ES+ Methodology: Mapping Social Entrepreneurship

Rita Megre[1], Miguel Alves Martins[2], João Cotter Salvado[3]

[1] Research Associate, Social Entrepreneurship Institute, rita@ies.org.pt
[2] Founder and Director, Social Entrepreneurship Institute, miguel@ies.org.pt
[3] Research Associate, Social Entrepreneurship Institute, joao@ies.org.pt

Abstract. *The Social Entrepreneurship Institute (IES) in Portugal has developed an innovative methodology called ES+ for the identification and research of Social Entrepreneurship initiatives at the local and regional level. This methodology was created as part of an overall policy to identify and support Social Entrepreneurship initiatives in Portugal, considering Social Entrepreneurship as a solution to yet unresolved social and environmental issues. The goal of this methodology is not only to identify innovative solutions that can be replicated in other regions/countries but also to identify the needs of social entrepreneurs, allowing for an action plan and for the tailoring of IES services, to be able to better serve these social entrepreneurs, empowering them for greater social and environmental impact. In this paper, the ES+ Methodology is described and presented with application to two contrasting Portuguese regions – one mostly urban, near the Portuguese capital and the other mostly rural in the remote Portuguese inland region of Trás-os-Montes.*

Keywords: *Social Entrepreneurship, Research, Methodology, Mapping, Identification, Support*

INTRODUCTION

Social Entrepreneurship (SE) is a rising field of activity worldwide. Given the inclusive nature of the field it is sometimes difficult to define it in a rigorous way, and several definitions have been proposed. We will approach this definition issue later in the next part of the paper. There are several characteristics that constitute a social entrepreneurship initiative, yet the growth and maturation of the field requires a systematic and consistent approach to identify and assess SE initiatives.

The field so far has been focused on identification of the high-impact entrepreneurs through national competitions and international awards[1]. However we need to move the field away from its focus on a few high-impact social entrepreneurs and develop methodologies that allow us to systematically identify and assess the thousands of initiatives, often at a local level, that can become the high-impact SE successes of tomorrow. It is to address this need that the ES+ project was developed and piloted in Portugal in 2008 and 2009.

---

[1] Schwab Foundation, Ashoka and the Skoll Foundation are some of the leaders in this area.

The Social Entrepreneurship Institute (IES) in Portugal has developed an innovative methodology called ES+ for the identification and research of SE initiatives at regional level. This methodology was created as part of an overall policy to identify and support SE initiatives in Portugal, considering SE as a solution to yet unresolved social and environmental issues. The goal of this methodology is not only to identify innovative solutions that can be replicated in other regions/countries but also to identify the needs of social entrepreneurs, allowing for an action plan and for the tailoring of IES services, to be able to better serve these social entrepreneurs, empowering them for greater social and environmental impact.

IES has started with the pilot development in the municipality of Cascais (coastal region in Portugal outside of Lisbon, with over 180,000 inhabitants), in 2008-2009, with the aim to identify and map all initiatives that can fall under social entrepreneurship. The selection criteria have been defined based on the social mission and the potential impact of the initiatives, the innovation of their approach, and the potential for scalability and/or replicability. The ES+ implementation is organized in four different stages explained later in the paper: Phase I – Identification interviews with local/regional observers; Phase II – Initial filtering calls with identified initiatives; Phase III – Questionnaire with the selected initiatives' leaders; Phase IV – Recognition and Development Plans. The pilot project finished in 2009 with extremely positive results and IES replicated the methodology in 7 municipalities in Vila Real District (interior North) in 2010 and started to replicate in Oporto Municipality in the beginning of 2011.

Based on the pilot project and replicas, the ES+ research methodology is confirming the potential for replicability and the need for support of social entrepreneurs in Portugal. We believe that this model provides us with a mapping of social entrepreneurship initiatives in each region, with needs identified, and an opportunity for both the initiative and IES to work together towards further empowerment. It also provides us with a unique insight into cultural aspects of each region, and how these play into the start-up and development of initiatives.

