1-1-2019

Exploring Knowledge and Awareness of Social Entrepreneurship

Barry Tishler
Nova Southeastern University, barryt@cfl.rr.com

Exploring Knowledge and Awareness of Social Entrepreneurship

by
Barry Jay Tishler

An Applied Dissertation Submitted to the
Abraham S. Fischler College of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University
2018

Approval Page

This applied dissertation was submitted by Barry Jay Tishler under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Bonnie Ronson, DPA
Committee Chair

Analisa Smith, EdD
Committee Member

Kimberly Durham, PsyD
Dean

Statement of Original Work

I declare the following:

I have read the Code of Student Conduct and Academic Responsibility as described in the *Student Handbook* of Nova Southeastern University. This applied dissertation represents my original work, except where I have acknowledged the ideas, words, or material of other authors.

Where another author's ideas have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's ideas by citing them in the required style.

Where another author's words have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's words by using appropriate quotation devices and citations in the required style.

I have obtained permission from the author or publisher—in accordance with the required guidelines—to include any copyrighted material (e.g., tables, figures, survey instruments, large portions of text) in this applied dissertation manuscript.

Barry Jay Tishler

Name

November 13, 2018

Date

Abstract

Exploring Knowledge and Awareness of Social Entrepreneurship. Barry Jay Tishler, 2018: Applied Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Abraham S. Fischler College of Education. Keywords: entrepreneurship, business, social responsibility, social action, nonprofit organizations

Exploring knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship is a study created to identify business students' awareness and knowledge of social entrepreneurship in a business degree program. The social entrepreneurship survey is a descriptive quantitative research instrument that was created to measure students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. The results of this study could be used to identify a potential need for social entrepreneurship academic programs or degrees within the business school. The study used the web-based survey to investigate business students enrolled in a degree program to determine and report if any correlation existed between business graduate students and the research questions that were studied.

The study identified that the current business model of the social enterprise, developed and run by the social entrepreneur, is a real and viable market and one that impacts society. Currently, there exists academic programs at U.S. universities, within academia, along with business incubators and institutions designed to educate and further the mission of the social entrepreneur. Within the business sector and academia, there exists a lack of a clear social entrepreneur theory. The lack of a clear theory is coupled by a lack of social entrepreneurship courses and programs offered by many business schools within the United States. The majority of students surveyed demonstrated a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship.

The results showed that students were not made aware of social entrepreneurship due to any course or program at the institution and were not made aware of social entrepreneurship through academia or outside of students' education or experience. Students were also questioned on their interest in adding social entrepreneurship courses and topics to the business program and specific topics of interest. The results of this study could be used to demonstrate and develop an accepted theory toward social entrepreneurship and new courses or degree programs within the business school studied. New courses and degree programs would prepare students who may choose to enter the private sector of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship and who may choose a civic-related career due to participation in or exposure to these academic programs and theories.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background and Justification

The topics discussed in this quantitative research study included social entrepreneurship and the social enterprise, social entrepreneurship education, a need for definitive theory on social entrepreneurship, and a need to offer social entrepreneurship degree programs and courses at business schools. Social entrepreneurship is an idea, practice, and a business designation that is attracting attention in today's nonprofit, social, and academic arenas. When investigating social entrepreneurship, understanding the currently accepted definitions and applications is significantly important in order to understand the phenomenon and true meaning and application of social entrepreneurship. There exists a variety of approaches in the way social entrepreneurs achieve their objectives and a diversity of definitions of social entrepreneurship that clouds the field of study (Ridley-Duff, 2008).

Social entrepreneurs create and operate social enterprises and do not receive the direct benefit of profits or wealth sharing that entrepreneurs enjoy in the for-profit enterprise (Ridley-Duff, 2008). According to Ridley-Duff (2008), social entrepreneurs agree almost unanimously on the primacy of social objectives; however, there exists a variety of ways in which individuals and agencies carry out their mission to achieve the needed change. Ridley-Duff stated the following:

> In social enterprises, all assets and accumulated wealth are not in the ownership of individuals; social enterprises are independent and provide services, goods, and trade for a social purpose and are nonprofit distributing; in social enterprises, profits are used to create more jobs and businesses and to generate wealth for the benefit of the community. (p. 291)

The assumption of the social enterprise is that the purpose of a not-for-profit corporate designation is to encourage high levels of economic reinvestment, and, more specifically, a definition of social enterprise is a "business with primary social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose" (Ridley-Duff, 2008, p. 293). Social entrepreneurs, in the view of the social enterprise, are change agents who engage in entrepreneurial behaviors with social aims that promote the commercial activities of the nonprofit or social enterprise in the support of their mission (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). Contrary to social entrepreneurship, Matlay (2005) defined entrepreneurship as specializing in the making of judgmental decisions about the coordination of scarce resources for profit, wealth, and the accumulation of assets.

According to Ebrashi (2013), the term social entrepreneur was first used in a work entitled *The Sociology of the Social Movement* in 1972 and described the need for managerial skills to address social problems and business challenges. Later in 1990, Peter Drucker described social innovation and the need for management practices in the nonprofit field to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of social good (Cohen, 2010). Social entrepreneurship became understood as the process in which "social-entrepreneurs create social value through the innovative use and combination of resources" (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012, p. 494).

A broader view of social entrepreneurship can be traced back to the 1980s when Drayton formed Ashoka, an organization whose mission was "to find and support outstanding individuals with pattern-setting ideas for social change" (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010, p. 32). Ashoka's focus involved the support of unique public entrepreneurs who brought about social innovation in a variety of industries and fields rather than centering on the organization they created (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

Ashoka sponsors those social entrepreneurs who are institutional and systems change agents (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). Several other foundations involved in venture philanthropy, such as Charles Schwab and the Skoll Foundation, embrace and support the idea of social innovation central to social entrepreneurship (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

These field developments that centered on new entrepreneurial behaviors were motivated by a social purpose and took place within the third sector (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). The third sector relates to business markets and the formation of a social society that seeks to fulfill a social mission and a quest for democracy through economic activity (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). The third sector brings together associations, cooperatives, mutual societies, foundations, and all nonprofit and not-for-profit organizations that do not seek profit maximization for those who control them (Defourny, & Nyssens, 2010). The idea that social enterprise and social entrepreneurship were formed and established by and in the third sector is important (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

This third sector, according to Defourny and Nyssens (2010), has come to be referred to as the social economy. As a result, new legal forms were introduced, and laws were passed to help promote and integrate social enterprise within government and markets. These laws and business structures have helped to provide financial support to social entrepreneurs. The result has been the development of an industry whose focus is on business methods and earned income strategies. New business methods and alternative income strategies enabling nonprofits to seek alternative stable sources of sustainable funding to come together and coexist with the understanding and theory of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

Driving the third sector were agents of change (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012): the

social entrepreneur (i.e., one who creates social value through the innovative use and combination of resources). Social entrepreneurship was described by Santos (2012) as "entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose" (p. 335). Social entrepreneurs tend to target local problems that have global relevance (Santos, 2012). These initiatives, such as access to water and waste management, aiding the homeless, and promoting small business creation or microfinance, usually start out as small initiatives that are validated within the local context. They can later be replicated in other geographical areas and through global industry (Santos, 2012). Social entrepreneurship has proven to have profoundly impacted global economic systems by creating new industry and substantiating new business models through the redirection of resources toward unaddressed and neglected social issues (Santos, 2012).

Social entrepreneurship has been recognized as a modern global movement that addresses many complex problems of the world (Stecker, 2014). According to Stecker (2014), social entrepreneurs identify problems at the systemic level and then construct innovative and sustainable solutions that result in a new stable equilibrium that provides "a better future for the targeted group and even society at large" (p. 351). Social entrepreneurs lead a wide range of business and nonprofit organizations that pursue a mission-related impact, which is a phrase quoted by Gregory J. Dees, a Harvard professor, who taught the first social entrepreneurial course in 1993 at the Harvard Business School (Stecker, 2014).

Many business colleges within the United States offer a wide range of civic and social entrepreneur courses and curriculums; however, the social entrepreneur was not a product of academia and did not evolve into the third sector as a result of higher education. Due to the creation of the social enterprise and the third sector, business

school and academia adopted this new business paradigm and practice with the creation of new courses in which there still lacks a clear social entrepreneurship theory or main stream acceptance. This study hypothesized that there was a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship among business students within schools who currently do not offer social entrepreneurship courses or degree programs. The lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge and awareness is due in part to a lack of social entrepreneurship theory and research within higher education. Due to the lack of a clear theory and awareness of social entrepreneurship, a need exists to educate and train future business graduate students. Through graduate business courses and degree programs in social entrepreneurship, future business leaders will be properly prepared to successfully participate in this evolving market addressing social need.

Research Problem

The problem examined in this study involved the lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship among business students located at a business school in the United States. The following paragraphs provide a description of the deficiencies in the evidence and the audience for the study.

Deficiencies in the evidence. According to Howorth, Smith, and Parkinson (2012), increasing numbers of social entrepreneurs from nonprofit organizations and social enterprises have sought out business schools to obtain the skills and competencies needed to successfully operate a social venture. The complexity and challenges of the third sector make it difficult for social entrepreneurs to navigate the market, funding, and operational challenges necessary for successfully creating and operating social enterprise ventures without social entrepreneurship education and training (Howorth et al., 2012). There exists a lack of methodical analysis of the explicit challenges related to educating

social entrepreneurs or to the effectiveness or variation in program designs and academia for social entrepreneurship education overall (Howorth et al., 2012).

In order to achieve the aim of the social enterprise, a social entrepreneur must possess the same knowledge and skills that commercial entrepreneurs possess in identifying and exploiting market opportunities (Howorth et al., 2012). Social entrepreneurs must possess the same business skills needed to synthesize resources toward the social enterprise venture that ensures organizational sustainability and mission execution (Howorth et al., 2012). Vital requirements essential for the success and sustainability of a social enterprise require social entrepreneurs to provide management proficiency, business expertise, and entrepreneurial traits and capabilities in nontraditional terms that remain mainly tacit (Howorth et al., 2012). Social entrepreneurs must be able to navigate within the public sector by creating and providing funding acquisition, achieving and maintaining profits and sustainability, growth and investment, efficient management and conservancy of resources, idea generation, innovation, business modeling, and routes to market (Howorth et al., 2012).

The social entrepreneur, according to Howorth et al. (2012), successfully translates these endeavors within the private sector that includes managing a double and often confusing triple bottom line. Within the third sector, there exists a business standard referred to as the triple bottom line, which is an accounting framework that incorporates three dimensions of performance (i.e., social, environmental, and financial) compared to a double bottom line that measures financial performance and adds the feature of social impact (James, Katie, Jitendra, & Bharat, 2015). Managing a social enterprise and effectively navigating the public and private sectors can lead to mission drift, identity confusion, and possible business failure (Howorth et al., 2012). Effective management is

further compounded by a firm's ability to comply with federal and state laws, accounting, and the regulation of for-profit, nonprofit, and not-for-profit entities that will take additional knowledge, skills, and abilities that a social entrepreneur must possess and demonstrate (Howorth et al., 2012).

The characteristics of a social entrepreneur are likely to be associated more with communities of practice and are characterized by mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire in which learning is related to one's social aim and values (Howorth et al., 2012). Prospective social entrepreneurs are guided by social learning through enrollment and participation in social entrepreneurship business school programs and course offerings (Howorth et al., 2012). Within the schools of traditional learning, the social entrepreneur becomes a tangential participant in a learning community that is centered on business primacy and profit rather than the social value that social entrepreneurs identify with more easily (Howorth et al., 2012).

Researchers have suggested that social entrepreneurs represent a specific breed of business participants who require separate and unique academic programs that stem from traditional entrepreneurial education that will lead to creating a social entrepreneurial paradigm skill set (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). However, recent attempts to conceptualize social entrepreneur education resulted in a lack of understanding of how social entrepreneur education positions itself in relation to entrepreneurship education (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). There is a lack of theorizing related to how social entrepreneurship education affects potential programs, organizations, and their efficacy (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012).

Entrepreneurial learning research suggests that entrepreneurs tend to learn best when the topic is directly relevant to their situation (Howorth et al., 2012). When

entrepreneurs learn in this manner, the expectation then exists that communities of practice may develop more readily for social entrepreneurs in dedicated programs that develop and are relative to programs that blend social and commercial entrepreneurship (Howorth et al., 2012). What is missing is a clear social entrepreneurship theory that will provide evidence of clear theoretical framework and that will allow students to understand and comprehend the world of the social entrepreneurship in the context of a social enterprise and the nonprofit (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012).

