

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS – WHAT MAKES THEM DIFFERENT FROM BUSINESS UNDERTAKERS?

*Julita E. Wasilczuk*¹
*Michał Łuński*²

Abstract

Social entrepreneurs, very often operate with highly limited resources, not to say with virtually nothing. They possess motivation, but apart from financial or technical resources very often they also need complex set of skills, especially those connected with leadership. Social entrepreneurship is similar to business entrepreneurship in many way, however there are some differences. Both similarities and differences can be find in theoretical papers, however there is a limited number of research which prove them. A research conducted in 2014 among 76 respondents, engaged in business and social activities, proved that to some extent social and business entrepreneurs have some common features, however some of them are unique for each of this entrepreneurship type.

Key words: social entrepreneurship, business entrepreneurship

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship, understood as a separate discipline of economics, has a relatively short history as a scientific field, especially, when compared to countless publications on economics. Specifically, when it comes to social entrepreneurship, the scientific legacy is even more limited, even if the public attention and awareness of this subject is constantly rising, especially in the last two decades. This, apart from personal interest and engagement into third sector, was the main reasons of undertaking this very topic by the author.

Social entrepreneurs always existed in societies, communities, churches, even if no one called them that way. Some part of important problem they were facing are still present today – poverty, illiteracy, human rights, no access to health care or education. They always were present in societies, always wanted to bring the

¹ Politechnika Gdańska, Wydział Zarządzania i Ekonomii / Gdańsk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics

² COMBIDATA Poland Sp. z o.o. – Grupa Asseco

change. They were called “visionaries, humanitarians, philanthropists, reformers, saints, or simply great leaders” (Bornstein, Davis, 2010). However, hundreds years ago their capabilities were dramatically limited by other powerful agents like royal monopolies, the Church, the feudal lords or trade guilds which significantly restricted any commercial activities and innovations.

As Bornstein wrote (2010) Better times for undertakers in Europe started around 17th century and later in Enlightenment period, when forces driving social and civilization development were released and created conceptual foundations of modern democracy and economics. On the basis of these changes people relieved themselves from serfdom and acquired rights to possess property on their own, which was a start for a new social sector for entrepreneurs – private sector.

Fortunately, nowadays introducers of social changes, social entrepreneurs, are still among us. They “*come from all walks of life. Some begin their careers as doctors, engineers, teachers, priests, social workers, clowns, journalists, computer programmers, artists, nurses, businesspeople, and architects. Some get pulled into their work because of friendship or family crises*” (Bornstein, Davis, 2010).

Defining an entrepreneur is quite challenging and ambiguous (see: McKenzie, Ugba, Smothers 2007). Therefore, whether it is hard to clearly name an entrepreneur, modifying it with another word “social” will not make the confusion disappear, though. Early definitions based mainly on: social mission, non-profit executive, strong ethical fibre, totally possessed (Bacq and Janssen, 2011). Now most definitions focused on both: social aspects (like maximising social impact, social value creation, social transformation) and entrepreneurial one (innovativeness, persuasiveness of opportunity etc.) (Mair and Schoen, 2007, Bacq and Janssen, 2011). Some researchers treated social entrepreneurship as a sub-species of the entrepreneur family (Dees, 1998).

For many social entrepreneurs working in order to evoke societal changes means fulfilling higher life purpose, some of them derive it from deep faith. Others try various occupation until they find work which enables them to express their skills and values. For others, being social entrepreneur is a way to relieve from pain caused by loss or trauma they suffered. For example, parents of children killed by drunk drivers organize foundation for other suffering families in order to raise social conscience and undertake actions rising safety on public roads. Very often, movements representing disabled people are managed by disabled leaders as well. Many doctors and missionaries become social entrepreneurs after witnessing enormous suffering of innocent, poor, downtrodden people. Some got into social movements by taking part in actions to help a relative, friend, neighbour. Once person decided to work as social entrepreneur it is hard to switch back to “regular” business entrepreneurship, because of experiencing “the moment of obligation” which pushed him to serve others, connected with “gall to think big” which means realizing that individual can take up vision of global world change (Dorsey, Galinsky, 2006). After all, as David Bornstein (2010) argues, “*social entrepreneurship is a long-term commitment, with many setbacks and disappointments. Those who stick it out and manage to recruit others always find ways to enjoy the journey*”.

