnings later in life (Leigh 2008; Krueger & Lindahl 2000). Proxies for human capital can be found in rates of school graduation from Year 12 or 13, enrolment in a tertiary institute after leaving school or the proportion of pupils who stay at school for an extra year after turning 16 (the age at which compulsory schooling ends). It might also be possible to estimate whether or not pupils' household income levels had an effect on achievement outcomes. If it could be shown that pupils who are poorer were able to achieve more highly at schooling run by educational entrepreneurs then this would demonstrate that it can help pupils to overcome their socio-economic status and enjoy better skills and opportunities in life.

The impact of the innovation

It will also be necessary to measure the impact of the innovation introduced by educational entrepreneurs. One simple way of doing so is to survey parents and ask if them if they are satisfied with their children's schooling and, if so, why. Parents could also be asked if they are more or less satisfied with their child's schooling than at their child's previous school and, if so, why. Another proxy is to measure by the popularity of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs. Waiting lists could be one indicator. Popularity could also perhaps be measured by the share of total enrolments within a particular area or the share of its roll that has switched from a regular state school over a period of years.

As suggested earlier, the diffusion of the innovation would also indicate its impact. This could be measured by the number of pupils who had benefited from it since it was introduced. It could also be observed in whether other schools had adopted the innovation or if policy changes had been made as a result of it. These outcomes will be hard to observe, however, within the time constraints of this research. Moreover, the small scale of schooling ventures is likely to have limited the impact which educational entrepreneurs may have had.

- **Survey and interviews with stakeholders**

Information about families and communities' experience and impressions of educational entrepreneurs will be collected through a parental survey questionnaire (Lohr 2010, pp. 11-6), and from semi-structured interviews with elites in the communities in which educational entrepreneurs operate. This data will help to illustrate whether or not the schooling ventures run by educational entrepreneurs have been successful according to the sorts of criteria and variables identified by Sharir and Lehner—and the propositions generated from the first study.

Frameworks such as the Pacific Outcomes Framework or the kura kaupapa Maori framework described before will be used to help frame the issues or outcomes that may be important to particular communities. Thus, impact might be seen in reported improved outcomes in the areas of health, education and skills, and employment and business, in family and community strength or in schooling being provided in a way that is relevant and useful. The survey and interviews will be conducted on one occasion since it is likely that the views of these participants will not change significantly over a school year.

Parental survey

A survey is likely to be an effective way of gathering data from multiple households. Reasonable causal inferences can be made if responses could be obtained from 20 to 30 families of similar backgrounds who send their children to schools run by educational entrepreneurs and regular state schools, as this design provides for treatment and control groups with background characteristics held reasonably constant. Alternatively, families who have switched their child's school from a regular state school to one of the case study schooling ventures could be surveyed so that families who switched their child's school become their own comparison group. If there is an insufficient number of households available for either of these designs, then a general survey of families whose child attends one of the case study schooling ventures could nevertheless provide data to answer the research question. However, the sample would include those who may have only ever chosen an alternative form of schooling for their child, too. Their motivations could be systematically different to families who have switched their child's schooling from one type to another.

The survey will ask parents questions about their reasons for choosing an alternative form of schooling for their child, what they think is valuable about it and whether and to what extent educational entrepreneurs have engaged with them and their community. The following questions are proposed.

- Why did you choose the school that you send your child to?
- What did you like about the school that made you want to send your child there?
- How much has your child's attitude, behaviour, effort or grades changed since attending the school?
- Are you satisfied with your child's schooling and, if so, why?
- Are you more or less satisfied with your child's schooling at this school than their previous one and, if so, why?
- What does this school do differently in education compared to your child's previous school?
- How does the school encourage higher educational achievement?
- Are you more or less involved with your child's schooling at this school than your child's previous school?
- How does the school draw upon aspects of (for example) Maori or Pasifika identity and culture to help pupils to learn at school?
- How involved, if at all, is the educational entrepreneur with the broader school community?
- What kind of activities, if any, do they perform for the community?
- Have any problems been experienced with your child's schooling while attending this school?

- How often do you participate in school activities and is this more than at the school which your child previously attended?

The questions will be adapted so that Likert response scales can be used. This will enable descriptive statistics to be generated and statistical analyses, such as a factor analyses, to be conducted, if desired.

Elite interviews

To investigate whether communities think that schools run by educational entrepreneurs have had a positive impact, semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key community leaders, such as: supporters or donors; city officials (if they have a connection with educational entrepreneurs); elders, community leaders (such as of a marae or a church), or principals of neighbouring state schools. A purpose of these interviews will be to help assess whether educational entrepreneurs have created value besides improvements in education. They will also help to determine whether or not their impact was affected by such factors as the quality of their networks and their capacity to mobilise human and financial resources.

The following interview questions will be asked.

- What is different about the schooling that educational entrepreneurs have provided compared to other schools?
- How have educational entrepreneurs improved education in the community?
- How have educational entrepreneurs worked with the community to improve education?
- How good is the relationship between educational entrepreneurs and the community?
- Have educational entrepreneurs done anything to help the community besides providing schooling?
- With whom have educational entrepreneurs formed relationships?
- Do you think that social outcomes have improved in this community due to what educational entrepreneurs have done?
- How have educational entrepreneurs distributed any surplus from their venture?

Finally, educational entrepreneurs themselves will be interviewed to determine whether they believe they have delivered upon their value proposition and what they think their impact has been. It will be a priority to re-interview the Partnership School operators from the first study. Re-interviewing these operators will illustrate whether their aspirations and goals changed over time; in particular whether their aspirations diminished and they reduced their ambitions because of the challenges of running a venture whose purpose is to solve a difficult educational problem. They may also illustrate whether or not educational entrepreneurs had to engage in activities other than educational ones to create value.

The following interview questions will be asked.

- What were your original goals?
- What opportunities have you had to make a difference in education?
- What impact have you had on educational outcomes?
- Have your goals changed since you started your school?
- Did you experience any barriers or constraints in realising your goals?
- How did you overcome those barriers or constraints?
- Did you have to engage in non-educational activities to achieve your educational goals?
- How good is your relationship with the community now compared to when you started your school?
- What is the balance between the social and income-generating aspects of your school now compared to when you started it?