We are convinced that this model can be replicated in other regions and countries and we aim to further replicate the model in Portuguese speaking countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

IES AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

IES

IES is a membership-based nonprofit organization located in Cascais, Portugal. It was created in partnership with the Cascais City Council and INSEAD, and is aimed at supporting individuals and organizations that seek to create social and environmental positive change. One of IES' main objectives is to build capacity for greater impact in the Portuguese society and it has two main areas of intervention (1. Research and Development and 2. Education and Training). IES aims to be the leader in the referred areas applied to Social Entrepreneurship in the Community of Portuguese Language Countries. Nowadays IES has 2 Institutional Partners (Cascais City Council and INSEAD), 4 Premium Members (Águas de Portugal, EDP Foundation, Redworks and Santander Totta), 6 Base Members (Abreu Advogados, Accenture, BMW Foundation, Ideiateca Consultores, Portuguese INSEAD Alumni Association Portugal and Once Upon a Brand), and more than 30 individual members.

Social Entrepreneurship

As referred previously, Social Entrepreneurship (SE) is a rising field of research and action all over the world. Specifically, applied research on this field has grown without precedents in the last years and this implies that it is an emergent and largely under theorized area of practice and research (Nicholls, 2006; Nicholls and Cho, 2006). Consequently, the concept of Social Entrepreneurship has been presented in different ways by different authors such as Dees (2001), Emerson and Economy (2001) Seelos and Mair (2005), Mair and Martì (2006), Nicholls (2006), Osberg and Martin (2007), Elkington and Hartigan (2008), Zahra *et al.* (2008), or London and Morfopoulos (2009) (just to cite some of them). It is not the objective of this paper to explore in detail the different approaches used by the referred authors.

Despite the lack of consensus on the definition of Social Entrepreneurship, for the purpose of this paper, Social Entrepreneurship initiatives have been defined as having: an innovative approach to solve societal problems, a clear social mission, sustainable, potential for replication and capacity to produce impact at large scale.

Innovation is a determining factor in understanding entrepreneurship (Vale *et al.*, 2008) and five types of innovation can be found: new or improved products; new methods of production; opening to new markets; use of new sources of raw materials; new organizational structures for an industry. This study will consider as innovative all the initiatives that are pioneering in the region under research, and that fall within one or more of the above types. Innovation is always associated to the creation of value for the client (Carlson and Wilmot, 2006). It is important to mention that innovation must be able to be applied outside of the local context; therefore the study also aims at identifying initiatives as replicable (geographical expansion) / scalable (number of people reached) (Dees *et al.*, 2004).

Having a strong social mission is the main element of social entrepreneurship (Dees, 2001), and what distinguishes from entrepreneurship as a whole. Social entrepreneurs work towards change (Bornstein, 2006) and the development of human skills that allow for autonomy and independence of a segment of the population for whom these conditions are not guaranteed. As referred in Salvado (2011, p. 84), there are a number of ways to define 'social mission' in this context and what seems logical to conclude from the different authors that tried to define it is that it refers to improving society and creating social value through catalyzing social change and meeting social needs (Tan *et al.*, 2005, Mair and Martí, 2006; Nicholls, 2006; Nicholls and Cho 2006).

Empowerment is another characteristic that this study believes essential to accomplish these goals as it is, as a concept, a deeper understanding of autonomy and individual responsibility (Fazenda, 2006, p.1) as an historical process towards individual liberation from structures, conjunctures and social and cultural practices that are oppressive and unfair, through a process of reflection about human life reality (Pinto, 2001, p.247). It is an approach to the problem that goes beyond a paternalistic attitude, excessive protection and unilateral decision making, as a liberating process that allows individuals and groups to be aware, face the need of change and assume a concrete and active role in it (Freire, 1970). Having a strong mission and innovative initiative must promote people, organizations and communities participation, in order to achieve major individual and communitarian control, more political efficacy, major life quality and social justice (Wallerstein, 1992).

In what empowerment is concerned, the selection criteria of the initiatives will be the potential for impact, instead of impact itself. This was measured taking into account the rigor and method of the initiative to face social problems, and how its performance metric is aligned with the problem the initiative is trying to solve.

