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Abstract.

In the last decade or so, there has been a growing interest in an area that researchers are calling social entrepreneurship. This paper describes the structure and process of international development in Africa from the perspective of a social entrepreneur. It begins with a review of the latest concepts in social entrepreneurship, a movement spearheaded by individuals with a desire to make the world a better place and then compares how the development model of social entrepreneurship is different from the model used by large development agencies such as the World Bank and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

An entrepreneurial bottoms-up structure, however, is not sufficient in itself to address development issues. A new approach to problem solution must consider how people in developing African countries affect social change in order to allow the social entrepreneur to focus on achieving results in the most cost-efficient manner possible. The authors address the opportunities and challenges faced by social entrepreneurs as they attempt to affect large-scale social change within African countries. These challenges and opportunities are organized in four distinct categories, and are situated within the context of maternal and child health in Tanzania and Cameroon. They are: 1) the identification of unique healthcare problems from a local perspective in addition to an overall national perspective; 2) the development of operational systems and the aggregation of needed resources to address the unique local health issues; 3) the information, communication, and healthcare related technology to facilitate the solution of the problem; and 4) the political and cultural issues that militate against the efforts of the social entrepreneur to address the first three challenges.

The result of this study is a unique development model that allows the social entrepreneur to address each of the various opportunities and challenges while at the same time building capacity and sustainability within the African context. The model has at its core an international group of equals, called the client consultant system infrastructure (CCSI). The recurrent interaction among members of the CCSI leads to the emergence of a collective mindset among its members and between the CCSI and its environment, both African and Western, and becomes the key to bridging the barriers between the social entrepreneur and his/her African partners. The study describes the structure of the CCSI and the way that it is situated within the African and Western contexts. It also discusses the various processes at work within the model, including structural coupling, participatory action research, and penetration and interpenetration. The authors also use examples from their work in Tanzania and Cameroon to illustrate the operation of the model.

Introduction

This is a descriptive paper defining the structure and process of international development from the perspective of a social entrepreneur. It begins with a review of the latest concepts in social
entrepreneurship, a movement spearheaded by individuals with a desire to make the world a better place, and then defines the structure of international development from the viewpoint of large international development agencies such as the World Bank and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The development model of social entrepreneurship is different from the model used by large development agencies. We believe, however, that an entrepreneurial, bottom up structure is not sufficient in itself to address development issues. A new process of problem solution based on how people in developing countries affect social change will help social entrepreneurs focus on achieving results in the most cost efficient manner possible. We will present a new development model and discuss how social entrepreneurs can use the model as a process for international aid.

**Social Entrepreneurship.**

In the last decade or so, there has been a growing interest in an area that researchers are calling social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship combines a social mission with business-like discipline. (Dees, May, 2001) Entrepreneurship is generally characterized as the exploitation of an opportunity in order to create value. It also involves mobilizing resources to achieve entrepreneurial objectives. (Timmons, 2009) Social entrepreneurship is a variation of entrepreneurship with the social mission explicit and central to its reason for being. The impact on society rather than wealth creation becomes the primary value created. The entrepreneur builds wealth and value within a market structure and the market discipline controls how the entrepreneur functions to build wealth and value. Social entrepreneurs operate in different environments, and, more importantly, under different rules than business entrepreneurs. When operating in developing countries, issues of government intervention, cultural biases, colonial traditions, and processes used by the development community, all impact the methods by which social entrepreneurs successfully function. Skills are not immediately transferable from business markets to social services. An entrepreneur identifies a need for vaccinations in developing countries and mobilizes resources to maximize the number of children being vaccinated. A social entrepreneur develops a one-to-one relationship with patients at the village level, integrating their concepts of health and wellness with the benefits of vaccinations. In this process, the worldviews of both the social entrepreneur, and the patients in a remote village move towards each other so that both can exploit the opportunity to improve children's health.
International Aid Agencies and Social Entrepreneurship—a difference in viewpoint