As well as evaluating how educational entrepreneurs create value in distinctive ways, another important way to show if educational entrepreneurs can meet an unmet educational need is whether or not they can help to improve the growth in achievement outcomes of the pupils who attend them, compared to those at similar regular state schools. This will matter if improving achievement outcomes is a core component of an educational entrepreneur's value proposition.

b. What is the impact, if any, of schooling run by New Zealand educational entrepreneurs on the educational achievement outcomes of their pupils compared to regular state schooling?

The key empirical question of the last part of this study is whether, and to what extent, schooling run by educational entrepreneurs has a significant impact over time on the achievement outcomes of the pupils who attend them at standardised tests, compared to pupils of a similar background who attend comparable regular state schools. For the new Partnership Schools this would be limited to their first year of operation. For other schooling ventures the period that could be considered may be longer if they hold usable data which goes back several years. Some consider five years to be a suitable minimum period over which to assess the impact of a school (Betts & Tang 2008, p. 7). This analysis will show the degree to which schooling run by educational entrepreneurs may be relatively more or less effective than regular state schools.

A problem is that there are a number of other explanatory variables besides schooling type that could explain the educational performance of pupils at each kind of school. Pupils' family background, and/or their families' motivation to see their children well-educated, are two explanatory variables that are difficult to disentangle from school effects (Lewis & Patrinos 2012, p. 10). The effect of other educational factors besides schooling, like the impact of pupils' prior achievement, teachers, resources or the curriculum, can also be tricky to isolate (Hattie 2003, pp. 1-2). A robust research design can help to ameliorate these problems.

- **Research design, some possible methods and their limitations**

The objective is to create treatment and control schools to assess the impact of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs against comparable regular state schools (cf. Miller 2013, p. 2). A hierarchy of possible methods is proposed, which reflect the logic of research design for drawing causal inferences. The use of one or more of these methods will enable plausible statements to be made about the impact of schooling run by educational entrepreneurs.

In education research, it is generally difficult to conduct randomised controlled trials because researchers cannot control the allocation of subjects to treatment and control groups. Non-experimental methods have to be used instead (Scriven 2008, pp. 13-4; 2005). Finding a situation in which a natural experiment can be observed is preferred so that assignment of pupils to treatment and control groups can be 'as-if' random (Dunning 2012; Howell et al. 2000). With 'as-if' random assignment of pupils to schooling run by educational entrepreneurs and regular state schools it can be assumed that: pupils will be alike according to their background and motivation for attending school (Schlotter et al. 2009, p. 4); there will be co-variation between the type of school that pupils attend; and pupils will have changed schools before achievement outcomes are evaluated. In other words, a natural experiment will closely satisfy the criteria of co-variation, non-spuriousness and time-order which are important for making reasonable causal inferences (Dunning 2012, p. 33). If a natural experiment cannot be observed, then regression analysis will be used to estimate impacts. Scoping will be performed immediately after the first study is completed to confirm what research design can be used.

Conducting a natural experiment

There are three conceivable ways that a natural experiment could be used to measure impacts on pupils' achievement. Whether these methods will work may influence which schools and communities can be included in the study. One option is to track pupils from families who live outside the geographical enrolment zone of an oversubscribed regular state school and who failed to be admitted by ballot. Some of these families may send their children to schooling run by educational entrepreneurs while some will choose a different regular state school, thereby creating natural treatment and control groups. However, it could be hard to find an oversubscribed regular state school at which enough educationally disadvantaged pupils have failed to gain entry whose family's second choice of schooling is one run by an educational entrepreneur. It is likely that this kind of schooling will be their family's first choice because of its values, reputation or special character (Thomas 2007). Further, as independent schools charge fees, it is unlikely that a low-cost independent school would be a disadvantaged family's second choice of school if it was not their first choice.

Another option is to track successful and unsuccessful 'Aspire Scholarship' applicants. This Government programme awards scholarships to 250 low-income pupils each year (New Zealand Ministry of Education 2013; New Zealand Government 2009). While the scholarships are allocated by ballot, they are limited to enrolment at independent schools. The schools run by educational entrepreneurs included in this study would be limited to the low-cost independent schools which Aspire Scholarship recipients attend. It is unknown, however, how many of the successful applicants attend low-cost independent schools. Both these issues could limit the number of observations and make statistical analysis difficult. A different issue is that if only families who are motivated to improve their children's education apply for an Aspire Scholarship then the sample would be of pupils who are more likely to do better at school. This would bias up the estimated impact. Lastly, for this to be a natural experiment, the scholarship ballot procedures would need to be checked to verify that they were truly random (Dunning 2012, p. 28).

A third option is to use an instrumental variables approach. This might work in Christchurch, where the February 2011 earthquake has brought about the closure of seven schools in January 2014 (New Zealand Government 2013a). The school closures will require some families to choose a different school. The earthquake-induced school closures may not affect pupils' achievement outcomes. Assuming that some pupils will attend schooling run by educational entrepreneurs and regular state schools it might be possible to use the event as an instrument to produce unbiased estimates of the variation in achievement caused by the type of school which pupils next attend (Schlotter et al. 2009, p. 12). The validity of the instrument would need to be demonstrated (such as by an F-test) for this to be considered a true natural experiment, however.

A propensity score analysis

Based on scoping so far, the Aspire Scholarship programme appears to stand the best chance of observing a natural experiment. In the absence of a plausible natural experiment, a propensity score analysis could be used to conduct a reasonably robust non-experimental evaluation. This approach is a more sophisticated form of matching study, in which pupils at treatment schools are compared with pupils who attend regular state schools. The idea is to compare outcomes for individual pupils who attend a treatment school with a virtual control pupil constructed from the observable characteristics of pupils who have a similar likelihood, or propensity, to attend treatment schools. This reduces the chance of unobserved factors from influencing observed differences in pupils' achievement outcomes. Thus, the growth in achievement of pupils who attend at least one case of each of the four kinds of schooling ventures of interest would be compared against a virtual control group that is representative of pupils who attend similar nearby regular state schools.

