2020

Toward a typology of social entrepreneurs: the interplay between passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise

Michael A. Abebe
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Sarah Kimakwa
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Tammi C. Redd

Toward a Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: The interplay between passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise

Abstract

Purpose- This paper contributes to research in social entrepreneurship by introducing a typology that describes four distinct types of social entrepreneurs based on the nature of their lives and career experiences and the scope of their social engagement.

Design/methodology/approach- In order to build a typology of social entrepreneurs, inductive profile analysis and archival research design approaches were used. A large variety of social entrepreneur profiles that are available in prominent social entrepreneurship organizations such as Ashoka Foundation, Echoing Green, Schwab Foundation and Skoll Foundation were examined.

Findings- Using four types of social entrepreneurs from the typology, the authors developed a number of predictions as to how social entrepreneurs with an activist background may benefit more in the short term but possibly struggle in the long term given their attachment to their venture's "original" cause and lack of corporate/business experience.

Originality-By developing a typology of social entrepreneurs and discussing the implications of this typology for post-launch social venture performance, the paper advances the current understanding of social entrepreneurs and the performance of their ventures. Additionally, by focusing on social entrepreneurs as agents of social change, this paper sheds some light on who these entrepreneurs are, what kind of life and career experiences they had and what motivates them to engage in social entrepreneurship.

Keywords: *Social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial passion, typology, entrepreneurial expertise, activism, disillusioned careerists, grass-roots activists, corporate veterans, local pragmatists, social activists*

Paper type: Conceptual

Introduction

Social entrepreneurship- defined as the 'the process of identifying, evaluating and exploiting opportunities aiming at social value creation by means of commercial market-based activities and the use of a wide range of resources' (Bacq and Janssen, 2011, p. 376)-is a rapidly growing field of scholarly inquiry (Arogyaswamy, 2017; Dacin *et al*., 2011; Saebi *et al.,* 2019). Given the growing work in this area, scholars have focused on understanding the role of prosocial motivation as a driver of social entrepreneurship. Past works in this area highlighted how compassion-a specific form of prosocial motivation-facilitates social venture formation (Miller *et al*., 2012; Yitshaki and Kropp, 2016). Research points to the strong emphasis among social ventures in solving socio-economic and environmental problems as the primary factor distinguishing them from commercial ventures (Mair and Marti, 2006; Miller *et al*., 2012). Whereas profitably exploiting market opportunity has been identified as a powerful motivator in commercial entrepreneurship (Schlaegel and Koenig, 2014), solving societal and environmental problems using market-driven approaches primarily serves as the dominant institutional logic among social ventures (Bacq and Janssen, 2011).

While there has been a robust scholarly insight on prosocial motivation and compassion as the primary motivations driving an individual's decision to launch a social venture (for example, Miller *et al*., 2012; Yitshaki and Kropp, 2016), not much is known whether and how a social entrepreneur's prosocial motivation and compassion affects post-launch external resource acquisition and stakeholder mobilization (Saebi *et al*., 2019). Similarly, much is yet to be known on whether and to what extent a social entrepreneur's prosocial motivation and compassion influence the growth and expansion of their ventures, especially when these social entrepreneurs lack formal business/managerial skills required to effectively run their ever-expanding ventures.

This paper seeks to address these gaps in the literature by focusing on two major forms of social entrepreneurial backgrounds- *disillusioned careerists* (entrepreneurs with well-established past careers in private and public sectors) and *grass-roots activists* (entrepreneurs with no formal career background but have strong activist experience on social and/or environmental issues)-and how these different backgrounds influence the performance of social venture. In particular, this paper explores the following research questions: *(1) what aspects of an entrepreneur's life and career experiences underlie their participation in social ventures? (2) what role, if any, does a social entrepreneur's human and social capital play in the survival and growth of their social ventures?* The paper explores the interplay between a social entrepreneur's passionate activism (a form of prosocial motivation) and entrepreneurial (business) expertise will lead to different outcomes across venture formation and growth stages. Specifically, we argue that while social a social entrepreneur's passionate activism-their passion and knowledge of the causes they advocate as well as their capability in grass root mobilization-serves as an important asset at the early stages of the social venture formation, it could, in fact, become a liability at the growth and expansion stage given their psychological attachment to the 'original' social mission and causes of the venture.

In order to develop these ideas further, the paper is structured in two parts. First, we develop a typology of social entrepreneurs based on extensive reviews of social entrepreneur profiles. Our approach in this paper differs from previous typologies that predominantly depict social entrepreneurs from the perspective of the entrepreneurial opportunities they exploit (e.g. Neck *et al.,* 2009; Zahra *et al.,* 2009). Neck *et al.,* (2009) typology is based on the primary market impact and venture mission while Zahra *et al.,* (2009) is based on how social entrepreneurs search and discover social opportunities. Second, we present an overview of the

social entrepreneurship literature, followed by a discussion on the development of the typology of social entrepreneurs. Finally, the paper concludes by pointing out the implications of this typology in terms of venture survival and growth.

Overview of Social Entrepreneurs and Venture Performance

Social entrepreneurship activities have existed for generations in different contextual settings (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010; Huybrechts and Nicholls, 2012). However, the use of the term social entrepreneurship emerged in the 1990s, coined by Bill Drayton (1980), founder of Ashoka, an international organization that supports social entrepreneurs through fellowships. Since then, social entrepreneurship has developed rapidly; and in the last decade has become a major area of research within the entrepreneurship literature (Bosma *et al.,* 2016; Saebi *et al.,* 2019; Sassmannshausen and Volkmann, 2018). Social entrepreneurs aim to address a myriad of social, environmental and economic challenges the world faces (e.g. poverty, hunger, illiteracy, contaminated water, poor health, overuse of fossil fuels, climate change, and environmental degradation) using innovative and entrepreneurial approaches (Austin *et al.,* 2006; Bornstein, 2007). Social entrepreneurs address these societal issues by embracing the dual mission of social and economic value creation. Social ventures can be particularly effective in addressing social and environmental challenges where markets and governments have failed or are inadequate (Bornstein, 2007; Griffiths, Gundry and Kickul, 2013). Necessity and opportunity factors are known to drive some individuals to engage in commercial entrepreneurship. However, these factors alone do not fully explain why some individuals engage in social entrepreneurship. Compassion, prosocial motivation, and empathy have been shown to predict social entrepreneurship as well. Social entrepreneur's compassion, prosocial motivation and empathy lead them to launch social ventures (Bacq and Alt, 2018; Mair and Noboa, 2006; Miller *et al.,* 2012). Social entrepreneurs start ventures as a way of giving back to the society, out of guilt that

what they have been doing contributes less to society and out of the need to solve pressing social issues (Bacq *et al.,* 2016). Social entrepreneurs are considered heroes, a "rare breed" and change agents (Dees, 2001) for addressing social issues and social change. They are relentless in their pursuit of social issues and do not allow resource constraints to hinder their efforts. They are driven by a social mission rather than economic value (Austin *et al.,* 2006; Certo and Miller, 2008; Dees, 2001).