Sustainability is a broad concept that includes both the continuation of the benefits that result from certain activities (understood as 'benefit sustainability') and the ability of the organization to continue to exist (understood as 'organizational sustainability') (Cannon, 2002). Many factors are seen to influence the sustainability of an organization, including the operating environment, national and local politics and policies, the activities of other organizations, the availability of skilled personnel, among others (Araújo et al., 2005; USAID, 2000; Salvado, 2011). In the ES+ Methodology this criterion is measured holistically taking into account a set of factors that influence the organizational sustainability. This criterion is used only in the last stages of the ES+ implementation and it does not count to select Initiatives in the end.

ES+ METHODOLOGY

ES+ is a strategic and innovative research methodology to identify and map social entrepreneurship initiatives with high potential of social and environmental transformation and to design regional strategies to develop locally social entrepreneurial practices and behaviors.

As referred previously in the discussion around the concept of Social Entrepreneurship, these initiatives solve neglected social and environmental problems with innovative approaches and new solutions that transform mentalities and social dynamics. They have high potential to be replicated and scaled-up and they are based in implementation, development and growth models which are financially sustainable.

The general goal of this methodology is to promote local and regional development within the logic of SE and ES+ is a pioneering methodology with this objective. The main objectives of ES+ are to identify and characterize socio-economic and environmental initiatives and the individuals that lead them in a specific region, and to understand which social and environmental initiatives exist in that region and of these how many would fall into a broad concept of Social Entrepreneurship. The methodology has been designed to help accomplish these objectives by:

1. Identifying, contextualizing and categorizing the solutions implemented and their methodologies according to specific social and environmental problems;
2. Identifying innovative processes, their origin, difficulties in the implementation and categorizing the types of innovation that exist;
3. Identifying models of monitoring of results and evaluation of impact;
4. Identifying strategies and financially sustainable actions, and their relationship with the community;
5. Identifying strategies and models for replication and/or scalability of the initiatives.

With the creation and communication of this valuable local knowledge, we admit to contribute to other general aims like the promotion of local and regional development within the logic of SE, the empowerment of efficient resolution of social and environmental problems and the development of a more dynamic and entrepreneurial social and environmental sectors. Actually, after identifying the initiatives according to the selection criteria we aim at understanding each initiative, in order to design and implement strategies to capacitate each one according to the real needs within the region.

In order to guarantee the quality and effectiveness of the research methodology, before the implementation of ES+, certain aspects were defined and guaranteed by a structured Research Team:

1. Build a Scientific Board with an interdisciplinary group of people with academic and professional experience in the social and environmental sector. The main aim of this Board is to support and monitor the research team during the implementation of ES+ and to select the SE initiatives in the end;
2. The target population is the set of all those initiatives that contribute for social and environmental transformation within the region in question. This includes initiatives from the private sector, non-profit and public sectors, individual, and other initiatives such as cooperatives and museums (Franco *et al*., 2006).
3. Initiatives selected are assessed based on 4 main criteria: innovation, potential for replication/scalability, social mission, and potential for social impact. The initiatives must be implemented and produce results in the region under analysis.

In terms of implementation the process was designed as follows:

Phase I - Identification Interviews:

The first step in the Project is the identification of Privileged Observers (POs), people that through professional or personal experience have contact with initiatives for social transformation in the region under analysis. The initial POs are identified by the different implementation partners in the region and, as they are geographically dispersed, it is ensured an optimal representativeness in the region where the Project is developed.
Personal interviews are carried out with POs in order to help identify initiatives in each region, according to the selection criteria and to help identify other POs in a sequential way, that results in different rounds of interviews and assures regional coverage.

Phase II - Filtering Calls (FC):

Once initiatives are identified by the POs, phone filtering interviews are carried out by the research team to those initiatives that might fit the selection criteria in order to have enough information to filter and select those initiatives that best fit the selection criteria.

Phase III - In-Depth Questionnaire:

Initiatives selected in Phase II are further studied through a detailed questionnaire filled by the representative of the initiative in the presence of a member of the research team. In this Phase, the research team aims to characterize the initiatives from different perspectives in order to obtain detailed information for another selection step and also to conceive and implement a strategy for support and development according to local realities and needs.