This approach provides a plausible method for evaluating the impact of treatment schools on those pupils who do not switch between treatment and control schools (Betts & Hill 2006, pp. 13-4). It would also enhance the external validity of the research—and the generalisations which may be drawn from it—because experimental studies have lower external validity since they focus on localised cases. However, the propensity score approach is only as good as the observable characteristics which are included to estimate the propensity of pupils to attend a given school type. The method also assumes that researchers have all of the information which they need about the variables that affect whether a given pupil is likely to attend a treatment or a control school. It cannot eliminate the possibility that unobserved differences exist between pupils who attend treatment and control schools that might bias the effect of attending a treatment school.

Nevertheless, Stanford University's Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (CREDO) has used propensity scores in the two national charter school studies it has conducted (Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2013; Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2009). It reports that the method produced results which were similar to lottery studies of charter school performance and which were more consistent with those results than other non-experimental methods, including fixed effects regression (Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2013, p. 6). This is likely to be because CREDO had access to hundreds of observations from which to construct accurate propensity scores.

Collecting this information can be time-consuming if it is not already available from official sources. This would be the case in New Zealand because of its system of self-governing schools. For this method to work in this study, pupil background data would have to be collected from a number of comparable regular state schools nearby schooling run by educational entrepreneurs. It could be worth the effort, however, for another reason. A propensity score analysis could reveal the degree to which pupils enrolled in schooling run by educational entrepreneurs have similar backgrounds to those in regular state schools. This would show whether or not schooling run by educational entrepreneurs skims off the pupils with a propensity for high achievement. The analysis could help to determine whether New Zealand educational entrepreneurs are successful at creating opportunities for educationally disadvantaged pupils to attend an alternative form of schooling. If these pupils do not comprise most enrolments then educational entrepreneurs may be failing in their social mission.

In summary, a propensity score analysis would be a robust way of measuring the difference in achievement outcomes and could produce some other interesting findings. Its use will be seriously considered instead of, or alongside, a natural experiment. However, it may not be possible to collect all of the data required within the time and resource constraints of this study, thereby precluding its use.

Fixed effects regression models

If none of these methods will work, then a fixed effects regression analysis could be used to determine the strength of the correlation between the type of schooling attended and pupils' achievement outcomes. A fixed effects analysis could account for unobserved differences among pupils that are constant across time by statistically controlling for an average 'fixed effect' variable for each pupil (Schlotter et al. 2009, pp. 23-4; Angrist & Pischke 2008, p. 182; Betts & Hill 2006, p. 13). Provided panel data can be obtained for the achievement of pupils who switch schools, individual pupils' achievement growth can be compared for the time that they attend schooling run by an educational entrepreneur with the time that they did not. Each pupil becomes his or her own comparison group, thereby making it unnecessary to identify a control group. However, it cannot be assumed that pupils' achievement growth will remain the same as if they had they continued to attend a regular state school. This limitation restricts the external validity of fixed effects studies.

A variation on fixed effects regression, known as hierarchical linear modelling (HLM) could be used instead of the conventional model. It allows for data from participants to be analysed at more than one level. In this case, HLM would enable effects at both the pupil and school levels and the inter-relationship between the two to be reported (Betts & Hill 2006, p. 13). This matters because the impact will be reported at the school level, but the analysis will be based on individual pupils' achievement data. A limitation of this approach is that it is more accurate with large numbers of observations which may not be available in this study. Thus, it may be prudent to use a conventional fixed effects regression model rather than HLM to avoid this limitation.

If fixed effects regression is used, the growth in achievement of pupils who switched from a regular state school to one of the four kinds of schooling ventures of interest would be compared against what their achievement would have been at the regular state school that they previously attended. As with the propensity score analysis, the goal would be to include at least one case of each kind of schooling venture. While it would be more difficult to infer causal relationships from a fixed effects regression model, these limitations may have to be accepted. Nevertheless, reasonably strong causal inferences could still be made provided that the characteristics of the schools and the pupils who attend them are highly alike, except for school type.

Collecting data about pupils

All of these analyses will require the collection of pupil achievement data and data about pupils' background characteristics. Standardised test score data, or at least test score data that can be standardised, will be essential. Data from assessments from at least the beginning and end of one school year will be required so that the growth in pupils' achievement can be measured over at least one period. This data could be obtained either directly from schools or by carrying out tests. A problem with using existing assessment data is that there is variation between how schools collect, use and make judgements from assessments. This is because New Zealand state schools do not use a common summative standardised test to assess literacy and numeracy. Another issue is that schooling run by educational entrepreneurs may use alternative curricula and assessments to the national curriculum. Thus, the cooperation of schools may be required to carry out particular tests at particular times to obtain assessment data.

To provide for comparability across schools, it is proposed that schools will be asked to use the asTTle assessment in reading and mathematics. This formative evaluation tool is already used in most New Zealand schools. It reports results against a normed scale and can be used to measure growth in pupils' achievement over time (Hattie et al. 2005). Schooling run by educational entrepreneurs may have to be asked to issue asTTle assessments if they do not use them. Failing this, schools could be asked to use a different standardised test, such as Australia's National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) test. NAPLAN is a summative standardised test in literacy and numeracy. If schools are asked to use a particular test, it will be necessary to conduct some pilot testing to determine the degree of variability in the assessment and reporting of results to devise procedures for schools to use to reduce the variability. It will also be necessary to instruct schools to report achievement data back in a standard form to improve the quality and ease with which the data can be analysed.

Data of pupils' background characteristics will have to be sourced directly from schools and/or families of children who attend schools. This will include data such as: pupils' prior attainment, sex, ethnicity and whether or not they have special education status; and parents' education and household income levels, as this information can indicate socio-economic status. Schools may be able to supply this data if they collect it, with families' consent. It is likely, however, that this data will need to be collected directly from households through a parental survey. Questions for households can be included in a parental survey which is likely to be used in the second part of this study.

In short, more investigation is required to determine which, or which combination, of these natural and non-experimental methods and data collection procedures can be used. A hierarchy of methods has been proposed which should ensure that educational entrepreneurs' impact on pupils' achievement outcomes can be measured with a reasonable degree of certainty if this analysis is required to help show the value which educational entrepreneurs may create.