Just like commercial entrepreneurial ventures, social ventures face the challenges of liability of newness, legitimacy and resource acquisition constraints (Brush et al., 2001). Entrepreneurial ventures fail because they either are unable to garner the necessary resources or recombine the resources in effective ways. New ventures do not have a reputation or prior organizational knowledge on which to base their decisions. New ventures face a major challenge of legitimacy (Brush *et al.,* 2001; Delmar and Shane, 2004), resulting from information asymmetry and uncertainty (Martens *et al.,* 2007), and the liabilities of newness (Singh *et al.,* 1984). To acquire external resources, entrepreneurs have to establish legitimacy to gain support from investors (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994; Plummer *et al.,* 2016). Entrepreneurs leverage their relationships to gain access to resources (Rawhouser *et al.,* 2017). Resources include human, social, financial, physical, technology and organizational. At the initial stages of the venture, the entrepreneur must have the capability to transfer personal resources into organizational resources (Brush *et al.,* 2001). However, the challenges are even more magnified in social ventures due to the inherent dual mission of social and economic value creation, multiple identities and a desire for satisfying multiple stakeholders' interests (Tracey and Phillips, 2007), which can create tension among stakeholders. Further, the tension can influence venture legitimacy, resource acquisition and subsequent growth (Perrini *et al.,* 2010). Moreover, they are established in

resource constraints areas and often by minorities (Zahra *et al.,* 2009) which further exacerbates the problems. Additionally, social venture opportunities are "complex, organic and fluid and clearly actor dependent" (Corner and Ho, 2010, p. 656). These problems challenge the nascent social venture development and survival (Renko, 2013). Thus, social ventures face higher risks of failure than commercial ventures due to the need for social entrepreneurs to carefully manage dual missions to avoid mission drift (defined as abandoning the original social mission to pursue profit) (Ometto *et al.,* 2019; Santos *et al.,* 2015) and social venture failure (André and Pache, 2016; Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Pache and Santos, 2013).

Even though compassion and prosocial motivation may inspire social entrepreneurs to launch ventures, this alone may not be adequate for social venture growth. Social entrepreneurs also need business skills to operate successful ventures. They blend the behaviors of commercial and nonprofit organizations for venture success (André and Pache, 2016; Katre and Salipante, 2012; Ometto *et al.,* 2019). Furthermore, scholars (e.g. Miller *et al.,* 2012) have observed that the top ten competencies for hybrid social ventures were similar to those for commercial ventures – (measuring outcomes, problem-solving, team building, leadership, financial management and strategic planning). Social entrepreneurs are like commercial entrepreneurs in entrepreneurial operational processes (Meyskens *et al.,* 2010). For instance, (Meyskens *et al.,* 2010) observed that financial capital and partnerships are related to innovativeness. Additionally, skills in staffing, communication, alliance building, lobbying, capital and stakeholder mobilization have been associated with social impact (Bloom and Smith, 2010). However, social entrepreneurs do not always possess the skills needed to run the venture as a business, mobilize necessary resources (Austin *et al.,* 2006), and gain access to capital networks (Clark *et al.,* 2013). Due to the complexity and organic nature of social entrepreneurial opportunities, social entrepreneurs

need diverse backgrounds such as experience, human capital and social capital to identify and exploit opportunities (Corner and Ho, 2010). In the next section, we introduce a typology of social entrepreneurs based on their life experiences and the scope of their social engagement.

Toward a Typology of Social Entrepreneurship

This paper proposes a systematic typology that categorizes social entrepreneurs based on their life and career experiences as well as the scope of their social engagement. The next section describes the steps that were followed in the development of the typology.

Data Sources

In order to build a typology of social entrepreneurs, we relied on inductive profile analysis and an archival research design approach that is common to similar entrepreneurship studies (for example, Datta and Gailey, 2012; Morris *et al*., 2011). Specifically, the analytical approach took the form of a critical examination of social entrepreneurs' profiles. We believe this approach is valid since it allows us to trace and carefully map the career trajectories of social entrepreneurs at the onset of their engagement. Furthermore, the archival biographical accounts and interviews[1] we relied on in this paper represent the social entrepreneur's firsthand description and documentation of their experiences while launching their ventures. The following steps were used in developing the typology. First, in order to ensure that we have an extensive observation set, a wide-ranging variety of social entrepreneurs' biographical profiles that are available in prominent social entrepreneurship organizations such as Ashoka (www.ashoka.org/), Echoing Green (https://www.echoinggreen.org/), Schwab Foundation (http://www.schwabfound.org/) and Skoll Foundation (www.skoll.org/) were reviewed. These foundations maintain extensive lists of

---

[1] We relied on social entrepreneurs' interviews conducted by media organizations in our analyses, but did not conduct a direct interview of these entrepreneurs. We believe this approach is a reasonable analytical approach since most of these interviews include verbatim response from social entrepreneurs to questions posed.

active social entrepreneurs both in the U.S. and around the world. Furthermore, the principal investigators also reviewed several business and entrepreneurship sources that contain biographical sketches of social entrepreneurs including the *Forbes 30 Under 30* and the *Inc. 5000* annual lists. Finally, advanced internet searches were conducted to identify social entrepreneur profiles that had appeared in major newspapers, magazine outlets and corporate websites.

Sampling Criteria

Given the presence of various types of social ventures (that is for-profit, hybrid and nonprofit), the following criteria were used to select social entrepreneur profiles. First, we focus on social ventures that are for-profit, based on our adopted definition by Bacq and Janssen (2011) that conceptualizes social ventures as those that are for-profit ventures using market-based strategies to generate social and economic value. Second, social ventures had to be primarily U.S. based even though they may have operations in other countries. We considered this criterion because the development and availability of career paths that we discuss in our typologies tend to be very different in other countries, especially developing countries. Data availability was another issue that limited us to consider U.S. based social ventures. The issue of data availability has been one of the challenges in advancing social entrepreneurship research (Short *et al*., 2009). Third, we considered social ventures launched in 2000 or later to ensure that the ventures have gone through the entrepreneurial life cycle. Studies indicate that social entrepreneurship has been on the increase in recent decades (Austin *et al*., 2006) and 60% of U.S. social ventures were started in 2006 or later (Thornley, 2012).

After applying these criteria, our final sample consisted of 81 complete social entrepreneur profiles. We excluded profiles that had missing data and those that did not meet

our criteria as outlined above. In addition, in the case where the social entrepreneur appeared in more than one list, s/he was counted just once. Next all ventures that did not have explicit mention of social objectives in their mission statements and product/service descriptions, such as the ones on the Inc. 5000 list were excluded. The social entrepreneurs in our sample had diverse backgrounds. Forty-four percent of social ventures in our sample have a male or all-male founding team; while 49.4% had a female or all-female founding team. Only 6.17% of social ventures in our sample were led by a male and female founding team. Thirty-seven percent of founders in our sample had a bachelor's degree, while 35% of them had a master's degree. Only 6.17% of founders had a JD (law) or Ph.D. degree. Most of the social entrepreneurs in our profile (60.49%) had at least some level of work experience. Finally, our review of their biography reveals that around 41% of the social entrepreneurs quit their regular jobs to launch a social venture.

After compiling the list of social entrepreneurs from these sources, a systematic summary document was created containing the name of the venture, biographies of the founding entrepreneur(s), their stated motivation for starting the venture, and the range of social impact by the social venture. We considered work experience at the time of founding the venture and whether the experience was related to the venture being launched. Two of the principal investigators independently reviewed and classified all 81 social entrepreneur profiles including their social entrepreneur background (Education, Occupation before social venture, work experience) as well as involvement as social activists. We then extensively discussed these entrepreneur profiles to determine consistent patterns in their life and career backgrounds prior to launching a social venture. In particular, both investigators observed a number of consistent patterns of entrepreneurial emergence. For instance, one pattern involved individuals launching

social ventures following their involvement as a grass-roots social activist. Another dominant

pattern suggests individuals pursuing social ventures following a successful career in corporate

or public organizations. Extensive review and discussion of entrepreneur profiles led to the

identification of *entrepreneur life and career experiences* and their *scope of social engagement*

as two distinct patterns (dimensions) in the analysis. Subsequently, we further categorized these

two dimensions into a typology of social entrepreneurs. These dimensions are discussed further

in the associated typology in the next section.

