

Social Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Study

Suparna Roy¹ and Alok Dhuriya²

Assistant Professor, BMS, Suman Education Society's LN College, Borivali East, Mumbai, India¹

Student, BMS, Suman Education Society's LN College, Borivali East, Mumbai, India²

Abstract: *As a practise and area of academic study, social entrepreneurship offers a singular chance to investigate, criticise, and re-evaluate ideas and presumptions from many management and business research domains. In this article, a theory of social entrepreneurship is presented as a method for addressing significant social needs without focusing primarily on the immediate financial gains of the entrepreneurs. In comparison to other types of entrepreneurialships, social entrepreneurship is seen to place a substantially higher premium on advancing social value and development than on maximising financial gain. The authors offer the idea of embeddedness as a nexus between theoretical approaches for the study of social entrepreneurship in order to inspire further research.*

Keywords: Social, entrepreneurship, financial, development.

I. INTRODUCTION

The activity of social entrepreneurship, which combines the development of economic and social value, has a long history and a widespread presence. The numerous initiatives of Grameen Bank, established by Professor Muhammad Yunus in 1976 to end poverty and empower women in Bangladesh; the use of arts to develop community programmes in Pittsburgh by the Manchester Craftsmen's Guild, founded by Bill Strickland in 1968; and the global efforts of Ashoka, founded by Bill Drayton in 1980, are all contemporary manifestations of a phenomenon that has been around for a while.

Researchers have recently become interested in entrepreneurship as a mechanism to promote social advancement, although entrepreneurial phenomena targeted at economic growth have drawn a lot of scholarly attention. Social entrepreneurship research continues to be mostly phenomenon driven, much like entrepreneurship in its early days as a subject of scholarly study. The majority of current research is often based on case studies or anecdotal data, using a variety of study designs and methodologies as well as incorporating knowledge from other fields. The word "social entrepreneurship" has taken on a range of interpretations, much like entrepreneurship, which even today lacks a unifying framework.

The definition of social entrepreneurship is still lacking, and it is unclear where it intersects with other academic disciplines. While this could seem like a problem to some, we see it as a rare opportunity for scholars from several disciplines, including entrepreneurship, sociology, and organisational theory, to question and re-evaluate key ideas and presumptions. In order to direct future study, this essay tries to expose the essence of social entrepreneurship.

Our fundamental premise is that in order for social entrepreneurship to develop into an organised field of study, an effort must be made to define and clarify important terms. To this purpose, we highlight and expound on the key elements using real-world instances of social entrepreneurship.

We perceive this article's analysis of social entrepreneurship as an essential first step toward improving our theoretical comprehension of the phenomena and facilitating future study, despite the fact that it is far from being a full view of the topic. We agree with Weick (1995) in saying that an excellent theory explains, predicts, and is enjoyable. This article aims to encourage research that goes beyond descriptive studies in order to fulfil the potential of social entrepreneurship as a source of justification, prognosis, and enjoyment.

The structure of the article is as follows. The concepts "social" and "entrepreneurship," which are at the heart of the phenomena, are first defined. We give a working definition of social entrepreneurship and expound on its specific traits. In a next step, we show social entrepreneurship as a fascinating playground for diverse philosophies and literatures. We focus on how structuration theory, ideas on institutional entrepreneurs, social capital, and social movements may help us understand social entrepreneurship, building on sociology and organisational theory. We finish with a few research topics that might help determine the future of social entrepreneurship as a field of study.

II. ON THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Varying persons and scholars have different interpretations of what the term "social entrepreneurship" signifies. According to one set of scholars, social entrepreneurship refers to not-for-profit endeavours looking for new funding sources or management models to provide social impact. According to a second set of scholars, it is the socially responsible corporate practise of cross-sector cooperation. A third group sees social entrepreneurship as a way to solve societal issues and spark social change.

The conceptual variations between definitions should be noted. Definitions of social entrepreneurship often relate to a method or activity; those of social entrepreneurs, however, place more emphasis on the person who started the project; and those of social businesses, on the actual product of social entrepreneurship. However, many definitions there are, systematic attempts to map activities and definitions are uncommon. We still need a complete explanation of the phenomena and a clear idea of how social entrepreneurship should be examined, even while complementary definitions, each concentrating on a different component of the phenomenon, are not always a barrier in the search for theory.

