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Abstract: The phenomenon of social entrepreneurship, sometimes denoted social entrepreneurship, receives increased attention and popularity by policy makers, opinion leaders, as well as by researchers. The number of papers, special issues of academic journals, workshops and conferences is constantly augmenting regarding the concepts, elements, processes, challenges and boundaries of social entrepreneurship. The main objective of this study is to analyze the concepts, elements, frameworks and practices of social entrepreneurship. The study was basically conducted based on a thorough analysis of existing literatures. In order to achieve the stated review objective, a systematic review of literature was conducted by using an archival method. The study has found that the concept of social entrepreneurship is in development phase. Confusion and uncertainty are still prevailing in the areas of concepts and practices of social entrepreneurship. The study identified the common concepts, features, elements, and scope and research gap in the field of social entrepreneurship.
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Introduction and Background
Social entrepreneurship is a new, emerging field challenged by competing definitions and conceptual frameworks, gaps in the research literature, and limited empirical data (Mair & Marti, 2006; Nicholls, 2006). A number of scholars argue that entrepreneurship is a process that can be applied to the creation of economic or social ends. For example, Drucker (1970) suggested that “the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity” regardless of whether that opportunity is commercial or social in nature.

The term social entrepreneurship was first coined in the 1980’s by Bill Drayton, founder of ASHOKA. Since then, social entrepreneurship has gained attention as a significant field that shows how critical societal issues can be addressed through the innovation, persistence, and sustainable results associated with entrepreneurship.
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The number of papers, special issues of academic journals, workshops and conferences is constantly augmenting and a recent count found over 350 professors teaching and researching social entrepreneurship in more than 35 countries, and a 750% increase in publication during the period 1991-2009 (Lepoutre et al., 2011). The development of social entrepreneurship as an area for research closely resembles the development of research on entrepreneurship itself (Mair and Marti, 2005). Lepoutre et al. (2011) point to the fact that research in this field is characterized by case studies and success stories, and lacks a theoretical base and therefore generalizability.

Although there are differences between the concepts of "social enterprise", "social entrepreneurship" and "social entrepreneur" (Defourny and Nyssens, 2008), the growth of interest in this area is closely related to the fact that social enterprises constitute the fastest growing category of organisations in the USA (Austin et al. 2006), and to the fact that universities and business schools around the globe are currently involved in various education programmes in social entrepreneurship and social enterprise. Thus, there is a fast growing interest for this field among both academics and practitioners in the area (Hulgård, 2010).

The use of the term social entrepreneurship is gaining increased popularity. However, confusion and uncertainty are constantly noted about what exactly a social entrepreneur is and does. The term social entrepreneur is ill-defined (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006), it is fragmented, and it has no coherent theoretical framework (Weerawardena and Mort, 2006). The absence of consensus on a research topic usually results in researchers working independently and failing to build upon one another’s work, therefore knowledge cannot be accumulated (Bruyat and Julien, 2000). Bygrave and Hofer (1991, p. 15) rightly pointed out “Good science has to begin with good definitions.”

A good number of research studies were found in the field of social entrepreneurship but there is a lack of consensus regarding the definition of the term ‘Social Entrepreneurship.’ The paper aims at analyzing the existing definitions of social entrepreneurship and thus concluding with a comprehensive definition.

Despite the significant growth of social entrepreneurship, academic research on this growing phenomenon is at an early but growing stage (Thompson et al., 2000). Since the publication of The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur (Leadbeater, 1997), the term social entrepreneurship has been the focus of a growing field of research, and is becoming increasingly well-anchored within the entrepreneurship literature (Certo and Miller, 2008; Zahra et al., 2009). Compared to the traditional for-profit commercial entrepreneurship, however, our understanding of social entrepreneurship is still limited.

The growing importance of this field is evidenced by the increasing numbers of calls for papers on the topic of social entrepreneurship by prestigious entrepreneurship journals. This suggests the timeliness of a comprehensive review of the emerging yet growing literature on the state-of-the-art of research on social entrepreneurship. This paper seeks to present this review, as well as identify research gaps and a future research agenda. The
paper presents an extensive analysis of papers on the topic of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship published in leading scientific journals over the last few years. Existing empirical research on the topic is identified and discussed.

