A Study on Typology of Social Entrepreneurship: Motivation, Mission and Challenges, Critics

Ms. Lavanya V[1] & Dr. S. Chitra[2]

[1]Assitant Professor and Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, College of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chennai, 603202, India. Email - lavanyav3@srmist.edu.in

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, College of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chennai, 603202, India. Email - chitras@srmist.edu.in

Abstract

The field of social entrepreneurship has sparked a lot of focus as a way to solve societal issues and strengthen communities and societies. Recent studies have begun to advance the development of this emerging new field by attempting to identify the development of social entrepreneurship and correlating that to the previous organizational activity of that kind as traditional entrepreneurship. This research provides an overall view of social entrepreneurs' motivations and missions, as well as the challenges and critiques they encounter in developing countries like India, wherein entrepreneurship is considered the most valuable asset to foster and stimulate. This study is conceptual in nature and analyses the aspects of social entrepreneurship in the realm of study, as well as proposing a range of research areas and research problems for further investigation.

Keywords – Entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneur, Typology, Motivation Mission, Critique & Challenges

Introduction

Entrepreneurship activity with a social objective is generally described as social entrepreneurship. It's an approach to emerging with novel solutions to social issues. Social entrepreneurs, in particular, embrace a social vision to modify society by building and sustaining social values. They are tireless in their pursuit of opportunities to serve this cause, adjusting and improving as they go. They capture people's attention and encourage them to think in both the corporate and nonprofit worlds about how to work in a variety of settings: local and global, new and old models, nonprofit, for-profit, and hybrid organizations. Social entrepreneurs frequently appear to be possessed by their ideals, devoting their life to reshaping society. They are not just visionaries, but also realists with the capacity to transform others.

Eleanor Shaw and Sara Carter, 2007 The Stanford University-based Social Entrepreneurship Initiative (SEI) has established a definition of social entrepreneurship that includes this variation. According to the SEI, social enterprises is categorized into three ways, Firstly For profit companies that are innovatively using their vital resources that identify and address societal problems, Secondly non profit organization that support people in starting their own small entities, for-profit entity or as non-profit entity that generate economic value to fund their own programmers or create employment and training opportunities for their client populations, based on this definition the researcher have categorized the social entrepreneurs into three types - for-profit, non-profit and hybrid models.

Social Entrepreneurship Scope and Importance

Socially concerned people all around the globe have developed and implemented creative business strategies to solve social issues previously ignored by Industry, Govt and by other Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs). Such businesspeople had a key role in improving bad social conditions, particularly in developing

and rising economies, where resource constraints and corruption among governments and even NGOs severely limit the attention devoted to pressing social issues (Prahalad, 2005; Zahra et al., in press). In affluent economies, social entrepreneurs became very prominent change-makers, as they have used inventive and cost-effective approaches to address pressing social problems (such as poverty, gender inequality, and so on) that have resisted traditional remedies (Cox and Healey, 1998). The urge to leverage the effectiveness of the competitive marketplace to improve social performance has been spurred by numerous countries' efforts to "marketize" the social service sector (Salamon, 1999). (Goerke,2003; Zahra et al.,2000). Several governments, notably the United States, have curtailed federal spending on social services such as education and community development, necessitating the use of entrepreneurship development to generate finances and solve social needs (Lasprogata and Cotton, 2003).

The global trend toward privatization and mercerization has had a significant impact on not-for-profit organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), pressing them to connect the dots in social welfare giving. While traditional financing for these activities has decreased (Wolverton, 2003), the costs of delivering these programmers have soared (Leadbetter, 1997). As a result, an increasing number of non-profit organizations are addressing a growing number of complex societal issues while relying on less funding. As a result, some non-profits have begun to employ entrepreneurial methods and business models. This includes establishing collaborative ties to fund and administer programmers that further their social missions (Foster and Bradach, 2005; Chell,2007; Pearce and Doh, 2005). These institutional shifts have also spawned a slew of new social enterprises (Dorado, 2006; Thompson and Doherty,2006).