In order to aid future research, this article seeks to clarify what social entrepreneurship is. We offer a working definition of the term based on current research on social entrepreneurship and established research in entrepreneurship. We define social entrepreneurship generally as a process that entails the creative use and synthesis of resources in order to explore chances to spur social change and/or meet social needs.

Entrepreneurial phenomena are difficult to fully describe using definitions. This article's definition seeks to represent some of our fundamental presumptions. First, we see social entrepreneurship as a method of integrating resources in novel ways to produce value. Second, the primary goal of these resource combinations is to identify and take advantage of chances to add value to society by inciting social change or addressing social needs. Thirdly, social entrepreneurship may refer to the formation of new organisations as well as the provision of services and goods when seen as a process. It's important to note that social entrepreneurship, as it is defined in this article, can take place in both new and old organisations, where it may be referred to as "social intrapreneurship." Similar to intrapreneurship in the commercial world, social intrapreneurship can refer to either the development of new businesses or the innovation of the entrepreneurial process. Social entrepreneurship differs from other less rigidly structured projects intended at social change, such as activist movements, in that it takes place within newly founded or established organisations.

In the subsequent paragraphs, we will methodically examine the two defining terms of the notion, namely, "social" and "entrepreneurship," in order to further develop the definition presented in this article. Using this strategy, we may study possible distinctions between social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurialism in the business sector as well as the essence of social entrepreneurship.

2.1. The Social Element in the Definition

Determining the parameters of what we mean by social presents maybe the biggest obstacle to understanding social entrepreneurship. At first glance, it may appear that social entrepreneurship is distinct from entrepreneurship in the commercial sector since the latter is linked to the profit motivation, while the former is an expression of compassion. We challenge such a binary way of thinking for two reasons. First off, despite the fact that social entrepreneurship is frequently driven by moral principles and ethical considerations, it can also be done for less altruistic reasons like personal fulfilment. Second, and more crucially, there is a social component to entrepreneurship in the corporate world. "Entrepreneurship is particularly productive from a social welfare perspective when, in the process of pursuing selfish ends, entrepreneurs also enhance social wealth by creating new markets, new industries, new technology, new institutional forms, new jobs, and net increases in real productivity," according to Venkataraman (1997: 133). Even if it may be "a primary motor" of entrepreneurship, the profit motive does not rule out other drivers. For instance, Shane, Locke, and Collins (2003) show the significance of motivation to the study of entrepreneurship.

What is social entrepreneurship's unique social domain then? The Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, the Aravind Eye Hospital in India, and Sekem in Egypt are three successful examples of social entrepreneurship from around the world that can be analysed. All three creatively combine resources—resources that frequently they themselves do not possess—to address social problems and subsequently change current social structures. The Grameen Bank, established in 1976 by Professor Muhammad Yunus, has impacted the lives of millions of people. Providing financial services to the disadvantaged, especially women, enables them to start successful enterprises and combat poverty (Yunus, 1999).

The Aravind Eye Hospital in India, founded in 1976 by Dr. Venkataswamy, has provided eyecare treatments including cataract surgery to treat blindness for the past 20 years for a very small fraction of the cost of similar procedures in the developed world. Last but not least, Sekem, which Dr. Ibrahim Abouleish founded in 1977 as a social enterprise, is now a multi-business. In addition to adding value on an economic, social, and cultural level, it has had a big influence on Egyptian society. It helped to reduce the use of pesticides in Egyptian cotton fields by 90% and has established institutions including schools, universities, adult education centres, and hospitals (Seelos & Mair, 2005a). In conclusion, these instances demonstrate how social entrepreneurship spurs societal change by attending to social needs. In all three instances, value creation has both social and economic facets. The development of economic value is considered as a necessary requirement to maintain financial viability, but the major emphasis is on social value.

It is crucial to remember that social entrepreneurship also occurs and has been researched in the developed world, even if the instances of it in poor nations that were used above were specifically picked to show how widespread the concept is. In fact, community development has been the subject of several studies in the US, Canada, and UK.