Audience. Current graduate students and professors of a business school located within the southeastern United States will benefit from this research study. Others who will benefit from this study include, but are not limited to, undergraduate and graduate business students, nonprofits, for-profits, not-for-profits, society, governments, business markets, organizations, educational institutions, and individuals who are interested in or engage in social or civic entrepreneurial or enterprise activities or endeavors. Individuals, organizations, and institutions benefit by the issues addressed by the social enterprise and social entrepreneur that fulfills socioeconomic environmental needs or deficits that government agencies and for-profit business organizations fail to address when executing their missions and visions or agendas.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this applied dissertation, the following terms are defined.

Double bottom line. Organizations who pursue a double bottom line are seeking both financial and social returns on investment (Peters, 2006).

Service learning. Community service is linked to classroom studies in which different forms of social learning combine in a mixture of dialogue and analysis of social issues plus activities that have a significant impact outside the class room (McKoy, Stern,

& Bierbaum, 2010).

Social enterprise. This term refers to "an organization or venture that achieves its primary social or environmental mission using business methods" (Aspen Institute, 2014, p. 1). Social enterprise is an organization that seeks to achieve social or environmental goals through sustainable profits (Massetti, 2008, 2012).

Social entrepreneurship. This term is understood as the creation of social value through the innovative use and combination of resources by a social entrepreneur (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). Other terms used to describe entrepreneur behavior with a social aim include nonprofit venture, nonprofit entrepreneurship, social purpose endeavor, social innovation, social purpose business, community wealth enterprise, public entrepreneurship, and social enterprise.

Social mission. This term refers to a situation in which a social need or opportunity, the explicit and central driving force of a social entrepreneur, results in a tangible outcome that yields and sustain a social benefit (Ebrashi, 2013).

Social need. According to Lane (2011), this term refers to the gap between one current existing reality and optimal socially desirable conditions. Social needs are based on social outlook, and those needs alternatively are based on social values that inform the outlook (Lane, 2011).

Third sector. This term refers to business markets and the formation of a social society that brings together cooperatives, associations, mutual societies and foundations, and all not-for-profit organizations defined as organizations that do not seek profit maximization (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). Leaders within the third sector are those who seek to fulfill a social mission and the quest for democracy through economic activity (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

Triple bottom line. This term refers to an accounting framework that incorporates three dimensions of performance: social, environmental, and financial (James et al., 2015).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine business students' knowledge of social entrepreneurship and business students' awareness of social entrepreneurship. The study also sought to identify evidence or frequency of social entrepreneurship ideas or concepts embedded in the business curriculum to determine the relationship between business graduate students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship and if an interest existed in enrolling in social entrepreneurship courses or curriculum. Finally, the study sought to determine if a potential need existed within the business school to offer social entrepreneurship courses or certificate and degree programs and to further academic and scholarly research toward new theories for social entrepreneurship education.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

The goal of this research was to provide an understanding of social entrepreneurship. The research was designed to assist in developing and broadening social entrepreneurship theories and include management and entrepreneurship theory, institutional theory, legitimacy, and grounded theory. The results of this study will further stimulate current and future research while exposing potential opportunities to engage in social entrepreneurship that will enhance education, business, and society conjointly (Santos, 2012). Many issues and challenges face social entrepreneurship research and the development of a theory (Hockerts, 2006).

The first challenge is the likelihood that the contributions made to field of social entrepreneurship will become lost in the definitions (Hockerts, 2006). Second, the area of social entrepreneurship is so broad that results are often unconvincing and become diluted (Hockerts, 2006). Another challenge of social entrepreneurship research is the lack of any rigorous empirical studies that ground or test social entrepreneurship theories and the lack of systematic data on social enterprise (Hockerts, 2006). To move social entrepreneurship from the infancy stage to a more rigorous theoretical level would require a focused mid-range theory and need for systematic data on social enterprise (Hockerts, 2006).

Social Entrepreneurship Definitions

In order for social entrepreneurship to be recognized as a structured field of research or a mainstream business paradigm, the clarification and definition of fundamental concepts and constructs must be established and examined. Through examination of the literature, this research will provide insight and understanding of

social entrepreneurship while generating awareness into the existence and relevance of the key ideas associated with social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is commonly referred to and defined as processes or behaviors, and the social entrepreneur is represented in terms of the founder of an organization or initiative (Mair & Marti, 2006). The tangible outcome of social entrepreneurship activity is described as the creation and operation of a social enterprise (Mair & Marti, 2006).

Over the last few years, several books on social entrepreneurship have been published, and some practitioner-orientated research has been conducted; however, most business schools have largely overlooked social entrepreneurship until recently where some business schools have joined this growing field by introducing academic centers and courses (Santos, 2012). According to Santos (2012), despite an increase in academic interests, the "management field lacks a conceptual understanding of the economic role and logic of action of social entrepreneurs" (p. 336). Definitions of the social entrepreneur derive mainly from a combination of two concepts: entrepreneurship and social mission. Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, and Shulman (2009) cited 20 definitions of social entrepreneurship. Dacin, Dacin, and Matear (2010) recorded 37 definitions of social entrepreneurship, and most were associated with practice rather than theory. Mainstream definitions characterize social entrepreneurs as having a social mission and the activity of social entrepreneurship as entrepreneurial activity with an inherent social purpose (Santos, 2012).

Haugh (2012) referred to social entrepreneurship as the "simultaneous pursuit of economic, social, and environmental goals by enterprising investors" (p. 7). Idealized definitions have defined social entrepreneurship as change agents within the social sector, and a pragmatic definition is offered as the "generation of earned income by ventures in

the pursuit of social outcomes" (Santos, 2012, p. 336). The result is that social entrepreneurship remains poorly defined and clouds boundaries with other fields of study (Santos, 2012). Santos (2012) suggested that some researchers feel an inclusive approach is beneficial to development of a scholarly field of social entrepreneurship in which social entrepreneurship is connected to and enriches the more established research theories such as structuration, institutional, commercial, and cultural entrepreneurship theory or social movements.

The view of broad inclusive theories approach is a belief that occurs during the pre-paradigm state of development of the field of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise (Santos, 2012). Broad inclusive theories might be better served through the evolution of a theory that begins with narrow constrictive well-framed theories (Santos, 2012). Applying broad inclusive theories toward social entrepreneurship would result in the lack of or the need for developing new social entrepreneurship theories, as social entrepreneurship would then fall within the broader theory of entrepreneurship (Santos, 2012). This is in contrast to a broad inclusive theory, for social entrepreneurship researchers believe clear well-bounded theories would then compete for attention and validation that are then expressed and developed into new social entrepreneurship theories (Santos, 2012).

Conceptual definitions between social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneur, and social enterprise differ (Mair & Marti, 2006). Each competing definition focuses on a separate aspect of the concept and does not impede the search for a theory; the way social entrepreneurship should be studied, however, remains unclear (Mair & Marti, 2006). The Institute for Social Entrepreneurs defines social entrepreneurship as "the art of simultaneously pursuing both a financial and a social return on investment" (Nicholls &

Cho, 2008, p. 99) or a double bottom line that clearly identifies the market oriented dimension of social entrepreneurship. Additionally, Nicholls and Cho (2008) defined social enterprise as a "generic term for a nonprofit enterprise, social-purpose business or revenue-generating venture founded to support or create economic opportunities for poor and disadvantaged populations while simultaneously operating with reference to the financial bottom line" (p. 102).

Social market failures, when institutions fail to address the need, contribute to social welfare in which complex social or environmental issues that exist and are ignored by current markets are then addressed by social entrepreneurs (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). Many times, these market failures are not addressed, as social disequilibrium often demands systematic interventions that are addressed by the social entrepreneur (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). Sociality, market orientation, and innovation are the three elements that map out a rooted set of conceptual dimensions for the field of social entrepreneurship (Nicholls & Cho, 2008).

A consideration of both the social and economic value proposition must also be discussed, along with factors such as stakeholders and social entrepreneurship opportunities (Hockerts, 2006). The concepts of activism, self-help, and philanthropy are three sources of social entrepreneurial opportunity that account for the existence of social purpose business ventures or social enterprise (Hockerts, 2006). These three drivers account for the generation of opportunities, along with the social and economic value proposition (Hockerts, 2006). Activism is one source of social entrepreneurial opportunity, as activists generate interference in the market place by influencing politicians and managers through the use of confrontational or cooperative campaigns (Hockerts, 2006).

Activism provides legitimization within the marketplace through implicit or explicit endorsements by organizations, which provides social enterprises with entrepreneurial opportunities through the availability of assets from these activist groups (Hockerts, 2006). Self-help or the beneficiaries of a social enterprise are another source of social entrepreneurship opportunity (Hockerts, 2006). Those receiving benefits from a social enterprise can become valuable resources and stakeholders to the social enterprise and the social entrepreneurship, such as in social enterprise microfinance organizations, for example, where lower defaults rates have resulted when compared to the pure for-profit banks because of a highly loyal and committed clientele (Hockerts, 2006). In philanthropy or philanthropist venture capital, the return on investment in many cases is satisfied by a social mission while competing in markets among incumbents (Hockerts, 2006).

Hockerts (2006) called for a more rigorous definition of social entrepreneurship in contrast to the previous constructs. Three distinct and pure forms of social engagement were identified in the pursuit of a legitimate and proper definition: social service provision, social activism, and social entrepreneurship (Hockerts, 2006). Martin and Osberg (2007) defined social entrepreneurship as having the following three components: (a) identifying a stable but inherently unjust equilibrium that causes the exclusion, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity that lacks the financial means or political clout to achieve any transformative benefit on its own; (b) identifying an opportunity in this unjust equilibrium, developing a social value proposition, and bringing to bear inspiration, creativity, direct action, courage, and fortitude, thereby challenging the stable states' hegemony; and (c) forging a new, stable equilibrium that releases trapped potential or alleviates the suffering of the targeted group, and through

imitation and the creation of a stable ecosystem around the new equilibrium ensuring a better future for the targeted group and even society at large.

Identifying the boundaries in which the social entrepreneur operates is necessary as a definition, for, without boundaries, the term would be left wide open to be essentially meaningless (Martin & Osberg, 2007). There are two forms of socially valuable activity addressing social needs that result in a new stable system or equilibrium that can be identified as a meaningful boundary of social entrepreneurship (Martin & Osberg, 2007). The first, social venture, takes the form of a social service provision where a resolute and committed individual identifies an unfortunate stable equilibrium, such as water for drought-stricken villages in Africa, and thereby sets up a program to address it (Martin & Osberg, 2007). The impact of this social venture is substantial and is designed to achieve large-scale results (Martin & Osberg, 2007). Due to the success and model offered by the service provision social venture, other ventures then take form that launch a myriad imitators or replicators; otherwise, it is unlikely that a new superior equilibrium paradigm would take place (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

There are many well-intended organizations around the world that address social issues; however, their services may be constricted or limited to a specific demographic or geographic location, where service may be interrupted or vulnerable, and even exemplary in their execution, but limited the same, and should not be confused with the social entrepreneurship (Martin & Osberg, 2007). The differences between these two ventures, the social entrepreneurial and social service, are not initially determined by entrepreneurial context or by the positive attributes of the founder, but rather it lies in the outcomes of the ventures' permanent equilibrium (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

A second class of social venture is social activism, where the motivation of the

activity is the same, unfortunate equilibrium, and the characteristics of the social entrepreneur or founders are the same (i.e., inspiration, courage, creativity, and fortitude); however, what is different is the orientation of the activists and the role they play (Martin & Osberg, 2007). In social activism, the organizer, instead of taking direct action as a social entrepreneur would, attempts to create change through indirect action by influencing others, such as governments, leaders, organizations, consumers, and workers, and should be referred to as a social activist and not a social entrepreneur (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

The literature offered several definitions of social entrepreneurship and differentiated it from social activism and social provision. Martin and Osberg (2007) stated the following:

> The successful social entrepreneur takes direct action and generates a new and sustained equilibrium; the social activist influences others to generate a new and sustainable equilibrium; and the social service provider takes direct action to improve the outcome of the current equilibrium. (p. 38)

These definitions help to create boundaries and distinguish social entrepreneurship from the social service provision and social activism (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

Social Entrepreneurship Typologies and Constructs

According to Swanson and Zhang (2011), creating and developing a theory toward scholarship and research of social entrepreneurship is inherently complex. The following social entrepreneurship constructs and contexts seek to provide a comparative analysis of existing research toward a theory in the field of social entrepreneurship research. A common theme within each of the following typography classifications is the social value proposition on which social entrepreneurship is based (Swanson & Zhang,

2011). A social entrepreneurship theory, based on entrepreneurship literature and empirical research carried out using grounded theory, would introduce new organizational typologies for social entrepreneur organizations, according to Ebrashi (2013), and would outline the conditions, contexts, and motivations that bring about typologies.