Despite the increasing scholarly interest in social entrepreneurship (Hemingway, 2005), its scope remains unclear. The diversity of social entrepreneurship's representations, as well as the diversity of scholarly communities investigating the subject, has made this effort more difficult.

Furthermore, the term itself is made up of two vague words that have varied meanings for diverse persons (Mair and Marti, 2004). Disputes concerning the concept of social entrepreneurship still exist (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000; ZahraandDess, 2001), and adding the value-laden word "social" adds to the confusion. Researcher did not try to find a statement that encompassed all characteristics of these many meanings while presenting them. Rather, we offer a definition that incorporates several points of view and facilitates the development of social entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs, especially those who create and run social initiatives, typically seek several purposes, including a range of personal aspirations.

A typology of social entrepreneurs

Social entrepreneurs contribute significantly and in a variety of ways to their communities and societies, using business models to provide innovative solutions to complicated and persisting social issues. "Acts and procedures conducted to uncover, define, and exploit possibilities to generate social wealth or solving social issues by launching new businesses or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner" are how we describe social entrepreneurship.

The researcher is identifying three types of social entrepreneurs: Social Bricoleur, Social Constructionist, and Social Engineer, based on the work of Hayak, Kirzner, and Schumpeter. The majority of Social Bricoleurs' efforts are focused on identifying and addressing small-scale local social needs. In order to propose changes and innovations to the wider social system, Social Constructionists generally bring the broader social system with new ideas and market imperfections by filling gaps for neglected regular customers.

Finally, Social Engineers identify underlying problems in current social institutions and propose radical transformation to fix them. As a result, these entrepreneurs frequently demolish outdated systems in favor of more modern and appropriate alternatives. Given these

distinctions, we propose that these three categories of social entrepreneurs vary in how actively find social opportunities (i.e., searching procedures), assess their influence on the wider social system, and gather the resources required to develop these possibilities. Since three categories of social entrepreneurs were chosen for the study, the researcher is emphasizing the three typologies of entrepreneurs and studies their motivation, mission, challenges, and critics faced by them.

Literature review

Despite the fact that the discipline does indeed have a lot of potential to assist nations address on their most pressing problems in novel ways, it confronts a lot of obstacles in doing so. Societal entrepreneurship is practised in a wide range of cultures and geographical areas, and it addresses a diverse range of social issues as a result (Sud et al., 2009). As a result, both on the theory and practice aspects, it is complex to describe a framework of implementation or principles. In one nation, health and poverty issues must be addressed, while in another, gender problems must be addressed. This big difference among social issues poses a significant barrier for academicians and practitioners seeking to progress the discipline both theoretically and practically. It is quite difficult to track of all social entrepreneurs or individuals true missions and outcomes from their actions. Muhammad Yunus, the world's most well-known social entrepreneur and Nobel Laureate, publically chastised many microfinance groups for "promoting and prioritising economic value (income) well over purpose of social creating value" (Dacin et al., 2011). So the challenge in this is staying committed towards the original mission, which itself is entirely societal in character. Social entrepreneurs strive to add value to the communities in which they work. Unlike financial value, social dimension and value is difficult to quantify and, as a result, difficult to transmit to the stakeholders involved, including Government and lawmakers, funding agencies, or the public in general.

Social bricolage

Levi-Strauss (1967) came up with the term "bricolage" to characterize a certain kind of interaction between people and the environment (Duymedjian and Ruling 2010). Bricolage is described as "trying to make" with "whatever is available" (Baker and Nelson 2005; Levi-Strauss 1967). Since Levi-initial Strauss's definition in 1967, the concept of bricolage has evolved and grown in prominence, particularly in a previous couple of decades.

Social constructionist

Entrepreneurs' activities can be viewed as dynamic processes, as a wide sequence of activities wherein people generate or develop anything new together, from a social constructionist approach (Pettigrew, 1997; Aldrich, 2000). As (inter)actors expand overall knowledge and understanding of themselves and their entrepreneurial environment, these dynamics continue to rise, develop, and change the environment with the help of the community. To understand how the entrepreneurship field develops, we must first study mechanisms and then track them over time.