**Justification of the Study:**

Interest in social entrepreneurship has been growing among researchers, practitioners and academics for several years. Discussions on the topics of social entrepreneurship have been held among a variety of participants and have proceeded in a number of different directions. Although the use of the term 'social entrepreneur' is growing rapidly, the field of social entrepreneurship lacks rigor and is in its infancy compared to the wider field of entrepreneurship (Abu-Saifan, 2012). This article aims at analyzing the concepts, features, boundaries and research gap in the field of social entrepreneurship. The study is critical for a number of reasons. First, this study is supposed to contribute to the field of social entrepreneurship. Second, it will help the academics by revealing additional data to add an entrepreneurial element to the knowledge base on social entrepreneurship in general. Third, the study is supposed to open the doors of future research.

**Objectives:**

The basic objective of this study is to explore the concepts, elements, boundaries and practices of social entrepreneurship. Accordingly this study is supposed to cover the following issues in a nutshell.

i. To examine Current studies on social entrepreneurship.

ii. To assess Social entrepreneurship versus business entrepreneurship.

iii. To analyze different views on Social Entrepreneurship.

iv. To provide implications of the study.

**Methodology:**

This study is mainly a conceptual analysis of social entrepreneurship. The study was conducted based on a review of existing literature of social entrepreneurship. Literature review is adopted as it enables to structure research and to build a reliable knowledge base in this field (Tranfield et al., 2003). In order to achieve the stated review objective, a systematic review of literature was conducted by using an archival method.

This paper employs a methodology to review the articles cited in the databases like Sage, Taylor and Francis Online, Springerlink, ScienceDirect, JSTOR, Wiley Online Library, EBSCO, and Emerald. The search phrases were: “social entrepreneurship”, “social entrepreneur”, “social venture”, and “social enterprise.” The other sources of data include books, journals, e-papers and websites. Contemporary research papers were given priority in analyzing the existing literatures. We followed three steps methodological approach. First, we collected the research papers. Second, we applied exclusion criteria to confine our intention to social entrepreneurship field. Third, we analyzed the relevant literatures.
Studies on Social Entrepreneurship :

The basis of this article is a comprehensive literature analysis of contemporary papers on the topic of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship published in leading business and management journals. As discussed, while social entrepreneurship is attracting increasing research attention, it is still at an early stage.

Social Entrepreneurship (SE) as an emerging research field has been well received by authors from a variety of disciplines (Ireland and Webb, 2007; Short et al., 2009) such as:

- sociology (Hockerts et al., 2010)
- entrepreneurship (Chell et al., 2010; Corner and Ho, 2010)
- (public) management (Bagnoli and Megali, 2009; Meyskens et al., 2010)
- ethics (Cornelius et al., 2008)
- finance (Austin et al., 2006)
- politics and institutions (Hemerijck, 2002; Dey and Steyaert, 2010)
- psychology and education (Chand and Misra, 2009)