Complexity theory, according to Swanson and Zhang (2011) previously applied to economics and entrepreneurship by researchers and was used to seek out improved ways to run organizations in diverse business fields, such as strategic management and international development, and sustainability would also be ideally suited to studying social entrepreneurship. A complexity thinking approach will provide researchers with the ability to more effectively conceptualize and study social entrepreneurship as a dynamic system rather than the static or equilibrium-based concept of traditional research methodologies (Swanson & Zhang, 2011).

Complexity management school of thought is associated with ethics and values that teach "the need to encourage a diversity and autonomous action implies a respect for other people (and their ideas) and a high level of trust" (Swanson & Zhang, 2011, p. 40) and common vision that makes it a prime candidate and well suited for social entrepreneurship research. Complexity thinking is referred to as a management tool and is relevant to researchers examining social entrepreneurship. It is demonstrated when social entrepreneurs seek to solve social issues and, when doing so, normally embrace an altruistic, holistic approach (Swanson & Zhang, 2011).

The following typologies present social entrepreneurship in broad terms yet remain cognizant and recognizing the complexity of the issue (Swanson & Zhang, 2011). Social entrepreneurship is a complex concept that is portrayed in the developing survey

of typologies and viewed from different perspectives (Swanson & Zhang, 2011). Social entrepreneurship differs from many typical organizational forms while, within each typology, the common consideration is the social value proposition (Swanson & Zhang, 2011). The first groups of typologies are framed because of the focus on the constraints to which the social entrepreneur is subject (Swanson & Zhang, 2011).

Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006) created the bounded multidimensional model of social entrepreneurship to recognize the context that social entrepreneurs operate within. The researchers constructed a model, based on nine indepth case studies, defined by the constraints of the social mission, operating environment, and the need for sustainability. Within these constraints, the authors conceptualized social value creation as a product of interaction between "innovativeness, pro-activeness, and risk management behavior" (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006, p. 32). Research in the field of social entrepreneurship is advanced because of this study and the development of an empirically derived model of social entrepreneurship identifying core behavioral dimensions of innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk management (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006).

The optimization constraints that the social entrepreneur operates within are identified and contributed by the study (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006). The resulting classification is the difference in the operational context from that of for-profit entrepreneurs (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006). The authors stated, "Social entrepreneurship is thus identified as a behavioral phenomenon operating within constraints that provide superior social value as the outcome of social entrepreneurship" (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006, p. 33).

Gillian, Weerawardena, and Carnegie (2003) developed the multidimensional

social entrepreneurship construct, positioning social entrepreneurship at the assemblage of four factors to include virtuous behavior resulting from the social mission priority, a balance between purpose and action in the face of a complex environment, recognition of opportunities to create social value, and "risk tolerance, pro-activeness and innovativeness propensity in their key decision making" (p. 82). Entrepreneur business behavior is characterized by researchers as those who demonstrate propensity for risk-taking, proactiveness, and innovativeness and are the three characteristics that provide the basis for the behavioral entrepreneur scale developed by Coven and Slevin (Gillian et al., 2003). Coven and Slevin argued for the recognition of the complexity of the nature of entrepreneurial behavior within an increasingly competitive business milieu (Gillian et al., 2003).

Many practitioners, as they attempt to represent the construct of social entrepreneurship, provide ideas that are multidimensional in nature (Gillian et al., 2003). Social entrepreneurship is expressed as encompassing the "need to develop a productive balance between mission and money" (Gillian et al., 2003, p. 81) and as "practical visionaries who possess vision, innovation, determination and long-term commitment to social change" (Gillian et al., 2003, p. 81). The multidimensional construct of social entrepreneurship is then justified because, first, business entrepreneurship that social entrepreneurship is founded on is multidimensional and, second, because researchers and practitioners discuss social entrepreneurship in terms of many dimensions (Gillian et al., 2003). When a construct consists of several interrelated attributes or dimensions and exists in multidimensional domains, it is referred to as multidimensional, in contrast to a set of interrelated unidimensional constructs where a conception of multidimensional construct can be theorized under an overall abstraction and, in the current case, social

entrepreneurship (Gillian et al., 2003).

According to Gillian et al. (2003), the first entrepreneurial dimension is the virtuous dimension that is theorized as a behavioral characteristic conveyed in the context of a social enterprise. Researchers suggest that social enterprises are theoretically different from commercial enterprises as they are extremely diverse but are identifiable by the primary and centrality of the social mission in relation to the goals and existence of the organization (Gillian et al., 2003). Social enterprise then has a virtual dimension, one that is frequently absent from the commercial enterprise (Gillian et al., 2003). The social entrepreneur displays attitudes and behaviors that illuminate the "virtue dimension of vision of moral purpose that will aid in operationalising the social mission and differentiates the social entrepreneur from the commercial entrepreneur" (Gillian et al., 2003, p. 82). According to Gillian et al. (2003), three criteria for virtue demonstrated by the social entrepreneurship are established:

> That the agent is consciously aware of what she/he is doing. In other words, the virtuous action did not occur accidentally or coincidentally; the agent must choose to perform the virtuous action for its own sake, not for any ulterior motive; the agent must continue to act in this way until the action has become habituated. (p. 82)

The social entrepreneur is then the socially virtuous entrepreneur whose mission is the creation of social value for the enterprise or organization with whom he or she associates himself or herself with (Gillian et al., 2003).

Next, social entrepreneurs, according to Gillian et al. (2003), frequently exhibit the ability for form balanced judgments. The researchers suggested that social entrepreneurs demonstrate balanced judgment or "coherent unity of purpose and action in

the face of complexity" (Gillian et al., 2003, p. 83) that constitutes the second dimension of the suggested multidimensional construct. Researchers have further identified the ability to develop and exhibit balanced judgment as the integrity capacity construct where those with a high-integrity capacity are more likely to demonstrate a coherent unity of purpose and action when confronted with moral complexity (Gillian et al., 2003).

The four related dimensions of the integrity capacity construct are the process, judgment, developmental and system integrity capacities (Gillian et al., 2003). The convergence of these dimensions on the judgment capacity is conceptualized behaviorally, as the social entrepreneur demonstrates a superior ability to deal with complexity and ability to prioritize, examine, and decide between competing activities (Gillian et al., 2003). These innate abilities related to the social entrepreneur's judgment capacity enables the social entrepreneur to maintain the social mission as the central basis and primary purpose of the social enterprise (Gillian et al., 2003). According to Gillian et al. (2003), a social entrepreneurial opportunity in the form of an attainable and viable venture provides superior social value to the populations served within the social enterprise. Compared to commercial entrepreneurship that is driven by a desire of creating superior commercial value for their clients and customers, social entrepreneurs seek market opportunities that will provide an opportunity to create improved social value for those they serve (Gillian et al., 2003).

Gillian et al. (2003) suggested that the social entrepreneur's decision-making behaviors are based on the three dimensions used by commercial entrepreneurs in decision making: tolerance for risk, proactiveness, and innovativeness that is expressed in the context of the social enterprise. Gillian et al. suggested that these characteristics are correlated with knowledge acquisition through exploration, challenging assumptions to

create generative learning opportunities, and rapidly developing new behaviors to leverage learning. Demonstrating these three behaviors allows the social entrepreneur to create superior social value in chaotic conditions within the environment in which the social enterprise operates (Gillian et. al., 2003).

Nicholls and Cho (2008) contended that social entrepreneurship is mainly characterized from other types of organizations by its social mission and the importance it places on innovation and market orientation. The three critical elements in their dimensions of social entrepreneur construct and within a social entrepreneurship organization will vary to a degree (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). According to Nicholls and Cho, one must first define social and entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurships' founding concepts, individually and in relation to each other in order to achieve a greater understanding of its meaning.

Social entrepreneurship is meaningful only as it relates to nonsocial entrepreneurship where it is important to understand what social means in the context of social entrepreneurship and then how the objectives of social entrepreneurship differ from entrepreneurship (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). Concurrently, social ventures themselves are not new. If the social enterprise is to distinguish itself from traditional social organization forms such as the nonprofit and philanthropic foundations, then its entrepreneurial component must differentiate it from other nonentrepreneurial social ventures (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). According to Nicholls and Cho (2008), "social entrepreneurship ventures are often social by a process of normative self-construction" (p. 101), as social organizations are professedly social because they advance social objectives. The question then is what social objectives include, the nature and boundaries of society, and then how these questions are answered and applied toward social

entrepreneurship (Nicholls & Cho, 2008).

Additionally, two questions are raised when using social as a modifier for entrepreneurship: the first a conceptual one, "which objectives can legitimately be considered social" (Nicholls & Cho, 2008, p. 101) and the second empirical that asks about the extent to which "a given organization actually advances these objectives (Nicholls & Cho, 2008, p. 101). One's ability to label an organization an example of social entrepreneurship unreservedly assumes one's ability to access whether or not an organization has legitimate objectives and the ability to make contributions toward achieving these goals (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). The goals differentiated from private objectives may not always be clear as to what they include, thus, "sociality, the extent to that an organization intentionally and effectively pursues the advancement of social objectives (however defined) is a critical, but problematic dimension for distinguishing socially entrepreneurial ventures from other organizations" (Nicholls & Cho, 2008, p. 101).

Entrepreneur, the second part of the social entrepreneur concept, must be defined in terms of traditional social purpose organizations versus socially entrepreneurial ventures where accessing the extent an organization is entrepreneurial that in turn means defining entrepreneurship (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). Nicholls and Cho (2008) identified the Schumpeterian interpretation of entrepreneurship, placing the role of entrepreneurship as an innovator, developing new combinations of goods, services, and organizational forms and a relentless drive to create. In contrast, Casson inferred innovations as high-level entrepreneurship and, placed in the context of social objectives, the social entrepreneurs are social innovators, and this definition is supported by several social entrepreneurship funding and support agencies (Nicholls & Cho, 2008).

The Skoll Centre suggested that social entrepreneurs differ from business entrepreneurs, who are mostly motivated by profits, where social entrepreneurs find motivation by improving society. Social entrepreneurs are change agents for society, seizing and capitalizing on opportunities others miss, improving systems, inventing new approaches, business models and platforms, and creating sustainable solutions that change and improve social issues that are ignored by government, business, and society. The actions of social entrepreneurs demonstrate the elements of entrepreneurship that are most relevant to social entrepreneurship: creativity, innovation, and resourcefulness (Nicholls & Cho, 2008).

Contrasting the Schumpeterian high-level mode of entrepreneurship with the low-level Casson was referenced by Nicholls and Cho (2008), who then go on to support the Austrian school approach of entrepreneurship. In the context of a market economy, the Austrian entrepreneur exploits arbitrage opportunities and buys cheap and then sells at a profit. The Austrian entrepreneur takes advantage of market un-equilibriums and is motivated by profit and the creation of efficiencies that produce additional arbitrage opportunities to exploit (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). In relation, the context of social entrepreneurship is not based in profits but in market orientation, similar in that it involves searching the market for financial returns (Nicholls & Cho, 2008).

Social Entrepreneurship Education

Social entrepreneurship research has reached a critical stage in evolution (Haugh, 2012). The social entrepreneur has created many new triple bottom line products, services, and business models that resulted in scholarly interest and an increase measured by the rise in journal papers (Haugh, 2012). The growing interest in social entrepreneurship has produced several important effects. For example, a cross-continent

global community of social enterprise scholars has emerged, and leading organization and management scholars have gained interest and attraction to this new business paradigm (Haugh, 2012). Further, researchers in disciplines beyond organizations and management have become fascinated and intrigued by the concept of social entrepreneurship (Haugh, 2012). Haugh (2012) stated, "The legitimacy of a scholarly field is linked to the quality of the theories that explain and predict the phenomenon of interest in that field and the social relevance of the theories and findings" (p. 7). Thus, as social entrepreneurship enlarges in both academic practice and policy and concurrently increases in visibility for a dynamic arena of theory, future testing, advancement, and development will further legitimize the field of social entrepreneurship (Haugh, 2012).