2. Social entrepreneurs versus business entrepreneurs

Both, social and business entrepreneur need reflect the same attributes of an successful undertaker, for example, innovative thinking, being opportunity-oriented, resourceful, and creating value. Social entrepreneurs represent a very unique group of undertakers which differs significantly from “regular”, business agents. The crucial difference between those groups lays in the core mission that keeps them running.

Many researches represent approach which implies that motivation of those two groups stays in opposition to each other. According to this approach, business entrepreneurs are motivated by expectation of potential pecuniary benefit, in other words – their greed. On the other hand, are those whose motivation is pure altruism – social entrepreneurs. This simple model does not seem right for one reason – in reality, business entrepreneurs are rarely motivated by potential financial gain, because the very chances of making a fortune of the business very often is questionable at first glance. “Instead, both the entrepreneur and the social entrepreneur are strongly motivated by the opportunity they identify, pursuing that vision relentlessly, and deriving considerable psychic reward from the process of realizing ideas” (Martin, Osberg, 2007). Another argument denying the greed-based motivation is that both business and social entrepreneurs in most cases are not fully compensated in comparison to what they invest, say, time, risk or capital.

Therefore, as Martin and Osberg (2007) argues, when it comes to looking for specific distinctive features between business and social entrepreneur one should focus on value proposition. For the entrepreneur, the value proposition anticipates and is organized to serve markets that can comfortable afford the new product or service, and is thus designed to create financial profit. From the very beginning, the expectation is that entrepreneur and his or her investor will derive some personal financial gain. Profit is essential to any venture’s sustainability and the means to its ultimate end in the form of large-scale market adoption and ultimately a new equilibrium.

When it comes to social entrepreneur, he does not aim at anticipating and organizing pecuniary profit for himself or his investors, which are mainly philanthropists or government organizations. Social undertakers are motivated by creating social value in form of large-scale benefit that is enjoyed by significant part of given society due to the bringing of the social change. Business-driven entrepreneur targets at those who can pay for innovations, unlike to the social entrepreneur who chooses target groups of downtrodden, neglected, disadvantaged population that cannot change their situation due to lack of financial or political instruments. Naturally, social entrepreneurs are not forbidden to generate income, but their core activities shall remain focused on their social mission and creating impact.

In case of business agents, the final measure of their success is profit they make on business transactions as they try to maximize their financial outcome. On the other hand, social entrepreneur wants to create social value that gets him little

closer to the aim of his mission – to make a world a better place. In this case main aim means maximizing social impact of their actions:

[w]e are surrounded by good ideas and effective models: we know how to teach disadvantaged kids to read, reduce energy consumption, and improve health care while reducing cost. We even know how to eliminate much of the bullying that takes place in school yards. At some level, all of these problems are solved [...] today. But what we don't know how to do is to take the knowledge we possess in bits and implement it at the scale of the problems we are facing. Many, if not most, international development and government schemes begin with impressive pilot projects and end with disappointing results. [...] Social entrepreneurs work to ensure that sensible ideas take root and actually change people's thinking and behaviour across a society (Bornstein, 2007).

Modern societies need both types of entrepreneurs, as both groups significantly contribute to development of modern societies. There are voices of part of the researches that making distinctions between those two groups is useless as both groups contribute to society, for example, by creating work places, and therefore all of them are social enterprises (Dacin, Dacin, Matear, 2010). In fact, there is no such an enterprise which operates in isolation, every enterprise, for-profit and social ones is based on different forms of interaction with others (in hope for income or without expectations of pecuniary benefits), and finally, every organization is created by people. Therefore, every organization influences directly or indirectly society it operates within. After all, it is not proper to call producer of liquors social entrepreneur, even if he generated millions, paid high taxes and hired thousands of people, he still delivers products that are cause of many health and social problems. Similar examples can be multiplied.