Interview procedures

At the beginning of each interview permission will be requested to record it. If a participant does not wish for the interview to be recorded, notes will be taken during it instead. All recorded interviews will be transcribed to allow for data analysis.

A 'contact summary sheet' will be completed no later than a day after each interview. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend completing the sheet within this period so that the researcher is not 'overly impressed with vivid incidents'. The contact summary sheet is meant to enable data analysis to commence while in the field so that themes in the data can be identified and better understood. This process is important for theory-building research as it allows adjustments to be made to future data collection instruments, such as interview protocols or questions, so that emerging themes can be explored in future interviews (Miles & Huberman 1994; Eisenhardt 1989).

Ethical considerations

As this research evaluates schooling, it will at times involve the collection of sensitive information about participants. Any data that is collected will be done so with informed consent, such as agreeing to an interview or returning a survey questionnaire. Data that is collected from human participants will be kept confidential and they will have the right to withdraw their responses from the research if they want.

The first study will have low-risk of harm to human participants since only consenting Partnership School operators will be interviewed in an environment similar to what they would encounter in everyday life. Further, the primary documents that will be accessed should not include sensitive information about families or children who attend the schools.

The second study, however, will collect information about families and children. Parents will be interviewed instead of children to offset the risk of harm. An issue that may have to be managed is the protection of participants' anonymity. If schooling run by educational entrepreneurs operates in small communities it could be possible to identify participants. New Zealand privacy laws can help to protect participants' anonymity, however. Some data which is collected about schools by central government cannot be released if the data for pupil cohorts is for groups of five pupils or less. For data collected from interviews, statements or quotes will not be published if it could lead to the identification of an individual or family.

Developing a contribution to theory from the research

As this research will make a contribution to the development of social and educational entrepreneurship theory, some brief comments are provided about how this may be done. Eisenhardt's (1989) suggested approach for developing theory from case studies will be followed. The first step is to 'sharpen' theoretical concepts by refining their definitions. The next step is to provide evidence of relationships between the concepts by ensuring that the emerging theory fits the data in each case. During this process some relationships will be confirmed by case study evidence, while sometimes it will be revised, disconfirmed or discarded due to a lack of evidence. The final step is to compare the emerging theory with the existing literature by identifying similarities between the new theory and existing literature. Identifying contradictions between the new theory and the existing literature matters because it could be assumed that the findings are specific to the case or that they are incorrect and a challenge to internal validity. This is why it is important to explain any discrepancies to strengthen the case that a new contribution has been made. It is expected that the theory generation process will be an iterative one, as it will be spread across the two hypothesis-generating and testing stages of this research.

Summary

The methods proposed to answer the two major questions of concern mean that this research will comprise a package of studies. These studies will hopefully prove beyond reasonable doubt whether or not educational entrepreneurs can create value for disadvantaged communities that they may not have benefited from if children from those communities had attended regular state schools. This will be evaluated by examining educational entrepreneurs' claims about whether and to what extent they generate value. Their claims will be measured against how well they do at providing schooling in ways that regular state schools may have neglected and, if appropriate, how much more growth in achievement pupils make at schooling run by them, if any, compared to regular state schools. Moreover, these methods will help to show whether educational entrepreneurs, as a kind of social entrepreneur, are more effective at meeting unmet social needs than government, private sector or non-profit organisations.

CONCLUSION

The first fifteen years of research and analysis of social entrepreneurship was driven by identifying what social entrepreneurship is and building up various theories, frameworks and methods for studying it. The next fifteen years ought to be marked by consolidation and more systematic study (Short et al. 2009, pp. 166, 184-5). This research will make an important contribution along these lines to both the emerging social entrepreneurship and educational entrepreneurship literature. It will test a core belief of the social entrepreneurship literature; that social entrepreneurs can identify and provide innovative, sustainable solutions to neglected problems with positive externalities, like educational underachievement (Santos 2012, p. 348). By doing so, it will test hypotheses generated from case study research and perhaps help to sharpen indicators for measuring social impact, thereby improving the quality of social and educational entrepreneurship research. It will also measure the effectiveness of a kind of schooling that has been under-studied in New Zealand; forms of independent and public-private schooling which are run by educational entrepreneurs. The claims that may be made from this research will be provisional, given its limited scope, short timeframe and likely cross-sectional nature. Nevertheless, it will help to determine the degree to which educational entrepreneurs can offer an education that is better for educationally disadvantaged pupils than that offered by regular state schools. It will also empirically test theories of how social entrepreneurs are believed to provide sustainable solutions and create value for local communities facing difficult problems. It is hoped then that this research might help to show that there are effective alternatives to state-provided public goods and services, which may be more effective precisely because they are provided by those who know and care for the wellbeing of the communities whom they serve.

TIMEFRAMES

Date	*Milestone*
2013	
November	Complete ANU Research Integrity Training. Submit proposal for the first study to the ANU Ethics Committee. File annual plan with the Crawford School.
December 2013 -January 2014	Work on research methods (e.g. draft and pilot interview questions) for the first stage of field research. Receive ethics committee approval for the first study.
2014	
February	Commence the field research for the first study.
March	Complete the field research for the first study.
March-April	Analysis of data from the first study.
April-May	Write-up first study.
May-June	Send first study for review. Work on approach and research methods, for the second stage of field research (e.g. piloting survey questions, and developing models and metrics for impact analyses).
June	Tentative: Complete block course in quantitative research methods run by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), Michigan. Work on ethics committee proposal for the second study.
July	Submit proposal for the second study to the ANU Ethics Committee.
August	Revise first study based on feedback. Complete development of models and metrics for the impact analyses in the second stage of field research.
September	Make any required revisions to the ethics committee proposal for the second study. File annual report with the Crawford School.
October	Receive ethics committee approval for second study. Commence field research for the second study.
November	File annual plan with the Crawford School.
December	Continue field research for the second study.
2015	
January-April	Complete field research for the second study.
May-July	Data analysis for the second study.
August-October	Write-up field research for the second study. File annual report with the Crawford School.
October-November	Update and revise literature review. Draft literature review and methodology chapters of thesis. File annual plan with Crawford School.
December	Revise second study based on feedback.
2016	
January-May	Write analytical thesis chapters.
June-August	Collect and process feedback on thesis chapters.
August-October	File annual report with the Crawford School. Write introduction and conclusion thesis chapters. Thesis submission preparations (e.g. abstract, contents page, copy-editing). Signal intention to submit.
October-November	Thesis submission.