2.2. The Entrepreneurial Element in the Definition

It is now commonly accepted that the emphasis of entrepreneurship study should be the entrepreneurial process or behaviour, whereas early studies focused on the issue of how an entrepreneur's personality or background influences entrepreneurial behaviour. More and more academics are researching the social impact of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial processes outside of the commercial world. Finally, the idea of opportunities has been widely acknowledged as a distinguishing aspect of entrepreneurship, despite the fact that the area is still defined by a variety of paradigms.

The empirical and theoretical development of entrepreneurship has been somewhat repeated in research on social entrepreneurship. In order to stress the entrepreneurial element of social entrepreneurship and to distinguish it from other phenomena, researchers have concentrated on the personality of the social entrepreneur, the specific behaviour or process involved, or the social opportunity. The personality of the social entrepreneur has been the subject of a popular early line of inquiry. This approach's research has found that social entrepreneurs have extremely unique features (Drayton, 2002), unique leadership abilities (Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000), a passion for achieving their goals (Bornstein, 1998), and a solid ethical foundation (Drayton, 2002).

We are doubtful that this strategy would clarify important distinctions between social entrepreneurs and other players, notwithstanding the continued momentum of research aiming at uncovering distinctive entrepreneurial human features. The incorrect thing to ask is "who the entrepreneur is," as has been said several times (Gartner, 1988). We propose, building on a behavioural heritage in entrepreneurship, that a more effective way may be to look at the set of behaviours that underlie social entrepreneurship as a process. Researchers have distinguished between social efforts and social "entrepreneurial" initiatives by emphasising the entrepreneurial process, or "how" entrepreneurs behave (Dees, 1998). In order to separate social entrepreneurship from other entrepreneurial phenomena, a new wave of study has concentrated on the "social value producing" aspect of the possibilities entrepreneurially uncovered and utilised.

2.3. Distinctive Features of Social Entrepreneurship

The non-profit character of social entrepreneurial activity has been highlighted by a number of authors as a defining aspect of social entrepreneurship. We contend that social entrepreneurship can exist just as well in the for-profit sector. Our analysis of numerous for-profit and not-for-profit projects indicates that the choice of organisational structure is typically determined by the type of social needs being addressed, the quantity of resources required, the potential for raising capital, and the capacity to realise economic value. The examples that follow demonstrate this pattern.

The world's first non-profit pharmaceutical firm, Institute for One World Health (IOWH), was established by Dr. Victoria Hale in 2000, and it creates medications for underserved illnesses. It has questioned long-held beliefs in the sector that appeared incompatible with giving medications to people who needed them most in poor nations. The whole value chain of medication research and distribution has been revamped. Because of its non-profit status, IOWH was able to get the funding needed to launch the business and other essential resources like buildings and expert time. A not-for-profit operating model is definitely more appropriate given the particular business model Dr. Hale has selected for IOWH and the specific (basic social) needs the organisation aims to address.

On the other hand, the business model that Dr. Abouleish adopted for Sekem or that Muhammad Yunus developed for the Grameen Bank works nicely with a for-profit plan. Both the Grameen Bank and Sekem use the earnings from their primary businesses to start additional social projects. Grameen has done this with businesses like Grameen Telecom and Grameen Energy, while Sekem has done it with a number of ventures including a university and a hospital. In conclusion, the particular business model and the unique social problems being addressed typically determine whether social entrepreneurs pick a not-for-profit or a for-profit vehicle.

We contend that the primary distinction between social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship in the business sector is the proportional weight placed on social wealth creation vs economic wealth creation, rather than on profit versus not-for-profit. According to Venkataraman (1997), social wealth is a by-product of the economic value generated in commercial entrepreneurship; while, in social entrepreneurship, the production of social value is the fundamental objective. However, as the aforementioned examples excellently illustrate, this does not imply that social entrepreneurship ventures should not use a "earned income" model. In order for the Grameen Bank to continue with its mission—to use loans to improve the lives of the poorest of the poor—creating economic value is essential.

The same is true for Sekem (to continue creating a better Egypt), the Aravind Eye Hospital (to continue providing eye care and cataract surgery for the underprivileged), and IOWH (to continue discovering medications to combat neglected illnesses in underdeveloped nations). In social entrepreneurship, building social wealth is the main goal, while building economic value in the form of earned revenue is essential to ensuring the initiative's sustainability and financial independence.

