

Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship

By: Shawn M. Carraher, [Dianne H.B. Welsh](#), Andrew Svilokos

Carraher, S.M., Welsh, D.H.B., Svilokos, A. (2016). Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship. *European Journal of International Management*, special issue on Internationalization of Social Entrepreneurship, 10(4), 386-402.

Made available courtesy of Inderscience: <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2016.077421>

*****© Inderscience. Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Inderscience. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. The version of record is available at <http://www.inderscienceonline.com/doi/abs/10.1504/EJIM.2016.077421> *****

Abstract:

We first discuss the notion of social entrepreneurship and how it extends beyond its geopolitical confines. This includes the various definitions of being a social entrepreneur, mission, opportunities and challenges. While the field of social entrepreneurship is moving forward globally, there still lacks a measure of social entrepreneurship. We test an 11-item measure of social entrepreneurship using a sample of social entrepreneurs and general entrepreneurs in order to examine the reliability and validity of a new measure of social entrepreneurship. We find support for the convergent and divergent validity of the instrument as well as differences between social entrepreneurs and general entrepreneurs. We also find very good levels of internal consistency for the scale. Implications for future research are discussed.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship measures | measure validation | social entrepreneurs

Article:

1 Introduction

The mission of the entrepreneur has been to create wealth and business growth (Carraher and Welsh, 2015). Accomplishments of these individual entrepreneurial missions result in additional benefits to members of society, whether intended by the entrepreneur or not (Welsh and Carraher, 2009). For instance, customers benefit because they are able to fill a need through the purchase of a product or service, while venture capitalists, lenders, and shareholders benefit by attaining returns on investments or interest through the entrepreneur's business (Grimmer et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2007; Peng et al., 2014; Peng et al., 2010). In addition, employees benefit by earning income through the business's growth and prosperity (Carraher, 2011; Yamakawa et al., 2013). As a result of this, employees then may become customers that have purchasing power to buy goods and services that entrepreneurs produce (Williams et al., 2008). Over time, some entrepreneurs begin to focus on a new, specific mission towards improving society (Miller et al., 2012; Soriano et al., 2015). This new mission helps to develop and define social

entrepreneurship. Mair and Marti (2006) propose a broad, working definition of social entrepreneurship which is a 'process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change and/or address social needs' (Carragher and Welsh, 2015, p.370).

In today's society, the role of social entrepreneurship is vastly increasing through both non-profit and for-profit businesses (Letaifa, 2015). Society's desire for philanthropy has created many new opportunities for entrepreneurs (Castellanos et al., 2015; Welsh, 2014). Ethics and a focus towards the common good are key concepts that are vital in today's business world (Lee et al., 2011; Peng, 2001). Dees' (1998) definition of a social entrepreneur is a change agent in the social sector who adopts a mission to create and sustain social value, who engages in continuous innovation, and who exhibits a higher accountability both to constituents and outcomes (Welsh and Krueger, 2009). Success of entrepreneurs such as Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, and Bill Gates created both personal wealth and public wealth. Although these three were not social entrepreneurs, their innovations greatly enhanced society and their products aided in the progress and advancement of an improved society (Mair et al., 2006; Selladurai and Carragher, 2014). The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has made a major difference worldwide in advancing the health and education for all, an inspiring social entrepreneurship mission (Certo and Miller, 2008; Selladurai and Carragher, 2014; Stallworthy et al., 2014). In this paper, we examine the development of a generalizable measure of social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship enables one to become both wealthy while improving society at the same time (Certo and Miller, 2008; Peng et al., 2000). Therefore, what motivates one to become a social entrepreneur instead of an entrepreneur for a profit seeking venture? (Sullivan et al., 2009a) Can social entrepreneurship invigorate society in ways that conventional entrepreneurship cannot? (Carragher et al., 2014; Peredo and McLean, 2006, Welsh, 2014) Can we measure social entrepreneurship? (Welsh and Tullar, 2014) We first discuss the concept of social entrepreneurship and provide a general framework for measuring social entrepreneurship. We then provide hypotheses about what we believe that we'll find in terms of the characteristics of the scale. This is followed by a description of the samples and then a description of the instrumentation used. Then we present the findings and discuss them in terms of current and past theory and research. Before concluding the paper we then make suggestions for future research.