According to Dees and Emerson (2001), researcher devoted to the subject of social entrepreneurship, an exemplary social entrepreneurs exhibit several characteristics, which are represented on modified model of Bygrave's "10-Ds":

- dreamers – they have a vision about their future, the future of their organizations, and society. They also have the ability to implement their dreams;
- decisiveness – they are rather quick in taking decisions, and this is an advantage of them;
- doers – after deciding about the course of action they implement it as quickly as possible;
- determination – they are very committed to their ventures and seldom give up;
- dedication – they are dedicated to their ventures, which influence their relations with friends and families, they work a lot;
- devotion – as they love what they do;
- details – controlling all of them is a key to the success;
- destiny – they want to control their destiny, that is why they don't want to work for anyone;



- dollars – money is important for the business however this is not the main motivation of being social entrepreneur;
- distribution – social entrepreneurs manage their ventures with the key stakeholders who are important for the success.

The role of social entrepreneur is strongly connected with the need for change of the situation he/she identified as a relevant social problem.

According to Martin and Osberg (2007), activities undertaken by social entrepreneurs distinguishes himself from behaviour of other market agents by three fundamental components:

- identifying a niche of activity for people who are excluded, marginalized or suffered;
- identifying an opportunity in this unjust equilibrium, proposing a solution for those problems,
- trying to keep this solution working, to release the new potential or forging a new stable equilibrium that releases trapped potential or just release people from suffering, building a new, stable ecosystem that will sustain these solutions.

3. Describing boundaries of Social Entrepreneurship

There is a need to discuss a question where are the definitional boundaries of social entrepreneurship as there are many types of activities that are socially desirable which are aimed at serving the others. Martin and Osberg (2007) divided three types of actions, according to their nature (direct or indirect) and outcome (extant system maintained and improved or creation and sustaining new equilibrium) (Fig. 1).

First category of social activities is **social service provision**. Actions undertaken as social service provision start by defining an unjust stable equilibrium – just like in case of social entrepreneurs. The key difference of social service provision lays in the general outcome, the impact brought by undertaken action. As an example we may imagine situation when group of committed undertakers identified state of unfair equilibrium – dramatic situation of immigrant families leaving in the close neighborhood, who suffer from hunger, lack of education or access to health care. Entrepreneurs address the problem and create help center, a place where those people could receive meal, necessary products or visit a doctor. New help center would bring relief and help to those people it serves, and maybe could enable some of those people to get out from poverty and change their lives. Nevertheless, until this action would not create a global, complex impact and attract countless groups of contributors and imitators, it would stay within its narrow, local frames.






Figure 1. Pure models of social engagement

Source: Martin and Osberg, 2007, p. 38

Such actions, even if well intended, serving generous purpose and properly managed stay dedicated to local communities, their impact is limited to relatively narrow group of people, and what is important, scale of the whole project is very often dependent on the resources undertakers are hoping to attract. There are many of such projects and organizations, which trying to address and solve local problems, but until they do not initialize large scale change, calling them social entrepreneurs is not justified.

Of course, the exemplary idea of help centers can be expanded to the large project, covering the whole network of similar centers, with stable and reliable business investors and global mission and accountability. Such global enterprise would address problems with all necessary power and authority, and therefore would create impact driving global social change by creative, social destruction of former unjust equilibrium, and setting new, better “order of things”.

Another type of social activity is **social activism**. And again, the beginning of the whole activity is same as it was in case of social entrepreneurship and social service provision – defining a unfortunate, stable order of things. People addressing the problem can reflect the same sets of personal characteristics, say, inspiration, courage, will to make a world better place. But what makes it different from social entrepreneurs and those providing social services, social activists do not introduce the change directly, but by creating an influence on other actors – governments, organizations, corporations or consumers. Social activism does not require creating a separate legal persons like organizations or foundations to postulate desired social changes. Successful social activism can bring postulated impact and even introduce new equilibrium, but generally it is directed at improving current order of things.