The process by which international aid agencies and social entrepreneurs each pursue their goals and objectives is dramatically different. The large development agencies tend to justify the expenditure of large amounts of money by focusing not on the validity of results, but rather on the process devised to achieve those results. Thus, indicators of a job well done are defined by bureaucratic or ceremonial factors like the number of conferences, and studies or meetings that take place to discuss subjects such as global poverty, and the number of keynote publications prepared. Recently, with the introduction of private donors to the mix, the total amount of money committed has become a measure of success. As Maurice Bertrand puts it: “the way in which the mill operates becomes more important than the quality of the flour it produces.” (Hancock, 1989)

The system used by large-scale development agencies is a sub optimized feedback loop. A thermostat is used to regulate the temperature of the room but if the thermostat is set at too low a temperature, than everyone in the room is cold. Everyone in the room then puts on additional clothing in order to remain comfortable, while the thermostat cycles the air conditioning on and off, maintaining an uncomfortable temperature. The entrepreneur, on the other hand, using creativity, recognizes that the system is operating sub optimally and sets out to change the structure and process in order to obtain more optimal results.

Entrepreneurs are driven by results! In order to survive, entrepreneurs have to make the sale, make the product, and make the profit, by any means, legal and ethical. It is the results that matter, rather than the process. The process becomes secondary in the sense that the quality of the process makes the system more or less efficient, but the goal of the system is still results. When combining entrepreneurship with social responsibility it is the results that are examined first. Social entrepreneurship is about the reduction of poverty, the increase in the level of education, or the quality and access to health care. The process is selected to maximize the efficiency of the system designed to deliver the result.

Micro-enterprise development, for example, has as its goal, the alleviation of poverty at the local level. The individual is responsible for accomplishing the results using a process devised for him, by him with the help from outside. Aid agencies tout the process of micro-enterprise development as making small
loans available for development. In fact, poverty is alleviated by making clothing that is then sold for profit.

The systems that comprise international aid at the local level can be conceived as a complex adaptive system that is balanced on a knife edge and, when perturbed, will move in nonlinear directions. Large-scale change can be introduced in these systems by introducing and leveraging small irritants. Separate systems interconnect with each other, providing a mutual environment, in what Luhmann called interpenetration (Luhmann, 1995). The authors have used both these concepts to develop a model for international development that we believe will uniquely fit the needs of social entrepreneurs and their clients.

**Affecting Change in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities**

In order to bring change to complex organizational systems, the social entrepreneurship must first address several broad challenges and opportunities. We have organized these challenges and opportunities into four distinct but overlapping categories situated within the context of maternal and child health in Tanzania and Cameroon.

They are: 1) the identification of unique healthcare problems from a local perspective in addition to an overall national perspective; 2) the development of operational systems and the aggregation of needed resources to address the unique local health issues; 3) the information, communication, and healthcare related technology to facilitate the solution of the problem; and 4) the political and cultural issues that militate against the efforts of the social entrepreneur to address the first three challenges.

**The Health Issue**

The first challenge in any health care intervention is identifying the health issue to be addressed. Focusing attention on health issues ensures that the health needs of a target population are the central focus of the intervention rather than the needs of those driving the intervention. Health initiatives in developing countries are frequently about the needs of the donor organizations, technology manufacturers, or political entities. By focusing first on the health issue, the social mission becomes explicit and the goal of the intervention is framed so as to emphasize the positive impact on society.

The difficulty with respect to health care is that much of the data from developing countries is national, while the health issues addressed by the social entrepreneur tend to be local. In Cameroon, for example the national statistics reflect the under 5 infant mortality rate is 147/1000 live births and has grown in
the past 15 years. The goal for 2015 is 47/1000 live births. (WHO, 2006) The infant mortality rate in Batchem Ville, a village in the north of the country where we are working may be significantly less than the national average. The same may be true for vaccinations, malaria prevention programs, HIV AIDS incidence, etc. In order to narrowly target the health intervention we are surveying the population in order to develop a health profile as a precursor to a health intervention. In this way we can narrowly target and address the health needs of the population of Batchem Ville.