Many of the issues that plague the current global community are related to social responsibility and sustainability (James & Schmitz, 2011). Addressing and identifying these complex issues (e.g., environmental, economic needs, social concerns, and political inequality) must include a new kind of analysis that calls into question commonly held beliefs and solutions (James & Schmitz, 2011). This analysis reinforces the need to return to a paradigm definition of sustainable community development based on the newly relevant concept of a triple bottom line economic analysis, social justice, and the environment (James & Schmitz, 2011). The outcome is then the challenge of defining approaches that are relevant and applicable in connecting purposeful work with sustainable community outcomes (James & Schmitz, 2011). According to James and Schmitz (2011), "a curricular shift is required in response to the demand to redress unsustainable business practices and to redefine the role of business in society" (p. 334).

Business schools historically have failed to engage in the exploration of sustainability because of the attraction to view sustainability as a for-profit tool instead of

responsibility (James & Schmitz, 2011). The same for-profit attraction that entices business markets and schools alike to view the economy strictly in terms financial outcomes has resulted in the neglect of environmental and social justice concerns (James & Schmitz, 2011). As a result, "the conversation focuses solely on consumer demand for sustainable products and services that respond to the ethical and practical maintenance of our environment and short-term profit" (James & Schmitz, 2011, p. 335). A major paradigm shift in pedagogical practices within leadership and management education is required if any transformative change sufficient to address the issue of sustainability is to take effect in current business markets (James & Schmitz, 2011).

According to James and Schmitz (2011), higher education focusing on a sustainability construct curriculum that addresses these interlocking issues and concerns provides a framework for entrepreneurial and leadership development that strengthens the student understanding of sustainable issues. Opportunities to examine new questions about the role of entrepreneur and leadership education are created through these changes in the global community (James & Schmitz, 2011). The critical exploration of political, economic, cultural, environmental, and social conditions that promote or disrupt programs designed to create sustainable changes creates the context for educators and students alike to challenge and reflect on what they know and what is not known rather than simply offering a gathering location to exchange static knowledge (James & Schmitz, 2011). The pedagogical focus then is one aimed toward ethics, democracy, justice, and civic courage (James & Schmitz, 2011).

Business schools, in collaboration with other academic fields, have the ability to demonstrate and model that business ventures, such as social enterprises and social entrepreneurial activity, are extremely well suited to address current global needs, with or

without profit motive (James & Schmitz, 2011). When business successes that include the engagement and development of social entrepreneurship ventures addressing social need are neglected and business schools continue to use the idea of money and profit, clouded in terms of economic development or capital investments, as the ultimate indicator of business success, then old ways of thinking will be retained and new paradigms unrealized (James & Schmitz, 2011).

The evolving field of social entrepreneurship lies within the stream of exploration regarding sustainable practices, economic development, and the wave of technological advancements (James & Schmitz, 2011). The ethical foundations of social entrepreneurship are transparency, collaboration, community, and creativity adding to its value within universities (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). The field of social entrepreneurship then creates opportunities to incite innovation and alternate models of education and practice for business success (James & Schmitz, 2011). The increased demand to address complex societal issues requires that academic decisions made at business schools and universities include pedagogical approaches that encourage students to create solutions (James & Schmitz, 2011).

According to James and Schmitz (2011), teaching and learning about social entrepreneurship can offer a distinctive contribution to the current dialogue regarding the preparation of leaders and entrepreneurs for the global community. Regarding theories, methods, and best practices in entrepreneurship education, James and Schmitz stated, "Entrepreneurship education requires a strong experiential component" (p. 334). Social entrepreneurship education involves the goal of teaching business skills in a legitimate context with the priority assigned to creating educational experiences that prepare social entrepreneurs for the demanding and often ambiguous world of the nonprofit social

enterprise (James & Schmitz, 2011).

As a new management education paradigm begins to take place within the niche markets of serving societal needs and not solely for the profit seeking, the social entrepreneur evolves and takes form (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). According to Muscat and Whitty (2009), this new way of thinking traverses the tools of traditional entrepreneurship with economic and community development as business education is beginning to reflect the gradual adoption of these social entrepreneurial skills by government, nonprofits, and various other communal organizations associated with civic society (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). Initially, schools endeavored to teach business ethics and corporate social responsibility that has led to an ever-broadening curriculum that seeks to apply the knowledge, skills, and abilities of a business degree to meet the perceived common good of society (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). Muscat and Whitty stated the following:

> Only by building strong, self-sustaining civil society with thriving local communities will people in every country be able to withstand the forces of technological displacement and market globalization that are threatening the livelihoods and survival of much of the human family. (p. 37)

Currently, many business and professional schools if not already done so are positioning themselves to offer additional coursework or programs that provide new career tracks for future social entrepreneurs and socially concerned students alike (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). The growing number of courses in social entrepreneurship now offer new career tracks that allow for broad applications to organizations of all sizes that range from the remote centers of the developing countries to the sustainable business movement (Muscat & Whitty, 2009).

In the field of social entrepreneurship that is lacking in theory and empirical studies, faculty members who embrace social entrepreneurship lean toward a focus on service or experiential learning activities for course assignments (Brock & Steiner, 2009). In doing so, students are then challenged to create tangible value for social ventures in the community through projects, and, in turn, social entrepreneurs who partner with colleges and universities benefit from students who add value to their organizations mission and vision (Brock & Steiner, 2009). Social entrepreneur programs typically include courses that recognize the characteristic of the social entrepreneur and to prepare future leaders in the field that includes addressing social needs or problems, innovation, scaling a social venture, resource acquisition, opportunity recognition, sustainable business models, and measuring outcomes (Brock & Steiner, 2009).

The aim of faculty and universities is to identify and include the course content and designs that are most likely to influence students to develop a social mindset and become service-oriented leaders (Brock & Steiner, 2009). The result of including social entrepreneurship courses and programs will be determined by the choices and actions of the graduates and the choice to engage a career path working for a social entrepreneurial enterprise or starting a new social venture as a social entrepreneur after graduation (Brock & Steiner, 2009).

Social entrepreneurship programs that are offered by major U.S. universities prepare Master of Business Administration and graduate degree students to enter and compete in the relatively new and quickly growing innovative civic marketplace also known as the third sector (Aspen Institute, 2014). Many top Master of Business Administration university programs (see Appendix A) lack social entrepreneurship courses or degrees, thus creating a potential lack of knowledge and awareness of social

entrepreneurship, leaving graduates unprepared to manage the triple bottom line or enter the civic arena (Aspen Institute, 2014). Most of the universities that do include social entrepreneurship as part of the curriculum generally offer only one or two courses (Brock & Steiner, 2009). Social entrepreneurship courses, as a result, are typically designed to provide a broad overview of the field instead of teaching didactic concepts and ideas central to the social entrepreneurship mission (Brock & Steiner, 2009).

In today's globally competitive market, it is imperative for social entrepreneurs to develop a well-rounded, global perspective of social, economic, and community issues. Participating in undergraduate and graduate business and Master of Business Administration social enterprise or social entrepreneur degree programs provides students and graduates with many advantages compared to other leading universities who currently do not offer programs or degrees in social entrepreneurship (Aspen Institute, 2014). Business schools, colleges, and universities that currently do not offer social entrepreneurship courses or degrees still address social issues through the discussion of nonprofit management and entrepreneurship that continue the current paradigm and lack of social entrepreneurship scholarship and research (Aspen Institute, 2014).

Increasingly, nonprofit strategies include traditional for-profit concepts not addressed through traditional business programs (Aspen Institute, 2014). Additionally, social entrepreneurship courses plus extracurricular activities are rarely connected to mainstream, for-profit, business training within Master of Business Administration programs (Aspen Institute, 2014). Institutions such as the Aspen Institute Center for Business Education prepare business leaders for the 21st century with the vision and knowledge to integrate corporate profitability and social value. Programs offering social entrepreneurship education often employ business educators who incorporate social and

environmental issues into teaching and research, providing guidance toward targeted resources, networks, and a platform to share new ideas and practices among collaborators and peers (Aspen Institute, 2014).

According to James and Schmitz (2011), changes needed within higher education require a "radical overhaul of higher education instruction to eliminate the highly specialized knowledge being nurtured, in favor of a multidisciplinary approach that is more capable of solving today's most difficult challenges" (p. 334). The division-of-labor model of separate departments is obsolete and needs to be replaced with a curriculum structured similar to a web or complex adaptive network where responsible teaching and scholarship become cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural (James & Schmitz, 2011). Social entrepreneurship and civic sustainability education provide a space in the community of higher education and scholarship for this type of engaged learning (James & Schmitz, 2011).

As the social entrepreneur and the third sector movement pertain to sustainability, an important pedagogical resource is provided in multidisciplinary education for students from social science disciplines that include business schools (James & Schmitz, 2011). Teaching sustainability through a multidisciplinary faculty alliance provides and exposes students to expanded perspectives and skills they can then bring to the field (James & Schmitz, 2011). Students learn multiple approaches toward sustainability through practices like social entrepreneurship and service learning that preparing graduates for their professional work, hopefully one that incorporates a sustainable and community-centered approach if one chooses to work outside the field of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship (James & Schmitz, 2011).

Benefits of Social Entrepreneurship Programs

Research has noted that service learning develops student knowledge skills and abilities and their commitment to address and participate in cooperative problems in the community and society (McKoy et al., 2010). Further, McKoy et al. (2010) suggested that, when leaders in the field of civic education endorse service learning schools, the outcome is the development of capable and responsible citizens. The authors stated, "Civic education at its heart must be about active participation, not passive observation" (McKoy et al., 2010, p. 82). The idea of a social enterprise for learning model takes this idea one step further where students engage in service learning that provides action with refection, thus further providing students the collaboration with peers and the community in a collective purpose that prepares them to participate as informed citizens by teaching the principle of shared or collective good, central to many social, environmental, and civic issues (McKoy et al., 2010).

In the current era, the need for more socially conscious education is reflected in the awarding of gifts toward civic professionalism, resulting in a multitude of benefits for organizations and society. Muscat and Whitty (2009) explained as follows:

> Only by building strong, self-sustaining civil society with thriving local communities will people in every country be able to withstand the forces of technological displacement and market globalization that are threatening the livelihoods and survival of much of the human family. (p. 37)

According to Muscat and Whitty, historically generous gifts have contributed to education and the next generation.

Business schools at large are in a position to offer new curricula and to adapt course offerings and programs that would create innovative career tracks for the social

entrepreneur and organizations of all sizes and missions (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). Institutions engaged in social learning that serve the greater good of society through academia have identified civil society as a powerful global force; "civil society may be the most important social innovation of the 20th century" (Muscat & Whitty, 2009, p. 38). Social entrepreneurship institutions that embrace a civil society offer and enrich new business ideas, organizations, careers, and employment opportunities for the next generation of business majors and graduates who seek a purpose-driven role in life (Muscat & Whitty, 2009).

Social entrepreneurship educational courses and programs would directly influence the knowledge, skills, and abilities of social entrepreneurs and civic managers and promote or motivate others to investigate and possibly engage in a civic field or endeavor (Pena, Transue, Riggieri, Shipp, & Atta, 2010). Social entrepreneurship education should be deemed an important discipline to the nation because it can facilitate the positioning of new discoveries, insights, and innovations into the economy (Pena et al., 2010). Potential benefits from entrepreneurial education include the following:

1. Increased social entrepreneurial activity through encouraging more adults to consider social entrepreneurship as a viable career path. Social entrepreneurship education could expand the base of potential social entrepreneurs but also help generate a wider interest in and support for those seeking to start and grow new social enterprises (Pena et al., 2010).

2. Greater diversity, as social entrepreneurship education provides for a wider diversity of demographics to learn the skills necessary and develop the networks to successfully engage in social entrepreneurship activities (Pena et al., 2010). Creating diversity through social entrepreneurship education results in a broader source of ideas

and perspectives in opportunity recognition and solution development (Pena et al., 2010).

3. Social entrepreneurship education would provide increased motivation for at-risk groups to complete formal education (Pena et al., 2010). Further, social entrepreneurship education would be an effective channel to engage youth and training them to contribute to social economic development and sustainable communities (Pena et al., 2010).

4. Social entrepreneurship education would create a heightened sense of business acumen among the business population and within markets. The more social entrepreneurship programs available, the greater the opportunities for individuals to acquire the competencies needed to effect change within their communities and abroad.

5. Social entrepreneurship education focuses on improved creative and critical thinking as social entrepreneurs must rely on creativity, opportunity recognition, and critical thinking when developing and managing a social enterprise and obtaining the funding requirements that are needed to support these ventures (Pena et al., 2010).