1.1 Social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurs pursue goals and objectives that relate to solving specific problems within the social economy (Dees, 1998). Although they possess similar characteristics to conventional entrepreneurs, they are more concerned with satisfying social needs rather than commercial needs (Roberts and Woods, 2005). Similar to conventional entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs should be innovative, creative, and motivated to pursue their venture. Characteristics between the two types of entrepreneurs are very similar; however, differences fall in the purpose and motivational aspects (Spais and Beheshti, 2015). While the conventional entrepreneur is concerned with making money and growing their business, the social entrepreneur is concerned with satisfying a social need and helping society to be better than it was yesterday (Welsh and Krueger, 2013). Social entrepreneurs believe that there is more to life than business and making money. Caring for people and providing them with opportunities are critical components towards the progression of a better world.

Social entrepreneurs face many of the same challenges that conventional entrepreneurs face (Castro and Cepeda, 2015). They must develop a business plan and execute it successfully. In addition, they must attain the necessary resources to start their venture (Welsh and Pendleton, 2006). If they are unable to do this, then failure will be imminent. Sharir and Lerner (2006, p.7) wrote that it is essential 'to the founding and establishing of any social venture are the individuals and groups with the vision, drive, and perseverance to provide answers to social problems and needs, whether educational, welfare, environmental or health related'. These individuals or groups should spend a considerable amount of time and energy towards defining the vision, mission, and strategies of the social venture (Memili and Welsh, 2013). They should also outline specific goals and objectives for the social venture. Social entrepreneurs should pursue proper strategies in order to provide answers to specific societal problems or needs. They should formulate the strategies in a clear and effective manner. In addition, they should gather sufficient resources to start and operate the new venture. Society should be able to easily comprehend the entrepreneur's offerings so that it may realise the potential benefits. Once the social entrepreneur entertains each of the preceding factors, then initial entry into the market will be the next critical step. The appropriate timing of initial entry is a key element in attaining the forecasted results and goals (Peng et al., 2015; Welsh et al., 2006).

Social entrepreneurship has been labelled 'caring capitalism' because the achievement of relevant social goals relies on competitiveness in the marketplace (Hibbert et al., 2005). Similar to conventional entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurs must first identify their competition and then develop strategies for competing effectively. Furthermore, they must realise that competition is not limited to non-profit or social-oriented competition (Dees, 1998). Next, we examine the components of the social entrepreneurship model which we have adopted from Dees (1998). His model calls for five facets of a unidimensional social entrepreneurship concept that can be turned into 11 items. Dees (1998) says that social entrepreneurs serve as change agents (change agents or world changers) who: (1) adopt a mission to create and sustain social value (have a mission), (2) recognise and pursue new opportunities to serve their mission (take action), (3) engage in a process of adaptation, innovation, and learning (active education), (4) are not limited by the resources they currently possess (resources), and (5) have a sense of accountability to those served and the outcomes created (results/outcomes).

1.2 Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value)

Social entrepreneurs are becoming more and more like traditional entrepreneurs; however, their difference lies in their mission (Selladurai and Carraher, 2014). Social entrepreneurs are concerned with creating and maintaining social value, while traditional entrepreneurs are concerned with maximising profits and growth (Letaifa, 2015). Furthermore, social entrepreneurs do not establish purely philanthropic organisations nor do they establish purely commercial ones (Herman and Rendina, 2001). They establish organisations that are uniquely in the middle of this spectrum. In fact, with the limitations placed on philanthropic organisations, they tend to lean closer to commercial establishments at times. Nevertheless, social entrepreneurs remain focused on improving society and helping those that are unable to assist themselves (Welsh and Al-Fahim, 2006). Whether they establish profit or non-profit businesses, social

entrepreneurs are willing to forgo profits and growth for a higher social value (Welsh et al., 2006).