The restricted ability to collect the value produced is another characteristic quality of social entrepreneurship. Basic social necessities like food, housing, and education are commonly addressed by social entrepreneurs, but they frequently struggle to realise economic value since their "clients" are frequently unwilling or unable to pay even a tiny portion of the cost of the goods and services offered.

There is little doubt that prior research on entrepreneurship has influenced and benefitted research on social entrepreneurship. The initial attempts to conceive social entrepreneurship were impacted by methods and frameworks derived from research on entrepreneurship in the business sector. The rise of social entrepreneurship, both as a practise and as a theoretical endeavour, offers the field of entrepreneurship a singular opportunity to challenge, question, and rethink significant concepts and assumptions in its pursuit of a unifying paradigm. In our opinion, it is time to move one step further.

III. PERSPECTIVES FOR STUDYING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Social entrepreneurship is diverse and has many forms, making it a fascinating playground for various viewpoints and literary works. Emerging fields of study frequently lack distinct theoretical limits and need the synthesis of ideas from other academic backgrounds. As stated by Busenitz et al. (2003), there is unquestionably a danger that social entrepreneurship "may never attain the consensus and legitimacy that academics desire and may be considered solely as an arena in which various disciplinary ideas may be explored." However, according to our opinion, the understanding of social entrepreneurship can only be improved by combining various theoretical frameworks and research methodologies. We assert that social entrepreneurship has several features and fluctuates depending on the socioeconomic and cultural milieu rather than offering an entire list of viewpoints. We use knowledge from sociology, political science, and organisation theory to further our theoretical understanding of social entrepreneurship by seeing it as a process that develops through constant interaction between social entrepreneurs and the environment in which they operate.

In a groundbreaking essay, Granovetter (1985) made the case that economic settings are entwined with social and structural linkages that alter the neoclassical predictions of atomistic economic behaviour. Like entrepreneurship in the commercial sector, we think that social entrepreneurship must be considered in the context of society and the local environment rather than being understood just in terms of economics. Therefore, we regard the idea of embeddedness as the connecting thread between the concepts and theoretical stances described in the parts that follow: structuration theory, institutional entrepreneurship, social capital, and social movements.

3.1. Structuration Theory

According to the idea of embeddedness, it is difficult to separate the actor (social entrepreneur) from the framework (community, society, etc.). The duality of agency and structure, as well as their integration, is one of the topics that has garnered the greatest attention in recent decades in sociological literature.

The Aravind Eye Hospital in India and Sekem in Egypt serve as illustrations of this duality of agency and structure, respectively. Dr. Venkataswamy and Dr. Abouleish were able to act because of the setting (structure), but their activities changed the socioeconomic situation (structure). Giddens' (1979, 1984) structuration theory is an effort to establish a process-oriented theory that sees structure as both a by-product of and a restraint upon human behaviour in response to this seeming duality and continual dynamic. By focusing on a key analytical unit—the interaction between the social entrepreneur and the context—Giddens' theory may aid in our understanding of how social entrepreneurship emerges. Understanding how those two interactions work is essential to comprehending social entrepreneurship.

3.2. Institutional Entrepreneurship

DiMaggio (1988) developed the idea of institutional entrepreneurship as an effort to understand how institutions originate or evolve. Actors who are interested in changing existing institutional systems or developing new ones are known as institutional entrepreneurs. They make use of resources to revamp or build new institutions. By transforming long-standing institutions or organisational fields, the founders of Grameen Bank or Sekem drove social transformation. These instances of social entrepreneurship help us see how this happened. Indeed, the capacity of social entrepreneurs to alter norms (such as the fact that money cannot be lent without collateral, much less to the impoverished) may end up being even more important than the initial issues that they set out to solve.

Additionally, it could be a fascinating lens through which to examine the development of social entrepreneurship, for instance by examining the tension between social entrepreneurs' values and their perceptions of reality, or, to use the terminology of institutional entrepreneurship, between their beliefs and their community's norms (i.e., institutions).