Phase IV - Recognition and Development Plans:

Initiatives are selected in Phase III by the Scientific Board (each member of this Board will give individually his/her vote for each criteria and each initiative and the ones that produce general consensus are selected) and then are considered Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives (ES+) and recognized as such publicly. In a participatory way, together with these ES+ initiatives one plan to empower them is designed, and together with the project's partners and other regional agents a plan to develop locally the social and environmental sectors is also designed.

After the Phase IV opportunities and priorities for local investment, research and training are established and developed in order to stimulate and motivate the general social and environmental ecosystem to become more entrepreneurial.

RESULTS IN CASCAIS AND VILA REAL

Introduction

This project was first implemented in Cascais Municipality (in the coastal area of Lisbon) with a partnership between IES, the Local Government and the Central Government institution for Employment and Professional Training. In this Municipality the results were very encouraging and there was a strong interest from the Civil Government of Vila Real in partnership with EDP Foundation and 7 Municipalities of this District to replicate this project in the Vila Real District.

The context of both implementations is very different: In the case of Cascais we are dealing with just one Municipality and in the other case we are dealing with 7 Municipalities. Furthermore, the municipality of Cascais is mainly urban territory with 97 km2 and a population of 183.573 inhabitants with high concentration of population per km2 (INE, 2001). It is organized into 6 parishes: Alcabideche, Carcavelos, Cascais, Estoril, Parede and São Domingos de Rana. The 7 municipalities of the Vila Real District (Alijó, Boticas, Mondim de Basto, Motalegre, Murça, Ribeira de Pena and Sabrosa) are mainly rural territory with 2162 km2 and a population of 60.641 with low concentration of population per km2 (INE, 2001).

Vila Real district is located in the northeast of Portugal and it is one of the poorest regions of the country and, in contrast, the Municipality of Cascais is located near Lisbon and it is one of the richest regions of Portugal (Alves, 2009). The context of Vila Real is characterized by lack of industrial economic activity (the primary sector still prevails), high unemployment rates, lack of general confidence and initiative of the population and a high rate of old population. On the other side, Cascais is characterized by high economic activity (mainly in tertiary sector) and unemployment rates in line with the national rates, generalized confidence and a majority of young population.

Results and Analysis

Phase I

As referred previously this is the first stage of the implementation of ES+. It is established a first set of POs that will refer social and environmental initiatives and other POs that can be useful to identify more initiatives and POs. This is an iterative process that enables the Research Team to initiate the exploration of the region in question and to begin the construction of local knowledge around Social Entrepreneurship.

Parish	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	TOTAL
Alcabideche	1	1	1	1	4
Carcavelos	0	1	3	0	4
Cascais	2	0	1	1	4

Parish	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	TOTAL
Estoril	4	4	0	0	8
Parede	0	1	1	1	3
São Domingos de Rana	0	1	3	2	6
Municipality	8	6	0	1	15
Other	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	16	14	9	6	45

Table 1: POs interviewed per Round and per Parish in Cascais

Municipality	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	TOTAL
Alijó	3	4	3	0	10
Boticas	1	2	0	0	3
Mondim de Basto	2	3	0	0	5
Montalegre	2	3	1	0	6
Murça	2	6	5	1	14
Ribeira de Pena	2	4	0	0	6
Sabrosa	1	4	1	0	6
District	7	4	2	0	13
Other	0	1	0	0	1
TOTAL	20	31	12	1	64

Table 2: POs interviewed per Round and per Municipality in Vila Real

As presented on Tables 1 and 2, on the Municipality of Cascais there was a total of 45 POs interviewed and on the 7 Municipalities of Vila Real there was a total of 64 interviews. The Table 1 and 2 segments these total numbers in terms of the different territorial divisions and Rounds (as explained previously this is an iterative process beginning with a set of initial POs that will nominate other POs in sequence). Although the population is higher in Cascais than in Vila Real, the geographical area of both regions is considerably different (the total area of Vila Real under study is around 22 times the area of the Municipality of Cascais) and this is the main reason to have a high number of POs identified and interviewed specifically on the Round 2. The average number of POs for Vila Real and Cascais (per Parish and per Municipality) were respectively and 4,8 and 7,1 which confirms what we have just referred. Furthermore, in Cascais we are concentrating our analysis in just one Municipality with 6 Parishes and, in the Municipalities under study and belonging to Vila Real District we are dealing with a total of 107 Parishes.