As stated earlier, the intent of social entrepreneurship is to enhance society; however, Cook et al. (2003) argue that the Social Entrepreneurship Movement (SEM) is based on two major false premises and also has some alarming implications with regard to unemployment and welfare. They believe that proposals established through the SEM do not provide solutions to unemployment or welfare but instead threaten potential solutions posed by other entities. Their argument is well-organised; however, they seem to interpret social entrepreneurship as being based on the premise of curing mass unemployment and solving all welfare problems. Unfortunately, social entrepreneurship is unable to solve all of society's problems rather its design is to aid in reducing such problems. In addition, social entrepreneurs do not necessarily intend to replace government programs but to distinguish themselves or supplement other programs. Social entrepreneurship establishes a motive for enhancing society through the innovativeness and resourcefulness of individuals or groups (Sullivan et al., 2009b). These individuals or groups create new and improved ways for tackling society's problems similar to the way conventional entrepreneurs create new and innovative products that enrich, advance, and promote an improved society.

1.3 Recognising and pursuing new opportunities to serve their mission

Currently, the opportunities for social entrepreneurs are increasing relative to increases in societal needs (Carragher and Welsh, 2015). Many entrepreneurs are acknowledging these opportunity increases by establishing themselves in the social arena (Welsh and Krueger, 2013). Their dreams of benefiting society can become a reality through the establishment of not-for-profit organisations (NFPs). As more and more entrepreneurs become interested in starting social entrepreneurial ventures, the barriers to entry become greater and competition rises. 'Today NFPs are operating in a highly competitive environment that is characterized by increasing needs in their target communities, and a generally tighter funding environment with growing competition for donors and grants' (Weerawardena and Mort, 2006, p.21). Society has a greater social need than ever before; however, society will select the organisations that best match their needs.

Commercial providers, NFPs, and other social entrepreneurs realise that there is a large opportunity for them to accommodate society's needs and, thus, are entering into the market. Their entrance leads to increasing competition and the unwillingness of consumers to accept products and/or services of social entrepreneurs that are substandard (Welsh and Carragher, 2011) due to increased expectations (Buckley et al., 1998; Buckley et al., 2002). The market demands that NFPs are society-oriented similar to the way for-profit businesses are consumer-oriented. Similarly, donors and providers of grants are tightening their funding allocations to the organisations that they feel are best suited to satisfy society's needs. In the past, many NFPs and Non-Governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) depended on public resources provided through these donors and grantors to help support their mission. The tightening and diminishing allocations from these providers created a shift in financial dependence for many social entrepreneurs (Castellanos et al., 2015). Currently, 'non-profit making organizations are being challenged to reduce their expectations of tax-based funding for social ends and to

generate more self-finance for their operations' (Fowler, 2000, p.645). Although this self-reliance takes away one benefit of entering into an NGDO, it provides social entrepreneurs with a greater motivation and interest in their organisation's future success.

Social service non-profit organisations are no longer operating in the comfortable environment that they once knew. Finance competition and globalisation are all factors that pressure these organisations to change their strategies and adapt to a new, more challenging environment. Similarly, trends are changing from a sector once dominated by these traditional social service non-profit organisations to one that requires a more entrepreneurial approach. Barriers are high, but opportunities are higher for those that are creative, innovative, and resourceful. Social entrepreneurs must respond to the changing environment that affects their organisation's sector by designing new ways to create value for their organisation (Lasprogata and Cotton, 2003). If they are able to create value, then their organisation will be better equipped to meet the growing needs of society. Social entrepreneurs can create value in many unique ways. Some social entrepreneurs create value by involving those that are less fortunate in the operations of the organisation. For instance, one British publisher sells its magazines to the public through homeless people (Welsh and Carraher, 2011). This enables homeless people to earn an income without receiving a handout. Other social entrepreneurs are searching new untapped markets where they can contribute to a cause by using Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) or by breaking through domestic barriers.