Social engineer

Social Engineers are the third kind of social entrepreneur in this typology. As stated by Zahra, social engineers work to create more efficient social structures to upgrade current ones (Zahra et al., 2009). Generally, social engineers are committed to assignments having a regional or international range. To eliminate this obstacle, such companies could be characterized as 'Disruptive enterprises' to remove the barrier. These social enterprises aim to "question traditional thinking" and "recreate the game rules," as Yunus, Moingeon, and Lehman-Ortega (2010) describe it.

Research methodology

Researcher has two goals to achieve with this article. We begin by working on **two objectives.** First, we work to advance a typology that identifies the motivation, and mission of social entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs seek opportunities with a view of their missions, acquire resources, and address social ills. Secondly, we use the proposed typology of

social entrepreneur challenges and critics. However, finding a balance between social aims and the urge to make money and retain wealth creation is no easy task.. The main goal of this article is to investigate the mission, motivation, and challenges,

· A critic in the area of social entrepreneurship in India confronts to draw policy conclusions.

· **The following two objectives have been set in light of this goal:**
Ø To study the typology of social entrepreneurs that identify their motivation and mission.
Ø To research a typology of social entrepreneurs that exposes their challenges and critics

We can present a recommendation to the Indian government to improve its assistance in the field of social entrepreneurship as an outcome of this research. This study was approached from an interpretative standpoint by the researcher. It is an exploratory study, and data triangulation has been used. Data was gathered through the use of a questionnaire and an interview method. The information on entrepreneurs is gathered from the District Industries Center. The convenience, snowball, and purposive sampling techniques are chosen for this study. Purposive sampling, according to Saunders et al. (2009), allows researchers to utilize their judgment in determining cases that will best enable them to meet the research objectives. This sampling technique is not statistically representative of the entire population; yet, it is appropriate for this study, notably the researcher sought to select particularly instructive cases. For this, a total of 73 respondents are collected for the study. Both organized and unorganized sectors are included in the research. The questionnaire and interviews were divided into three portions based on three key issues. Section A examines the respondent's understanding of social entrepreneurship as an area of study and its scope, Section B will examine at the mission and motivations of social entrepreneurship, while section C will explore at the challenges and critics that social entrepreneurship encounters in India. This study will primarily present and discuss the findings relating to the mission and motives of social entrepreneurs in the Chennai region, India, as well as the obstacles and criticism they encounter. The data-gathering methodologies are summarized in

Technique	Source of entrepreneurs	Time	Comments
Questionnaire	District Industries centre, Chennai	July 2021 – January 2022	The questionnaire was circulated to 51 respondents digitally and in person. The aim of this study was to obtain a view on the social entrepreneurship in general, its mission, motivation and challenges, critics, the role of the government in supporting the field

Interview	District Industries centre, Chennai	July 2021 – January 2022	22 respondents were interviewed in person and digitally to study views of social entrepreneurship in general, mission, motivation and challenges, and critics. Social desirability bias is faced by the researcher while adopting the interview technique.

Source – "The author"

Mission and Motivation

Social entrepreneurship is a prominent concept that has prompted a lot of debate and discussion (Austin et al 2006). Several scholars have started to define this phenomenon's separate domain, analyze its ability to solve societal issues and consider its consequences on economic development Austin et al, (2006); Bornstein, (2004); Davis, (2002); MacMillan, (2005). Social entrepreneurship, which employs traditional commercial and market-oriented methods, provides new answers to complicated and persistent social concerns (Spear (2006); Dorado, (2006); Mair, (2003); Pearce and Doh, (2005). But on one hand, perceive social entrepreneurs as a nebulous and misunderstood notion Martin & Osberg, 2000 whose use creates ethical issues (Fowler, 2000). These difficulties reflect the ideals that social entrepreneurs cherish, as well as the ongoing search for solutions.