REFERENCES

Education Act 1989 (New Zealand).

Alter, R 2007, *Social entrepreneurship typology*, Virtue Ventures.

Alvord, S, Brown, L & Letts, C 2004, 'Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: an exploratory study', *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* no. 40, pp. 3-260.

Angrist, JD & Pischke, JS 2008. *Mostly harmless econometrics: an empiricist's companion*, Princeton University Press.

Aroney, N & Thomas, S 2012, 'A house divided: does MMP make an upper house unnecessary for New Zealand?' *New Zealand Law Review*, vol. 2012, no. 3, pp. 403-441.

ASB Community Trust 2013, 'C-Me mentoring trust', viewed 25 September 2013, http://www.asbcommunitytrust.org.nz/education-initiative/stage-one-funding/c-me-mentoring-trust.

ASB Community Trust 2013, 'Maori boys in high-performance zone', viewed 26 September 2013, http://www.asbcommunitytrust.org.nz/News-publications/united-maori-mission.

Ashoka 2013, 'Vision and mission', viewed 3 October 2013, https://www.ashoka.org/visionmission.

Austin, J, Stevenson, H & Wei-Skillern, J 2006, 'Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same different, or both?' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 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*, vol. 23, no. 5-6, pp. 373-403.

Bate, R 2009, *What is prosperity and how do we measure it?* Development Policy Outlook, 3, American Enterprise Institute, Washington D.C.

Battle Anderson, B & Dees, JG 2006, 'Rhetoric, reality, and research: building a solid foundation for the practice of social entrepreneurship', in *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable social change*, A Nicholls, ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 144-168.

Betts, JR & Hill, PT 2006, *Key issues in studying charter schools and achievement: a review and suggestions for national guidelines*, NCSRP White Paper Series, 2, National Charter School Research Project; Center on Reinventing Public Education; University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Betts, JR & Tang, YE 2008, *Value-added and experimental studies of the effect of charter schools on student achievement*, National Charter School Research Project; Center on Reinventing Public Education; University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Betts, JR & Tang, YE 2011, *The effect of charter schools on student achievement: a meta-analysis of the literature*, National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education, Washington D.C.

Bhuller, M, Mogstad, M, & Salvanes, KG 2011, *Life-cycle bias and the returns to schooling in current and lifetime earnings.* Paper presented to the CESifo Area Conference on the Economics of Education.

Bolton, E & Savell, L 2013, *Towards a new social economy: blended value creation through social impact bonds*, Social Finance, London.

Booth, P 2007, 'Taxation and the size of the state', in *Catholic social teaching and the market economy*, P Booth, ed., Institute of Economic Affairs, London.

Bornstein, D 1998, 'Changing the world on a shoestring', *The Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 281, no. 1, pp. 34-9.

Bornstein, D 2007. *How to change the world: social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*, Oxford University Press.

Boston, J, Martin, J, Pallot, J, & Walsh, P 1996, *Public management. The New Zealand model*, Oxford University Press, Auckland; New York.

Boyett, I & Finlay, D 1993, 'The emergence of the educational entrepreneur', *Long Range Planning*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 114-122.

Brinkerhoff, RO 2003. *The success case method: find out quickly what's working and what's not*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, CA.

Brinkerhoff, RO 2005, 'The success case method: a strategic evaluation approach to increasing the value and effect of training', *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 86-101.

Catford, J 1998, 'Editorial. Social entrepreneurs are vital for health promotion-but they need supportive environments too', *Health Promotion International*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 95-98.

Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2009, *Multiple-choice: charter school performance in 16 states*, CREDO; Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2013, *National charter school study*, CREDO; Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2013, *National charter school study technical appendix*, Stanford.

Chamberlin, M & Caygill, R 2012, *Key findings from New Zealand's participation in the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in 2010/11*, Ministry of Education, New Zealand, Wellington.

Chand, V & Amin-Choudhury, G 2006, 'Teachers and socio-educational entrepreneurship competence as a consequence', *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 97-114.

Chand, V & Misra, S 2009, 'Teachers as educational-social entrepreneurs: the innovation-social entrepreneurship spiral', *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 219-228.

Chell, E, Nicolopoulou, K & Karatas-Ozkan, M 2010, 'Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: international and innovation perspectives', *Entrepreneurship Regional Development*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 485-493.

Corner, PD & Ho, M 2010, 'How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 635-659.

Cukier, W, Trenholm, S, Carl, D & Gekas, G 2011, 'Social entrepreneurship: a content analysis', *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 99-123.

Cummings, TG 2007, 'Quest for an engaged academy', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 355-360.

Dacin, MT, Dacin, PA & Tracey, P 2011, 'Social entrepreneurship: a critique and future directions', *Organization Science*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1203-1213.

Dacin, PA, Dacin, MT & Matear, M 2010, 'Social entrepreneurship: why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here', *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 37-57.

Davis, K 1973, 'The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 312-322.

de Bruin, A & Stangl, LM 2013, 'Insights on scaling social enterprise', in *Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: concepts in context*, H Dougals, ed., Tilde University Press, Melbourne.

Dees, JG 1998, *The meaning of 'social entrepreneurship'*.

Defourny, J & Nyssens, M 2010, 'Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: convergences and divergences', *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 32-53.

Defourny, J & Nyssens, M 2008, 'Social enterprise in Europe: recent trends and developments', *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 202-228.

Dey, P & Steyaert, C 2010, 'The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship', *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 85-108.

Douglas, H 2013, 'Looking beyond the light? Seeking theories to illuminate social entrepreneuring', in *Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: concepts in context*, H Dougals, ed., Tilde University Press, Melbourne.

Drucker, PF 1985. *Innovation and entrepreneurship*, Harper Business, New York.

Dunning, T 2012. *Natural experiments in the social sciences*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Durie, M 2012, 'Interview: Kaupapa Maori: shifting the social', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 21-29.

Eikenberry, AM & Kluver, JD 2004, 'The marketization of the nonprofit sector: civil society at risk?', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 132-140.