An Entrepreneur's Life and Career Experiences

The first dimension focuses on the social entrepreneur's life and career experiences. The

extensive review of the social entrepreneurs' profiles reveals two distinct archetypes of life

experiences reflected among social entrepreneurs. The first group of social entrepreneurs seems

to have extensive formal career experience (often at managerial or leadership levels) either in the

business or public sectors. Given their financial security and social status, these individuals are

considered to have had successful careers. They enjoy high status and achievement in their

careers and the financial security that is associated with such an achievement. However, a

common theme among these career professionals is a feeling of dissatisfaction and perceived

lack of life meaning after a relatively successful career in traditional sectors (for example,

corporate lawyers and executives, senior administrators in government/public sectors). This

group of professionals seems to believe that, despite the financial security and status, their

current career does not adequately help improve the world around them by addressing pressing

socio-economic and environmental problems. Accordingly, they decide to leave their careers (for

example, retire or quit) to pursue ventures that focus on social/environmental issues and thereby

achieve a higher level of fulfillment. We refer to this group as *Disillusioned Careerists.* The

second major group of social entrepreneurs that we observed is what we refer to as *Grass-Roots Actors.* This group of social entrepreneurs exhibits a strong passion and a heightened sense of urgency towards solving economic, social and/or environmental problems. However, unlike the first group (disillusioned careerists), these entrepreneurs do not necessarily have extensive professional career experience. In fact, some of them are stay-at-home mothers, young college graduates (or dropouts) and longtime local community activists. What makes this group distinct is their proactive approaches to social entrepreneurship including their promotion of public campaigns, issue selling, and aggressive community organizing efforts. Further, they are less likely to seek (wait) for formal institutional intervention from the government or other social agencies but instead insist on 'taking matters in their hands' to solve pressing social and/or environmental problems.

The Entrepreneur's Scope of Social Engagement

The second dimension of the typology focuses on an entrepreneur's scope of social engagement. The scope of social engagement is primarily driven by the social and/or environmental issues or causes that resonate with the entrepreneur. The scope of social engagement pertains to the types of social issues/causes that attract an entrepreneur's attention. Based on the extensive review of the social entrepreneurs' profiles, we identified *cause-based (large scale)* and *problem-focused (localized)* social engagements as two aspects of this dimension. *Cause-based (large scale)* social engagement refers to a social entrepreneur's engagement in prevalent social problems (such as inadequate access to education and health care, poverty/income inequality, environmental degradation) that affect people across the demographic and socio-economic spectrum. This type of social engagement is partly motivated by an entrepreneur's interest in venture scalability and a desire for large-scale socio-economic and environmental impact. An

11

example of cause-based social engagement is 4Ocean, a for-profit social venture founded by Andrew Cooper and Alex Schulze to tackle the growing plastic trash crisis in the oceans. The company sells recycled plastic bracelets and use part of the proceeds to fund ocean plastic cleanup efforts. According to the company website, 4Ocean seeks to "end the ocean plastic crisis" by "…employing new business solutions to the ocean plastic crisis such as reselling the materials we collect and working with governments and industry for contracted waterway cleanup services" (https://4ocean.com/mission/). *Problem-focused (localized)* social engagement, on the other hand, concentrates on the social entrepreneur's efforts in solving socio-economic and environmental problems that are particularly relevant to the entrepreneur's immediate environment. This type of social engagement emphasizes local social/environmental problems affecting the entrepreneur's community. *Problem-focused (localized)* social engagement tends to emphasize community problems related to homelessness, crime, food security (food deserts), lack of educational opportunities, etc. An example of such social engagement is Pilleve, a social venture founded by Gautam Chebrolu and Yossuf Albanawi. The mission of this social venture is fighting the opioid crisis plaguing several local communities in the United States by offering a secure pill dispenser that reduces the abuse of prescription medication. The idea of this venture was partly inspired by one of the co-founders struggle with opioid addiction.

Typology of Social Entrepreneurs

Based on an entrepreneur's life and career experiences (*disillusioned careerists* or *grass-roots actors*) and scope of their social engagement (*cause-focused* or *problem-focused)* as two dimensions, distinct categories of social entrepreneurs were developed: *Seasoned Champions, Local Pragmatists, Social Activists* and *Corporate Veterans*. These typology categories were

developed based on a review of the 81 social entrepreneur profiles in the sample. Figure 1 below presents our typology of social entrepreneurs.

Insert Figure 1 about Here

Table 1 below presents a summary of the four types of social entrepreneurs identified in the typology along with their descriptions and performance implications including the likelihood of survival and growth.

Insert Table 1 about Here

Seasoned Champions

Seasoned Champions are social entrepreneurs who have extensive professional career experiences in the public/non-business (for example, public/government, not-for-profit) sectors. Over the course of their careers, they are more likely to have held extensive senior managerial (administrative) positions. By most measures, they are considered successful in their careers. *Seasoned Champions* could be former politicians/policy-makers, educators, military veterans or civil servants. Despite such an accomplished career in public/non-business sectors, however, these individuals often grapple with a lack of fulfillment. These individuals typically express concern that they are not doing enough to contribute to society despite their professional success. They have a strong conviction that they must contribute to their communities by addressing certain socio-economic and environmental needs that they witness on a regular basis. Given this strong lack of fulfillment and desire to make a change in their communities, *Seasoned Champions* see social ventures as opportunities to help meet community socio-economic and environmental needs. Consequently, their passion for solving social and environmental problems

in their community drives them to start social ventures. In most cases, they either retire or quit their long-time careers to start and manage social ventures. Accordingly, these types of social entrepreneurs often concentrate on *problem-focused (localized)* social ventures. An example is *Revolution Foods* which was founded by two women "Kristin + Kirsten founding moms" who were education specialists. They call themselves "moms on a mission". They were dissatisfied with the school meals served to students and they decided to start *Revolution Foods. Seasoned Champions* are more likely to accumulate a considerable level of human (formal education, work experience and expertise) and social capital during their public/non-business career, which will be valuable in their pursuit of personally meaningful social ventures. These specific resources become particularly helpful in the startup and maintenance of a social venture.

Local Pragmatists

Local Pragmatists are social entrepreneurs who are passionate about solving socio-economic and environmental issues affecting their families, relatives, and neighbors as well as the local community. *Local Pragmatists* can be local residents (ordinary citizens), community organizers, college students (recent graduates/dropouts) and stay-at-home moms (dads). They are keenly aware of the socio-economic and environmental problems that afflict their communities. Their motivations partly arise from frustrations and distrust in the inability of formal institutions (for example, local and state government agencies) to solve these problems. *Local Pragmatists* are often the ones that 'take matters in their own hands'. They are strong believers in the community's collective ability in solving their problems. Consequently, these types of social entrepreneurs often concentrate on *problem-focused (localized)* social ventures. *Local Pragmatists* use grass-root organizing strategies in launching and managing their social ventures. An example of a *Local Pragmatist* social entrepreneurial team is Caitlin Crosby and Brit

Gilmore, co-founders of *The Giving Keys,* a social venture that employees people transitioning from homelessness in Los Angeles using a revenue-generating business model. Since starting *The Giving Keys*, they have liaised with a local nonprofit to recruit potential employees who are employed in assembling, packing, stamping jewelry and setting up displays, offering more than 114,375 hours of employment. Not only are *Local Pragmatists* passionate about their causes, but they are also very skilled in convincing and enlisting family and community members in support of these causes. However, *Local Pragmatists* often do not have extensive human and social capital unlike other types of social entrepreneurs (for example, *Seasoned Champions* and *Corporate Veterans*). They often rely on their friends, family and local residents for advice, information and financial support. They can be described as 'reluctant warriors' since they have neither aspired nor trained to be a social entrepreneur but seem to be thrust into being one for pragmatic reasons (such as solving local socio-economic and environmental problems). Furthermore, resource acquisition is challenging for these entrepreneurs due to a lack of well-developed professional networks. In order to overcome the significant resource constraints, they face in launching and managing their ventures, *Local Pragmatists* often rely on entrepreneurial bricolage strategies. These strategies represent approaches in 'making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities' (Baker and Nelson, 2005, p. 333). Under resource constraints, entrepreneurial bricolage has been shown to be an important approach in the entrepreneurial process (for example, Baker and Nelson 2005; Senyard *et al*., 2014). While *Local Pragmatists* are passionate about their causes and have strong grass root organizing skills, they face significant challenges in rallying various stakeholders beyond their immediate community and manage large-scale operations.