Because there has been very little research on the underlying motives for social entrepreneurship, and even though they are a subcategory in entrepreneurs who differ throughout their mission and how they begin their business, all of this had been important to check the literature on commercial or traditional entrepreneurial motivations (Dacin, Dacin,&Matear,2010). Motivation, that can be utilized to describe overall commitment and resilience taken to accomplish a task (Latham & Pinder, 2005), is vital in the development of organisations because that impacts decision taken, particularly ones referring to the creation of the new firm (Segal, Borgia & Schoenfeld, 2005). Motivation has three complimentary effects on entrepreneurial behaviour: it drives the individual's personal choice, it influences the individual's decision-making process, It has an impact on the volume of activity based on the relevance or worth of the activity towards the entrepreneur and it has an impact on the persistence of approach focusing on the clarity of the direction to accomplish the stated value (Locke,2000). Motivation has been explored using a range of theories in both the generic and entrepreneurial fields.

Social entrepreneurs are unique, in that way they are economic agents who, as a consequence of their motivation, produce value without concern for profit. According to Zahra et al. (2009), helping others is frequently a motive for social entrepreneurs' behavior and an effect on their operations. Hwee and Shamuganathan (2010), on the other hand, argue that profound personal beliefs enable social entrepreneurs to not only sympathize with the poor but also to go beyond and develop unique solutions that benefit these people by using their commercial talents and personal networks. The fundamental driver for social entrepreneurship, according to Austin et al. (2006), is the social concerns being addressed. Social entrepreneurs are driven by a variety of factors, including prevailing societal problems and challenges, passion, prior life experiences, and their social networks. And they always include the mission to solve the social and community-based problems through innovative ideas and strategies especially implying in the local network.

Critics and Challenges

Critics of social entrepreneurship point out how it can promote business and consumer hypocrisy. Some critics argue that social entrepreneurs are simply employing strategic communications or social welfare techniques to indulge in greenwashing, whether environmental or social, thereby manipulating and leveraging the power of people's willingness to help others.It has been argued that social entrepreneurs might sometimes cause more harm than good (for example- the criticism has even been leveled at TOMS). Social business can destabilize local marketplace and if organizations don't completely know the socio - economic and cultural aspects of the developing nations wherein they operate, they would be more dependency on external handouts. Continual funding, access to skilled specific services The key gathered challenges for a social enterprise are technology support, marketing aspects, sustainability, and networking components. Unfortunately, due to the absence aforesaid factors in India, the rise of social entrepreneurship is modest. Although, in recent years, things have improved in the entrepreneurship field in general, as well as in the social sector. Second, "psychological barriers" exist as a consequence of the shortage of knowledge on the subject in education or at higher education institution.

Lack of financial assistance

- The most challenging barrier for social businesses to conquer is financing. Based on academic literature, the most of social companies struggle to identify startup funding. Because the majority of social entrepreneurs are micro-businesses, raising adequate resources can be troublesome initially. Some firms rely over time, but due to a lack of finance or recurrent streams of income, the vast majority of enterprises struggle to stay afloat and viable.

Lack of an effective business strategy

- An lacking with appropriate business strategy, often results in failure products, is yet another significant difficulty which most social entrepreneurs face. The expansion of the social firm's actual service or product is limited to a certain degree since the emphasis is primarily on social needs. Because several organisations competing with for-profit businesses, developing a suitable business strategy to compete in the market is tough. Moreover, many social entrepreneurs begin their journey with no prior business expertise, just out of goodwill. As an outcome, the vast proportion of them would be unable to plan, execute strategic planning, and foresee financial information, among many other things.

Capability to expand

- Social companies arise as a consequence of social disparity or market imperfections when traditional mechanisms seem unable to address the requirements. The bulk of social firms have trouble scaling up. It usually starts with a strong desire to solve a problem or a social plan. The social firm's potential to grow, however, is impeded by a lack of support and policy. Partially as a result of the widespread discontent and mistrust towards socially oriented activities, which are routinely neglected. It affects the long-term viability of social companies.