Social entrepreneurship, as it is labeled, is briefly entrepreneurial activity that mainly serves a social objective (Austin et al., 2006). The concept came into sight in the 1980s from the work of Bill Drayton at Ashoka Foundation which provides funding to social innovators around the world, and Ed Skloot of New Ventures that helps the nonprofits to explore new sources of income (Dees, 2001). In spite of the newness of the term and the concept, the practice that employ entrepreneurial capacities to ease social problems has existed for decades (Barendsen & Gardner, 2004). Some of the practices that specifically focused on the problems of poor and marginalized populations have succeeded in transforming the lives of thousands of people around the world (Alvord et al., 2002). Nonetheless, only recently social entrepreneurship became a widely discussed topic and increasingly mainstreamed among policy makers, civil society groups, businesses, financial institutions, and academics in the universities (Nicholls & Young, 2008). Danko et al. (2011) summarized the contemporary studies on social entrepreneurship. See Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) (Year)</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Topic of the investigation</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Result(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, 2002</td>
<td>The International Journal of Public Sector Management</td>
<td>The concrete measures taken by and activities of social enterprises for achieving their social mission</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs have a precise understanding of the needs of clientele and how important they are; making clear the importance of entrepreneurial enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockerts, 2003</td>
<td>Ph.D. Dissertation</td>
<td>Opening up mass markets via social enterprises</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Develops a four-phase model that social enterprises are subject to on their way towards entering larger markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord et al., 2004</td>
<td>The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</td>
<td>The success factors found in seven cases of successful social entrepreneurship initiatives</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Identification of success-determining factors of (1) scaling-up strategies (2) political influence and (3) adaptive leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spear, 2006</td>
<td>International Journal of Social Economics</td>
<td>The differences and similarities found between social enterprises in the for-profit sector and commercial entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs have an ideological Weltanschauung; similarities found in the application of (business) contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korosec and Berman, 2006</td>
<td>Public Administration Review</td>
<td>Relationship between municipal support and the success of social enterprises</td>
<td>Quant.</td>
<td>Municipal support leads to a stronger effect of social entrepreneurship within a society; degree of municipal support correlates positively with the quality and success of social entrepreneurship initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharir and Lerner, 2006</td>
<td>Journal of World Business</td>
<td>The success factors found in Israeli social enterprises</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Social capital, personal commitment, an equity base in the founding phase, public acceptance, who the enterprise’s team members are, market ability of the social enterprise, and management experience are what determine success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort, 2006</td>
<td>Journal of World Business</td>
<td>The characteristics of social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship strives for the development of social gain and requires innovative, proactive, and risk-taking behavior by the social entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Slyke and Newman, 2006</td>
<td>Nonprofit Management &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>Tom Cousins: A case study</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Tom Cousins is both a transformative leadership person and a change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al., 2008</td>
<td>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour &amp; Research</td>
<td>The personality formation process of social entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs create their identity via segmentation that is based on contrasting and attributive isolation and merging principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban, 2008</td>
<td>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour &amp; Research</td>
<td>The success factors of South African social entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Quant.</td>
<td>Risk-taking, using business contacts, the ability to locate capital, and leadership and management experience are factors for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyskens et al., 2010</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</td>
<td>The tendencies and patterns of social entrepreneurship compared to commercial entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Quant.</td>
<td>The identification of similar patterns on a statistically significant level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Entrepreneurship:

Social entrepreneurship needs to be defined in a way that is consistent with what is known about entrepreneurship (Abu-Saifan, 2012). Any definition of the term “social entrepreneurship” must start with the word “entrepreneurship.” The word “social” simply modifies entrepreneurship. If entrepreneurship doesn’t have a clear meaning, then modifying it with social won’t accomplish much, either. Entrepreneurship, according to Onuoha (2007), “is the practice of starting new organizations or revitalizing mature organizations, particularly new businesses generally in response to identified opportunities.”

Schumpeter (1965) defined “entrepreneurs” as individuals who exploit market opportunity through technical and/or organizational innovation. According to Knight (1921) and Drucker (1970), “entrepreneurship is about taking risk”. Bolton and Thompson (2000) have defined an entrepreneur as “a person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognized value around perceived opportunities”. Hisrich (1990) defined that an entrepreneur is characterized as “someone who demonstrates initiative and creative thinking, is able to organize social and economic mechanisms to turn resources and situations to practical account, and accepts risk and failure”.

Mueller and Thomas (2000) argue that the study of entrepreneurship should be expanded to international markets to investigate the conditions and characteristics that encourage entrepreneurial activity in various countries and regions.

Entrepreneurship has been a well-defined area within economic theory since Schumpeter published his seminal work in 1911 (Swedberg 2000), but social entrepreneurship was not a core element in such general entrepreneurship theory, and was hardly dealt with or even mentioned in textbooks or review articles on entrepreneurship. Like entrepreneurship, which even today lacks a unifying paradigm (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), the term ‘social entrepreneurship’ has taken on a variety of meanings (Dees, 1998).

Due to a relatively recent growth of interest in social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, and with the variety of actors and arenas involved, it is not surprising that terminology is an issue. For example, the terms “social entrepreneurship” and social enterprise are sometimes used interchangeably, and sometimes distinguished from one another. This has been and will continue to be a source of confusion and contention.