We also believe that the phenomena of social entrepreneurship have the potential to contribute to institutional entrepreneurship theory. The paradox of embedded agency is not explicitly addressed in either DiMaggio's (1988) or Fligstein's (1997) theories of institutional entrepreneurship (Holm, 1995). The institution itself may have conditioned highly ingrained players, who may not be open to altering the status quo. Embeddedness may simultaneously indicate an enabling and a restricting circumstance. Less embedded actors are more inclined to engage in social enterprises that question laws and norms since they are not "locked" into the current framework, despite the fact that highly embedded social entrepreneurs find it simpler to get access to resources and gain legitimacy. It is obvious that more study will be necessary to determine whether such a contradiction exists and how to overcome it.

3.3. Social Capital

Researchers define social capital as existing and prospective resources that are entrenched in interactions between people, groups, networks, and societies (Burt, 1997; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Sociologists and organisational theorists have defined three closely related aspects of social capital: relational capital, which is the type and quality of an actor's personal relationships, cognitive capital, which is the extent to which an individual shares a common code and systems of meaning within a community (Burt, 1992). The implications of the third dimension, or cognitive dimension, are thus congruent with our earlier discussion because it likewise discusses how normative and mimetic factors influence conduct. We will go into more detail about how the first two aspects may help with the study of social entrepreneurship in the paragraphs that follow.

The general pattern of connections between actors, or who one is able to reach, is referred to as the structural dimension (Burt, 1992). The significance of networks for social entrepreneurship has been stressed by a number of writers. The potential or options that the social entrepreneur has to access knowledge, assets, and assistance are defined by structural capital. Since one of the factors affecting whether and to what extent social entrepreneurs are able to solve and alleviate social problems and elevate them to the public sphere is the structural dimension of social capital, it is crucial to understand how it can be built, increased, and, most importantly, maintained.

The relational component of social capital is concerned with the nature of relationships, including mutual regard, friendliness, and trust. There is emerging evidence that when parties feel trusted, they are more motivated to cooperate,

which may lead to the development of further trust (Fukuyama, 1997). A excellent illustration is the credit distribution mechanism used by the Grameen Bank. The organisation of borrowers into small, homogeneous groups fosters participation, solidarity, and the sharing of responsibility for loans made to other group members. Understanding how trust develops not just between the group's many participants but also between them and the Grameen Bank is crucial. Social capital can have dangers and unfavourable outcomes, even though the literature mostly focuses on its positive effects.

Four significant negative effects have been discovered by prior research: exclusion of outsiders, excessive claims made about group members, limitations on personal liberties, and downward levelling of standards (Portes, 1998).

Think about how the Grameen Bank's loan delivery method fosters solidarity. Although it is widely accepted that solidarity is a good thing, there are times when it might backfire. The negative effects of over embedding have been addressed by several authors. For instance, Gargiulo and Bernassi (1999) asserted that excessive loyalty to ingroup members may lead to over embedding, which inhibits the inflow of fresh ideas and fosters parochialism and inertia.

3.4. Social Movements

Political opportunities and threats, resource mobilising structures, active appropriation of mobilisation sites, collective action frames, and identity formation, as well as established repertoires of contention and creative collective action by challengers and their member opponents, have all received the attention of social movement researchers (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2001)

The study of social entrepreneurship has made use of a number of revelations from the literature on social movements. Social transformation is a topic that social movements and social enterprises both addresses. The study of social entrepreneurship may learn a lot from academics studying social movements who are trying to understand why people want to affect social change. Similar to this, understanding the many strategies utilised by social movements, such as crowdsourcing, protest, and negotiation, among others (Andrews, 2001), may be helpful for social entrepreneurship study and application.

The social movements literature also advises against assessing efforts solely in terms of their success or failure. Success "implies the fulfilment of particular, broadly agreed goals, yet the aims of most social movements are challenged by participants and spectators," according to Andrews. Over the course of a movement, goals might also shift. (2001: 72). Applying these insights to evaluate the outcome or performance of social entrepreneurship, one might argue that it would be preferable to begin measuring the degrees of success or failure, always keeping in mind the intended and unintended consequences of the initiative, rather than focusing on the success or failure of a programme or initiative. This would enable us to examine whether and how learning occurs throughout the process, as well as how social entrepreneurs identify and deal with issues and mistakes. More importantly, it would enable us to examine whether they learn from their mistakes and adjust their behaviour as a result.