1.4 Acting boldly without being limited by resources on hand and exhibiting a sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes achieved

Christie and Honig (2006, p.1) note 'social entrepreneurship is gaining wider notoriety as a means to assist individuals and societies adjusting to new circumstances, as well as to promote economic development'. The success of a social entrepreneur depends on properly addressing the social need(s) their organisation encompasses. Social entrepreneurs are increasingly adopting the strategies, concepts, and practices of the business world to better develop their organisation (Dees and Anderson, 2003). Social entrepreneurs realise that their operations must run efficiently if goals are going to be met. In order for social entrepreneurs to achieve their goals, they must be able to attain a viable amount of financial resources (Thompson et al., 2000). Reasonable price and quality are key elements that consumers expect just as they would in any other business. In today's global economy, social organisations may not be able to be run as they were in the past (Carraher and Welsh, 2015). The distinguishing features between a non-profit organisation and a for-profit organisation are becoming more blurred than they were in the past. These organisations are crossing lines into each other's sector so that performance and execution improve (Carraher et al., 2014). Business entrepreneurs recognise that their venture's success depends on them becoming more socially vigilant, while social entrepreneurs understand they must be more innovative and aggressive in attracting resources and warding off competitors (Carraher and Van Auken, 2013; Van Auken and Carraher, 2013). Changes in societal needs, competition, government, supply, and finance have compelled social entrepreneurs to improve in all operational areas (DeLeon, 1996). Social entrepreneurs should actively prepare and plan for their venture to enter new markets, pursue new customers, and combine resources in creative ways (Zietlow, 2002). A good business plan should outline all elements of the venture so that those

involved can develop a clear understanding of the organisation and its purpose in relation to wider social issues (Carragher and Welsh, 2015).

Social entrepreneurs are responsible for many governmental changes in public policy with respect to social issues but they are not responsible for the creation of social entities within government (Waddock and Post, 1991). They may, however, work hand-in-hand with government on solving many problems in society. Social entrepreneurs focus on a specific societal issue and attempt to improve the issue through the most efficient means possible. In the global economic crisis that has occupied the last ten years, social entrepreneurs have had to withstand major cuts in government grants and expenditures (Ahmed et al., 2013). Social entrepreneurs and their businesses will play an even greater role in being the catalysts for change in how we look at the entire sphere of social entrepreneurship and the relationship between the economic markets, social programs, funding, and the global economy. Local is now global (Carragher et al., 2008; Crocitto et al., 2005), although cultural differences can still be significant (Schmid et al., 2015).

1.5 Engaging in a process of adaptation, innovation, and learning

As with traditional entrepreneurship, educational facilities play a critical role in developing social entrepreneurs. Even though it takes certain inherent qualities to become a successful entrepreneur, education can cultivate one to be better prepared for the challenges that lay ahead (Winfield, 2005). As a subject, social entrepreneurship is growing; however, similar to entrepreneurship in its infancy, social entrepreneurship is still largely phenomenon-driven (Mair and Marti, 2006). The influence of education and other matters concerning social entrepreneurship are increasing and becoming more widespread because society warrants that business acknowledges its significance (Mas-Tur and Bolufer, 2015; Sfeir-Younis, 2002).

With that in mind, in 2007 the faculty team of Dianne Welsh, Norris Krueger, Debbie Brock, and Susan Steiner conducted a survey to discover how SE is being taught in schools. We asked faculty to describe what drives or blocks the initiation of social entrepreneurship courses, what most influences course formats, and whether they use experiential, service-based, or case-based methods, and the influence they thought these courses had on changing students' mindsets. We content analysed almost 300 syllabi from social entrepreneurship classes from around the world and discovered that most courses are project-based – that is, instructors typically require students either to engage the community through real-world projects or design viable ventures of their own. Also, most courses place very little emphasis on innovation or ethics, unless they include a heavy dose of sustainability. However, we found a wide variety of approaches faculty are taking to teaching social entrepreneurship. In other words, what is taught and how it is taught can be highly idiosyncratic – that is, there are no shared mental models. We found that faculty with no entrepreneurship training are significantly less likely to use the experiential pedagogies that entrepreneurship-trained faculty take for granted. Instructors who view social entrepreneurs as social activists who happen to have business ventures will teach their courses much differently than instructors who see such individuals as entrepreneurs whose missions are primarily social.