On Tables 3 e 4, we have the total numbers of initiatives identified in the different rounds of interviews with the POs. As noted, POs identified 163 initiatives in the Municipality of Cascais and 81 initiatives in the District of Vila Real. The next phase is the Filtering Call in which each initiative is analyzed through a set of questions that will enable us to find whether each of them are really social entrepreneurial. If we compare once again these numbers we find that, on average, each PO referred 3,6 and 1,3 initiatives in Cascais and Vila Real respectively which mainly has to do with the dynamism of the ecosystem in the social and environmental sectors and the effect that this fact has in the presence of entrepreneurial

practices locally. This can be observed later on when we analyze the next Phases of the Research.

Parish	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	TOTAL
Alcabideche	8	1	2	0	11
Carcavelos	5	1	9	0	15
Cascais	4	2	1	1	8
Estoril	31	4	5	0	40
Parede	1	2	3	1	7
São Domingos de Rana	2	3	7	0	12
Municipality	36	5	2	3	46
Other	15	6	3	0	24
TOTAL	**102**	**24**	**32**	**5**	**163**

Table 3: Initiatives identified by the POs per Round and per Parish in Cascais

Municipality	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	TOTAL
Alijó	12	10	0	0	22
Boticas	5	0	3	0	8
Mondim de Basto	5	2	0	0	7
Montalegre	12	0	0	0	12
Murça	7	1	0	0	8
Ribeira de Pena	7	3	0	0	10
Sabrosa	6	0	0	0	6
District	0	0	0	0	0
Other	6	2	0	0	8
TOTAL	**60**	**18**	**3**	**0**	**81**

Table 4: Initiatives identified by the POs per Round and per Municipality in Vila Real

Phase II

In this Phase, a set of organized questions is asked to the leader of each initiative identified previously in order to filter the initiatives referred by the POs according to the criteria associated with Social Entrepreneurship. Each small set of questions oriented for each criterion will enable us to select which initiatives can potentially be considered as social entrepreneurial.

In Cascais, from the 163 initiatives initially identified by the POs in Phase I, only 39 (approximately 24%) were selected in Phase II as potentially fitting the concept of Social Entrepreneurship as defined in the early stages of the paper. In Vila Real, from the 81 initiatives identified in Phase I, only 10 (approximately 12%) were selected in Phase II.

As the selection ratio was relatively low, it became essential to try to understand what characteristics were mostly missing in those initiatives in order to be innovative, replicable/scalable, mission-driven, have social impact and to, ultimately, become effective agents of social change.

In the next Table information about the presence of criteria is organized. Each number shows the percentage of initiatives identified that accomplishes each of the criteria.

- From the four criteria, only Scale/Replica Potential is higher in Vila Real than in Cascais. Probably the explanation for this fact has to do with the characteristics in terms of dynamism of both regions. As in Vila Real we found less social and environmental vivacity the only initiatives that are implemented in this context are *per se* replicas from another place in the country;
- In terms of innovation, we observe that this is the least present criterion in the initiatives under analysis in both contexts. It is only present in 40% of the initiatives in Cascais and in 30% of the initiatives in Vila Real and this can be explained probably due to the fact that this sector in Portugal is not intensely oriented towards innovative practices in general;
- In Vila Real, the presence of Social Mission initiatives is lower than in Cascais. Probably, this has to do with two main factors: First, the higher social and environmental dynamism in Cascais which enables the ecosystem to be more worried with these issues and create more initiatives to tackle them. Second, in Vila Real there is lower economic activity which motivates individual initiatives to fall more on economic core activity than on the social or environmental one;
- The Social Impact Potential is generally low in both cases. Although, when we observe the reality in Cascais and Vila Real (respectively 63,3% and 32,9% of the initiatives respect this criterion) we can refer that the first context motivates more the initiatives potential to generate impact. Once again the reason should be the same of the previous analysis.