**Systems and Organizational Development**

The next major challenge is the development of operational systems and the aggregation of needed resources to address the unique local health issues. International aid agencies often attempt to deal with this problem by taking charge of the organizational process. They generally focus on the macro strategic level of the organizational system, first defining the mission and vision of the project and then developing an organizational structure to assure results, perhaps with input from health professionals in the developing country. By controlling the organization, these agencies control the results. The social entrepreneur, on the other hand, is responsible for helping to create new patterns of relationships which will address the needs of the target population and which have continued sustainably after the team’s departure. The approach is to focus on change at the micro level, because that is where relationships, interaction, small experiments, and simple rules shape emerging patterns. According to this view, the only way that real change is made is from the bottom up.

We have found that systems theory and some of the perspectives of complex adaptive systems (CAS) provide us with a good framework for understanding how patterns of relationship evolve and sustain themselves. Relationships, in a broad sense, are the glue that helps to form organizations systems. They develop among a set of mutually interdependent parts that function as a whole to achieve a common purpose and exist within a boundary that separates the system from its environment. Mutually interdependent parts form subsystems that depend on one another as parts of a larger system. In this sense, systems can be embedded within larger ones.

For projects involving international development, understanding these relationships, as well as the boundaries that exist around subsystems within the larger system, can spell the difference between failure and success. For example, the development of a telemedicine system in Tanzania involves subsystems that cross cultural boundaries within the country as well as subsystems that cross international boundaries. Thus we find that a mother in an African village generally relies on her
relationship with the village healer and other people in the village to address her healthcare needs. If we wish to encourage the interaction between a nurse in a western oriented hospital and a mother in the village, we must provide an opportunity for them to interact in a meaningful away across the boundaries of their respective cultural subsystems. Similarly, these boundaries can make it difficult for a western-oriented and educated consultant/entrepreneur to truly understand the differences between the way he accesses and processes information with those used by his counterparts in the developing world.

Complexity theory adds the perspective that organizations continuously evolve as they adapt to interactions with other systems and to the interaction of their subsystems. According to Dooley (Dooley, 1996) complex adaptive systems (CAS) behave/evolve according to three key principles: 1) order is emergent as opposed to hierarchical, 2) they system’s history is irreversible, and 3) the system’s future is often unpredictable. The basic building blocks of the CAS are agents. Agents are semi-autonomous units that seek to maximize some measure of goodness or fitness by evolving over time. From a complexity perspective, everyone can be an intentional change agent in an organization if they become more aware of options to help an organization adapt to its environment. Since everything in an organization is interconnected, organization change emerges from the evolution of individuals and small groups. The obvious implication for the social entrepreneur is to identify a team of people who will champion the project and whose organizational role will facilitate the relationship building necessary to sustain new patterns of interaction.

Another concept from systems theory that has relevance for our work is networking. Networks are often described as the basic units of organizational structure, wherein the total organization is viewed as a complex arrangement of interconnected networks of people carrying out their work both independently and interdependently. These networks use a small central coordinating group to link independent specialized organizations that are each very good at one thing. The idea behind networks is that an organization can concentrate on what it does best and rely on other organizations to provide assistance in areas where they have distinctive competences. For example, we are in the process of implementing a cooperative agreement between our University and a private university in Tanzania. This agreement will allow both of these universities to share resources across international boundaries using technology as the enabling infrastructure. California State University Dominguez Hills (CSUDH), has developed a unique online nursing program that can be made available to nursing students at Hubert Kairuki Memorial University (HKMU) and HKMU can provide unique research opportunities in areas such
as malaria, HIV AIDS, and maternal and child health for faculty at CSUDH. Thus, networking reduces unnecessary duplication of talent and resources and enables an organization to do more with less.

**The Supporting Technology**

Another challenge facing the social entrepreneur is the development of a technology infrastructure, i.e., the information, communication, and healthcare related technology, to facilitate the solution of the design problem by supporting communication and relationship building across time and distance. The technical system, notably, is not the primary fix in this model. While many developing African countries are understandably excited about the potential for using information and communication technology (ICT) to leapfrog them into the 21st century, in reality there are several obstacles in the way.