There is an identity crisis that seems to divide the field of social entrepreneurship. 42% of our respondents believe that SE should, in fact, be its own field. They argue that it possesses a

unique set of characteristics and research agendas that cut across sociology, public policy, social work, urban and community development, education, and business. 58% believe SE should be taught as part of their schools' general entrepreneurship programs. Education is gradually responding as the field of social entrepreneurship evolves (Welsh and Krueger, 2009).

However, to date, there is not an accepted measure of social entrepreneurship. This is a major issue to compare results to move the field forward. In 2012 and 2013, Carraher examined 210 of the most cited papers, journal articles, and books on social entrepreneurship in an effort to identify a reliable and valid measure of social entrepreneurship. He failed to find a generalisable measure of social entrepreneurship that was both valid and reliable. Therefore, one of the authors developed a measure to test using the most widely cited source used to provide a definition of social entrepreneurship – an unpublished paper produced by the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership (Dees, 1998). Initially, Carraher (2012) created a seven-item scale but then after receiving more than a dozen comments he created a longer and revised version of the scale which contained 11 items. Here, we examine the validity and reliability of the longer version of the scale (see Table 1) with the following three hypotheses:

- 1 we hypothesise that the 11 items shall be unidimensional;
- 2 we hypothesise that the scale shall possess adequate levels of convergent validity; and
- 3 we hypothesise that the scale shall possess adequate levels of divergent validity.

Table 1 Social entrepreneurship scale

1 I am adopting a mission to create social value (not just private value).
2 I am recognising new opportunities to serve my mission.
3 I am engaging in a process of continuous adaptation related to my mission.
4 I am acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand in the fulfilment of my mission.
5 I am relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve my mission.
6 I am caring deeply about the outcomes created by the fulfilment of my mission.
7 I seek to be a 'world changer' through the accomplishment of my mission.
8 I am adopting a mission to sustain social value (not just private value).
9 I am engaging in a process of continuous innovation related to my mission.
10 I am exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served by my mission.
11 I am engaging in a process of continuous learning related to my mission.

2 Methodology

2.1 Sample

We collected data on two samples for this study. The first sample has an average age of 49 and includes 282 social entrepreneurs. The second sample includes 170 non-social entrepreneurs with an average age of 52. A test of their average ages showed that the two samples did not differ at the 0.05 level of significance. In the two samples, 51% were males and 49% were females. Both

groups of entrepreneurs attended training on entrepreneurship lead by the first author and over 90% of both samples chose to complete the surveys during the training.

2.2 Instruments

The first instrument is the 11-item social entrepreneurship scale by Carraher (2013). He found that it had a coefficient alpha reliability estimate of 0.944 for a sample of healthcare professionals. Combining the two samples, the scale has a coefficient alpha reliability estimate of 0.943. It has a coefficient alpha reliability estimate of 0.910 in the sample of general entrepreneurs and 0.950 in the sample of social entrepreneurs.

The second instrument was Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) 13-item Index of Job Satisfaction. Individuals used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to respond to statements including: 'I definitely like my work', 'My work is pretty interesting', and 'I find real enjoyment in my work'. We believe that both social and regular entrepreneurs should enjoy and be satisfied with their work so we believe that there should not be meaningful differences between social entrepreneurship and job satisfaction (Miller et al., 2012; Welsh and Krueger, 2013)

The third instrument is concerned with intergroup relationships and was measured using Hemphill's (1956) 12-item viscosity index. Individuals used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to respond to statements including: 'There is constant bickering among my team members' (reverse scored) and 'Team members know that each one looks out for the other members as well as for him/herself'. We believe that owing to the social nature of social entrepreneurship that there should be a strong correlation between intergroup relations and social entrepreneurship (Welsh and Krueger, 2013).