Corporate Veterans

Corporate Veterans are social entrepreneurs who have extensive career experiences in business organizations (corporations), often at senior managerial/executive levels. They enjoy a comfortable lifestyle with high social status and earnings. In many respects, they are considered successful and accomplished by prevailing societal standards. *Corporate Veterans* can be corporate executives such as Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Chief Operating Officers (COOs), corporate lawyers, directors, and management consultants. These individuals often have advanced degrees and substantial corporate experience. They are more likely to have developed robust network ties (and the associated social capital) with other executives and directors of other firms both within and outside of their industries. Despite their impressive accomplishments in the corporate world, these individuals believe that they are not making enough difference in the world beyond their personal well-being. They tend to be disillusioned and express strong dissatisfaction with their professional life. They struggle with a lack of fulfillment and meaning in their personal lives. They view social ventures as avenues of 'giving back' to society and obtaining personal fulfillment. An example of a *Corporate Veteran* is Karen Aiach, Founder and CEO of Lysogene a biotech company whose mission is "developing gene therapy treatments for rare central nervous system diseases" (http://www.lysogene.com/). She was forced to quit her job as an audit specialist after her daughter was diagnosed with a rare neurodegenerative disease to pursue a cure for the disease which would not only help her child but others in the world suffering.

Corporate Veterans believe they have a responsibility to help meet the socio-economic needs of others (Bacq *et al*., 2016). Leveraging their high human and social capital, they often leave their established careers to launch social ventures. These entrepreneurs are often interested in pursuing

broader socio-economic and environmental causes in the hopes of making a large-scale impact. Unlike *Seasoned champions* who are primarily motivated by addressing localized problems, *Corporate Veterans* tend to concentrate on large-scale socio-economic and environmental causes that affect communities across ethnic and socio-economic categories. Furthermore, these types of social entrepreneurs focus on *cause-based (large-scale)* social ventures. *Corporate Veterans* are inherently interested in leveraging their extensive corporate (business) experience and social network ties by launching social ventures that address socio-economic and environmental causes. In doing so, they are more likely to appeal to broader stakeholder groups. Social ventures led by *Corporate Veterans* enjoy several advantages. Given their significant level of social capital, these entrepreneurs are more likely to rally support for their causes from diverse stakeholder groups. The combination of strong professional network ties and broad scope of engagement allow these entrepreneurs to secure robust external resource support.

Social Activists

Social Activists are social entrepreneurs who launch social ventures to tackle socio-economic and environmental challenges through *cause-based (large-scale)* social ventures that broadly focus on communities across ethnic and socio-economic categories. They display a strong passion for broader social and environmental challenges such as economic inequality, access to quality education and healthcare, climate change, social justice, environmental protection. Unlike *Corporate Veterans*, however, they often do not have extensive career experiences in business or public sectors. Instead, they are more likely to view advocacy for these socio-economic and environmental causes as their life calling. While they may not have extensive formal career experience in corporate or public sectors, they possess deep knowledge of the major socio-economic and environmental causes of the day and spent years as grass-roots actors. An example

of a social activist social entrepreneur is Jessica Matthews, Founder and CEO of *Uncharted Play,* an energy company that designs renewable technology systems to provide renewable energy worldwide. She designed a soccer ball that stores energy in motion which can be used as a source of light at night. The idea was sparked in her mind when she visited a developing country where the power went off in a ceremony. Diesel generators were used as a backup, but the smell of diesel was unbearable to Jessica. She discussed it with her relatives who just brushed it aside and said, "Don't worry, you'll get used to it,'" Matthews said. "I remember this bothered me so much because it was them telling me to essentially get used to dying. But what was even more saddening for me was that it was very clear that's what they had gotten used to doing." *Social activists* have sophisticated skills in creating societal awareness, large-scale stakeholder mobilization and community organizing. Similar to *Corporate Veterans*, they are more likely to build broader stakeholder support for their venture's causes. *Social Activists* can be social workers, young activists, community organizers and civic-minded citizens. They see social ventures as a 'means to the end' as achieving social objectives takes prominence. Their sustained passion and organizing/fundraising skills may lead to some external resource support despite a lack of extensive professional network ties and managerial experience. Consequently, social ventures led by *Social activists* have a greater likelihood of survival due to their *cause-based (large-scale)* engagement and ability to rally support from a diverse group of stakeholders.

The Interplay between Passionate Activism and Entrepreneurial Expertise

We conceptualize passionate activism as a social entrepreneur's attitudes and behaviors that are geared towards advocating for specific social (environmental) cause (s). It is proposed that passionate activism is comprised of three conceptual dimensions: the *passion for social or*

environmental causes, *knowledge of social or environmental causes* and *advocacy ('issue selling') for social or environmental causes.*

Passion for social or environmental cause refers to the intensely positive affective reaction social entrepreneurs display toward their social venture and the social or environmental cause(s) that it supports. This concept is similar to the entrepreneurial passion construct discussed in mainstream entrepreneurship literature. Entrepreneurial passion has been defined as 'consciously accessible, intense positive feelings experienced by engagement in entrepreneurial activities associated with roles that are meaningful and salient to the self-identity of the entrepreneur' (Cardon *et al*., 2009, p. 517). Scholars in mainstream entrepreneurship literature have demonstrated that passion plays an important role in the entrepreneurial process (Cardon *et al*., 2013; Cardon *et al*., 2009). Despite the conceptual similarity, entrepreneurial passion in social entrepreneurship is also distinct from commercial entrepreneurship because it involves passion for both the social venture and the social or environmental problem(s) that it helps solve. In the social entrepreneurship context, we posit that entrepreneurial passion is associated with not only a strong affective commitment to the social venture but also a long term, persistent positive affective commitment to the larger societal and environmental causes that the entrepreneur cares deeply about independent of the social venture.

The second dimension of passionate activism is the knowledge of social, economic or environmental causes. Social entrepreneurs, especially those with grass-roots activist experience, are often very knowledgeable about the social or environmental causes they advocate for. Some have experienced the social or environmental issue (for example, limited or no access to healthcare or education, homelessness, hunger, pollution) firsthand in their own communities. Such a "lived experience" (Berglund, 2007) provides them with a deep understanding of the

issue and its associated consequences. In addition to their personal experience, others also receive formal education in applied fields such as public policy, political science, sociology and environmental studies that provide the intellectual foundation for not only understanding the issue at a cognitive level but also developing an informed opinion on the issue. Such a deep level of knowledge of the social or environmental issue will then serve as a strong catalyst behind a social entrepreneur's pursuit of social ventures as mechanisms for solving societal or environmental problems. The third dimension of passionate activism is the advocacy ('issue selling') for social, economic or environmental causes. Beyond their knowledge and passion for the social or environmental cause, social entrepreneurs, especially those with grass-roots activist backgrounds, are well-versed in 'issue-selling' (Dutton *et al*., 2001). 'Issue selling' in this context refers to the ability of social entrepreneurs to articulate the importance of the social or environmental causes they pursue and effectively persuade key stakeholders in the community and secure their support (London and Morfopoulos, 2010). The advocacy ('issue selling') ability of social entrepreneurs also extends into their ability to create awareness among key stakeholders regarding the social or environmental causes they pursue through various formal and informal means (Bornstein, 2007).

Finally, the social entrepreneur's ability to advocate is also associated with effective stakeholder mobilization. Social entrepreneurs, especially those with a grass-roots activist background, are often very capable of creating stakeholder coalitions around a central social or environmental cause (London and Morfopoulos, 2010). These stakeholder groups, in turn, provide both instrumental and moral support for social entrepreneurs and their ventures. Such ability in stakeholder mobilization, as we argue in this paper, becomes an indispensable source of support in the nascent stage of the social venture. Overall, the interplay between passionate

activism and expertise provides a particularly important insight in understanding why some social entrepreneurs are more likely to be successful in launching and growing their ventures. In the next section, the implications of entrepreneurial passionate activism and expertise across the early and late stages of the social venture is discussed.