Working in Africa really is different from working in the U.S., and each of these two different worlds provides unique perspectives about development, health and wellness, healthcare capacity and the role of technology. Systems that work in the Western world do not necessarily work equally well in Africa and are not necessarily accepted by the client users of the system. In healthcare as in other areas, there is considerable evidence to suggest that the introduction of new technologies invariably creates turbulence within an organization, primarily because the new organizational structures associated with the innovation are not assimilated within the existing status quo. (Coombs, 1996)

Our work in India is a case in point. After significant conversations with health professionals, government officials, patients and experts worldwide, an integrated telemedicine program was suggested to government officials, these government officials decided that, rather than proceed based on the recommendations presented, they would proceed with the construction of a telemedicine room and purchased telecommunications hardware and software. The equipment was installed in the telemedicine room and never used. Without integrating system design, discussed above, misunderstanding and mistrust among all the stakeholders conspires to defeat the project.

While the ICT infrastructure in many developing countries is undergoing rapid modernization, and is no longer the major barrier it has been to the spread of email and full Internet service, problems with bandwidth and the urban-rural divide reduce its effectiveness as “the solution.” In our view, the technical system should be optimal for the cultural environment in which it operates and compatible with the local health care system. Most importantly, designing an optimal system does not mean using the most advanced technology available, but rather using technology that is appropriate for the local environment. Generally, the key is that the technology should suit the level of development in the
country, as well as the specific site at which it is installed. This approach assures that the people using the system will begin to learn the new skills and patterns of social organization that are necessary to support the project through its design evolution.

**Political and Cultural Issues**

The fourth and possibly the most critical challenge confronting the social entrepreneur relates to the political and cultural issues that militate against the efforts of the social entrepreneur to address the first three challenges. For International Aid Agencies, this is less of a problem because they typically set up a closed system that supports a western approach to problem solution. The social entrepreneur, on the other hand, believes that the solution to the problem requires an in depth understanding of the context or environment which sustains the current reality of the target population. Culture matters, to quote the title of a book by Harrison and Huntington. (Harrison, 1991) When interacting with people from different cultures, we need accurate perceptions, sound diagnosis, and appropriate adaptation if we are to manage diversity effectively. In other words, the social entrepreneur must learn how to “learn culture.”

When the study of culture was first applied to organizational settings, it was considered predominantly to be a property of a nation. This view, however, leads to the belief that the complexity experienced in “going international” is represented largely by the different passports carried by the team members. (Goodman, 1999) The current focus is a heightened awareness of the multiple cultures carried both by individuals and by organizations and deepening understanding of the impact of these multiple cultures within work settings. (Sackman, 2003) However, while this expanded view of the cultural context provides a better understanding of the complexity of working in different cultures, it does little to help understand how they work. The process of enactment, described by Karl Weick, suggests that although we see ourselves as living in a reality with objective structural characteristics, we actually play an active role in bringing our reality into existence. (Weick, 1995) Understanding culture as an ongoing, proactive process of reality constructions suggests that we must root our understanding of organization in the processes that produce systems of shared meaning. Rather than focusing on what the system looks like, we must focus on how the system works.

In our work in Africa, we used storytelling and scenario-building to identify some of the shared frames of reference surrounding healthcare in Africa. (Chrispin and Katzenstein, (2005/06) These scenarios provided a rich and dynamic picture of the patterns of social organization and shared behavior that is
likely to occur among potential users of a healthcare delivery system. For example, the strong, positive forces embodied in the kinship system support reliance on the family, village elder and village healers as the first line of defense when making health decisions. In addition, people in the village observe the impact that outside influences have on one of their members and collectively integrate this information into the collective wisdom of the village. These findings suggest that the social entrepreneur must become aware of the collective mindset held by the potential end users of the system and work to transform this mindset into a new shared reality that can be lived on a daily basis.

At the other end of the social hierarchy is the seat of power -- the government. African governments are frequently autocracies where power is held by a small group who control critical resources. In Cameroon, for example, these small groups are referred to as the “lions” and may engender real fear among those bureaucrats trying to make a living in the community at large. In projects of the type discussed here, the support and active participations of these bureaucrats and professionals is necessary to engender change and sustainability. There is an African proverb that states: The hand that receives is always under the hand that gives. Frequently, even though these bureaucrats really want to help, they can’t or won’t until the “lions” give permission. As a result, the social entrepreneur must spend significant amounts of time trying to win over the support of the lions in order to gain active cooperation from the bureaucrats. They also must develop strategies that will provide self-empowerment.