It must be added here, that again, models depicted above are purely theoretical and many, if not most, of organizations undertake different actions, which very often ends up by creating hybrid models of project/ organizations.

4. Social entrepreneurs – questions and doubts

Social entrepreneurs, as it has been said before, very often operate with highly limited resources, not to say with virtually nothing. They possess motivation, but apart from financial or technical resources very often they also need complex set of skills, especially those connected with leadership.

One of the biggest challenges for social entrepreneurs is the question of their accountability. Social entrepreneurs try not to operate within closely demarcated frameworks, they much prefer highly limited number of procedures and formalised processes around them. The less bureaucracy, the better for them. On the other hand, in many situations, like every time applying for public grants, paths of public administration and social entrepreneurs crosses, which very often is problematic for the latter. Organizations very often lack *contract culture* which is a basis in contact with administration bodies, which makes a dialogue harder. In result, organizations find it complicated to go through all needed bureaucracy in order to cooperate with administration with use of public money (why do we need to fill all those attachments? What is it for?). On the other hand, such attitude may raise doubts of local authorities “*about whether social entrepreneurs are willing to be held accountable for the way they spend public money*” (Leadbeater, 1997). According to Leadbeater (1997), this is “*part of larger question*” frequently asked by social entrepreneurs themselves “*to whom are we accountable*”? As quoted Authors suggests, social entrepreneurs can prove their accountability to their customers by the quality of their actions.

Before given organization gets into co-operation as part of welfare provision system, their leaders should present mechanism and competences to prove they are accountable to the public. Very often huge, enormous motivation to bring change and action is not enough. NGOs and social enterprises need good leaders who can transform their organization into mature, organized and innovative entities. Before that, though, professionalism must be reflected in actions of every single worker of such organization. In reality, very often social entrepreneurs lack such a skills like project management skills, program management skills, or analytical and executive skills.

Succession of any enterprise is always a demanding challenge, as it usually means making difficult decisions, burdened with great risk and uncertainty. An exemplary business entrepreneur that wants to exit from his enterprise usually has to revise three general options:

- handing the business over to family members / board members / employers,
- selling the firm to the external party,
- closing down the enterprise.



According to Goldsmith (2009), when it comes to family enterprises, only 30–40% of them go successfully through succession within the family members, majority, 60–70% of them, however, is sold or liquidated. It illustrates that succession is not an easy process for small business enterprises. The case is not that simple with social entrepreneurs – as Leadbeater (1997) concludes, “*There is no external job market. [...] In the world of social entrepreneurs there is no market in which to sell a business. These organisations will only be long lasting if they have an orderly way of ensuring management succession. As yet most do not have such a mechanism*”.

In order to create impact in the global scale, which is absolutely crucial for solving important social problems, there is a vital need for organization of global horizons and capabilities, which can effectively manage not only projects, but whole portfolios of programmes, highly transparent and effective in spending public funds. Big sums of donations do not make organizations big and mature, as they lack “managerial depth”. As Leadbeater summarizes, “at the moment they [social entrepreneurs] are small and medium sized business that do not seem capable of becoming national or international businesses, with franchised operations and subsidiaries around the country”. This fact, in Author’s opinion, creates doubts whether public policies of “picking winners” in hope that they will cope to solve social problems is proper. Organizations, just like business entities needs time to go mature and expand, create nets of co-operatives and go out of local scale, to regional and cross-country organization of public trust.

5. Research methodology

As it was stated, social entrepreneurship is important for health modern society, therefore the new entrepreneurs in this sphere are desired. As long, as people think with sympathy about this type of entrepreneurship and perceived it as the good activity for themselves, there will be more new entries into this activities.

The aim of the research conducted among the 76 person, was to check, whether the social entrepreneurship really differ from business one. The research was carried out with the mean of questionnaire which was powered by Google tools.

The subject of research conducted from October 2014 till November 2014 was a group of 76 people, living and working in the area of Tricity, mainly engaged in Business Sector and Third Sector. The aim of the research was to investigate the nature of social entrepreneur in comparison to business entrepreneurship.