Eisenhardt, KM 1989, 'Building theories from case study research', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 532-550.

Evans, L, Grimes, A, Wilkinson, B & Teece, D 1996, 'Economic reform in New Zealand 1984-95: the pursuit of efficiency', *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1856-1902.

Eyal, O 2008, 'When parents choose to start up a school', *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 99-118.

Frumkin, P 2011, 'Measuring social enterprise performance: toward a universal dashboard', in A de Bruin & LM Stangl, eds., Proceedings of the Social Innovation & Entrepreneurship Conference Extending Theory Integrating Practice Auckland, New Zealand Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Research Centre (SIERC), p. 33.

Frumkin, P, Manno, BV & Edington, N 2011. *The strategic management of charter schools. Frameworks and tools for educational entrepreneurs*, Harvard Education Press, Cambridge, MA.

Goldstein, JA, Hazy, JK & Silberstang, J 2008, 'Complexity and social entrepreneurship: a fortuitous meeting', *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 9-24.

Gordon, L 1996, 'School choice and the quasi-market in New Zealand: 'Tomorrow's Schools' today', in *School choice and the quasi-market*, G Walford, ed., Triangle Books, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, United Kingdom, pp. 129-144.

Gordon, L 2013, *Who achieves what in secondary schooling? A conceptual and empirical analysis*, New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA), Wellington.

Granovetter, M 1985, 'Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology* pp. 481-510.

Grant, RM 1996, 'Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm', *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 17, pp. 109-122.

Grant, S 2008, 'Contextualising social enterprise in New Zealand', *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 9-23.

Gustafson, B 2006, 'New Zealand Since the War', in *New Zealand government and politics*, R Miller, ed., Oxford University Press, Auckland, pp. 3-13.

Hattie, JAC, Brown, GTL, Keegan, PJ, MacKay, AJ, Irving, SE, Patel, P, Sussex, K, McCall, S, Sutherland, T, Yu, J, Cutforth, S, Mooyman, D, Leeson, HV, & Campbell, ART 2005, *Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (asTTle) version 4, 2005: manual*, University of Auckland; Ministry of Education & Learning Media, Wellington.

Hattie, J 2003, *Teachers make a difference: what is the research evidence?* Paper presented to the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) annual conference on 'Building Teacher Quality'.

Haugh, H 2012, 'The importance of theory in social enterprise research', *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 7-15.

Hayek, FA 1945, 'The use of knowledge in society', *American Economic Review*, vol. 35, pp. 519-530.

Henig, J & Hess, F 2010, 'The declining significance of space and geography', *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 92, no. 3, pp. 57-61.

Hess, FM 2007, 'The case for educational entrepreneurship: hard truths about risk, reform, and reinvention', *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 89, no. 1, pp. 21-30.

Hess, FM 2008. *The future of educational entrepreneurship*, Harvard Education Press, Cambridge, MA.

Hess, FM 2008, 'The supply side of school reform', *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 211-217.

Hess, FM 2009, 'Cages of their own design', *Educational Leadership*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 28-33.

Hess, FM 2010, 'The transformative promise of "greenfield" schooling', *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 91, no. 5, pp. 49-53.

Hess, FM & Perkins-Gough, D 2010, 'Where are our greenfields? A conversation with Frederick M. Hess', *Educational Leadership*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 12-15.

Hess, FM 2006. *Educational entrepreneurship. Realities, challenges and possibilities*, Harvard Education Press, Cambrdige.

Howell, WG, Wolf, PJ, Peterson, PE, & Campbell, DE 2000, *Test-score effects of school vouchers in Dayton, Ohio, New York City and Washington D.C.: evidence from randomised field trials*, Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington D.C., September 2000, Program on Education Policy and Governance, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Huybrechts, B & Nicholls, A 2012, 'Social entrepreneurship: definitions, drivers and challenges', in *Social entrepreneurship and social business*, CK Volkmann et al., eds., Springer Gabler Verlag, pp. 31-48.

Jeffs, L 2006, *Social entrepreneurs and social enterprises - do they have a future in New Zealand?'* Paper to be presented at the 51st ICSB World Conference, Melbourne, June.

Kant, I 2002. *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*, Yale University Press.

Kelsey, J 1993. *Rolling back the state: privatisation of power in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Bridget Williams Books, Wellington.

Kelsey, J 1995. *The New Zealand experiment*, Auckland University Press.

Kerlin, JA 2006, 'Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: understanding and learning from the differences', *Voluntas*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 246-262.

Kirzner, IM 1973. *Competition and entrepreneurship*, University of Chicago Press.

Krueger, AB & Lindahl, M 2000, *Education for growth: why and for whom?* National Bureau of Economic Research.

Laird, A & Wilson, J 2012, *Social enterprise schools. A potential profit-sharing model for the state-funded school system*, Policy Exchange, London.

Langley, J & ed. 2009. *Tomorrow's Schools 20 years on ...*, Cognition Institute, Auckland.

Lehner, OM & Kansikas, J 2013, 'Pre-paradigmatic status of social entrepreneurship research: a systematic literature review', *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* pp. 1-22.

Leigh, A 2008, 'Returns to education in Australia', *Economic Papers*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 233-249.

Lewis, L & Patrinos, HA 2012, *Impact evaluation of private sector participation in education*, CfBT Education Trust; World Bank, Berkshire, Washington D.C.

Lohr, SL (eds.) 2010. *Sampling: design and analysis*, Boston, MA, Brooks/Cole.

Machin, S, Marie, O, & Vujae, S 2010, *The crime reducing effect of education*, CEP Discussion Paper, 979, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, London.

Mair, J & Marti, I 2006, 'Social entrepreneurship research: a source of explanation, prediction, and delight', *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 36-44.

Mair, J & Marti, I 2004, *Social entrepreneurship: what are we talking about? A framework for future research*, IESE Business School.

Mair, J & Noboa, E 2006, 'Social entrepreneurship: how intentions to create a social venture are formed', in *Social entrepreneurship*, J Mair et al., eds., Palgrave Macmillan New York, Basingstoke and New York, pp. 121-135.