Program Deficits

Brown University and Georgetown University were at the forefront of the early civic engagement movement in U.S. higher education with much of their initiatives focused on undergraduate student experiences outside of the formal curriculum and both members in 1985 of the Campus Compact (Hollander, 2011). Since the founding of the Campus Compact, circular-based service or community-based service learning has grown dramatically across the higher education landscape; however, very few research universities were in the forefront of that growth (Hollander, 2011). Many faculties in research-focused campuses greeted service learning with skepticism because attention to pedagogy was not generally rewarded as many questioned both the rigor of this approach

and with the knowledge of how to do it and do it well (Hollander, 2011).

In 2005, the Campus Compact, a U.S. national organization of university presidents committed to civic education, and Tufts University gathered civic engagement leaders at research universities and created a learning community interested in fostering civic education for their students (Hollander, 2011). Growing to over 30 universities, the Campus Compact, now referred to as the Research Universities Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN), meets annually to address the particular needs and challenges of research universities in fostering civic education and strengthening their leadership contributions (Hollander, 2011). These challenges include the need to gain credibility for civic and social learning education in settings that value research as the most powerful measure of faculty quality and success (Hollander, 2011). According to Hollander (2011) more recently, research universities are declaring the importance of educating their students to be effective leaders and advocating for the common good.

Over the last several decades, much has been published about civic education and universities; however, there has been little or no major research effort to document the particular perspective and practices of civic education in research-intense U.S. universities (Hollander, 2011). This lack of research suggests the resistance among research-intensive universities to incorporate civic and social learning in the curriculum (Hollander, 2011). A recent study of the TRUCEN group provided some insight into the current state of civic education among undergraduate students at some research universities (Hollander, 2011). In 2009, an online survey of all TRUCEN members was undertaken, with a total of 50% of the TRUCEN group responding to the survey including 15 major U.S. universities (Hollander, 2011).

All responding universities and campuses, public or private, expressed a desire to

prepare students to improve society and the quality of life or contribute to the common good (Hollander, 2011). According to Hollander (2011), to accomplish the mission of preparing students to improve society, students needed to gain both knowledge about societal issues and problems and the skills needed to successfully address the issues. All but one of the responding TRUCEN universities had formal goals with a definitive civic emphasis; however, it should be noted that each university defined their civic goals differently (Hollander, 2011). Among the respondents, only one reported conducting a longitudinal survey to measure the impact on students, and only Tufts reported that it has a longitudinal student survey designed to measure the impact of their civic education approaches on students (Hollander, 2011). In all, more than half of respondents have senior capstones courses, learning communities, or freshman required courses that address social learning or civic issues, and only four campuses have a minor or major in civic engagement:

1. Georgetown University's Sociology Social Justice Analysis Concentration.
2. University of Minnesota's Community Leadership Minor.
3. North Carolina State's Nonprofit Studies Major.
4. University of Oklahoma's minor in Nonprofit Organizational Studies

(Hollander, 2011).

Despite the prevalence of programs, theoretical foundations remained missing, and very few universities, according to the survey, were able to cite theories of how undergraduates develop civic skills (Hollander, 2011). Those theories described or mentioned were general learning theories or the impact of experiential learning theory (Hollander, 2011).

A broad topic of concern when including civic education and an improved

integration of students' curricular and cocurricular activities is the additional learning through many new civic experiences (Hollander, 2011). The field of higher education and scholarship has increasingly recognized that the students' experience of their education in and out of the classroom is a holistic one and when integrated can deepen a student's learning and capability (Hollander, 2011). A combination of institutional collaboration, incentives for students to obtain support for civic research, guidelines for students and faculty, and student advising are among the current strategies used to accomplish this experience and type of learning (Hollander, 2011).

According to Hollander (2011), the greatest challenge in fostering social learning and civic education at research universities is getting the acceptance of the faculty. Nine of the responding TRUCEN universities communicated the issue, and most cited the lack of faculty incentives combined with the absence of promotion or tenure rewards for engaged scholarship and teaching and concurrently the lack of faculty knowledge of service or community-based learning (Hollander, 2011). The study suggests that, in addition to common challenges of winning over faculty and the coordination across huge complex campuses and a widespread concern with integrating student curricular and cocurricular experiences, several areas of continuing challenge exist for most of these universities: developing strategies to provide a civic learning opportunity for all students, increasing opportunities for student engagement in governance of the institutions themselves, and encouraging deeper discussion and articulation of the developmental theory underlying the reasons for, and approaches to, civic education (Hollander, 2011).

Research Questions

The following research questions were established to guide this applied dissertation:

1. To what extent do business students understand social entrepreneurship?

2. To what extent is business students' awareness of social entrepreneurship?

3. To what extent is business students' knowledge of social entrepreneurship?

4. What percentage of business graduate students would be interested in social entrepreneurship courses or a degree program?

5. What percentage of business graduate students plan to enter the private sector after graduation?

6. What percentage of business graduate students plan to be self-employed after graduation?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were students enrolled in course or semester required for the completion or confirmation of a business degree at a business school located in the United States. The study hypothesized that students enrolled in a business degree program and who participated in the social entrepreneurship survey (see Appendix B) would demonstrate a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship, thus demonstrating, as a result, the need for academic social entrepreneurship programs and courses within the business school. It was further hypothesized that the ideas of students who were presented with or exposed to social entrepreneurship business models or the ideas, concepts, theories, or principles of social entrepreneurship would be reflected in the following: a) students' knowledge of social entrepreneurship, (b) students' awareness of social entrepreneurship, (c) the evidence or frequency of social entrepreneurship embedded in the business curriculum, and (d) the relationship between student knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship and the interest in enrolling in a social enterprise or social entrepreneurship course.

The goal of the social entrepreneurship survey was to determine the extent of business students' current knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. The results of the social entrepreneurship survey determined the percentage of academic courses graduate students perceive were devoted to the study of social entrepreneurship. Participation in the social entrepreneurship survey also determined the percentage of business graduate students who plan a career path in the private sector or who choose to be self-employed. The study determined a correlation between business students who participated in the social entrepreneurship survey and the absence of social

entrepreneurship embedded within their education program and a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship.

Instrument

The instrument utilized for this quantitative study was the social entrepreneurship survey created by the researcher. Research surveys or instruments used to evaluate the research questions did not exist or could not be located. The social entrepreneurship survey was composed of 28 Likert-scale, dichotomous, and multiple-choice questions that included the following: (a) 11 items requiring a *yes*, *no*, or *not sure* answer; (b) 11 items ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*; (c) three items ranging from *always* to *never*; (d) two items instructing respondents to select all that apply; and (e) one item instructing respondents to select only one. The survey took approximately 5 minutes from start to finish and began with short, clear, and easy-to-follow directions. The survey was a web-based instrument that was administered online through an email link that was sent directly to students enrolled at the institutions three satellite campuses. Participation in the study was completely voluntary, and all information and answers remained anonymous.

The survey's aim was to evaluate students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship within the institution's business college and to identify a potential need for new academic courses or additional certificate or degree programs. The importance of evaluating trends and paradigms is significant when considering the introduction of new degree programs and courses into academia and higher education. Researching new business models and markets at the business school is essential in carrying on the tradition of scholarship at the university and drives innovation, economic growth, and social well-being. The questions presented in the survey are relevant to the research

problem, the field of study, the institution, academia, civic education, and the research of social entrepreneurship. The results of the survey determined the internal validity through the survey questions presented that resulted in the explanation of the research question; the goal of this research is to provide an understanding of the business graduate students knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship.

The results are of value to the individual institution and provide an account of social entrepreneurship education provision, engagement, exposure, knowledge, and awareness. The research will help determine if new certificate or degree programs should be developed and offered by the institution addressing the business model of social enterprise and the profession of social entrepreneurship. Current graduate students and professors of a business school located within the southern region of the United States will benefit by this research. Others who will benefit from this study include, but are not limited to, society, business markets, organizations, educational institutions, and individuals who are interested in or who engage in social or civic entrepreneurial or enterprise organizations, nonprofit, not-for-profit, and hybrid-nonprofits.

This survey also benefits those affected by the issues addressed through the social enterprise that fulfills socioeconomic-environmental needs or deficits that government agency and for-profit business organizations fail to address or acknowledge. Research data were analyzed and will be presented to the university to help determine if a need exists to develop and implement certificate or degree programs in social entrepreneurship and to further create academic boards, committees, departments, chairs, members, and faculty toward the creation and administration of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship learning.

Procedures

The social entrepreneurship survey was a web-based instrument created by the researcher and administered online through Survey Monkey that utilizes predetermined analytical and statistical tools to determine if any correlation or statistical significance exists. The survey was conducted while students were enrolled in class at the business school necessary in the completion of a business degree. After university approval, access to the survey was provided by school administrators who informed the students that a survey was being conducted to determine educational awareness at the university. Students currently enrolled received an email with the instrument link and were asked to complete the survey. After agreeing to the adult general informed consent form, students who volunteered then completed the 5-minute online survey. The response rate was collected and applied to the analysis. Survey results were analyzed based on the researcher's predetermined statistical requirements. The statistical findings of the survey were gathered and published as a part of this final report for this study and for evaluation and future research.

The social entrepreneurship survey was a descriptive quantitative research instrument. Purposive sampling often referred to a judgment or selective sampling, a form of nonprobability sampling, where the researcher decides what members of the population is to be sampled was used to conduct the survey. The sample was selected based on the population's demographic, which involved business students who may or may not have been presented or exposed to the ideas, concepts, theories, and principles of social entrepreneurship during their course studies toward degree completion. The social entrepreneurship survey was designed to identify if any correlation existed between the identified population and a statistically significance that resulted by a lack of knowledge

and awareness of social entrepreneurship. Demographics of the population were collected and shall be made available to the university for informational purposes that may be relevant to the institution and future studies.

Demographic results were not subject to statistical analyses and simply recorded as a part of the study as an information tool. This study impacts the university and specifically current business or future business certificate or degree programs that potential include social entrepreneurship concepts within business programs. Students who participated in the survey contributed valid and appropriate data, in terms of both relevance and depth, which will impact the survey findings. The impact of the findings may result in the possible continued research of social entrepreneurship or changes in curriculum at the university studied to include social entrepreneurship. The data analysis used within the study included (a) descriptive statistics and specifically frequency percentages and central tendency to determine average response, mean, median, and mode; (b) variability-dispersion, range, and standard deviation to determine the constancy of the scores; and (c) distribution, to demonstrate the amount of responses for each category using frequencies that show the count and proportion percentage of cases in each category of a variable.

For the purpose of this study, an assumption of equality of interval was made for the total of all responses of all survey categories as it was assumed each response offered a Likert-scale format to choose from and where each survey response analyzed would then be assigned a number that would be an equal distance from the other (Stewart, 2010). This assumption allows for the data collected to be analyzed as quantitative variables utilizing parametric and nonparametric statistic procedures that can be utilized to compare individual survey questions and survey groups (Stewart, 2010).

Nonparametric statistics work well in studies that include small populations and are better represented by frequency, percentages, mode, mean, range, and when ordinal and ranked data are used (Stewart, 2010).

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to determine business students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship in a business degree program located in the United States, as measured by the social entrepreneurship survey. The survey was a descriptive quantitative research instrument that was created to measure students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. This chapter includes the presentation of findings obtained from responses to the survey.

Sample

The social entrepreneurship survey was conducted during a semester at the business school and administered online through Survey Monkey. The student population, approved by Nova Southeastern University to be included in the study, were made aware of the survey at the beginning of the semester by email and asked to voluntarily participate. The sample of students invited to participate in the study composed of students enrolled in online classes at the university's three satellite campuses. All students participating agreed to the adult consent required to take the survey. The survey was open for a single semester, and email reminders were sent to students requesting participation on regular intervals. At the end of the term, all responses were collected and the survey was closed. A total of 14 respondents represented a response rate of 7.4% based on 188 students enrolled at the time.

The study resulted in 92% of the population surveyed as women with the majority age 26 to 35. A diversity of survey respondents was reported revealing an average of 42.9% African American or Black, 28.6% percent White, 21.4% Hispanic or Latino, and 7.1% Asian. Demographic data aligned to the school's fact sheet stating a median age of

33 for full-time graduates, a student population that is 70% female and 30% male, and ethnicity breakdown of 32% White non-Hispanic, 57% minorities, and 11% from other racial or ethnic groups. Business students participating in the survey represented eight Master of Business Administration programs ranging from accounting, human resources, leadership and management, marketing, and international business. The demographic data represented a cross-section of the business school students and programs.