Clarifying the characteristics and function of the system that social entrepreneurs are a part of, as well as their place within it, would help us to better understand social entrepreneurship as an area of study and practise. In this part, we've emphasised the value of ongoing communication between social entrepreneurs and the environment they operate in. This will aid in our ability to comprehend, justify, and demonstrate the feasibility of social change.

IV. CONCLUSION

This article's goal was to pique scholarly interest in social entrepreneurship. We believe that social entrepreneurship is a particularly interesting and rewarding study topic, and we believe that this article will help to inspire and legitimise social entrepreneurship as a way to generate social and economic value as well as a research area.

The working definition of social entrepreneurship presented in this article is meant to make it easier to examine the social element and the entrepreneurial element of social entrepreneurship in greater depth. We argued that further conceptual and empirical research is required to paint a complete picture of social entrepreneurship.

The need to establish boundaries to define the field's scope and determine if it is truly an autonomous field of study, as well as the necessity of identifying the many levels of analysis, disciplines, and literatures, are only a few of the problems we have discussed in this article. In order to deepen our understanding of social entrepreneurship, we will

elaborate on the following subjects and issues: social entrepreneurship as a separate field of research, gauging social performance and effect, and defining the function of embeddedness.

The question of whether social entrepreneurship is a separate topic of study is likely one of the most contentious. Numerous studies on social entrepreneurship have incorporated ideas and vocabulary from the body of research on traditional entrepreneurship. Does this suggest that social entrepreneurship is a subcategory of entrepreneurship where the social context offers a fresh and novel environment to investigate and evaluate entrepreneurial phenomena? We have made an effort to pinpoint the particular area of social entrepreneurship in this essay. We made the case that social entrepreneurship differs from other types of entrepreneurships in that it prioritises social value creation over value capture through igniting social change and/or meeting social needs. We think that as a topic of study, social entrepreneurship merits a lot of attention. It offers a great chance to question and reevaluate fundamental ideas and presumptions, which has the ability to greatly advance and advance the area of entrepreneurship.

One of the biggest issues for social entrepreneurship practitioners and scholars is evaluating social performance and effect. The actual issue may not be measurement in and of itself, but rather how the measurements may be applied to "quantify" the effectiveness and impact of social entrepreneurship. Many believe that quantifying socio-economic, environmental, and societal repercussions is highly difficult, if not impossible. The majority of social value's components, Emerson said, "stand beyond measurement and quantification, which has been regarded as a virtual given for many of those operating in the social sector."

However, significant efforts must be made in this area in order to create valuable metrics that represent the goals sought while also capturing the effects of social entrepreneurship. It is obvious that additional study and managerial practise are required to make social impact a crucial component of performance evaluation.

We have highlighted time and time again that social entrepreneurship may take many different shapes, depending on the socioeconomic and cultural context. To put it another way, we highlighted the significance of the embeddedness notion to the study of social entrepreneurship. Examining the enabling and/or restricting impacts of embeddedness is a potential topic of research. Initiatives for social change may be hampered by a high level of embeddedness, especially if they require altering the rules of the game. . This raises an intriguing follow-up query: assuming that

How does embeddedness impact social entrepreneurship at each of these many stages, such as the intention formulation stage, the start-up stage, the growth stage, the consolidation stage, etc.? One may contend that embeddedness is crucial during the start-up, development, or scaling out stages since it positively impacts entrepreneurs' capacity to get essential resources and assure their availability. On the other side, it could have a negative impact while the entrepreneur is forming their intentions, or when they are deciding whether or not to take on the task.

It is significant to highlight that a range of research problems need more consideration considering the early stage of the area. Research on social entrepreneurship offers an engaging setting for the exploration of various viewpoints and bodies of literature. We finish with a set of queries that simply provide a quick overview of key problems. How far can practises and initiatives be scaled out beyond national and local boundaries if context and embeddedness are so crucial? Do some social entrepreneurship organisational strategies work better than others to meet particular needs? What are the differences between social entrepreneurship in developed and underdeveloped nations? Can we identify geographic regions with larger concentrations of social entrepreneurship, such as Brazil and Ecuador or India and Bangladesh? If so, why do you think these clusters started to form? Exist isomorphic forces both inside and across clusters? What institutional variables, and what theoretical frameworks, could shed light on the rise of social entrepreneurship? What is the relationship between social entrepreneurship and sustainable development, and how can social entrepreneurship support it?