Performance Implications across Social Venture Stages

In this paper, it is argued that the interplay between entrepreneurial passion and expertise unfolds over the early (organizing) and late (stability and growth) stages of the entrepreneurial process (Redd *et al*., 2016). Specifically, by developing a typology of social entrepreneurs, this research highlights the role of entrepreneur's passionate activism in the social venture creation process tending to be stronger in the early (post-launch) stages of the venture but progressively weakens in later stages. Conversely, the role of entrepreneurial expertise (in the form of human and social capital) may be less visible in the early stage, given the excitement and passion for the social venture, but becomes increasingly important as coordination and management problems associated with venture growth materialize. In the next section, the influence of entrepreneurial passionate activism and expertise on social venture performance at the early and late stages of the venture is discussed.

Early-Stage (post-launch) Venture Performance- The Importance of Passionate Activism
As described in earlier sections, it is proposed that a social entrepreneur's passionate activism and expertise play distinct roles across the stages of social venture development. In the early stages of the social venture, the social entrepreneurs' (especially those with activist background*)* passionate activism can become particularly beneficial compared to later (advanced) stages. This argument is based on several considerations. First, it is important to note that social entrepreneurs with grass-roots activist background (that is *Local Pragmatists and Social Activists*

in our typology) possess higher levels of passion and awareness of socio-economic and environmental causes compared to the other groups of social entrepreneurs. Passion has been associated with resilience which is necessary for entrepreneurial start-up (Fisher *et al.*, 2018). They are not only extremely motivated to advance these causes through their social ventures but also are very effective in articulating these causes to key stakeholders. Some draw from their own personal anecdotal experiences to make a case that causes their social ventures to advance are important challenges that need to be addressed with urgency. In contrast, other types of social entrepreneurs without a grass-roots activist background (that is disillusioned careerists) are less likely to emphasize their personal experiences but instead are more likely to rely on traditional relational approaches (human capital and close network ties) to support their social ventures at the early stage. This approach puts more emphasis on leveraging the extensive social capital these entrepreneurs accrued during their long careers in the business and public sectors.

In addition to their personal passion and deep knowledge of socio-economic and environmental causes, social entrepreneurs with a grass-roots activist background are also better skilled in identifying and mobilizing relevant stakeholders that might have a particular interest in their social ventures. Using their strong grass-roots activist skills, these entrepreneurs are often more capable of recruiting and educating individuals and community groups that are affected directly (or indirectly) by the causes emphasized in the social venture. Finally, insights from the institutional theory and organizational legitimacy (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Suchman, 1995) suggest that new firms that engage in cognitive and moral legitimacy building are more likely to perform well. Scholars have shown that achieving legitimacy allows organizations to marshal critical resource support from external stakeholders (Suddaby *et al*., 2017). Given their emphasis on solving pressing social and environmental challenges ('doing the right thing') (Suchman,

1995), and their grass root activist experiences, these social entrepreneurs are more likely to

achieve moral legitimacy from key stakeholders. It is then reasonable to expect, based on the

logic of institutional theory, that social ventures that excel in building moral and cognitive

legitimacy among their constituents are more likely to obtain greater external resource support

(Bornstein, 2007; Suchman, 1995). Given their strong passion, grass-roots organization and

mobilization skills and their focus on addressing important social and environmental problems,

we expect that social entrepreneurs with grass-roots activist backgrounds (that is, *Local*

Pragmatists and Social Activists) will secure relatively more external resource support.

Following the above arguments, we propose the following:

Proposition 1: In the early stages of social venture development, social ventures led by Local
Pragmatists and Social Activists will have the highest level of organizational
legitimacy and external stakeholder resource support.

Late-Stage Venture Growth- The Importance of Entrepreneurial Expertise

Beyond survival and the ability to secure external funding, the proposed typology of social

entrepreneurs has an important implication for social ventures' growth prospects. In the context

of social entrepreneurship, we draw from current insight into the entrepreneurial growth

literature and specifically propose that a social venture's growth prospect is primarily driven by

the entrepreneur's human and social capital. Growing a social venture, similar to commercial

ventures, requires that the entrepreneur at times re-define the scope/mission of the venture in a

manner that is consistent with the nature of the intended social causes (objectives). This often

entails articulating the venture's vision and mission as well as developing specific strategies for

realizing this mission (Kickul and Lyons, 2016). Social ventures are often scalable by either

expanding their service to more beneficiaries or possibly embracing new social issues/causes in

addition to their original mission (Keizer *et al*., 2016). Given these strategic options, a social

venture's growth prospects will be higher if it is led by social entrepreneurs with strong organizational and management skills (Lee, 2019). In order to grow their ventures, it becomes necessary for social entrepreneurs to pursue several strategies for recruiting qualified employees, enhancing revenue and product-service offerings and cultivating a good working relationship with various stakeholders (such as local and state governments, community groups, business organizations) (Kickul and Lyons, 2016). Additionally, these entrepreneurs need to carefully balance the smooth operation of the venture in existing programs with the addition of new initiatives and programs. These requirements suggest that social entrepreneurs who have a strong managerial and administrative experience, as well as a robust social capital, will fare well compared to those that lack these critical skills. Accordingly, we propose that entrepreneurs categorized as *Corporate Veterans* are in the best possible position to grow their social ventures compared to other categories of social entrepreneurs.

Social entrepreneurs characterized as *Corporate Veterans* have extensive experience working for business organizations, often in a variety of management positions. They are more likely to use their wealth of business experience and knowledge (that is human capital) in successfully managing the growth stage of their social ventures. The role an entrepreneur's human capital plays in new venture performance has been extensively explored in the commercial entrepreneurship literature (Cooper *et al*., 1994; Davidsson and Honig, 2003; Unger *et al*., 2011). Entrepreneurial human capital has been conceptualized to include the education, knowledge, skills, and experiences (work, entrepreneurial, industry, managerial) of entrepreneurs (Cooper *et al*., 1994; Dimov, 2017; Unger *et al*., 2011, Meyskens *et al.,* 2011). Research has shown that new ventures are more likely to survive longer and perform better if they are led by entrepreneurs with high human capital (Sharir and Lerner, 2006; Davidsson and Honig, 2003;

Unger *et al*., 2011). Research shows that entrepreneurs with high human capital investments are likely to have growing and profitable businesses than those with less human capital investments (Dimov, 2017; Gimeno *et al*., 1997). Additionally, entrepreneurs with high human capital are more likely to transfer their knowledge and skills from prior experience for the success of their firms (Davidsson and Honig, 2003; Unger *et al*., 2011). In this study, we identified *Corporate Veterans* as social entrepreneurs who are more likely to be highly educated with a wealth of extensive business experience that they draw from in addressing important social and environmental problems.

Furthermore, due to their education levels and extensive work experience, *Corporate Veterans* are more likely to have efficient and well-maintained social networks, which can in turn supply a steady flow of critical resources to support their social ventures. This advantage is widely supported by prescriptions of Social Capital Theory (Granovetter, 1973). Individuals with higher education levels who have worked for several organizations have been exposed to more 'professional contacts' and thus have more relationships in their social networks. Accordingly, *Corporate Veterans* are more likely to leverage their professional network ties (social capital) to secure external funding and garner support for causes their venture engages in (Praszkier and Nowak, 2012). Finally, in a growth context, this group of social entrepreneurs is more likely to display competence in effectively managing the increasing administrative complexities and business demands that are associated with a growing social venture. Given the robust human capital endowments this group of social entrepreneurs enjoys and extensive social capital they possess, it is reasonable to expect that they will be more effective in managing their social ventures compared to other social entrepreneurs that often lack the requisite human capital. Based on the above arguments, we propose the following:

Proposition 2: From the four categories of social entrepreneurs, social ventures led by Corporate Veterans are the most likely to experience long term growth.