The group of respondents consisted of 35 women and 41 men from 24 to 44 years old. The average age of the respondent equalled 27. 75% of respondents were people in age from 25 to 30. 89% of respondent was of Polish nationality, the rest (2 women, 6 men) was of Spanish nationality. Respondents’ group constituted people engaged within business sector (First Sectors) – as business owners or employees, public administration (Second Sector) as functionaries of public offices/institutions, but also people working in foundations/associations (Third Sector). The characteristics of the respondents is at the Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of respondents

Characteristics	Female	Male	Total	%
Age				
<25	3	3	6	8%
25–30	28	29	57	75%
31–40	4	7	11	14%
>40	0	2	2	3%
Sector				
Business	31	32	63	83%
Administration	1	4	5	7%
Third Sector	3	5	8	11%
Nationality				
Polish	33	35	68	89%
Spanish	2	6	8	11%
Sum	35	41	76	100%

Source: own elaboration on the basis of collected data, $n = 76$

The main two questions which gave the answer to the basic question about the differences and similarities between both type of entrepreneurs. Respondents were given 14 features with 5 possible answers in form of Likert scale (++ strongly agree, – agree, +/- it's hard to say, – disagree, — strongly disagree). List of features (Table 2) are presented in the same order in the question about business entrepreneurs and then about social entrepreneurs. For further analysis and interpretations the columns “++” and “+” was summed up in one column, and the same was done with columns “—” and “–”.

Table 2. List of features in alphabetic order

Brings change, is change agent	Is committed to the mission he/she believes
conducts action based on cold calculation	is for-others oriented, runs on empathy
conducts action when he/she feels it is right to do	is opportunity aware
creates value for society	is self-oriented, runs on greed
is a risk-avoiding	is strategic thinker
is a risk-bearer	is visionary
is an innovator	seeks challenges

Source: own



6. Results

Characteristics of business entrepreneur

From answers given by respondents one can easily pick the most important features of model business entrepreneur. There are 8 features which have been chosen by majority (greyed out in Table 3). Respondents created a model shape of entrepreneur who (in order based on number of answers) operates on the basis of cold calculation, is opportunity aware, seeks challenges, is self-oriented, is an innovator, is strategic thinker, risk-bearer and change agent. Generally, for every of the 8-top features chosen by respondents there are a link to scientific entrepreneurial definition:

- Operates on the basis of cold calculation (analytical skills, result orientation) – Fillion, Kirzner (arbitrageur),
- Opportunity aware – Cantillon, Kirzner (alertness), Kao & Stevenson,
- Seeks challenges – Welsh & White, McLelland (need for achievement),
- Self-oriented – Smith,
- Innovator – Schumpeter (creative destruction), Hornaday & Aboud,
- Strategic thinker – Carland,
- Risk-bearer – Mill, Palmer, Timmons, McLelland,
- Change agent – Schumpeter.

What is interesting, only 51% of respondents described business entrepreneur as not *risk-avoiding*, whilst 58% picked *risk-bearer* as typical feature. People tend to see entrepreneurs as gamblers, constantly exposed to high risk and blind fate, even if in a fact they are a bearer of calculated risk rather, and they are merely moderate *risk-takers* (Wee, Lim and Lee, 1994).

Table 3. Hierarchy of characteristics of business entrepreneur

No	Feature	+	–	+/-	Sum
1	conducts action based on cold calculation	87%	5%	8%	100%
2	is opportunity aware	84%	7%	9%	100%
3	seeks challenges	84%	5%	11%	100%
4	is self-oriented, runs on greed	82%	11%	7%	100%
5	is an innovator	80%	13%	7%	100%
6	is strategic thinker	62%	22%	16%	100%
7	is a risk-bearer	59%	33%	8%	100%
8	brings change, is change agent	55%	29%	16%	100%
9	is visionary	45%	37%	18%	100%
10	conducts action when he/she feels it is right to do	39%	43%	18%	100%
11	is committed to the mission he/she believes	37%	49%	14%	100%
12	creates value for society	32%	36%	32%	100%
13	is a risk-avoiding	28%	51%	21%	100%
14	is for-others oriented, runs on empathy	21%	64%	15%	100%