Within any culture or organization, there may be different and competing value systems that create a mosaic of organizational realities rather than a uniform culture. As noted above, besides familiarity with some of the cultural variable universal to most cultures, the social entrepreneur must be aware of how the mindsets of different parties associated with the project, particularly those of the end-users and those of the people in power, can impact the direction and the success of the project. Addressing this challenge entails creating a social context through which participants can enact a new organizational reality.

The Model

Conventional consulting models haven’t worked in Africa, primarily because they stress technical solutions to problems that have their roots in the cultural environment. The model that we have forged provides an alternative paradigm in which an international consulting team of both Western and local partners can collaborate to design and develop an effective system to address a critical national need. It
consists of structural components and process components that relate to each other to form a dynamic organization.

In this section we deconstruct the model in order to explain these structural and process components. It should be noted, however, that the challenges described above, notably those pertaining to systems and organizational development and cultural and political issues, are critical to understanding how the model works.

**The Client-Consultant System Infrastructure (CCSI)**

An important aspect of social entrepreneurship is creating mechanisms to make sure new ideas are carried forward, accepted and implemented. Whether or not innovation flourishes in the system depends on whether there is a structure that supports entrepreneurial activities, provides people with a degree of autonomy, and rewards learning and risk-taking.

The key component of the model’s structure is a mini organization that we call the client-consultant system infrastructure (CCSI). Comprised of agents from several of the constituencies that are involved in the development effort, the CCSI provides the organizational hub for directing the energies of the group and for doing much of the innovative work of the project. These individuals may be perceived of as “idea champions,” that is, people who see the need for and champion productive change within the proposed organizational system. They believe in the project idea and are able to visualize the system opportunities and benefits, confront obstacles, and gain the support needed to bring it to reality.

The concept behind the CCSI emerged from the Action Research process developed by Kurt Lewin in the 1940’s. Action Research has as its core the democratic work group that Susman and Evered called the client system infrastructure (Susman G.I., 1978). The researcher works closely with practitioners located within the client-system, who provide the subject system knowledge and insight necessary to understand the anomalies being studied. Participatory action research encourages the researcher to observe and draw conclusions from the democratic interaction of the agents within the client system infrastructure. In his research in Tanzania, Katzenstein looked at this process from a consulting perspective and realized that the traditional consultant, in the role of researcher and facilitator, was by definition outside the democratic system. Because the outside consultant often is viewed as the expert, inequities develop in the status between the client infrastructure and the consultant. Inequities in status are magnified by cultural differences in worldviews and erect barriers to communication and understanding between the consultant and his client system. Katzenstein suggested that the consultant
should become part of the client system to form a structure that he called the client consultant system infrastructure (CCSI). (Katzenstein, 2000) Rather than the consultant having a privileged outside position, the CCSI is an organizational structure of equals. It is a learning organization with a flat horizontal structure, empowered roles, shared information, collaborative strategy making, and perhaps most important, an adaptive culture.

It is through this ad hoc organization that innovative work is done. Its defining characteristics, what Maturana calls criteria of distinction, are as follows:

- An ad hoc, multinational, multicultural, social entity of equal partners
- Oriented toward the solution of practical problems
- Individual agents come and go as needed, not all agents work together all the time.
- Individual agents are structurally coupled to multiple environments with different cultures. (See Figure 1)

In essence, the CCSI is a small central coordinating group with links to several independent, specialized organizations that are goal directed.