Findings for Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked the following: To what extent do business students understand social entrepreneurship? Survey Items 12, 13, 14, and 15 were used to answer the first research question. The results for Survey Item 12 are represented by a frequency table providing insight into the characteristics business students believed a social entrepreneur should possess and are the characteristics of social entrepreneurs as identified within the research literature (see Table). Students were asked to select all that applied to the eight characteristics of social entrepreneurship. The characteristic selected most involved working well with peers (78.6%), and the characteristic least selected involved extroversion (42.9%), with the remaining scoring in the middle. All eight characteristics of social entrepreneurship, as identified within the study, should be selected for Survey Item 12 as the best possible answer. The survey findings for Survey Item 12 indicate a maximum of eight and a minimum of zero ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 2.12$), indicating half of the characteristics were selected as being associated with social entrepreneurship.

Survey Item 13 asked whether social entrepreneurs are needed and beneficial. The results showed that more than half either disagreed (8%) or neither agreed nor disagreed (46%), totaling 54%, compared to 23% who agreed and 23% who strongly agreed.

Survey Item 14 polled students' knowledge of whether social entrepreneurs provided valuable solutions that contributed to U.S. business markets that would otherwise be neglected. Of those surveyed, 8% disagreed and 42% neither agreed nor disagreed, totaling 50%, compared to 25% who agreed and 25% who strongly agreed.

Table

Frequencies and Percentages for Characteristics of Social Entrepreneurs

Item	Frequency	%
Affinity toward risk taking		
No	5	35.7
Yes	9	64.3
Works well with peers		
No	3	21.4
Yes	11	78.6
Constructive		
No	6	42.9
Yes	8	57.1
Conscientiousness		
No	6	42.9
Yes	8	57.1
Openness		
No	5	35.7
Yes	9	64.3
Charitable		
No	6	42.9
Yes	8	57.1
Extroversion		
No	8	57.1
Yes	6	42.9
Creativity		
No	6	42.9
Yes	8	57.1

Survey Item 15 addressed needs and concerns of social entrepreneurs ignored by society and the government, which resulted in a response of 7% of respondents who

disagreed and 62% who neither agreed nor disagreed, with less than 8% agreeing and 23% strongly agreeing. The findings for Research Question 1 showed a divided awareness of social entrepreneurship; however, survey items polling the need and value of social entrepreneurship recorded a statistically higher number of students who do not understand social entrepreneurship.

Findings for Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked the following: To what extent is business students' awareness of social entrepreneurship? Respondents were asked in Survey Items 6, 8, 9, and 10 if they ever heard of social entrepreneurship, knew a social entrepreneur, knew someone who studied social entrepreneurship, or if they knew someone who wanted to be a social entrepreneur. Thirteen individuals responded. Survey Item 6 resulted in 69.2% responding negatively and 30.8% responding affirmatively. Survey Item 8 resulted in 83.3% responding negatively and 16.7% responding affirmatively. Survey Items 9 and 10 resulted in 92.3% of the population responding negatively and 7.7% responding affirmatively. Therefore, survey respondents were shown to have a low awareness or knowledge of social entrepreneurship.

Findings for Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked the following: To what extent is business students' knowledge of social entrepreneurship. Survey Items 7, 11, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 29 were used to answer the third research question. Survey Item 7 about defining social entrepreneurship, resulted in a statistically significant lack of awareness of social entrepreneurship, 71.4% responding negatively and 24.4% responding affirmatively. One participant did not address this item. When asked if business students knew someone who studied social entrepreneurship most students (92%) reported they did not. Ninety-two

percent responded negatively and 8% did not know if they were not aware of social entrepreneurship due to any assignment or part of any course that they participated in at the university.

When asked if one learned about social entrepreneurship outside of academia, roughly one third (31%) reported affirmatively. Students either did not know (15%) or responded negatively (85%) if the institution offered any courses or programs that included social entrepreneurship, and 85% of students surveyed were not aware of social entrepreneurship programs or courses offered by any other major U.S. universities. When asked about being exposed to the term social entrepreneurship within any course or program at the institution, 69% stated *never* and 23% reported *seldom*. Ninety-two percent of the students also reported that they were seldom exposed to an idea or example of social entrepreneurship during any course they participated in while enrolled. The findings indicate that students present a lack of knowledge of social entrepreneurship or that knowledge is extremely limited either due to no knowledge of courses that exist at the institution or due to not having learned of social entrepreneurship through any assignments or through someone who is a social entrepreneur or who has studied social entrepreneurship.

Findings for Research Question 4

Research Question 4 investigated the percentage of business graduate students who would be interested in social entrepreneurship courses or a degree program. Survey items used to address this research question included Survey Items 16, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, and 33. Survey Item 16 asked if students would be interested in enrolling in social entrepreneurship courses or degree programs at the business school. A minimum of 1 (*strongly disagree*) and a maximum of 5 (*strongly agree*) indicated a larger proportion of

students (44%) would enroll in social entrepreneurship courses or programs, leaving 33% who neither agreed nor disagreed and only 14% who disagreed. Survey Item 24 surveyed students while attending the institution and asked if they would have enrolled in social entrepreneurship courses. Survey Item 24 is similar to Survey Item 16 except the response is indicated by *yes, no,* or *don't know,* where 46.2% responded affirmatively, 15.4% did not know, and 38.5% responding negatively. Survey Items 25 and 26 asked students whether they are aware of social entrepreneurship programs or courses offered by the institution or other major U.S. universities. Both items recorded identical responses: 84.6% responding negatively and 15.4% responding affirmatively.

Survey Item 30, about a need existing at the institution to learn about social entrepreneurship, required a Likert-scale response ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Survey findings for Survey Item 30 reported a frequency of 38.5% of students who agreed, 53.8% who neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7.7% choosing to disagree. Survey Items 31 and 32 offered similar findings to Survey Item 30. Survey Item 31 asked students whether a certificate or degree program in social entrepreneurship would have a positive impact on the institution. Results showed 33.3% agreeing, 58.3% neither agreeing nor disagreeing, and 8.3% disagreeing.

Students were then polled in Survey Item 32 if a certificate or degree program should be included in the curriculum at the institution, and 23.1% said they agreed, 69.2% reported they neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7.7% disagreed. Survey Item 33 asked about social entrepreneurship topics that students would be interested in learning about at the institution (see Appendix C). Students in this survey showed a greater interest in certificate or degree programs than students who did not by more than 25% in most cases and showed a clear interest in specific social entrepreneurship topics,

suggesting that a significant percentage of the survey population was interested in social entrepreneurship education.

Findings for Research Question 5

What is the percentage of business graduate students who plan to enter the private sector after graduation? Responses that addressed Research Question 5 included Survey Item 17, 18, and 19. For Survey Item 17, students reported that 7.7% would strongly agree that they would consider a career as a social entrepreneur and work for in the private sector or for a nonprofit, along with 30.8 who agreed, 30.8% who neither agreed nor disagreed, and 30.8% who disagreed. For Survey Item 18, students who would consider a career with a social purpose after graduation accounted for 7.7% who strongly agreed, 61.5% who agreed, 23.1% who neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7.7% who disagreed. Survey results for Item 19 (After graduation, I plan to be a social entrepreneur and lead or manager a social enterprise) resulted in 7.7% with both *strongly agree* and *agree*, 61.5% reporting they neither agreed nor disagreed, and 23.1% disagreeing. Results were mixed equally, both positively and negatively, for Survey Items 17, 18, and 19; however, a greater response was shown for students interested in a career that included a social purpose. Students presenting an interest in entering the private sector is a leading indicator that a significant amount of the population place an importance on a social purpose.

Findings for Research Question 6

Research Question 6 (What is the percentage of business graduate students who plan to be self-employed after graduation) was answered with responses to Survey Item 20. The results indicated that 77% of students reported they do not plan to be self-employed after graduation with the remaining 15.4% agreeing and 7.7% strongly

agreeing. Research Question 6 showed most students do not plan to be self-employed after graduation, which would indicate students plan to enter the global business market. Students who have a social entrepreneurship education or who have a participated in classes whose topics include a social driven purpose, as students within the survey indicated they are interested in enrolling in, are at a greater advantage when marketing themselves after graduation in the global marketplace. A global marketplace that includes the social enterprise that manage and drive a triple bottom line and organizations that include a social driven or sustainable purpose are organizations that would benefit by employees educated on the principles and practices of social entrepreneurship.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to identify business students' knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship in a business degree program. The study revealed business students presented a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. The study determined students were not exposed to the theories or business practices of social entrepreneurship within the business program and did not learn of social entrepreneurship outside of the program or within academia. These results were expected and follow the idea that many business programs follow the for-profit paradigm model of business and sustainability is viewed as a for-profit tool.

Summary of the Findings

Social entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship represent a new market and business paradigm that exist all over the world and within academia at prominent business schools. To identify if business students are being exposed to this socially valued civic area of theory and practice, it is important to study student's current knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship theory has developed to include social entrepreneurship, a theory and practice that business students should be aware of prior to entering the global market place. A business paradigm that values innovation, addresses important social economic and environmental issues, one's social entrepreneurs embrace and solve.

The results of the social entrepreneurship survey showed a lack of knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship among students surveyed at the business school. Students surveyed did not learn of social entrepreneurship business practices or theories while enrolled in the business program or prior. Most students reported they had not

heard of social entrepreneurship and were not able to sufficiently define it. Students were only able to identify some of the characteristics associated with the social entrepreneur that are closely associated with the idea of who a social entrepreneur is. The majority of students did not know a social entrepreneur or someone who studied social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs create complex systems that solve issues that affect society or the environment. Many times, these are issues that government or society fail to address and are left unchecked resulting in externalizes and the ongoing effects and impact of the core problem. The results of the survey were expected, including the results received once students were provided with the definition of social entrepreneurship.

Interpretation of the Findings

The researcher offers the following interpretation of the findings related to student knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship. The study involved six research questions designed to address the various issues associated with the topic.

Research Question 1. To what extent do business students understand social entrepreneurship? The social entrepreneurship survey questioned students' insight into the characteristics a social entrepreneur would possess as identified in the research study. The survey findings ranged from two to four characteristics that were identified by the respondents as being associated with a social entrepreneur. If an understanding of social entrepreneurship were present, all eight characteristics should have been selected as a tacit response. Social entrepreneurs solve complex problems within the third sector of business that create social value, address local problems that have global relevance, such as access to water through small business innovation, and then later are replicated at a regional or global level (Santos, 2012). However, more than half the respondents in the

survey reported social entrepreneurs are not needed or beneficial and do not provide valuable business solutions in the U.S. market.

These expected results, that a lack of understanding exists, were further represented by 68% of the population who reported that social entrepreneurs do not address the needs and concerns ignored by society or government. If an understanding of social entrepreneurship were acquired through the business program, students reporting would able to correlate the issues addressed by social entrepreneurs and those that are neglected by society and government. The social market failures and disequilibrium that exists and are ignored by current markets demand systematic interventions that then are addressed by the social entrepreneur (Nicholls & Cho, 2008). The finding for Research Question 1 (To what extent do business students understand social entrepreneurship?) showed a statistically higher number of students who did not understand social entrepreneurship. The majority of the population did not understand what a social entrepreneur does or the impact they have on global systems or socioeconomic and environmental issues.

Research Question 2. To what extent is business students' awareness of social entrepreneurship? The results for Research Question 2 included Survey Items 6, 8, 9, and 10. Survey Item 6 (Have you ever heard of social entrepreneurship?) resulted in 69.2% responding negatively and 30.8% responding affirmatively, a clear indication that students are not being presented with or instructed on social entrepreneurship, the business models they create, or the issues they address. Having a lack of awareness was further demonstrated in the response to Survey Item 8, where 83.3% stated they do not know a social entrepreneur. This result is further reinforced by the response to Survey Items 9 and 10, where the responses were identical, as 92% did not know anyone who

studied social entrepreneurship or knew someone who wanted to be one. Students would have an awareness of social entrepreneurship if the theories, ideas, and business practices were a part of any of the business degree programs courses or curricula at the institution or through students completing the required program courses who were planning to enter the field of social enterprise as social entrepreneurs.

For social entrepreneurship to move toward the theoretical level, as the literature review implies, business programs must incorporate a social entrepreneurship curriculum that would develop a focused mid-range theory and systematic data on the social entrepreneurship and the empirical studies that would test and ground these theories. Enriching the scholarly field of social entrepreneurship is an inclusive approach that can connect to and cultivate the more established research theories such as structuration, institutional, commercial and cultural entrepreneurship theory or social movements.