Source: own elaboration on the basis of collected data, $n = 76$

Characteristics of social entrepreneur

When it comes to picking of the features typical for social entrepreneurship, respondent chose significantly different ones than they chose in case for business entrepreneur. From 14 enlisted features there are 9 that are chosen by majority (positive percentage of votes higher than 50%, greyed out in the Table 4). The features of model social entrepreneur are (in hierarchical order) being visionary, for-others oriented, committed to the mission, opportunity aware, creating value for society, being risk avoiding, conducting action when he/she feels it's right to do, change agent and innovator.

Table 4. Hierarchy of characteristics of social entrepreneur

No	Feature	+	–	+/-	Sum
1	is visionary	92%	0%	8%	100%
2	is for-others oriented, runs on empathy	86%	11%	3%	100%
3	is committed to the mission he/she believes	88%	7%	5%	100%
4	is opportunity aware	85%	4%	11%	100%
5	creates value for socjety	84%	9%	7%	100%
6	is a risk-avoiding	71%	18%	11%	100%
7	conducts action when he/she feels it is right to do	70%	11%	19%	100%
8	brings change, is change agent	70%	22%	8%	100%
9	is an innovator	63%	25%	12%	100%
10	is a risk-bearer	41%	41%	18%	100%
11	is strategic thinker	38%	50%	12%	100%
12	seeks challenges	34%	49%	17%	100%
13	conducts action based on cold calculation	12%	70%	18%	100%
14	is self-oriented, runs on greed	4%	83%	13%	100%

Source: own elaboration on the basis of collected data, $n = 76$

At first glance one can observe that received outcome significantly differs from results gathered in Table 3, describing business entrepreneur. Again, to great extent, the results probably are not surprising and correspond with general, intuitive stereotype of people engaged in social work. Top 3 features relate to being visionary, empathic and committed to a certain social mission. Without a doubt, those characteristic are dominant at profiles of people engaged in activities within social entrepreneurship and fits to model described by Dees modified Bygrave's "10-Ds".

Interesting fact is, that fourth important feature of the social entrepreneur pointed out by respondents is *opportunity awareness*, which scored 86%, which is higher score than in case of business entrepreneur (84%). Based on analysed data,

there are 3 features that are chosen as typical for both model kinds of entrepreneurs:

- opportunity aware,
- change agent,
- innovator.

It is surprising, that in eyes of the respondents, social entrepreneur is *risk-avoiding* (71%) and is rather not a risk-bearer. For some reason respondents tended see business entrepreneur more as gambler, but social entrepreneur as risk-avoiding person, who from one side represents characteristics like empathy and typical for business opportunity alertness on the other side. This fact corresponds with conclusions of Dees (1998) upon that matter: “*Social entrepreneur combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination commonly associated with, for instance, the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley.*”

Having juxtaposed these two sets of data we are able to create personal profiles of both kinds of entrepreneurs. % points have been transferred into 0–10 points scale. Such a data representation gives a possibility for better visual realization of differences between two types of model entrepreneurs (Fig. 2).




Figure 2. Business and social entrepreneurs – comparison of profiles

Source: own elaboration on the basis of collected data, $n = 76$

7. Conclusions

Summing up, key feature of an social entrepreneur is the way he perceives value proposition. Oppositely to entrepreneurs in classical business definition, social entrepreneurs find a value proposition is social change implementation. Instead of maximization of pecuniary return, social undertakers are devoted to maximizing social impact of their actions. Social and business entrepreneurs naturally share similar personal features which determines their abilities to implement entrepreneurial activities, like determination, creativity, pro-active attitude, resourcefulness and so on. Social entrepreneurs usually enjoy higher social esteem of their work, but still both, social and business entrepreneurs are highly needed in modern economies in order to assure economic and social development of societies.