Discussion

This study report aimed to learn more about social entrepreneurship's mission, motivation, challenges, and critics. The mission of social entrepreneurs, according to the research, is to assist the society with their innovative ideas by tackling societal and community problems that are prevalent in the economy. And social entrepreneurs are driven primarily by the sense to change the world. Address unmet social needs, social entrepreneurs' personal experiences lead to social initiatives in general. The study indicated that the majority of the motives for starting a social venture are drivers of change. These variables are more widespread in attracting people to start a new enterprise, which is important because entrepreneurs driven by motivations are more successful. The major factor of motives is Innovation, creative

thinking, autonomy, recognition, mentors, economics, sense of accomplishment, desire, opportunity, and prosocial. And the mission is to solve the social problem prevailing in the economy either through their service or product or by reinvesting their profit for community development or a combination of both.

For the critics faced by the social entrepreneurs like hypocrisy, the government should enshrine the notion of social entrepreneurship in law and develop policies to support it, as they are the ones who after the government and non-governmental organizations, are responsible for resolving social issues on a local and national level. Once it is implemented only the real social value creator will be benefited and it can reduce hypocrisy among the public the difficulties have come from three directions. Financial assistance, an effective company strategy, and the ability to expand are indeed lacking. While the research indicated for government policy actions to boost India's social entrepreneurship sector. It is recommended that policies be developed to raise public awareness about the concept. This awareness can be raised with the help of educational institutions by studying and developing modules for social entrepreneurs. Through education, we can produce more social entrepreneurs in the future, and the young generation will be influenced by social and ethical values in the careers they pursue. Second, by providing financial help such as concession incentives, subsidies, and tax benefits for social entrepreneurs by providing an additional percentage than the prevailing percentage.

While many entrepreneurs are concerned about the possibility of reduced or discontinued funding, particularly during difficult economic times, maintaining a social goal and running a sustainable business can be a distinct and jointly rewarding activity. As a result, It's worth noting that the fighting skill and determination to keep conquering these difficulties, which are frequently expanding, are communicated through how they were overcome in the hunt for alternative and new solutions. Over time, motivation appears to rise in parallel with the challenges experienced, and they tend to have an inverse result, this is how the tie happens for

social entrepreneurs with motivation and challenges. Factors discussed in motivational, mission, challenges, and critics apply to the three typologies of social entrepreneurs in the study Social Bricoleurs, Social Constructionists and Social Engineers

There are certain limitations to the study. The social desirability bias, however, is still present in the study and cannot be ignored. Furthermore, while the researcher attempted to include a representative sample of both organized and unorganized social enterprises for this study, the respondents' perspectives and assertions cannot be applied to all other social companies, From the theoretical viewpoint, the subject of social entrepreneurship in India remains unexplored. It is critical to determine strategic areas in India where the greatest challenges exist and where social entrepreneurship efforts could be most beneficial. Identification of areas wherein government lacks in operating effectively or efficiently in terms of social concerns, should be prioritized and that task to be associated with social entrepreneurs.

Conclusion

Our paper recommends social entrepreneurs maintain the objective of enhancing the social wealth in view and avoid becoming enamored with their personal creation's refinement or towards profit. Furthermore, while pursuing chances to enhance income may be appealing, those actions should never be pursued if it compromises the social venture's ability to serve its target audience. An imbalance like this creates severe ethical difficulties, especially for investors and financial supporters who want to promote an organization's social mission rather than its operations.
The lack of control and possibility of unethical behavior should also drive social entrepreneurs to implement robust monitoring methods. To ensure that their companies do not fall victim to the ethical violations we discussed previously, social entrepreneurs should consider forming external advisory boards and implementing efficient governance structures to avoid misconduct in the process. By overcoming the challenges and critics and by motivating them

entrepreneurs' objectives and the success of their endeavors can be achieved. The study identifies the major obstacles to starting and growing a social enterprise. This study highlights the necessity of identifying opportunities in the area of social entrepreneurship.