This term social entrepreneurship is problematic. At this point, there is no agreement on major aspects of a definition (Light, 2005; Mort, Weerawardena & Carnegie, 2003; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Seelos & Mair, 2004). Definitions can range from narrow to very broad. A scan of definitions reveals a number of limiting notions in many of them (Light, 2005). The focus is almost always on individuals as change agents, and not on groups or organizations. Social entrepreneurs almost always work in the nonprofit sector, and are invariably only interested in new programs or solutions, which they generally want to start from scratch (as opposed to adapting existing programs). There are only occasional references to management practices. In addition, such people are seen as entrepreneurial at all times, and the use of social-enterprise (Commercial) income is stressed as a key factor.
For the purpose of this study, we conducted a content analysis of twenty two definitions of social entrepreneurship from some of the most cited researchers and organizations in the field. See table 2.

### Table 2: Social Entrepreneurship Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) &amp; Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu-Saifan, S. (2012)</td>
<td>The social entrepreneur is a mission-driven individual who uses a set of entrepreneurial behaviours to deliver a social value to the less privileged, all through an entrepreneurially oriented entity that is financially independent, self-sufficient, or sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka (<a href="http://canada.ashoka.org">http://canada.ashoka.org</a>)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are individuals with innovative solutions to society’s most pressing social problems. They are ambitious and persistent, tackling major social issues and offering new ideas for wide-scale change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, J., Stephenson, H. &amp; Wei-Skillen, J. (2006)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship is an innovative, social value-creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, businesses or government sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornstein, D. (2003)</td>
<td>A path breaker with a powerful new idea, who combines visionary and real-world problem solving creativity, who has a strong ethical fiber, and who is totally possessed by his or her vision for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boschee, J. (1998)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are nonprofit executives who pay increasing attention to market forces without losing sight of their underlying missions, somehow balancing moral imperatives and the profit motive– and that balancing act is the heart and soul of the movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinckerhoff, P.C. (2000)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are people who take risks on behalf of the people their organization serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship falls into two categories. First, in the for-profit sector it encompasses activities emphasizing the importance of a socially-engaged private sector and the benefits that accrue to those who do well by doing good. Second, it refers to activities encouraging more entrepreneurial approaches in the nonprofit sector in order to increase organizational effectiveness and foster long-term sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dees, J.G. et al. (2001)  | Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by:  
  - Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),  
  - Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,  
  - Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,  
  - Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.  |
| Fowler A. (2000)          | Social entrepreneurship is the creation of viable (socio-) economic structures, relations, institutions, organizations, and practices that yield and sustain social benefits.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Hibbert, Hogg et al. (2002)| Social entrepreneurship is the use of entrepreneurial behavior for social ends rather than for profit objectives, or alternatively, that the profits generated are used for the benefit of a specified is advantaged group.                                                                                                                           |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson S. (2000)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship is emerging as an innovative approach for dealing with complex social needs. With its emphasis on problem-solving and social innovation, socially entrepreneurial activities blur the traditional boundaries between the public, private and non-profit sector and emphasize hybrid model of for-profit and non-profit activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light P. C. (2006)</td>
<td>A social entrepreneur is an individual, group, network, organization, or alliance of organizations that seeks sustainable, large-scale change through pattern-breaking ideas in what or how governments, nonprofits, and businesses do to address significant social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mair, J. &amp; Marti, I. (2006)</td>
<td>Innovative models of providing products and services that caters to basic needs (rights) that remain unsatisfied by political or economic institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, R.L. &amp; Osberg, S. (2007)</td>
<td>Someone who targets an unfortunate but stable equilibrium that causes the neglect, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity and the spirit of community to build social capital in the process of community improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse &amp; Dudley (2002)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are those who combine the spirit of enterprise and the spirit of community to build social capital in the process of community improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols, A. (2006)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship entails innovations designed to explicitly improve societal well being, housed within entrepreneurial organizations which initerate, guide or contribute to change in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS “The New Heroes”</td>
<td>A social entrepreneur identifies and solves social problems on a large scale. Social entrepreneurs act as the change agents for society, seizing opportunities others miss in order to improve systems, invent and disseminate new approaches and advance sustainable solutions that create social value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwab Foundation</td>
<td>A pragmatic visionary who achieves large scale, systemic and sustainable social change through a new invention, a different approach, a more rigorous application of known technologies or strategies, or a combination of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skoll Foundation</td>
<td>The social entrepreneur is a pioneer of innovation that benefits humanity. They are ambitious, mission driven, strategic, and resourceful and results oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute for Social Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>The art of simultaneously pursuing both a financial and a social return on investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J. (2002)</td>
<td>People with the qualities and behaviors we associate with the business entrepreneur but who operate in the community and are more concerned with caring and helping than “making money.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddock &amp; Post (1991)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are private sector citizens who play critical roles in bringing about catalytic changes in the public sector agenda and the perception of certain social issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