	Cascais	Vila Real	Total
Social Mission	87,5%	55,7%	75,8%
Innovation	40,0%	30,0%	36,3%
Social Impact Potential	63,3%	32,9%	52,1%
Scale/Replica Potential	70,0%	84,3%	75,3%

Table 5: Main information from Phase II

Phase III and IV

In Phase III, In-Depth Questionnaires to the selected initiatives' leaders from Phase II were carried out. As referred, 39 and 10 questionnaires were carried out respectively in Cascais and Vila Real. The results of the Questionnaire and the valuable opinion of the Scientific Board gave us sufficiently information to organize initiatives into two groups: Group A, where we locate the Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives, and Group B, where we organize the ones that have some potential to become Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives. Further analysis was carried out in order to study the main characteristics in each group, their differences and common points, and to understand the needs to better cater for those in each group. The next Table shows the main characteristics found in relation to the initiatives selected in Cascais and Vila Real, and the data for each group. The information is organized in Table 5.

Main Characteristics	Cascais		Vila Real	
	Group B (34)	Group A (5)	Group B (5)	Group A (5)
Women are responsible for the initiative	56%	100%	43%	20%
Initiatives that act on a local level	77%	80%	86%	40%
Most represented sectors	Capacity Building, Adult Education, Access to Education, Disabilities	Access to Education, Disabilities, Capacity Building	Access to Education, Disabilities, Employment	Access to Education, Disabilities, Resource Mobilization
Most represented targets	Volunteers, Elderly, Disabled, Children	Children, Students, Communities	Youth, Disabled, Community	Communities, Disabled, Children
Offer a Service	75%	80%	100%	100%
Partnerships with the public sector	74%	80%	100%	100%
Partnerships in general are essential factor for project implementation and success	30%	40%	71%	80%
Measure impact	44%	33%	43%	40%
Compares expected results with those achieved	68%	80%	29%	60%
Do benchmarking	14%	0%	43%	20%
Own generation of financial resources	38%	80%	14%	40%
Willing to grow	79%	100%	71%	100%

Table 6: Main Characteristics identified in Phase III and IV

Some interesting observations can be taken from the previous Table:

• Every Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives in Cascais is led by a woman and the reverse happens in Vila Real, where only 1 of them is led by a woman. If we observe the initiatives that have some potential to become Social Entrepreneurship the ratio between women and men leadership is balanced;

• In Vila Real, most Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives act at a regional level instead of a more local level. In Cascais we observe exactly the reverse;

• Access to Education and Disabilities are the most represented sector in all the Initiatives analyzed in this phase for both contexts. As a consequence of this point, the most represented target population are Children and Disabled people;

• Most of the Initiatives analyzed here offer a Service. In Vila Real, all the Initiatives offer a Service instead of a Product;

• Partnerships with the public sector are highly persistent in the Initiatives under analysis and this fact reaches 100% for the context of Vila Real for all of them;

• Partnerships in general are seen as essential for most initiatives in Vila Real but the reverse is found in Cascais. We can also observe that the Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives perceive partnerships as more central than the other Initiatives for both contexts;

- Impact assessment habits obtain generally low levels for all initiatives. Interestingly, Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives measure less the impact than the other Initiatives;
- Comparison of expected results with those achieved is higher in Cascais than in Vila Real. It is also a practice that Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives use more than the other Initiatives;
- Initiatives in Vila Real apply more Benchmarking than the ones in Cascais. Unexpectedly, Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives do less Benchmarking than the others in both contexts of Vila Real and Cascais;
- Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives tend to generate more financial resources from the market. In Cascais and for both types of Initiatives, the own generation of resources is higher than in Vila Real;
- Generally, the majority of the Initiatives are willing to grow and the numbers are similar in both contexts. Every Social Entrepreneurship Initiative in Cascais and Vila Real want to grow.