Long-Term Venture Survival- The Importance of Entrepreneurial Expertise

While a disproportionate level of scholarly attention has traditionally been given to topics of growth and success of entrepreneurial firms, some scholars have examined the antecedents and consequences of entrepreneurial failure (for example, Cardon *et al*., 2011; Yamakawa and Cardon, 2015). Research evidence suggests that new entrepreneurial ventures have a higher propensity for failure (Aldrich and Martinez, 2007). The primary theoretical explanation for a higher failure rate is the significant presence of 'liability of newness' (Stinchcombe, 1965), which focuses on a new venture's lack of managerial experience, social ties and institutional resource support. In addition to internal organizational constraints, research utilizing an ecological theoretical framework has also shown that the degree of competitive intensity and environmental munificence significantly contribute to the failure of most new entrepreneurial ventures (Aldrich and Martinez, 2007). Social ventures are no exception to the 'liability of newness' challenge especially at the early stage of their formation (Ko, 2012; Starnawska, 2015).

In this study, we suggest that from the four distinct types of social ventures identified in our typology, *Local Pragmatists* are particularly the most susceptible to failure. *Local Pragmatists* are social ventures that are established to address pressing social and environmental issues around the entrepreneurs' local communities. Compared to other social entrepreneurs in our typology, *Local Pragmatists* do not possess a high level of human capital, business management expertise and robust professional network ties. One of the biggest challenges faced by *Local Pragmatists* is not only the lack of social capital but also the idea that social capital is contingent upon the number of people doing the same work or having the same experiences. As many of these ventures begin with volunteers and 'sweat equity', the social capital to which the

social entrepreneur has access to is limited to the social networks of volunteers and founders. Unfortunately, this creates challenges in obtaining the resources typically obtained through social capital such as bargaining power, access to unique information and public visibility. Given the narrow scope of social engagement by *Local Pragmatists*, it is reasonable to expect that the associated stakeholder support will be limited. The limitations in acquiring social capital also hinder *Local Pragmatists* from recruiting new talent to further their missions in addition to limiting their ability to effectively 'pitch' their venture vision to supporting organizations and governmental agencies. Furthermore, *Local Pragmatists* are more likely to possess limited human capital, which hampers their ability to effectively manage the start-up and growth of the social venture. Because the issues or causes they address may not fully resonate to wide range of stakeholders at the state, national or international levels, *Local Pragmatists* are more likely to depend on a rather limited number of local stakeholders, which creates greater difficulty in securing the necessary level of resource support to sustain their operations. Based on the above arguments, we propose the following:

Proposition 3: From the four categories of social entrepreneurs, social ventures led by Local Pragmatists are the most likely to fail.

Implications for Research

Overall, this paper contributes to the social entrepreneurship literature in several ways. By exploring how entrepreneurial backgrounds influence venture performance across the entrepreneurial life cycle, we seek to make a number of contributions to social entrepreneurship literature. First, by developing a typology of social entrepreneurs (as an explanatory approach) and discussing the implications of this typology for post-launch social venture performance (predictive approach), the paper advances the current understanding of social entrepreneurs and the performance of their ventures. Second, by primarily focusing on social entrepreneurs as

agents of social change, this paper sheds some light on who these entrepreneurs are, what kind of life and career experiences they have had and what motivates them to engage in social entrepreneurship. Finally, drawing from works on the entrepreneurial life cycle (stages), we propose how the interplay of passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise affect the performance of social ventures. By developing a systematic typology of social entrepreneurs, this paper provides a deeper scholarly understanding of social entrepreneurs, including their life and career experiences and the range of their social engagement. In examining the scope of social engagement along with the entrepreneur's life and career experiences, the paper helps to reveal the motivation, entrepreneurial aspirations, and mindsets of those who set out to launch socially oriented ventures. The work in this paper is a distinct contribution to the social venture literature because it points to the importance of individuals' background characteristics as a predictor of the establishment, management and sustainability of social ventures. In this respect, this paper contributes to emerging work as the focus on the social entrepreneur has recently developed (Van Ryzin *et al*., 2009; Bacq *et al*., 2016).

The focus on the social entrepreneur per se is a major departure from prior descriptive works that primarily focused on the types of social ventures as a unit of analysis (for example, Weerawardena and Mort, 2006; Zahra *et al*., 2009). Moreover, we introduce the construct of passionate activism and discuss its three dimensions of passion for the cause, knowledge of the cause and advocacy (issue-selling). Accordingly, passionate activism (combining passion and community organizing/advocacy skills) is a useful construct for studying social venture performance across the entrepreneurial life cycle. The passionate activism construct creates opportunities for empirical testing and also contributes to theory development in social entrepreneurship, which is a rapidly growing research stream (Arogyaswamy, 2017; Saebi *et al.,*

2019). Passionate activism may not be adequate to ensure the survival and growth of social ventures and that entrepreneurial expertise becomes increasingly important in the later stages of venture growth. While passion may be good for the launch of the venture, 'too much of a good thing' may not be so in later stages. It would be interesting to explore whether and how a social entrepreneur's psychological attachment affects venture performance among *grass-roots actors* and *disillusioned careerists.* Additionally, we observed that *disillusioned careerists* leave their jobs because of a lack of fulfillment and a sense of guilt. It appears that otherwise accomplished career professionals who seek meaning and a sense of well-being in their lives seem to engage in social entrepreneurship as an avenue to satisfy these personal needs, which in turn meets the needs of others. It would be interesting to further investigate the role social entrepreneurship plays in fostering meaningful work and well-being. Unlike the *disillusioned careerists* who are motivated to engage in social entrepreneurship as means to satisfy their own personal needs, *grass-roots actors* engage in social entrepreneurship primarily because they are driven by the need to help others (Bornstein, 2007). It seems that *grass-roots actors* engage in social entrepreneurship as a lifelong 'calling' compared to *disillusioned careerists* who might view engagement in social entrepreneurship as a social or moral obligation. It would be interesting to investigate how these two motivational factors intersect to influence subsequent social venture performance.

Implications for Practice

Beyond the scholarly contributions, this paper also offers important implications for practitioners. Our typology has timely implications for policymakers, social entrepreneurs, and communities which face a myriad of social, economic and environmental challenges. As social entrepreneurship becomes a global movement (Bornstein and Davis, 2010) and with the United

Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Bebbington *et al.,* 2018) serving as scaffolding for communities around the world to pinpoint social, economic and environmental challenges (Le Blanc, 2015); communities, states and governments all over the world are looking for multiple resources to support this global effort. Our typology highlights the importance of localized, problem-focused social entrepreneurs (*Local Pragmatists)* who will no doubt play a role in achieving the United Nations goals. Since they have grass-roots-oriented goals and have less formal career experience, their passion and desire to solve challenging social issues in their communities will need to be supported by government and philanthropic efforts. Furthermore, local level social entrepreneurial efforts must include programs that address social challenges with sustainable solutions. Although many of the social entrepreneurs used in our sample are based in the United States, the many are carrying out their venture efforts in developing countries. The social networks of these social entrepreneurs in connection with those who are *Local Pragmatists* is where the true value and motivation will be created. These entrepreneurs' social networks will need to be intentionally developed by creating a positive entrepreneurial climate where it hasn't existed before and by creating access to a richer pool of resources. At the local level, small business development centers and innovation laboratories will need to allow for collaboration, idea exchange and most importantly incentives for participation in solving some of the world's most challenging problems. Our typology identifies those who have the most trouble acquiring resources across the stages of venture creation and identifying these groups creates an opportunity for direct support.

   Local Pragmatists use grass-roots strategies to launch social ventures, but despite having the ability to convince the family and the local community to support a specific cause, they lack social and human capital. Social and human capital resources, according to Bloom and Chatterji

(2009) are the keys to scaling a social venture. *Local Pragmatists* may need to focus on the benefits of networking for the purpose of gaining access to resources they otherwise wouldn't. This includes increasing visibility of social entrepreneurial efforts through lobbying and alliance building. Another important implication of this observation is that *grass-roots actors* labeled *Local Pragmatists* and *Social Activists* will need government and non-profit organizations to provide entrepreneurial expertise by offering formal business training or alternatively by creating partnerships with neighboring communities and educational organizations which specialize in supporting the launch and growth of social ventures. Finally, the implications of this paper suggest that in the late stages of the entrepreneurial process, *Corporate Veterans* are much more likely than the remaining archetypes to achieve long term success. We attribute this to many years of formal business experience, training, and access to robust social capital. It is these higher-order resources that allow a social venture to successfully transition into the growth stages (Murphy *et al*., 1996). This should encourage more *disillusioned careerists* to not only pursue social ventures of their own, but also to serve as knowledge bases and consultants to those social ventures which struggle.