Based on the analysis of definitions of Table 2, some common features of social entrepreneurs are found including mission leader, persistent, emotionally charged, social value creator, change agent, highly accountable, dedicated, socially alert, opinion leader, manager, leader, innovator, initiative in taker, opportunity alert, visionary and committed.

Figure 1: Concepts Cited Most Often in Social Entrepreneurship Definitions
Brock & Steiner (2009) highlighted the seven most common elements in these definitions including social needs/problems, innovation, scaling a social venture, resource acquisition, opportunity recognition, creating a sustainable business model and measuring outcomes. Figure 1 presents the frequency with which the most common phrases/concepts were used.

Entrepreneurial behavior is typically seen as purposive directed towards a specific entrepreneurial event, such as creation of a new company or new products. The link between entrepreneurial behavior and intentions is well explained in social psychology. Mair & Noboa (2003) proposed a model of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions that better explain the intentions of a social entrepreneur. See figure 2.

**Figure 2: A Model of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions**

![Figure 2: A Model of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions](image)

Business Entrepreneurship versus Social Entrepreneurship: 
A number of researchers have argued that differences between for-profit and SE exist with respect to motivations, opportunities, and outcomes. First, according to the literature, social entrepreneurs are — unlike for-profit entrepreneurs — mainly motivated by a strong desire to change society, by discomfort with the status quo, by altruistic feelings, and by a need to be socially responsible (Prabhu, 1999). Second, in addition to for-profit opportunities, social entrepreneurs attribute different types of value to opportunities. While in the context of traditional entrepreneurship the value of an opportunity is the economic gain (mainly to the entrepreneur) that result from (Eckhardt & Shane, 2003), in the context of SE the value of an opportunity also includes all other forms of social benefits generated by the initiative, e.g. a higher level of ecological awareness or education. In the case of socially inspired opportunities, the person who creates value (the social entrepreneur) is different from the one who appropriates it (a social group). Finally, social entrepreneurs differ from for-profit entrepreneurs in their focus, i.e. while the former concentrate on social value creation, the latter focus on economic wealth creation (Hibbert, Hogg & Quinn, 2002).

Another basic (and perhaps more immediate) issue is the question of the degree to which there are similarities and differences between social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship.

This clearly has implication for theory and research, as well as practice and policy. Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern (2006) provide a detailed examination of this question. They define social entrepreneurship as innovative and social value-creation. Abu-Saifan (2012) identified some common characteristics of both social entrepreneurship and business entrepreneurship based on the comparative analysis. See Table 3.

**Table 3: Unique and common characteristics of profit-oriented entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique characteristics of the profit-oriented entrepreneur</th>
<th>Characteristics common to both types</th>
<th>Unique characteristics of the social entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High achiever</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>Mission leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk bearer</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Emotionally charged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Initiative taker</td>
<td>Change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinker</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value creator</td>
<td>Opportunity alert</td>
<td>Social value creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Socially alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrageur</td>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Boundaries of Social Entrepreneurship:**
The term social entrepreneurship is becoming more popular and is attracting growing amount of resources. However, the lack of consensus on the definition of social entrepreneurship means that other disciplines are often confused with and mistakenly associated with social entrepreneurship. Philanthropists, social activists, environmentalists, and other socially-oriented practitioners are referred to as social entrepreneurs. It is important to set the function of social entrepreneurship apart from other socially oriented activities and identify the boundaries within which social entrepreneurs operate. In defining the scope of social entrepreneurship, Huybrechts & Nicholls (2012) noted that social entrepreneurship is not a discrete sector; it is not a synonym of social business; it is not a new form of corporate social responsibility; and it is not the only model of social innovation. Despite these ongoing disputes and debates, there remains some broad agreement about a number of key characteristics that set the boundaries of socially entrepreneurial action (Martin & Osberg 2007; Nicholls 2006).