Research Question 3. To what extent is business students' knowledge of social entrepreneurship? Knowledge of social entrepreneurship was not evident from the results of Research Question 3 and included Survey Items 7, 11, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 29. Responses to Survey Item 7 indicated that 76.9% of students were unable to define social entrepreneurship that, according to Pache and Chowdhury (2012), is the creation of social value through the innovative use and combination of resources by a social entrepreneur. The survey provided students with the definition of a social entrepreneurship, and the finding reinforced that business students did not learn of social entrepreneurship due to any course within the institution, nor did students have any knowledge of courses or programs offered by the school. The lack of knowledge of social entrepreneurship and the absence of courses, programs, or even as topics within the circular, is due, in part, to the failure to engage in the exploration of sustainability through social entrepreneurship

(James & Schmitz, 2011).

The for-profit attraction that entices business markets and schools alike to view the economy strictly in terms financial outcomes has resulted in the neglect of environmental and social justice concerns (James & Schmitz, 2011). The result is institutions focus the conversation solely on the consumer demand for sustainable via products and services that respond to the ethical and practical maintenance of our environment and short-term profit (James & Schmitz). Once a paradigm shift occurs in pedagogical practices within leadership and management, education will then begin to take part in the transformative change sufficient to address the issue of sustainability that is currently addressed by business markets (James & Schmitz, 2011). Most of the students were not exposed to the idea of social entrepreneurship while engaged in a business degree at the institution and therefore unable to know or understand the impact social entrepreneurship has on business markets through sustainable solutions.

Research Question 4. What is the percentage of business graduate students who would be interested in social entrepreneurship courses or a degree program? Research Question 4 included Survey Items 16, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, and 33. The researcher predicted that students would have an interest studying social entrepreneurship after being introduced to the business concept and the feature of social change and sustainability. Business students should be able to relate to entrepreneurship principles and be further attracted to the idea of social entrepreneurship and the social entrepreneur, who target local problems that have global relevance, as explained by Santos (2012), as "entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose" (p. 335). Students polled, 44%, showed a significant percentage interested in social entrepreneurship courses or programs. Most students were unaware if social entrepreneurship courses or programs

were offered by the institution or major U.S. universities, 84.6% and 38.5%, respectively.

Students stating a need exists within the business program along and combined with the researcher predicting students would be interested in social entrepreneurship courses and program would suggest that the research question is valid and true. Additional support shows 33.3% of students believe social entrepreneurship courses or degree programs would have a positive effect on the institution, and another 23.1% stated certificate or degree programs should be included in the curriculum. As presented in the research, students' educational experience and capacity for learning, as recognized by higher education, are further deepened when there is institutional collaboration for civic research in and out of the classroom. Business schools able to offer new courses and programs create new career tracks for the social entrepreneur along with organizations of all sizes and missions (Muscat & Whitty, 2009). These business institutions that identify the social entrepreneur and civic society as a powerful global force can further offer and enrich new business ideas, careers, employments opportunities, and new paradigms for those who seeks a purpose-driven life role.

Research Question 5. What is the percentage of business graduate students who plan to enter the private sector after graduation? Research Question 5 included Survey Items 17 and 18. Entering the private sector after graduation would be a leading indicator of individual who look to join a sustainable cause or social action platform. Of those surveyed, 17.7% stated they would consider a career as asocial entrepreneur, and 30.8% reported they would work for a nonprofit. The greatest response was indicated by students who were asked if they would enter a career with a social purpose, with 7.7% who strongly agreed and 61.5% who agreed as a strong indicator that social entrepreneurship education is needed and necessary.

Research Question 6. What is the percentage of business graduate students who plan to be self-employed after graduation? This research question was interested in determining the percentage of the population that were entrepreneurial and who potentially sought to own a business after graduation with the idea that students studying entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship theory might be stimulated to engage in social entrepreneurship studies and a social purpose mission. Students offered the opportunity to study social entrepreneurship theory and practices while engaged in a business degree would be more effective in a global market the represented social enterprise and purpose driven missions.

Context of the Findings

The findings of the social entrepreneurship survey, in relation to other research, would suggest the business school has the opportunity to embrace and formulate a civic education plan within the business program by offering social entrepreneurship degrees and /or courses. When an institution challenges the status quo and promotes a paradigm shift, one that changes the faculty and students, that places importance on a civic mission and on social entrepreneurship then, like many institutions, the institution gains access to resources to further such initiatives such as the Campus Compact now referred to as TRUCEN. This is an important paradigm shift for education and one that would lead the institution in the direction of educating students toward becoming more effective leaders and ones who advocate for the common good (Hollander, 2011). The study would further support the evidence that suggests universities are reluctant to incorporate civic and social learning into the curriculum based on the lack of research studies by research intense universities and schools of higher learning.

The social entrepreneurship survey would also support recent studies of civic

education where it was reported that all campuses, public and private, expressed a desire to improve society and to contribute to the common good or social purpose (Hollander, 2011). The research was designed to survey student's current awareness and knowledge of social entrepreneurship. The findings would provide an indication of the institution's current status in regard to civic education and social entrepreneurship theories and practices to be specific. The results would indicate that the intuition lacks courses and/or degree programs that apply social entrepreneurial civic theories or social purpose learning. It is important to note that, in the context of the literature and findings of the social entrepreneurship survey, a need within the institution exists and is one that is supported by paradigm shifts previously experienced by other major U.S. universities of a business model and education based on purpose and the needs of people and society.

Implications of the Findings

The findings from the social entrepreneurship survey would extend and validate previous research on social entrepreneurship and civic education. With the addition of social entrepreneurship courses or degree programs within a business school, the implications can be far reaching. By creating a civics education plan and expanding curriculum to include social entrepreneurship courses and program, the effect is the further developing and broadening of social entrepreneurship theories such as management and entrepreneurship theory, institutional theory, legitimacy, and grounded theory. Haugh (2012) stated, "The legitimacy of a scholarly field is linked to the quality of the theories that explain and predict the phenomenon of interest in that field and the social relevance of the theories and findings" (p. 7). For a university to engage in social entrepreneurship education, the institution would develop both in academic practice and policy. Civic business engagement would increase the potential broadening of theories, as

well as present future research and testing opportunities that would further legitimize the field of social entrepreneurship (Haugh, 2012).

Engaging in social entrepreneurship education will stimulate research and present opportunities to engage in social entrepreneurship that will enhance education, business, and society conjointly (Santos, 2012). The results of the social entrepreneurship survey reinforce the need for academia and business schools to include a paradigm definition of sustainable community development based on the newly relevant concept of a triple bottom line, sustainable economic analysis, social justice, and the environment (James & Schmitz, 2011). According to James and Schmitz (2011), a "curricular shift is required in response to the demand to redress unsustainable business practices and to redefine the role of business in society" (p. 334). Social entrepreneurial research and education can provide business students with the necessary knowledge and skills, theory, and practices needed to operate a triple bottom line, which is one that realigns the role of business in society.

Limitations

Limitations to this study, as with other such research studies, involve the feasibility in conducting a survey on a limited or finite budget, sample size, and the reporting of errors that can dilute the research findings (Visser, Krosnick, & Lavrakas, 2000). The research was limited based on the low response rate of 14 respondents of the 188 enrolled students, or 7.4.%. A low response rate can affect the nonresponse bias, how well the data can affect the population, and the difference between those views represented in the response and those views not represented. Reducing the total survey error is reflected in the limitation to the survey design where survey design impacts data quality within the constraints of a limited budget, as with a limited budget, the survey is

limited to reduce error (Visser et al., 2000).

Total survey error represents the perspective that the goal of a survey is to accurately measure constructs within a sample population and the overall deviation from this ideal such as sampling variability, response bias, and nonresponse bias that could impact this survey and is a collective result from several sources of survey errors (Visser et al., 2000). The four components of overall error of the total survey error perspective are coverage error, sampling error, nonresponse error, and measurement error (Visser et al., 2000). By identifying any potential error of each component within the study as it relates to the limited budget of the study, or cost related, the researcher can identify and possibly reduce study limitations and increase the statistical significance of the research study (Visser et al., 2000).

Coverage error is the bias that can exist when the pool of selected participants does not include some portions of the populations of interest or choosing the wrong sample population and should not be relevant or extremely low within the context of current study (Visser et al., 2000). Sampling error is identified as the random differences that exist between any sample and the population from that it was selected (Visser et al., 2000). Due to the sample size and the number of business degrees offered, a limited determination could be made that the sample represents a fair cross-section of the student population within the business school. Nonresponse error is the bias that occurs when data are not collected from all the members of a sample (Visser et al., 2000). Nonresponse error is a valid concern that should be reduced due to the survey being conducted at the institution and during a current semester that will provide aid toward future research and curricula at the institution.

It was hypothesized that the results of this survey should demonstrate a moderate

participation and response rate because of the length of the survey and the ease of completing it within in allotted class time. At the close of the survey, it was evident that participation was low; however, all the data were collected from the entire sample, except for one who failed to report any results compared to the remaining sample that reported 100%. Measurement error is due to all the distortions in the assessment of the portions of interest that may lead to systematic bias or random variance that may be due in part to the respondent's attitude, such as misreporting one's true attitude or failure to understand or pay attention to a specific question (Visser et al., 2000). Measurement error will be reduced first by utilizing a Likert-scale survey that is solely quantitative and removes the qualitative variable.

Second, the instructions for the survey are within the survey that should eliminate interviewer bias as there is no interviewer. Each survey questions asks for a specific insight into the subject in the simplest of term and then provides for a response at either end of the spectrum. Survey questions are straightforward and easy to understand with responses that are fair and ones that will provide clear insight into the business students' experiences and attitudes as it relates to the subject (Visser et al., 2000). When creating the social entrepreneurship survey, the researcher took into consideration each source of error along with any allocation of resources, or cost, to reduce the sum of the four components that make up total survey error (Visser et al., 2000). Reducing potential errors was addressed by developing questions specifically for the population studied and by narrowing the scope of the study to address only those questions relevant to the study and research questions.

This research study was further limited to a business school located in the southern region of the United States where the views, attitudes, and beliefs are

representative solely of this population alone, standing apart from the total population of all business school students. Additional limitations of this study reflect only the current business school cohort where retesting additional or future cohorts could possibly demonstrate a higher correlation to the research questions and statistical significance of the study. Additional limitation to the study may include false reporting, inability to verify self-reporting due to costs, survey technical issues preventing survey completion or that may reduce the size of the sample, and a potential risk of bias.

Future Directions

The results of this study could be used to identify a potential need for social entrepreneurship academic programs or degrees within the business school. The study identified that the current business model of the social enterprise, developed and run by the social entrepreneur, is a real and viable market that impacts society. Currently, there exist academic programs at U.S. universities, within academia, along with business incubators and institutions designed to educate and further the mission of the social entrepreneur. Within the business sector and academia, there exists a lack of a clear social entrepreneur theory. The lack of a clear theory is coupled by a lack of social entrepreneurship courses and programs offered by many business schools within the United States. Students surveyed will demonstrate current knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship.

The results of this study could be used to demonstrate and develop an accepted theory toward social entrepreneurship and new courses or degree programs within the business school studied. New courses and degree programs would prepare students who may choose to enter the private sector of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship and who may choose a civic related career due to participation in or exposure to these

academic programs and theories. The field of higher education suggests the value of students' experience of their education in and out of the classroom. This can be accomplished by a combination of institutional collaboration, incentives for students to obtain support for civic research, guidelines for students and faculty, and student advising, which are among the current strategies used to accomplish this experience and type of learning (Hollander, 2011).

References

Aspen Institute. (2014). *Center for business education: About us*. Washington, DC: Author.

Brock, D. D., & Steiner, S. (2009). *Social entrepreneurship education: Is it achieving the desired aims?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, W. (2010). *Drucker on leadership: New lessons from the father of modern management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*(3), 37-38.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1*, 32-33.

Ebrashi, R. E. (2013). Social entrepreneurship theory and sustainable social impact. *Social Responsibility Journal, 9*, 188-209. doi:10.1108/SRJ-07-2011-0013

Gillian, S. M., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: Toward conceptualization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 8*, 76-88.

Haugh, H. (2012). The importance of theory in social enterprise research. *Social Enterprise Journal, 8*, 7-15. doi:10.1108/17508611211226557

Hockerts, K. (2006). Entrepreneurial opportunity in social purpose business ventures. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 142-154). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hollander, E. L. (2011). Civic education in research universities: Leaders or followers?

Education and Training, 53(2), 166-176. doi:10.1108/00400911111115708

Howorth, C., Smith, S. M., & Parkinson, C. (2012). Social learning and social entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 11*(3), 371-373.

James, B., Katie, G., Jitendra, M., & Bharat, M. (2015). "The big idea," the sustainable economy, and the TBL (triple bottom line). *Advances in Management, 8*(1), 1-8.