3 Results

Initially we factor analysed the results from the two samples and then the combined sample. As shown in Table 2, in all three cases the instrument is one-dimensional and the single dimension explains over 50% of the variance (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Sethi and Carraher, 1993). In Table 3, we have factor analysed the social entrepreneurship and job satisfaction items in order to examine the divergent validity of the social entrepreneurship scale (Scarpello and Carraher, 2008; Sturman and Carraher, 2007). As shown, there is a clear two-dimensional structure.

In Table 4, we have correlated social entrepreneurship, job satisfaction, and intergroup relationships in order to examine both convergent and divergent validity for the social entrepreneurship scale (Campbell and Fiske, 1959). As shown, there is a correlation of 0.173 between social entrepreneurship and job satisfaction, while social entrepreneurship and intergroup relations have a correlation of 0.629. Going a step further, we performed a t-test in order to examine the differences between general entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs and found significant differences ($t = 6.627$) for the social entrepreneurship scale and the intergroup relations scale ($t = 3.889$) at the 0.05 level but not for gender, age, or job satisfaction. Thus, we provide beginning support for the convergent and divergent validities of the social

entrepreneurship scale (Carraher and Buckley, 1996; Carraher et al., 1999; Carraher et al., 2000; Scarpello and Carraher, 2008; Sturman and Carraher, 2007).

Table 2 Factor analysis results

TABLE 2 IS OMITTED FROM THIS FORMATTED DOCUMENT

Table 3 Factor analysis for discriminate validity

*Job satisfaction & social entrepreneurship
Pattern matrix (a)
Component*

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
JS1	0.033	-0.704
JS2	0.182	0.554
JS3	-0.015	-0.702
JS4	0.377	-0.504
JS5	0.047	0.721
JS6	-0.124	-0.374
JS7	0.054	0.739
JS8	-0.090	-0.328
JS9	0.128	-0.838
JS10	0.205	-0.494
JS11	0.522	-0.565
JS12	0.411	-0.712
JS13	0.051	0.635
Q47	0.724	0.235
Q48	0.717	-0.007
Q49	0.684	0.055
Q50	0.762	0.007
Q51	0.760	-0.198
Q52	0.805	-0.152
Q53	0.893	-0.031
Q54	0.854	0.156
Q55	0.862	0.160
Q56	0.757	-0.097
Q57	0.854	0.072

Note: (a) Extraction method: principal component analysis; rotation method: Oblimin with Kaiser normalisation.

Table 4 Correlations of social entrepreneurship, job satisfaction, & interrelationships

		<i>Social entrepreneurship</i>	<i>Job satisfaction scale</i>	<i>Interrelationship scale</i>
Social entrepreneurship	Pearson correlation	1	0.173*	0.629*
	Sig. (two-tailed)		0.000	0.000
Job satisfaction scale	Pearson correlation	0.173*	1	0.371*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000		0.000
Interrelationship scale	Pearson correlation	0.629*	0.371*	
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	

Note: * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

4 Discussion

Certain characteristics, challenges, and the desire to benefit society are motivational factors that may lead one to become a social entrepreneur (Mort et al., 2003). In other words, social entrepreneurs must actively balance different issues that are all relative to the organisation and its mission in order to enhance society's well-being. Social entrepreneurs must identify social opportunities and create ways to pursue those opportunities. They must be able to compete effectively and make decisions that will benefit the organisation and society. Many other people understand that the world is rapidly changing and organisations must be flexible if they want to remain successful in the future (Smothers et al., 2010). Social entrepreneurs understand this and recognise an increasing societal need for their visions. They have a social mission and distinguish themselves from those individuals who participate in community or social groups by initiating some form of new activity or venture to achieve social objectives towards that mission (Harding, 2004). Social entrepreneurs attempt to pursue their mission through economic and social means. They do not restrict themselves to what others define them as (Lasprogata and Cotton, 2003). They must not forget that the social mission rather than the profit motive was their principal purpose for initiating the venture (Dees and Anderson, 2003).