![Figure 1: The Client Consultant System Infrastructure (CCSI)](image)
As these various people from diverse backgrounds and organizations begin to interact, they draw on each other’s excitement and expertise, and become aware of more options to help the organization develop a better fit with its environment. Alan Fowler states "Partnership is about gaining a deep organizational relationship, which is not a project. Look at a project as a vehicle to explore relationships, not as the basis of them. In doing this a longer-term perspective is to help both parties develop capability to analyze effectively and address unforeseen problems that will arise in the future, not just in the immediate context of a project— in other words, a case where partnership makes each organization, more agile and adaptive" (Fowler, 2006)

Establishing a democratic group of equal participants within the CCSI, however, is easier said than done. As discussed in the culture challenge earlier, each member of the CCSI is a carrier of multiple cultures reflecting the individual’s background and organizational affiliations. As such, they are likely to have competing views of how the project should proceed unless there is some intervention that helps them to transform their individual mindsets into a new shared reality. Thus, development of the CCSI requires that a social entrepreneur possess certain qualities of leadership, what Bennis calls leadership competencies, among which is the ability to engage others in shared meaning, and to facilitate communications effectively and empathetically across cultures (Bennis, 2009). This occurs through the process of structural coupling and reality enactment.

Structural Coupling and Reality Enactment
The success of the CCSI is enhanced by a process of structural coupling. Maturana and Varela define structural coupling as the recurrent interaction between two or more entities that produces structural changes in the interacting entities and leads to the structural congruence. (Maturana, 1992) This process is the means by which members of the CCSI achieve a common worldview. The key activity in this concept is the mutual recurrent interaction that results in the structural linking of the parties. Practically, it means sleeping in your host’s house, eating what he eats and developing empathy for the life he leads and the difficulties he faces. It means listening to his stories and telling him yours until you both create a common world. This recurrent interaction changes all participants, and links them to each other and to the CCSI.

Thus, through the process of structural coupling, the CCSI provides the social context through which participants can begin to enact a new organizational reality. As the various members of the CCSI interact with each other, the multiple cultures that each person brings to the CCSI evolve into a shared
culture that is neither Western nor non-Western. The recurrent interaction among the members of this
groups leads to the emergence of a collective mindset from which an appropriate organization system
can be developed and implemented.

Thus, a critical issue that the social entrepreneur must consider is whether the group of agents has the
requisite variety and diversity needed to co-evolve with the environment. Importantly, the major
stakeholders in the project, such as healthcare professionals, ICT professionals, consultants, and
villagers, must be included in the CCSI so that their voice contributes to the emergence of a new and
shared mindset. (See Figure 2)

![Figure 2: Structural Coupling and Reality Enactment](image)

**Networking and Penetration - Interpenetration**

The CCSI is not only the organizational hub for directing the energies of the agents involved in the
project, but it also the hub connecting members of the CCSI with their home organizations. The
organization structure now involves a complex arrangement of interconnected networks of people
carrying out their work both independently and interdependently. As such, the CCSI becomes the hub
of a complex network of interdependent parts that can be made available to assist in the solution of the
problem. In essence, this network links independent specialized organizations that are each very good
at what they do through a central coordinating group, i.e., the CCSI. The benefit of such a networked system is that it allows each organization to concentrate on what it does best and to rely on other organizations in the network to handle the areas in which they have distinctive competences. Thus, networking reduces unnecessary duplication of talent and resources and enables an organization to do more with less.

When individual agents now return to their home environment, they infect the environment with new thoughts. The answer is in the return. They change their environment because they have changed; their perceptions have been altered. For the social entrepreneur, this means identifying an agent who organizational role will facilitate the relationship building necessary to sustain new patterns of interaction.

Luhmann refers to this process as penetration. "We speak of penetration, if the system makes its own complexity available for constructing another system (Luhmann, 1995). It occurs when individual agents of the CCSI go back to their home organizations and infect the culture there with new thinking that has emerged from the CCSI. In effect, the CCSI as a system penetrates the African environment, and the Western environment of the social entrepreneur, forming a new system and context. The interaction of the CCSI as a system, within the context as a system, results in changes to both.

Figure 3: Penetration
Interpenetration is a mutual change, which sets up recurrent interaction and results in structural drift. (Maturana, Luhmann) "Accordingly, interpenetration exists when this occurs reciprocally, that is when both systems enable each other by introducing their own complexity into each other." (Luhmann, 1995)

It refers to the mutual interaction between the system and its environment where both system and the environment change. Through penetration and interpenetration, the various subsystems involved in the project continue to infect and re-infect each other such that there is an evolving change occurring throughout the entire system.