All the definitions of social entrepreneurship agree on a central focus on social or environmental outcomes that has primacy over profit maximization or other strategic considerations. A second defining feature is innovation. Innovation can be pursued through new organizational models and processes, through new products and services, or through new thinking about, and framing of, societal challenges. Several social entrepreneurship initiatives combine these different ways of innovating. Finally, many authors emphasize how social entrepreneurs diffuse their socially innovative models via market oriented action that is performance driven, scaling up their initiatives in other contexts through alliances and partnerships, with the idea of reaching broader and more sustainable outcomes. These dimensions map onto what Nicholls and Cho (2006) identify as the main building blocks of social entrepreneurship: sociality, innovation, and market orientation.

According to the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, the definition of social entrepreneurship should not extend to philanthropists, activists, companies with foundations, or organizations that are simply socially responsible. While all these agents are needed and valued, they are not social entrepreneurs.

**Research Gap in the Field of Social Entrepreneurship**

As noted earlier, social entrepreneurship has gained attention in many diverse fields, and this diversity has resulted in several definitions. First, an important agenda for the further development of social entrepreneurship research involves creating consensus across these fields as to the definition and key elements of the construct, as well as resolving some of the foundational debates. For example, social entrepreneurship has been characterized both broadly as an innovative social venture (Dees & Anderson, 2003) and more narrowly as the use of market-based activities to solve social needs and generate earned income through innovation (Thompson, 2002). Second, there is a need for more research into understanding how differences in importance of the social motive influence strategy and resources (Austin et al., 2006). Third, area for future research may involve examining the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. Similar to early work in entrepreneurship, which compared characteristics of managers to those of entrepreneurs, research is needed to understand the personal characteristics and cognitive schemas of social entrepreneurs.
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(Roper & Cheney, 2005). Fourth, Future research could also focus on the actions and behaviors of social entrepreneurs that help improve the performance of these ventures. Establishing consistent measures of social performance represents a critical development needed to examine this issue. Finally, although there exists some broad, empirical research on social entrepreneurship, the lack of empirical studies has placed limits on our understanding of the important antecedents and outcomes of social entrepreneurship.

Moving toward more rigorous empirical studies, and establishing major theoretical perspectives by which researchers may explore these questions, should benefit both practitioners and academics (Mair & Marti, 2006).

Braunerhjelm & Hamilton (2012) provided a list of research gap in the field of social entrepreneurship under different dimensions. See Table 4.

**Table 4: Research areas in the domain of social entrepreneur**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the phenomenon</td>
<td>What is social entrepreneurship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does a social entrepreneur do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are social enterprises like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison between SE and others forms of organization</td>
<td>What are the differences between social and business entrepreneurship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the differences between social entrepreneurship and government, NGO's, activism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is social entrepreneur different from business entrepreneur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study the core elements of social entrepreneurial process</td>
<td>How is the social entrepreneurial process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are social opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do social entrepreneurs evaluate their impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify environmental factors</td>
<td>What are the main financial constraints?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the field attract and cultivate talented workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How social entrepreneurs interplay with their environment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Braunerhjelm & Hamilton (2012)

**Conclusion and Implications:**

Social entrepreneurship represents both a growing field of hybrid action and a catalyst for wider recalibrations of the roles and boundaries of the market, the state and civil society. However, the field is still in a pre-paradigmatic state where definitions remain contested and various actors are promoting self-legitimating accounts of what social entrepreneurship is and is not. In such a context, scholars can play a useful role in assessing competing claims on the field and presenting theoretically and empirically driven accounts of the reality of practice in context. The concept of social
entrepreneurship is largely misunderstood by the readers and researchers. There is no clear distinction found regarding the difference between social entrepreneurship and business entrepreneurship.

This study analyzed a notable number of contemporary research papers and books on social entrepreneurship. Thus, the meaning of social entrepreneurship, a state of current research on social entrepreneurship, major points of differences between social entrepreneurship and business entrepreneurship, boundaries of social entrepreneurship were critically analyzed. Finally, a list of research gaps in the field of social entrepreneurship was presented. This paper is supposed to contribute to the literature of social entrepreneurship and also open the door to suggest future research in the field of social entrepreneurship.
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