The needs identified in this Phase III were organized and summarized in the next Table:

Main Needs	Cascais		Vila Real		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Access to Funds	12	8%	8	22%	20	11%
Achieve Sustainability	16	11%	4	11%	20	11%
Human Resources	15	10%	5	14%	20	11%
Impact Measurement Tools	19	13%	1	3%	20	11%
Infrastructure	12	8%	3	8%	15	8%
Marketing/Promotion	12	8%	3	8%	15	8%
Investment	8	5%	6	17%	14	8%
Visibility	10	7%	0	0%	10	5%
Business Skills	9	6%	0	0%	9	5%
Legal Support	7	5%	2	6%	9	5%
Coaching	7	5%	0	0%	7	4%
Management Tools	7	5%	0	0%	7	4%
Networking	5	3%	1	3%	6	3%
Advocating with Governmental Bodies	4	3%	1	3%	5	3%
Bridge with Academia	4	3%	1	3%	5	3%
Incubators	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Facilitators	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%
Recognition	0	0%	1	3%	1	1%
Credibility	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sharing Knowledge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 7: Main Needs identified in Phase III

In Cascais the top three needs are Impact Measurement Tools, Achieve Sustainability and Human Resources and in the case of Vila Real we found Access to Funds in the first place, then Investment and to finalize Human Resources.

CONCLUSIONS

After these two implementations of a novel methodology to identify and assess Social Entrepreneurship initiatives we believe we are well positioned to address our central goals. First, we were able to develop a concept of Social Entrepreneurship and observe the dynamics of the social interventions in two different regions in Portugal, while recognizing the evolving nature of the concept and the societal needs. This process has been carried out by interviewing local people and by finding various interesting initiatives and selecting those with the major potential to create social change in their very own realities. Furthermore, we were able to meet, know and connect with the entrepreneurs working on the field towards a common purpose of solving specific social and environmental problems and, with them, establish a local development strategy for strengthening social entrepreneurship in both regions. On the other hand, we had the possibility to learn by doing, with the active participation of all the individuals (POs and entrepreneurs) interviewed (around 350) during the different implementation phases.

This local or regional project aims to promote, capacitate and increase the number of social entrepreneurs effectively solving societal problems. In the field, we found very strong and dedicated people with an enormous will "*to do good, doing well*". In fact, the data collected in the different phases allowed us to quantitatively and qualitatively understand the general characteristics of these people and the main needs and gaps the must be fulfilled in order to achieve the IES vision "more social entrepreneurs, more impact, better society".

The main objective of broader IES strategy is to put social entrepreneurship in the national agenda by identifying innovative initiatives that provoke positive social change in the Portuguese reality and that advance the social sector towards a more entrepreneurial and transformational one. Therefore, the main objectives are to promote innovation, scalability, create more impact, and to ultimately lead to more sustainable initiatives, and more sustainable social change.

References

Alves, N. (2009). Novos Factos sobre a Pobreza em Portugal. *Boletim da Primavera 2009 do Banco de Portugal*, 125-154.

Araújo, E.; Melo, V. & Schommer, P. (2005) O Desafio da Sustentabilidade Financeira e suas Implicações o Papel Social das Organizações da Sociedade Civil. Paper presented at the Conferência Latino Americana Y Del Caribe – Internacional Society For Third Sector Research (ISTR), Lima, Peru.

Bornstein, D. (2006). How to Change the World. Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cannon, L. (2002). Defining Sustainability. In M. Edwards & A. Fowler (Eds), The Earthscan Reader on NGO Management (pp. 363-365). London: Earthscan.

Carlson, C., & Wilmot, W. (2006) Innovation: The Five Disciplines for Creating What Customers Want. New York: Crown Business.

Dees, G. (2001). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. Centre for the Study of Social Entrepreneurship Publications, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University.

Dees, G., Anderson, B., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2004). Scaling Social Impact: Strategies for Spreading Social Innovations." *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* 1(4), 24-32.