Future Research

There are some underlying limitations in this research that present opportunities for further investigation. To boost representative in future studies, broader and more varied samples may be used. This study model can indeed be replicated over cultures for broad applicability.

Secondly, this research is limited to mission and motives, as well as problems and critics. Psychological traits could be combined with other aspects in future studies, and the scope of this research was confined to learning about the motivation and problems of establishing a social business, rather than the process of transforming conventional business to social. The future research could be based on applying this diverse region and examining psychology views, mission drift of social entrepreneurship in different culture and region.

REFERNCE

- Aldrich, H.E. (2000), Organizations Evolving, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Amit and Muller, 1995] Push and pull entrepreneurship (two types based on motivation),Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 12 (1995), pp. 64-80
- Amit, R., & Muller, E. (1995). Push and pull entrepreneurship(two types based on motivation). Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 12(4), 64---80.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 30(1), 1---22.
- Baker, T., and R. E. Nelson. 2005. "Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage." Administrative Science Quarterly 50 (3): 329–366
- Bornstein, D., 1996. The price of a dream: The idea of the Grameen Bank and the idea that is helping the poor to change their lives. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Bornstein, D., 2004. How to change the world: Social entrepreneurship and the power of ideas. Oxford University Press.
- Chell, E., 2007. Social enterprise and entrepreneurship. International Small Business Journal 25 (1), 5–26.
- Cox, A., Healey, J., 1998. Promises to the poor: the record of European development agencies. Poverty Briefings, vol. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A. and Tracey, P. (2011) Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Direction. Organization Science, 22, 1203-1213, https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620
- Davis, S., 2002. Social entrepreneurship: Towards an entrepreneurial culture for social and economic development. Prepared for Youth Employment Summit Sept 7–11. http://www.ashoka.org/global/yespaper.pdf.
- Dees, J.G., 1998. Enterprising nonprofits. Harvard Business Review 76 (1), 55–66.
- Dees, J.G., Anderson, B.B., Wei-Skillern, J., 2004. Scaling social impact. Stanford Social Innovation Review 1, 24–32.
- Di Zhang, D., & Swanson, L. A. (2013). Social entrepreneurship in nonprofit organizations: An empirical investigation of the synergy between social and business objectives. Journal of Non-profit & Public Sector Marketing, 378 25(1), 105- 125.
- Duymedjian, R., and C. C. Rüling. 2010.

"Towards a Foundation of Bricolage in Organization and Management Theory." Organization Studies 31 (2): 133–151

- Entrepreneurial Bricolage." Administrative Science Quarterly 50 (3): 329–366
- Entrepreneurial Bricolage." Administrative Science Quarterly 50 (3): 329–366
- Foster, W., Bradach, J., 2005. Should nonprofits seek profits? Harvard Business Review 83, 92–100.
- Fowler, A., 2000. NGDOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? Third World Quarterly 21 (4), 637–654.
- Goerke, J., 2003. Taking the quantum leap: nonprofits are now in business. An Australian perspective. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing 8 (4), 317–327.
- Hayek, F.A., 1945. The use of knowledge in society. American Economic Review 35, 519–530.
- Hemingway, C.A., 2005. Personal values as a catalyst for corporate social entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Ethics, 390   60 (3), 233–249.
- Herman, R., 1990. Methodological issues in studying the effectiveness of nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 19, 293–306.
- https://www.researchgate.net/publicatio n/238086333_Social_constructionism_a nd_entrepreneurship_Basic_assumptions _and_consequences_for_theory_and_res earch#:~:text=From%20a%20social%20 constructionist%20perspective %2C%20entrepreneurial,time
- https://www.researchgate.net/publicatio n/323681278_Researching_bricolage_in _social_entrepreneurship#:~:text=D39u ymedjian%2C%20R.%2C%20and,2)%3 A%20133%E2%80%93151, International Review, 49(3), 408-429.
- Kirkwood and Walton, 2010, What motivates ecopreneurs to start businesses, "International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research", 16   (2010),   pp.   204-228