The aim of the research was to investigate, whether and how the model of social entrepreneur differs from model business entrepreneur, according to the perception of respondents. The general conclusion is that respondents found both models different to some extent. The most important unique personal characteristics of social entrepreneurs pointed out by respondents are: visionary, for-others oriented, committed to the mission, creating value for society, risk-avoiding, conducting action when it is right to do. On the other hand the most unique features of business entrepreneur are: conducting action based on cold calculation, seeking challenges, being self-oriented, being strategic-thinker, being risk-bearer.

Respondents also found three common features for both entrepreneurs models, which are:

- being opportunity aware,
- innovator,
- change agent.

General assessment of this research should be positive, as the research served the expected aim – brought answers to research problem.

As a final remarks one question appears, whether it is possible for the person to posse both features: business and social ones? Probably yes, and the social responsibility actions of business entrepreneurs is an example to some extent.

References

1. Bacq S., Janssen F. (2011): The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5/6), pp. 373–403. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.577242.
2. Bornstein D., Davis S. (2010): *Social Entrepreneurship. What everyone needs to know*. New York, Oxford University Press.
3. Dacin P., Dacin 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*, August, pp. 37–57.
4. Dees J., Emerson J. (2001): *Enterprising Nonprofits. A Toolkit for Social Entrepreneurs*. New York, John Wiley & Sons Inc.



5. Dees J. (1998): The Meaning of „Social Entrepreneurship”, http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf.
6. Dorsey C., Galinsky L. (2006): *Be Bold: Create a Career with Impact*. New York, Echoing Green Publication.
7. Goldsmith M. (2009): *How Entrepreneurs Should Handle Succession*. Retrieved from Harvard Business Review: <https://hbr.org/2009/10/how-entrepreneurs-should-handl/>.
8. Leadbeater C. (1997): *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. London, Demos.
9. Mair J., Schoen O. (2007): *Successful social entrepreneurial business models in the context of developing economies: An explorative study*. International Journal of Emerging Markets 2, No. 1, pp. 54–68.
10. Martin R., Osberg S. (2007): *Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definiton*. Stanford Social Innovation Review – Spring, p. 34.
11. McKenzie B., Ugbah S.D., Smothers N. (2007): “Who is an entrepreneur” is it still wrong question?. *Academy Of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13(1), pp. 23–43.
12. Wee C., Lim W., Lee R. (1994): Entrepreneurship: A Review with Implications for Further Research, *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 35–36.

PRZEDSIĘBIORCY SPOŁECZNI – CO ODRÓŻNIA ICH OD OSÓB ANGAŻUJĄCYCH SIĘ W PRZEDSIĘWZIĘCIA BIZNESOWE?

Przedsiębiorcy społeczni bardzo często działają wykorzystując dostępne im bardzo ograniczone zasoby lub praktycznie nie mając zasobów w ogóle. Posiadają motywację, ale poza finansowymi czy technicznymi zasobami potrzebują często również złożonego zestawu kompetencji, szczególnie tych, które wiążą się z przywództwem. Przedsiębiorcy społeczni w wielu aspektach wykazują podobieństwo do przedsiębiorców operujących w otoczeniu biznesowym, jednak istnieją też między nimi pewne różnice. Zarówno podobieństwa, jak i różnice między tymi dwoma grupami przedsiębiorców można odnaleźć w artykułach teoretycznych, natomiast niewielka liczba badań dowodzi ich istnienia. Badanie przeprowadzone w 2014 roku w grupie 76 respondentów zaangażowanych w działalność społeczną i biznesową wykazało, że do pewnego stopnia przedsiębiorcy społeczni oraz przedsiębiorcy zaangażowani w działalność nastawioną na zysk wykazują podobne charakterystyki, choć każdy z tych dwóch typów przedsiębiorców cechuje się także właściwościami unikatowymi dla siebie.

Słowa kluczowe: przedsiębiorczość społeczna, przedsiębiorczość nastawiona na zysk