In the future, social entrepreneurship support systems such as non-profits, small business development centers and the like may consider connecting *disillusioned careerists* to *Local Pragmatists* for example. These types of network connections and ties would improve resource access for those who struggle, increase education through mentorship, and improve chances of venture success through collaboration. As with any social network connection the benefits of the relationship would be bi-directional. While a struggling *Local Pragmatist* may gain access to new resources such as knowledge, training, and capital, the *disillusioned careerist* will also be able to meet their own personal need to improve the world around them by addressing a pressing

socio-economic or environmental issue. The path forward in terms of creating long term solutions to these wicked problems truly calls for an intermeshing and collaboration amongst the four archetypes presented in the typology.

Conclusion

While there is much research which reveals the motivation of social entrepreneurs, not much is known about the effect of the social entrepreneur's prosocial motivation and compassion; specifically, in terms of resource acquisition after the business has launched and in the process of mobilizing stakeholders. We propose that the interplay between the social entrepreneur's passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise leads to different outcomes across the venture formation and growth stages of the venture creation process. Based on a social entrepreneur's life and career experiences as well as the scope of his/her social engagement, we have developed four distinct archetypes: *Seasoned Champions, Local Pragmatists, Social Activists and Corporate Veterans*. While a social entrepreneur's passionate activism may serve as an asset in the early stages of venture creation, it may certainly become a liability at the growth and expansion stage. Most importantly, of the four types of social entrepreneurs in this typology, we posit that *Local Pragmatists* are particularly susceptible to failure because of lower levels of human capital, management expertise, and lack of professional network ties. In creating this typology, we seek to provide a greater understanding of individuals' participation in social ventures and most importantly the likelihood of resource acquisition, survival and growth throughout the various stages of venture formation.

References

4Ocean, available at: https://4ocean.com/ (accessed January 31, 2020).

Aldrich, H. E. and Fiol, C. M. (1994), "Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation", *Academy of Management Review*, *19*(4), 645-670.

Aldrich, H.E. and Martinez, M.A. (2007), "Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 41-56.

André, K. and Pache, A. C. (2016), "From caring entrepreneur to caring enterprise: Addressing the ethical challenges of scaling up social enterprises", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 133 No. 4, pp. 659-675.

Arogyaswamy, B. (2017), "Social entrepreneurship performance measurement: A time-based organizing framework", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 60 No. 5, pp. 603-611.

Ashoka, available at: https://www.ashoka.org/en-us (accessed October 17, 2017).

Austin, J., Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006), "Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 1-22.

Bacq, S., and Alt, E. (2018). "Feeling capable and valued: A prosocial perspective on the link between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 333-350.

Bacq, S., and Janssen, F. (2011), "The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development,* Vol. 23 No. 5-6, pp. 373-403.

Bacq, S., Hartog, C. and Hoogendoorn, B. (2016), "Beyond the moral portrayal of social entrepreneurs: An empirical approach to who they are and what drives them," *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 133 No. 4, pp. 703-718.

Baker, T. and Nelson, R.E. (2005), "Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp.329-366.

Battilana, J., and Dorado, S. (2010), "Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of commercial microfinance organizations", *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 53 No. 6, pp. 1419-1440.

Bebbington, J. and Unerman, J., (2018), "Achieving the United Nations sustainable development goals", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 2-24.

Berglund, H. (2007), "Researching entrepreneurship as lived experience. In Neergaard, J. and Ulhøi, P. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton, MA, pp.75-93.

Bloom, P. N., and Smith, B. R. (2010), "Identifying the drivers of social entrepreneurial impact: Theoretical development and an exploratory empirical test of SCALERS", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 126-145.

Bloom, P.N. and Chatterji, A.K. (2009), "Scaling social entrepreneurial impact", *California Management Review*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp.114-133.

Bornstein, D. (2007), *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K.

Bornstein, David., Davis, Susan. Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.

Bosma, N., Schøtt, T., Terjesen, S., and Kew, P. (2016), "Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2015 to 2016: Special Topic Report on Social Entrepreneurship", *Global Entrepreneurship Research Association (GERA)* (pp. 1-40).

Brush, C. G., Greene, P. G., and Hart, M. M. (2001), "From initial idea to unique advantage: The entrepreneurial challenge of constructing a resource base", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 64-78.

Cardon, M.S., Gregoire, D.A., Stevens, C.E. and Patel, P.C. (2013), "Measuring entrepreneurial passion: Conceptual foundations and scale validation", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 373-396.

Cardon, M.S., Stevens, C.E. and Potter, D.R. (2011), "Misfortunes or mistakes? Cultural sensemaking of entrepreneurial failure", *Journal of Business Venturing,* Vol. 26 No. 1, pp.79-92.

Cardon, M.S., Wincent, J., Singh, J. and Drnovsek, M. (2009), "The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 511-532.

Certo, S. T., and Miller, T. (2008), "Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 267-271.

Clark, M.A., Keyton, J., and Dawson, A.E. (2013), "Do good, make good: The business landscape of social entrepreneurship", In Wankel, C. and Pate L. E. (Eds). *Social Entrepreneurship as a Catalyst for Social Change,* Information Age Publishing (IAP) Charlotte, NC. pp. 15-37.

Cooper, A.C., Gimeno-Gascon, F.J. and Woo, C.Y. (1994), "Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 371-395.

Corner, P. D. and Ho, M. (2010), "How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 635-659.

Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A. and Tracey, P. (2011), "Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions", *Organization Science*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 1203-1213.

Datta, P.B. and Gailey, R. (2012), "Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: Case study of a women's cooperative in India", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 569-587.

Davidsson, P. and Honig, B. (2003), "The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 301-331.

Dees, J. G. (2001), "The meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship", available at: https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Dees_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf (accessed January 30, 2020).

Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. (2010), "Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 32-53.

Delmar, F. and Shane, S. (2004), "Legitimating first: Organizing activities and the survival of new ventures", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 385-410.

DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1983), "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 147-160.

Dimov, D. (2017), "Towards a qualitative understanding of human capital in entrepreneurship research", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 210-227.

Dutton, J.E., Ashford, S.J., O'Neill, R.M. and Lawrence, K.A. (2001), "Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp.716-736.

Echoing Green https://echoinggreen.org/ (accessed October 17, 2017)

Fisher, R., Merlot, E. and Johnson, L.W. (2018), "The obsessive and harmonious nature of entrepreneurial passion", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp.22-40.

Forbes 30 under 30, available at: https://www.forbes.com/30-under-30/2019/#1b1354d063b0 (accessed October 10, 2017).

Gimeno, J., Folta, T.B., Cooper, A.C. and Woo, C.Y. (1997), "Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 750-783.

Granovetter, M. (1973), "The Strength of Weak Ties", *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 78 No. 6, pp. 1360-1380.

Griffiths, M. D., Gundry, L. K. and Kickul, J. R. (2013), "The socio-political, economic, and cultural determinants of social entrepreneurship activity: An empirical examination", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 341-357.

Huybrechts, B., and Nicholls, A. (2012), "Social entrepreneurship: definitions, drivers and challenges. In Volkmann C., Tokarski K. and Ernst K. (Eds), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies,* Springer Gabler pp. 31-48.

Katre, A., and Salipante, P. (2012), "Start-up social ventures: Blending fine-grained behaviors from two institutions for entrepreneurial success", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 967-994.

Keizer, A., Stikkers, A., Heijmans, H., Carsouw, R. and Van Aanholt, W. (2016), "Scaling the Impact of the social enterprise sector", *McKinsey & Company Research Report*.