Figure 4: Interpenetration
Participative Action Research

The work of the CCSI and others is based on participative action research (AR), with several important additions. Put simply, action research is “learning by doing” - a group of people identify a problem, do something to resolve it, see how successful their efforts were, and if not satisfied, try again. (Susman, 1983) While this is the essence of the approach, there are other key attributes of action research that differentiate it from common problem-solving activities that we all engage in every day. A more succinct definition is,

"Action research...aims to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to further the goals of social science simultaneously. Thus, there is a dual commitment in action research to study a system and concurrently to collaborate with members of the system in changing it in what is together regarded as a desirable direction. Accomplishing this twin goal requires the active collaboration of researcher and client, and thus it stresses the importance of co-learning as a primary aspect of the research process. (Gilmore T, Fall 1986)"

The process of AR is cyclical and consists of five elements. Initially, a problem is identified and data is collected for a more detailed diagnosis. This is followed by a collective postulation of several possible solutions, from which a single plan of action emerges and is implemented. Data on the results of the intervention are collected and analyzed, and the findings are interpreted in light of how successful the action has been. At this point, the problem is re-assessed and the process begins another cycle. This process continues until the problem is resolved (Susman, 1983)

- Diagnosing – Identifying or defining a problem
- Action planning – Considering alternative courses of action
- Action taking – Selecting a course of action
- Evaluating – Studying the consequences of an action
- Learning – Identifying general findings

Action Research is more of a holistic approach to problem-solving, rather than a single method for collecting and analyzing data. Thus, it allows for several different research tools to be used as the project is conducted. These various methods, which are generally common to the qualitative research
paradigm, include: keeping a research journal, document collection and analysis, participant observation recordings, questionnaire surveys, structured and unstructured interviews, and case studies.

The members of the CCSI move back and forth through the elements in a somewhat messy process from which answers become apparent. In more complex social change processes, as described here, the learning that emerges from one solution often opens up new issues to explore. Thus, our model adds a linear component as well as a cyclical one, to the AR process.

The final component of the Model is the interlude. The interlude is an outgrowth of the consultant being inside the CCSI as a participant, instead of outside as an observer. While an insider, the consultant can interact with other insiders, e.g., the client system, and facilitate the change with the AR model. In the process, however, the consultant gives up the privileged position as a researcher that allows them to understand the relationships between the client system and its environment. The interlude, a time between periods of activity when members of the CCSI are not working as a unit, is a period of reflection in which the participant/consultant withdraws from the system and examines what has been accomplished in the role of researcher/observer. (Katzenstein, 2000) (See Figure 5)
**Conclusion**

Someone said, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Pouring large sums of money into African countries, with the hope that somehow the money will translate into development has proven to be a failed strategy. If the Africans are ever to build an enlightened and prosperous continent, they must develop processes that will allow development to occur.

Social entrepreneurship may be such a process. Entrepreneurship that develops economic and social benefits within the grassroots of African society may allow Africans to rebuild their society in bite-size pieces and avoid the problems that a sea of money dumped into a society frequently causes. Social entrepreneurship also may allow African societies to focus on their social issues in addition to their economic ones using techniques and systems that have long since demonstrated their efficacy in the economic arena. Entrepreneurship is after all, the engine of economic growth in developed countries and the concepts of entrepreneurship have proven effective in many developing countries. Social entrepreneurship may also be the means by which African countries can, in a non-colonial way, harness the power of large numbers of young, dedicated professionals in the developed world with interest in giving back to the greater world in which they live.

In order to be successful, however, social entrepreneurship in African countries must navigate four broad barriers to successful development. They must clearly develop consensus around the definition of the issue to be addressed, develop systems and processes that effectively address the issues, design and develop technological solutions that support the systems and processes, and integrate all this within an African political and cultural context.

The authors of this paper have provided a model to guide the social entrepreneur. It begins with a structural framework called the CCSI which consists of an international, intercultural, ad hoc organization of equals. The process that drives the CCSI is structural coupling, which binds the members of the organization to each other and to the context in which they function. The CCSI uses an iterative, modified action research process to address the first three barriers to successful development-a consensus around the definition of the issue to be addressed, effectively designed systems and processes, and appropriate technological solutions.
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