James, C. D., & Schmitz, C. L. (2011). Transforming sustainability education: Ethics, leadership, community engagement, and social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*, 334-335.

Lane, M. J. (2011). *Social enterprise: Empowering mission-driven entrepreneurs*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*, 36-44.

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 5*(1), 28-39.

Massetti, B. L. (2008). The social entrepreneurship matrix as a "tipping point" for economic change. *Emergence, 10*(3), 1-8.

Massetti, B. L. (2012). The duality of social enterprise: A framework for social action. *Review of Business, 33*(1), 50-64.

Matlay, H. (2005). Researching entrepreneurship and education: Part 1: What is entrepreneurship, and does it matter? *Education and Training, 47*(8), 665-677.

McKoy, D., Stern, D., & Bierbaum, A. H. (2010). Social enterprise for learning: A replicable model of service learning and civic engagement. *Social Studies Review, 49*(1), 82-85.

Muscat, E., & Whitty, M. (2009). Social entrepreneurship: Values-based leadership to transform business education and society. *Business Renaissance Quarterly, 4*(1), 31-44.

Nicholls, A., & Cho, A. H. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: The structuration of a field. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change* (pp. 99-118). New York, NY: Wiley.

Pache, A., & Chowdhury, I. (2012). Social entrepreneurs as institutionally embedded entrepreneurs: Toward a new model of social entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 11*(3), 494-495.

Pena, V., Transue, M., Riggieri, A., Shipp, S., & Atta, R. V. (2010). *A survey of entrepreneurship education initiatives*. Washington, DC: Science and Technology Policy Institute.

Peters, A. A. (2006). *Toward developing a classification scheme for social enterprises.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Ridley-Duff, R. (2008). Social enterprise as a socially rational business. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research, 14*, 291-312. doi:10.1108 /13552550810897669

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*, 335-351. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1413-4

Stecker, M. J. (2014). Revolutionizing the nonprofit sector through social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economic Issues, 48*, 349-357.

Stewart, A. R. (2010). *Entrepreneurial perception: A survey of graduates of a global management MBA program*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swanson, L. A., & Zhang, D. D. (2011). Complexity theory and the social

entrepreneurship zone. *Emergence, 13*(3), 39-56.

Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2000). *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Weerawardena, J., & Sullivan Mort, G. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business, 41*, 21-35.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing, 24*, 519-520.

Appendix A

Top 30 U.S. Social Entrepreneurship Graduate Business Programs

Top 30 U.S. Social Entrepreneurship Graduate Business Programs

Rank	School Name	Relevant Coursework Rank	Student Exposure Rank	Business Impact Rank	Faculty Research Rank
1	Stanford Graduate School of Business	2	24	1	4
2	U. of Notre Dame (Mendoza)	5	65	5	2
3	Yale School of Management	3	30	5	17
4	Northwestern University (Kellogg)	6	34	2	14
5	U. of Michigan (Ross)	11	62	7	5
6	Cornell University (Johnson)	7	6	20	34
7	U. of North Carolina (Kenan-Flagler)	15	49	4	19
8	UC Berkeley (Haas)	12	71	13	10
9	GWU School of Business	16	36	11	29
10	Columbia Business School	13	83	14	9
11	Portland State U. School of Business Admin.	36	22	10	39
12	U. of Denver (Daniels)	9	16	14	62
13	Loyola U. Chicago (GSB)	17	3	70	22
14	San Francisco State U. College of Business	28	14	18	31
15	Wisconsin School of Business	28	92	11	8
16	Simmons School of Management	25	2	37	62
17	U. of Colorado at Boulder (Leeds)	24	15	33	27
18	NYU (Stern)	4	64	27	30
19	Willamette University (Atkinson)	14	23	7	124
20	Duquesne University (Donahue)	48	4	14	90
21	Colorado State University	100	7	23	31
22	U. of Texas at Austin (McCombs)	19	97	18	25
23	U. of South Carolina	23	54	33	21

	(Moore)				
24	Illinois State U. College of Business	59	56	23	18
25	Monterey Institute of International Studies	26	10	20	127
26	Rutgers Business School	51	46	60	12
27	U. of Pennsylvania (Wharton)	46	107	27	14
28	U. of Maryland (Smith)	22	80	37	46
29	Brandeis University (Heller)	56	5	37	115
30	U. of San Diego School of Business Admin.	46	20	46	62

Appendix B

Survey

Survey

Social Entrepreneurship Knowledge and Awareness Survey

Why complete this survey?

This survey aims to evaluate the knowledge and awareness of social entrepreneurship within the institution and the potential need for new academic courses and additional degree programs. The importance of evaluating trends and paradigms is significant when considering the introduction of new degree programs and courses into academia and higher education. Researching new business models and markets at the business school is essential in carrying on the tradition of University which further drives innovation, economic growth, and social wellbeing.

What are the benefits?

The results will be of value to the individual institution and provide an account of social entrepreneurship education provision, engagement, knowledge, and awareness. The research will help determine if new certificate and degree programs should be developed and offered by the institution addressing the profession of social entrepreneurship. Current graduate students and professors of a business school located within the southern region of the United States will benefit by this research. Others who would benefit from this study include but are not limited to; society, business markets, organizations, educational institutions, and individuals who are interested in or who engage in social or civic entrepreneurial or enterprise endeavors due to issues addressed by the social enterprise that fulfill socioeconomic environmental needs and/or deficits that government agency and for profit business organizations fail to address.

How will the data be used?

Research data shall be analyzed and presented to the institution to determine if a need exists to develop and implement certificate or degree programs in Social Entrepreneurship and to further create academic boards, committees, departments, chairs, members, and faculty toward the creation and administration of social entrepreneurship learning.

Who should complete the survey?

Students enrolled at the institution in a class/course necessary to complete the academic requirements for a graduate business degree.

Instructions

Please read and answer all the questions in order and provide the best possible answer for all.

Demographic Information

1. Age

(Select only one)

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45

- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76 or more

2. Your Gender

(Select only one)

- Female
- Male

3. Race

(Select only one)

- Hispanic Latino
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Caucasian or White
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Other

4. Ethnicity

(Select only one)

- Hispanic Latino
- Non- Hispanic Latino

5. Academic Program

(Select only one)

- MBA in Business Intelligence / Analytics
- MBA in Entrepreneurship
- MBA in Finance
- MBA in Global Management
- MBA in Human Resource Management
- MBA in Leadership
- MBA in Management
- MBA in Marketing
- MBA in Process Improvement
- MBA in Sales Management
- MBA in Sport Revenue Generation
- MBA in Supply Chain Management
- Master of Accounting
- Master of International Business Administration
- Master of Public Administration
- MS in Human Resource Management
- MS in Leadership
- MS in Real Estate Development
- MA in Taxation

Social Entrepreneurship

	Social Entrepreneurship	Yes	No			
6	Have you ever heard of Social Entrepreneurship?	O	O			
7	Can you define Social Entrepreneurship?	O	O			
8	I know someone who is a Social Entrepreneur.	O	O			
9	I know someone who studied Social Entrepreneurship.	O	O			
10	I know someone who is or wants to be a Social Entrepreneur.	O	O			

11. Which description defines what a Social Entrepreneur does?
(Select only one.)

- □ A person who starts a business whose mission is social or environmental
- □ A person who creates a social business
- □ A person who starts a charity
- □ An individual with innovative solutions to society's most pressing social problems
- □ I never heard of a social enterprise
- □ I don't know

12. Social Entrepreneurs possess the following personality characteristics.
(Select all that apply.)

- □ Affinity toward risk taking
- □ Works well with peers
- □ Constructive
- □ Conscientiousness
- □ Openness
- □ Charitable
- □ Extroversion
- □ Creativity

	Social Entrepreneurs	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
13	Social Entrepreneurs are needed and beneficial.	O	O	O	O	O
14	Social Entrepreneur's provide valuable solutions that contribute to US business market that would otherwise be neglected.	O	O	O	O	O
15	Social Entrepreneurs address needs and concerns ignored by society and the government.	O	O	O	O	O

Instructions

Please read the following definitions and then answer the remaining questions.

Social Entrepreneurship The process is understood as the creation of social value through the innovative use and combination of recourses by a social entrepreneur.

Views and Attitudes Toward Social Entrepreneurship

	Social Entrepreneurship	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
16	I would be interested in courses or degree programs in Social Entrepreneurship.	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**
17	After graduation I would consider a career as a Social Entrepreneur working in the private sector or for a nonprofit	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**
18	After graduation I would choose a career path with a social purpose.	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**
19	After graduation I plan to be a Social Entrepreneur and lead and/or manage a Social Enterprise.	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**
20	After graduation I plan to be self-employed	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**	**O**

Social Entrepreneurship Education

	Social Entrepreneurship Education	Yes	No	Don't Know		
21	Were you made aware of Social Entrepreneurship due to any assignment or part of any course that you participated in at the institution?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
22	Have you taken any courses at the undergraduate level that involved Social Entrepreneurship Learning?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
23	Did you learn of Social Entrepreneurship outside of academia?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
24	While attending the institution would you have enrolled in courses or programs that offered Social Entrepreneurship learning?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
25	Are you aware of any course or programs at the institution that include Social Entrepreneurship learning?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
26	Are you aware that programs and courses in Social Entrepreneurship are offered at other major US universities?	**O**	**O**	**O**		
	Social Entrepreneurship Education	**Always**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Seldom**	**Never**
27	How often were you exposed to the term Social Entrepreneurship within any course curricula at the institution?	O	O	O	O	O
28	How often were you exposed to the term Social Entrepreneurship within any program at the institution?	O	O	O	O	O
29	How often were you exposed to the idea or an example of Social Entrepreneurship during any course work that you participated in while enrolled at the institution?	O	O	O	O	O

	Social Entrepreneurship Education	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
30	A need exists at the institution to learn about Social Entrepreneurship.	O	O	O	O	O
31	A certificate or a degree program in Social Entrepreneurship would have a positive impact on the institution.	O	O	O	O	O
32	A certificate or degree program in Social Entrepreneurship should be included in the curriculum at the institution.	O	O	O	O	O

33. Which of the following topics would you have been interested in learning about while enrolled at the institution?

(Select all that apply.)

- □ Introduction to Social Enterprise
- □ Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship
- □ Social Investment and Investment Readiness
- □ Measuring Impact
- □ Social Enterprise Business and Strategic Planning
- □ Funding a Social Enterprise
- □ Recruiting and Working with Volunteers
- □ Community Engagement
- □ Grant Writing and Fundraising
- □ Working with the Private Sector
- □ Social Entrepreneurship & Sustainability
- □ Nonprofit Governance
- □ Social Innovation & Design for Sustainable Communities
- □ Practicum in Social Entrepreneurship & Sustainability
- □ Other _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Appendix C

Responses to Survey Item on Specific Topics of Interest

Responses to Survey Item on Specific Topics of Interest

Table 7
Survey Question 33 Frequency Percent

Introduction to Social Enterprise		
	Frequency	Percent
No	8	57.1%
Yes	6	42.9%
Total	14	100.0%

Grant Writing and Fundraising		
	Frequency	Percent
No	10	71.0%
Yes	4	28.6%
Total	14	100.0%

Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship		
	Frequency	Percent
No	8	57.1%
Yes	6	42.9%
Total	14	100.0%

Working with the Private Sector		
	Frequency	Percent
No	8	57.1%
Yes	6	42.9%
Total	14	100.0%

Social Investment and Investment Readiness		
	Frequency	Percent
No	9	64.3%
Yes	5	35.7%
Total	14	100.0%

Social Entrepreneurship & Sustainability		
	Frequency	Percent
No	12	85.7%
Yes	2	14.3%
Total	14	100.0%

Measuring Impact		
	Frequency	Percent
No	11	78.6%
Yes	3	21.4%
Total	14	100.0%

Non-Profit Governance		
	Frequency	Percent
No	11	78.6%
Yes	3	21.4%
Total	14	100.0%

Social Enterprise Business and Strategic		
	Frequency	Percent
No	9	64.3%
Yes	5	35.7%
Total	14	100.0%

Social Innovation & Design for		
	Frequency	Percent
No	11	78.6%
Yes	3	21.4%
Total	14	100.0%

Funding a Social Enterprise		
	Frequency	Percent
No	12	85.7%
Yes	2	14.3%
Total	14	100.0%

Community Engagement		
	Frequency	Percent
No	9	64.3%
Yes	5	35.7%
Total	14	100.0%

Recruiting and Working with Volunteers		
	Frequency	Percent
No	10	71.4%
Yes	4	28.6%
Total	14	100.0%