Kickul, J. and Lyons, T.S., (2016), *Understanding social entrepreneurship: The relentless pursuit of mission in an ever-changing world*. Routledge, New York, NY.

Ko, S. (2012), "Viability of social enterprises: the spillover effect", *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol.8 No. 3, pp. 251-263.

Le Blanc, David. "Towards integration at last? The sustainable development goals as a network of targets." *Sustainable Development* 23, no. 3 (2015): 176-187.

Lee, B. (2019), "Human capital and labor: the effect of entrepreneur characteristics on venture success", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp.29-49.

London, M. and Morfopoulos, R.G. (2009), *Social entrepreneurship: How to start successful corporate social responsibility and community-based initiatives for advocacy and change*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Lysogene, available at: http://www.lysogene.com/ (accessed January 31, 2020).

Mair, J. and Marti, I. (2006), "Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 36-44.

Mair, J., and Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. In *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121-135). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Martens, M. L., Jennings, J. E., and Jennings, P. D. (2007), "Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 1107-1132.

Meyskens, M., Allen, I. E., Brush, C. G. (2011), "Human capital and hybrid ventures" in Lumpkin, G. T. and Katz, J. A. (Eds), *Social and Sustainable Entrepreneurship. Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, Vol. 13, Emerald Group, pp. 51-72.

Meyskens, M., Robb–Post, C., Stamp, J. A., Carsrud, A. L. and Reynolds, P. D. (2010), "Social ventures from a resource–based perspective: An exploratory study assessing global Ashoka fellows", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 661-680.

Miller, T. L., Wesley, C. L. and Williams, D. E. (2012), "Educating the minds of caring hearts: Comparing the views of practitioners and educators on the importance of social entrepreneurship competencies", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 349-370.

Miller, T.L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. and Vogus, T.J. (2012), "Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 616-640.

Morris, M.H., Webb, J.W. and Franklin, R.J. (2011), "Understanding the manifestation of entrepreneurial orientation in the nonprofit context", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 947-971.

Murphy, G.B., Trailer, J.W. and Hill, R.C. (1996), "Measuring performance in entrepreneurship research", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 15-23.

Neck, H., Brush, C. and Allen, E. (2009), "The landscape of social entrepreneurship", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 13-19.

Ometto, M. P., Gegenhuber, T., Winter, J. and Greenwood, R. (2019), "From balancing missions to mission drift: The role of the institutional context, spaces, and compartmentalization in the scaling of social enterprises", *Business & Society*, Vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1003-1046.

Pache, A. C., and Santos, F. (2013), "Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 972-1001.

Perrini, F., Vurro, C. and Costanzo, L. A. (2010), "A process-based view of social entrepreneurship: From opportunity identification to scaling-up social change in the case of San Patrignano", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 515-534.

Pilleve, available at: https://www.pilleve.com/ (accessed January 31, 2020).

Plummer, L. A., Allison, T. H. and Connelly, B. L. (2016), "Better together? Signaling interactions in new venture pursuit of initial external capital", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 59 No. 5, pp. 1585-1604.

Praszkier, R., and Nowak, A. (2012), *Social Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rawhouser, H., Villanueva, J. and Newbert, S.L. (2017), "Strategies and tools for entrepreneurial resource access: A cross-disciplinary review and typology", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 19, pp. 473-491.

Redd, T. C., Abebe, M. A. and Wu, S. (2016), "Entrepreneurial Network Composition and the Venture Creation Process: An Empirical Investigation," in A. Fayolle, A., Jack, S., Lamine, W. and Chabaud, D. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Process and Social Networks: A Dynamic Perspective,* Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, U.K. pp. 29-48.

Renko, M. (2013), "Early challenges of nascent social entrepreneurs", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 37 No. 5, 1045-1069.

Saebi, T., Foss, N.J. and Linder, S. (2019), "Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp.70-95.

Santos, F., Pache, A. C. and Birkholz, C. (2015), "Making hybrids work: Aligning business models and organizational design for social enterprises", *California Management Review*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 36-58.

Sassmannshausen, S. P. and Volkmann, C. (2018), "The scientometrics of social entrepreneurship and its establishment as an academic field", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 251-273.

Schlaegel, C. and Koenig, M. (2014), "Determinants of entrepreneurial intent: a meta-analytic test and integration of competing models", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 291-332.
Schwab Foundation, available at https://www.schwabfound.org/ (accessed October 17, 2017).

Senyard, J., Baker, T., Steffens, P. and Davidsson, P. (2014), "Bricolage as a path to innovativeness for resource-constrained new firms", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 211-230.

Sharir, M. and Lerner, M. (2006), "Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs", *Journal of World Business,* Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 6-20.

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. and Lumpkin, G.T. (2009), "Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 161-194.

Singh, J. V., Tucker, D. J. and House, R. J. (1986), "Organizational legitimacy and the liability of newness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 171-193.

Skoll Foundation, available at: http://skoll.org/ (accessed October 17, 2017).

Starnawska, M. (2015), "Social entrepreneurship and its hybridity determining resource challenges and chances", *Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. 38-53.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965), "Social Structure and Organizations", in March, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations,* Rand McNally, Chicago, IL. pp 142-193.

Suchman, M.C. (1995), "Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 571-610.

Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A. and Haack, P. (2017), "Legitimacy", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 451-478.

Thornley, B. (2012), "The facts on U.S. Social enterprise", available at: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/ben-thornley/social-enterprise_b_2090144.html (accessed November 8, 2017)

Tracey, P. and Phillips, N. (2007), "The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 264-271.

Uncharted Play – now called Uncharted Power, available at: https://www.u-pwr.co/ (accessed January 31, 2020).

Unger, J.M., Rauch, A., Frese, M. and Rosenbusch, N. (2011), "Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 341-358.

Van Ryzin, G.G., Grossman, S., DiPadova-Stocks, L. and Bergrud, E. (2009), "Portrait of the social entrepreneur: Statistical evidence from a US panel", *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 129-140.

Weerawardena, J. and Mort, G.S. (2006), "Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 21-35.

Yamakawa, Y. and Cardon, M.S. (2015), "Causal ascriptions and perceived learning from entrepreneurial failure", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 797-820.

Yitshaki, R. and Kropp, F. (2016), "Motivations and opportunity recognition of social entrepreneurs", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 546-565.

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.

Disillusioned Careerists versus Grass Root Activists: Toward a typology of social entrepreneurs

Figure 1

A typology of social entrepreneurs based of their life experiences and scope of social engagement

Entrepreneur's Life and Career Experiences

	Disillusioned careerists	*Grass Root Actors*
Problem-Focused (Localized)	**Seasoned Champions**	**Local Pragmatists**
Cause-Based (Large-Scale)	**Corporate Veterans**	**Social Activists**

Scope of Entrepreneur social Engagement

Table 1
Description and implication of social entrepreneur typology

Type of social entrepreneur	Description	Level of Human and Social Capital	Likelihood of Venture Survival[a]	Venture Growth Prospect
Seasoned Champions	Entrepreneurs that have extensive career experience in non-business/corporate positions (for example, public/government, not-for-profit). They aspire to use their work experience and expertise to pursue personally-meaningful social ventures. They often grapple with lack of fulfilment in their careers	Extensive/ Extensive	High	Moderate
Local Pragmatists	Entrepreneurs that are concerned with socio-economic and environmental issues around their local communities. They do not necessarily have extensive formal career experience	Limited/ Limited	Low	Low
Corporate Veterans	Entrepreneurs that have extensive corporate/business experience but grow increasingly disillusioned with their career. They view social ventures as avenues of 'giving back' to society and obtain personal fulfilment. They are eager to apply their extensive business expertise and experience to launching and managing successful social ventures.	Extensive/ Extensive	High	High
Social Activists	Entrepreneurs that display strong passion for broader social and environmental challenges (for example, inequality, access to education and health care, environmental degradation, etc.). They see social ventures as a 'means to the end'; achieving social objectives takes prominence. They generally do not have extensive career in business or public sectors.	Moderate/ Moderate	High	Moderate

[a] *Survival refers to the first five years of the social venture's existence.*