Our objective is that the answers to these questions, as well as the new inquiries and responses they inspire, will strengthen social entrepreneurship's position as a rich source of justification, prognostication, and amusement.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3): 260–282.
- [2]. Andrews, K. T. (2001). Social movements and policy implementation: The Mississippi civil rights movements and the war on poverty, 1965 to 1971.

- [3]. American Sociological Review, 66(1): 71–95. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2003). Social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? (Working paper series no. 04-029). Harvard Business School.
- [4]. Bornstein, D. (1998). Changing the world on a shoestring. *Atlantic Monthly*, 281(1): 34–39.
- [5]. Boschee, J. (1995). Social entrepreneurship. *Across the Board*, 32(3): 20–25.
- [6]. Boschee, J. (1998). Merging mission and money: A board member's guide to social entrepreneurship. <http://www.socialent.org/pdfs/MergingMission.pdf>. Accessed on October 30, 2004.
- [7]. Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [8]. Burt, R. S. (1997). The contingent value of social capital. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(2): 339–365.
- [9]. Busenitz, L. W., West, G. P., III, Shepherd, D., Nelson, T.,
- [10]. Chandler, G. N., & Zacharakis, A. (2003). Entrepreneurship research in emergence: Past trends and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 29(3): 285–308.
- [11]. Dees, G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf. Accessed on October 30, 2004
- [12]. Dees, J. G., & Elias, J. (1998). The challenges of combining social and commercial enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(1): 165–178.
- [13]. DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3–22). Ballinger: Cambridge, MA.
- [14]. Drayton, W. (2002). The citizen sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business. *California Management Review*, 44(3): 120–132.
- [15]. Emerson, J. (2003). The blended value proposition: Integrating social and financial returns. *California Management Review*, 45(4): 35–51.
- [16]. Fligstein, N. (1997). Social skill and institutional theory. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4): 397–405.
- [17]. Fukuyama, F. (1997). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- [18]. Gargiulo, M., & Bernassi, M. (1999). The dark side of social capital. In R. Leenders, & S. M.
- [19]. Gabbay (Eds.), *Corporate social capital and liability* (pp. 298–322). Boston: Kluwer.
- [20]. Gartner, W. (1988). Who is the entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4): 11–32.
- [21]. Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [22]. Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [23]. Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3): 481–510.
- [24]. Granovetter, M. S. (1992). Problems of explanation in economic sociology. In N. Nohria, & R. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and organizations: Structure, form and action* (pp. 25–26). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [25]. Guclu, A., Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2002). The process of social entrepreneurship: Creating opportunities worthy of serious pursuit. Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship: Duke—The Fuqua School of Business.
- [26]. Holm, P. (1995). The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 398–422.
- [27]. McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [28]. Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 242–266.
- [29]. Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1): 1–24.
- [30]. Sagawa, S., & Segal, E. (2000). Common interest, common good: Creating value through business and social sector partnership. *California Management Review*, 42(2): 105–122.

- [31]. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005a). Entrepreneurs in service of the poor— Models for business contributions to sustainable development. *Business Horizons*, 48(3): 241–246.
- [32]. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005b). Sustainable development, sustainable profit. *European Business Forum*, 20: 49–53.
- [33]. Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human resource management review*, 13(2): 257–279.
- [34]. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 217–226.
- [35]. Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Less, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship: A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5): 328–338.
- [36]. Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. In J. Katz & R. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth* (Vol. 3, pp. 119–138). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [37]. Waddock, S. A. (1988). Building successful partnerships. *Sloan Management Review*, 29(4): 17–23.
- [38]. Waddock, S. A., & Post, J. E. (1995). Catalytic alliances for social problem solving. *Human Relations*, 48(8): 951–972.
- [39]. Weick, K. (1995). Definition of theory. In N. Nicholson (Ed.), *Blackwell dictionary of organizational behavior* (pp. 565–567). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [40]. Yunus, M. (1999). *Banker to the poor: Microlending and the battle against world poverty*. New York: Public Affairs