- http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.20 14.04.027
- Kirzner, I., 1973. Competition and entrepreneurship. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Koe Hwee Nga, J., Shamuganathan, G. The Influence of Personality Traits and Demographic Factors on Social Entrepreneurship Start Up Intentions. J Bus Ethics 95, 259–282 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0358-8
- Latham, G. P. , & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Research at the dawn of the twenty-first of Psychology, 56, 485-516.
- Leadbetter, C., 1997. The rise of social entrepreneurship. Demos, London.
- Levi-Strauss, C. 1967. The Savage Mind. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Levi-Strauss, C.   1967. The   Savage Mind. Chicago, IL: university of chicago press,https://www.researchgate.net/publi cation/323681278_Researching_bricola ge_in_social_entrepreneurship#:~:text= Duymedjian%2C%20R.%2C%20and,2) %3A%20133%E2%80%93151
- Locke, E. A. (2000). Motivation, cognition, and action: An analysis of studies of task goals and knowledge. Applied Psychology: An MacMillan, I.A.   2005. http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/ind ex.cfm?fa=viewfeature&id=766.
- Mair, J., Marti, I., 2004. Social entrepreneurship: what are we talking about? A framework for future research. Barcelona: IESE Business School Working Paper No. 546.
- Mair, J., Noboa, E., 2003. Social entrepreneurship: how intentions to create a social enterprise get formed. Barcelona: IESE Business School Working Paper No. 521.
- Martin, R.J., Osberg, S., 2007. Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for a Definition, Stanford Social Innovation Review, pp. 29–39. Spring.
- Pettigrew, A.M. (1997), "What is a processual analysis?", Scandinavian

- Journal of Management,Vol. 13, pp. 337-48.
- Prahalad, C.K., 2004. The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty Through Profits. Wahrton School Publishing, New Jersey.
- Prahalad, C.K., 2005. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: eradicating poverty through profits. Wharton School Publishing, Upper Saddle, NJ.
- Salamon, L.M., 1999. America's nonprofit sector: A primer. The Foundation Center, New York, NY.
- Schumpeter, J.A., 1934. The theory of economic development. Oxford University Press, London.
- Schwab Foundation. 2005. http://www.schwabfound.org.
- Segal et al., 2005, The motivation to become an entrepreneur, International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research, 11 (2005), pp. 42 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.027
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., & Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motiva- tion to become an entrepreneur. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research, 11(1), 42---57.
- Tan LP, Pham LX, Bui TT. Personality Traits and Social Entrepreneurial Intention: The Mediating Effect of Perceived
- Desirability and Perceived Feasibility. The Journal of Entrepreneurship. 2021;30(1):56-80.doi:10.1177/0971355720974811
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., & Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur. International Journal of EntrepreneurialBehaviour & Research, 11(1), 42-57.
- Shaker A. Zahra, Eric Gedajlovic, Donald O. Neubaum, Joel M. Shulman, Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges, Journal of Business Venturing September 2009, 24(5):519-532, , DOI:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007
- Shane, S., Venkataraman, S., 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. Academy of Management, Review 25, 217–226.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: theoretical antecedents and empirical analyses of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 14(3), 418- 434. https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529
- Spear, R., 2006. Social entrepreneurship: a different model? International Journal of Social Economics 33 (5/6), 399–410.
- Wolverton, B. 2003. Surviving tough times. Chronicle on Philanthropy, October 30.
- YUNUS, M.; MOINGEON, B.; LEHMAN-ORTEGA, L. Building social business models: lessons from the grameen experience. Long Range Planning, v. 43, n. 2, p. 308-325, 2010.
- Zahra, S.A., Dess, G.G., 2001. Entrepreneurship as a field of research: encouraging dialog and debate. Academy of Management Review 26 (1), 8–10.
- Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. and Shulman, J.M. (2009), "A typology of social entrepreneurs: motives, search processes and ethical challenges", Journal of Business Venturing, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 519-532.