Mair, J & Marti, I 2009, 'Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: a case study from Bangladesh', *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 419-435.

Mair, J & Sharma, S 2012, 'Performance measurement and social entrepreneurship', in *Social entrepreneurship and social business*, CK Volkmann et al., eds., Springer Gabler Verlag, pp. 175-189.

Malone, R 2009, 'Who's the boss? Executive-legislature relations in New Zealand under MMP', *New Zealand Journal of Public and International Law*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-20.

Martin, RL & Osberg, S. 'Social entrepreneurship: the case for definition', *Stanford Social Innovation Review* vol. 5, no. 2, 2007, pp. 28-39.

Massetti, BL 2008, 'The social entrepreneurship matrix as a "tipping point" for economic change', *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1-8.

Miles, MB & Huberman, AM 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*, Sage.

Miller, MK 2013, *The case against matching*, George Washington University, Washington D.C.

Ministry of Education, New Zealand 2011, *Annual report 2011*, Wellington.

Ministry of Education 2013, New Zealand *National education profile*, Wellington.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs 2012, *Career futures for Pacific peoples. a report on future labour market opportunities and education pathways for Pacific peoples*, Wellington.

Miron, G, Urschel, JL, Aguilar, MAY & Dailey, B 2012, 'Profiles of for-profit and nonprofit education management organizations', *Thirteenth Annual Report, 2010-2011*, National Education Policy Center, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Moloney, P 2006, 'New Zealand's ideological tradition', in *New Zealand government and politics*, R Miller, ed., Oxford University Press, Auckland.

Mort, GS, Weerawardena, J & Carnegie, K 2003, 'Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation', *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 76-88.

Mt Hobson Middle School 2013, 'Aims and future', viewed 26 September 2013, http://www.mthobson.school.nz/dir/index.php.

Neck, H, Brush, C & Allen, E 2009, 'The landscape of social entrepreneurship', *Business Horizons*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 13-19.

New Zealand Council for Educational Research 2009, 'Competent children, competent learners at 16 report series', viewed 11 October 2013, http://www.nzcer.org.nz/research/competent-children-competent-learners.

New Zealand Government 2009, *Aspire Scholarships support choice in education.* Media release, Wellington.

New Zealand Government 2012, *Ministers announce framework for Partnership Schools/Kura Hourua.* Media release, Wellington.

New Zealand Government 2013, *Ministers announce first Partnership Schools/Kura Hourua.* Media release, Wellington.

New Zealand Ministry of Education 2008, *'Teaching and learning in middle schooling: a review of the literature'. A summary of the review document prepared for the Ministry of Education by: Stephen Dinham & Ken Rowe of the Australian Council for Educational Research*, New Zealand Ministry of Education, Wellington.

New Zealand Ministry of Education 2013, 'First partnership schools announced', viewed 26 September 2013, http://www.minedu.govt.nz/theMinistry/EducationInitiatives/PartnershipSchools/FirstPartnershipSchoolsAnnounced.aspx.

New Zealand Ministry of Education 2013, 'The Aspire Scholarship', viewed 8 July 2013, http://www.minedu.govt.nz/NZEducation/EducationPolicies/Schools/Initiatives/AspireScholarship.aspx.

NewSchools Venture Fund 2013, 'FAQ', viewed 27 September 2013, http://www.newschools.org/faq.

Nicholls, A 2006. *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable social change*, Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, A 2010, 'The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 611-633.

Nicholls, A & Cho, AH 2006, 'Social entrepreneurship: the structuration of a field', in *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable social change*, A Nicholls, ed., Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 99-118.

NSW Government 2013, 'Newpin social benefit bond', viewed 2 October 2013, http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/docs_menu/for_agencies_that_work_with_us/our_funding_programs/newpin_social_benefit_bond.html.

Nusche, D 2012, *OECD reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: New Zealand 2011*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Nussbaum, MC 2000. *Women and human development: the capabilities approach*, 3 edn, Cambridge University Press.

O'Connor, P, 11 April 2013. 'Public education is a treasure we must protect', *New Zealand Herald*.

OECD 2010, *PISA 2009 results: executive summary*, Paris.

Osborne, SP 2003, 'Managing and measuring social enterprises', *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 16, no. 4/5, pp. 333-334.

Overall, J, Tapsell, P & Woods, C 2010, 'Governance and indigenous social entrepreneurship: when context counts', *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 146-161.

Palmer, GWR & Palmer, M 2004. *Bridled power: New Zealand's constitution and government*, 4th edn, Oxford University Press, Auckland.

Partnership Schools Working Group 2012, 'Frequently asked questions', viewed 8 August 2012, http://partnershipschools.education.govt.nz/FAQs.

Pearce, JA & Doh, JP 2005, 'The high impact of collaborative social initiatives', *Sloan Management Review*, vol. 46, no. 2.

Peredo, AM & Chrisman, JJ 2006, 'Toward a theory of community-based enterprise', *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 309-328.

Perry, B 2013, *Household incomes in New Zealand: trends in indicators of inequality and hardship 1982 to 2012*, Ministry of Social Development, Wellington.

Pfeffer, J 1993, 'Barriers to the advance of organizational science: paradigm development as a dependent variable', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 599-620.

Phills, JA, Deiglmeier, K & Miller, DT 2008, 'Rediscovering social innovation', *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 34-43.

Pierre, A, von Friedrichs, Y, & Wincent, J 2011, *A review of social entrepreneurship research and outline of academic dialogues,* Paper presented to the 2011 Nordic Academy of Management Conference.

Polanyi, K 1968, 'The economy as instituted process', in *Economic anthropology*, E Le Clair & EH Schneider, eds., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) 2013, *Charter schools.* Paper presented to the PPTA Annual Conference, 1-3 October, Wellington.

Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) 2013, *Equipping schools to fight poverty: a community hub approach.* Paper presented to the PPTA Annual Conference, 1-3 October, Wellington, New Zealand.

Rothbard, MN 2008, 'Free market', in *The concise encyclopedia of economics*, Liberty Fund Inc.

Ruebottom, T 2011, 'Counting social change: outcome measures for social enterprise', *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 173-182.

Santos, FM 2012, 'A positive theory of social entrepreneurship', *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 111, no. 3, pp. 335-351.