Dees, G., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2001). Enterprising Nonprofits: A Toolkit for Social Entrepreneurs. New York: Wiley.

Elkington, J. & Hartigan, P. (2008). The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets that Change the World. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Fazenda, I. (2006). *Empowerment e Participação, uma Estratégia de Mudança.* Centro Português de Investigação e História e Trabalho Social Publications.

Franco, R., Sokolowski, S.; Hairel, E. & Salamon, L. (2006). *The Portuguese Nonprofit Sector in Comparative Perspective, National Report.* The Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-profit Sector Project. Lisboa/Baltimore: Universidade Católica Portuguesa and John Hopkins University.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogia do Oprimido. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

INE (2001). *Censos 2001: XIV Recenseamento Geral da População - Resultados Definitivos.* Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Estatística.

London, M. & Morfopoulos, R. (2009). An Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship. In M. London and R. Morfopoulos (Eds), *Social Entrepreneurship: How to Start Successful Corporate Social Responsibility and Community-Based Initiatives for Advocacy and Change* (pp. 1-30). London: Routledge.

Mair, J. & Martí, I. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 36–44.

Nicholls, A. (2006). Introduction. In A. Nicholls (Eds), *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change* (pp. 1-35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, A. & Cho, A. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: The Structuration of a Field. In A. Nicholls (Eds), *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change* (pp. 99-118). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osberg, S. & Martin, R. (2007) Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 28-39.

Pinto, C. (1998). Empowerment, uma Prática de Serviço Social. In Barata, O. (eds), *Política Social* (pp. 247-264). Lisboa: Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas.

Salvado, J. (2011). Social Enterprise Models and Social Purpose Organizations Financial Sustainability: The Case of BRAC. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 79-98.

Seelos, C. & Mair, J. (2005) Social Entrepreneurship: Creating New Business Models to Serve the Poor. *Business Horizons,* 48, 247-252.

Tan, W., Williams, J., & Tan, T. (2005). Defining the 'Social' in 'Social Entrepreneurship': Altruism and Entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1, 353–365.

USAID (2000). Fundamentals of NGO Financial Sustainability. Bethesda: Abt Associates.

Vale, G., Wilkinson, J. & Amâncio, R. (2008) Empreendedorismo, Inovação e Redes: Uma Nova Abordagem. *RAE Electrônica*, 7. ISSN 1676-5648. doi: 10.1590/S1676-56482008000100008.

Zahra, S., Rawhouser, H., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D., & Hayton, J. (2008). Globalization of Social Entrepreneurship Opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2, 117–131.

Wallerstein, N. (1992). Powerlessness, Empowerment, and Health: Implications for Health Promotion Programs. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 6(3), 197-205.

Biographical Notes

Rita Megre is Research Associate at IES. She holds a degree from Social Business, UCAM – Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; INSEAD Social Entrepreneurship Initiative Certificate and a Masters of Media and Cultural Studies from the Portuguese Catholic University – Lisbon, Portugal. Rita has worked as social Project consultant at Beyond sustainable ideas (Portugal) and as Project and Communication Manager at NGO Praticável - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She has experience at volunteering (Rio de Janeiro slums).

Miguel Alves Martins is co-founder and Executive Director of IES. He holds a Masters in Social Economy (ISCTE), has the Professional Certificate in Non-profit Management from Kellogg School of Management; Management Acceleration Programme (MAP) from INSEAD; INSEAD Social Entrepreneurship Initiative Certificate and a Degree in Social Administration, ISSSL. Miguel was a consultant in several start-up projects in the Portugal Telecom group, among others and has experience in social projects, helping the launch of several organizations in Portugal and Mozambique.

João Cotter Salvado is Research Associate at IES. He holds an Undergraduate and Master Degree in Economics from Universidade Nova de Lisboa (UNL) and a Master Degree in NonGovernmental Organizations (NGO) Management and Development from London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). He was Research Assistant at Autoridade da Concorrência and Teaching Assistant at Faculdade de Economia of UNL. He was co-founder and Member of the Board of two international NGOs which work currently in Mozambique and São Tomé e Príncipe.

Aknowledgement