Sarasvathy, SD & Kotha, S 2001, 'Dealing with knightian uncertainty in the new economy: the real networks case', in *Research on management and entrepreneurship*, vol. 1, J Butler, ed., IAP Inc., Greenwich, CT, pp. 31-62.

Sarasvathy, S & Dew, N 2011, 'Without judgment: an empirically-based entrepreneurial theory of the firm', *The Review of Austrian Economics*, pp. 1-20.

Schlotter, M, Schwerdt, G, & Woessmann, L 2009, *Econometric methods for causal evaluation of education policies and practices: a non-technical guide*, CESifo Working Paper, 2877, CESifo GmbH, Munich.

Schumpeter, JA 1942. *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy*, Harper and Brothers, New York.

Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship & World Economic Forum 2013, *Breaking the binary: policy guide to scaling social innovation*, Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship; World Economic Forum, Geneva.

Scriven, M 2005, *Can we infer causation from cross-sectional data?* National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C.

Scriven, M 2008, 'A summative evaluation of RCT methodology: & an alternative approach to causal research', *Journal of multidisciplinary evaluation*, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 11-24.

Seelos, C & Mair, J 2005, 'Social entrepreneurship: creating new business models to serve the poor', in *Business Horizons*, 48 edn, HI Kaplan & BJ Sadock, eds., pp. 241-246.

Sharir, M & Lerner, M 2006, 'Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs', *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 6-20.

Short, JC, Moss, TW & Lumpkin, G 2009, 'Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities', *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 161-194.

Sirico, RA 2007, 'Rethinking welfare, reviving charity: a Catholic alternative', in *Catholic social teaching and the market economy*, P Booth, ed., Institute of Economic Affairs, London.

Smith, G 2012, 'Interview: Kaupapa Maori: the dangers of domestication', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 10-20.

Smith, K, Petersen, JL & Fund, NV 2006, 'What is educational entrepreneurship', in *Educational entrepreneurship. Realities, challenges and possibilities*, FM Hess ed., Harvard Education Press, pp. 21-44.

Social Finance 2009, *Social impact bonds: rethinking finance for social outcomes*, London.

Social Ventures Australia 2013, 'Newpin social benefit bond', viewed 2 October 2013, http://socialventures.com.au/work/newpin-social-benefit-bond/.

Spear, R 2006, 'Social entrepreneurship: a different model?' *International Journal of Social Economics*, vol. 33, no. 5/6, pp. 399-410.

Spiess-Knaft, W & Achleitner, A-K 2013, 'Financing of social entrepreneurship', in *Social Entrepreneurship and social business*, CK Volkmann et al., eds., Springer Gabler Verlag, pp. 158-173.

Statistics New Zealand 2013, '2012 yearbook population tables', viewed 3 October 2013, http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/yearbook/people/population/yearbook-pop.aspx.

Stiglitz, JE, Sen, A, & Fitoussi, JP 2009, *Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress*.

Stuart, D 2011, 'Schools and social innovation', in A de Bruin & LM Stangl, eds., Proceedings of the Social Innovation & Entrepreneurship Conference Extending Theory Integrating Practice Auckland, New Zealand Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Research Centre (SIERC).

Tapsell, P & Woods, C 2008, 'A spiral of innovation framework for social entrepreneurship: social innovation at the generational divide in an indigenous context', *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 25-34.

Tapsell, P & Woods, C 2010, 'Social entrepreneurship and innovation: self-organization in an indigenous context', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 535-556.

Telford, M & May, S 2010, *PISA 2009. Our 21st century learners at age 15*, Ministry of Education, Wellington.

Thomas, S 2007, *Roll Play. How creating better access to schools in Christchurch could affect school rolls*, Maxim Institute, Auckland.

Thrupp, M 1999, 'Special Issue. A decade of reform in New Zealand education: where to now?' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1.

Treasury 2011, *Working towards higher living standards for New Zealanders*, WP 11/02, Wellington.

Treasury, NZ 2013, *Budget economic & fiscal update*, Wellington.

TU-TOA 2013, 'TU-TOA-Tai Wananga secondary education', viewed 26 September 2013, http://www.tutoa.co.nz/about-tu-toa.html.

United Kingdom Department for Education 2013, 'What is an academy?', viewed 20 September 2013, http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/academies/b00205692/whatisanacademy.

United Kingdom Department for Education 2013, *Academies annual report: academic year 2011 to 2012*, London.

United Maori Mission 2013, 'Education for Maori and Pacific Island boys', viewed 26 September 2013, http://umm.org.nz/.

Volkmann, CK, Tokarski, KO & Ernst, K 2012, 'Background, characteristics and context of social entrepreneurship', in *Social entrepreneurship and social business*, CK Volkmann et al., eds., Springer Gabler Verlag, pp. 3-30.

Weerawardena, J & Mort, GS 2006, 'Investigating social entrepreneurship: a multidimensional model', *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 21-35.

Whittall, L 2011, 'Explorers or planners: the decision making processes of social entrepreneurs in a developing country', in A de Bruin & LM Stangl, eds., Proceedings of the Social Innovation & Entrepreneurship Conference Extending Theory Integrating Practice Auckland, New Zealand Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Research Centre (SIERC).

Whittall, L 2012, *Towards a behavioural theory of social ventures',* Paper presented to the Developing Social Entrepreneurship Theory Symposium, RMIT University, Melbourne, 14 February.

Wolfe, BL & Haveman, RH 2002, 'Social and nonmarket benefits from education in an advanced economy', in Conference Series-Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; 1998, pp. 97-131.

Wylie, C 1999, 'Is the land of the flightless bird the home of the voucherless voucher?' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 99-109.

Yujuico, E 2008, 'Connecting the dots in social entrepreneurship through the capabilities approach', *Socio-Economic Review*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 493-513.

Zahra, SA, Gedajlovic, E, Neubaum, DO & Shulman, JM 2009, 'A typology of social entrepreneurs: motives, search processes and ethical challenges', *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 519-532.

Zahra, SA, Rawhouser, HN, Bhawe, N, Neubaum, DO & Hayton, JC 2008, 'Globalization of social entrepreneurship opportunities', *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 117-131.