Although many social entrepreneurs pursue their visions through non-profit organisations, organisational resource levels (Stan et al., 2014) and organizational structure do not constrain them (Roberts and Woods, 2005). While true to some extent, the global social market appears to be still in high demand for socially focused businesses and social entrepreneurs (Drayton, 2005). The future of social entrepreneurship will be challenging yet rewarding and may be the key to successfully changing economies worldwide, especially in emerging economies. Many other countries are also adopting a liberal ideology of less government involvement with respect to the economy and society (Sharir and Lerner, 2006). These factors open up opportunities for individuals to fulfil dreams of living a meaningful existence and accomplishing something significant. Social entrepreneurship invigorates society in ways that conventional entrepreneurship might not by examining specific societal problems and addressing those problems through creative, innovative, and social-specified activities. While conventional entrepreneurship may aid with society's problems during its quest for profits, social entrepreneurship facilitates social enterprise as its chief purpose for existence.

Acknowledgement of social entrepreneurship as a contribution but not a solution to society's problems is critical for understanding its role in the social sciences. The intention of social

entrepreneurship is not to directly solve problems but to spur other efforts at problem-solving by increasing awareness of the problem and beginning to make linkages among organisations that did not previously exist (Waddock and Post, 1991). Eventually, solutions to society's problems may transpire through changes that evolve through social entrepreneurs; however, one must understand that social entrepreneurship is just now beginning to define itself. Full comprehension will emerge as social entrepreneurs further distinguish themselves and successfully contribute to society's well-being. The first step is a valid and reliable measure of social entrepreneurship. We found support for all three hypotheses as well as significant differences between social and non-social entrepreneurs on the social entrepreneurship scale.

Initially these results should be replicated with other samples. Once the instrument has been further validated it can be used in order to examine what factors might differentially increase the likelihood to be a social or non-social entrepreneur. The current research is limited in terms of the sample characteristics so it is possible that different results might occur with different mean group differences in terms of gender, age, experience as an entrepreneur, education or country of origin (Welsh and Krueger, 2013).

Future research should examine potential personality differences, ethical and value differences, as well as cultural differences, and how they might be related to social entrepreneurship. Examining personality differences research should be performed which would examine the Big Five personality factors (Carragher et al., 2009), the Big Nine personality factors from Project A (Hough, 1992), the 16 PF (Cattell and Eber, 1969), or Eysenck's (1991) three-dimensional model and their relationships to social entrepreneurship. Ethical and value models which might prove fruitful for exploration include the models of Forsyth (1980), Inglehart's (1997) cultural change model, Rokeach Values model (Rokeach, 1973), Allport Values model (Allport et al., 1960) and Schwartz's (1994) model of values. The major cultural differences models which might be beneficial to examine include Hofstede's (1980) national culture model, the GLOBE model (House et al., 2004) or Huntington's (1993) model of civilisations, although we would suggest using a more broad version of Huntington's model (Toynbee, 1946; Voss and Murphy, 2011/2012).

It could be constructive to examine individual differences such as differences in cognitive abilities, behaviours, and background experiences. In the area of cognitive abilities differences in intelligence, cognitive complexity, cognitive differentiation, sustained attention, cognitive flexibility, creativity, and cognitive processing speed (Carragher and Buckley, 1996; Sturman and Carragher, 2007). In the area of personal experiences research on biographical data or biodata (Carragher et al., 2009) should prove fruitful at providing insights into what individual background experiences might be related to social entrepreneurship behaviours, actions, and outcomes. Biodata research should also be able to provide excellent guidance as to where to examine what family backgrounds might lead to increased social entrepreneurial behaviour (Carragher et al., 2009).

Using the various facets of social entrepreneurship it could also be a good idea to examine which facets might play a larger part in terms of outcomes and results from social entrepreneurship. As we previously have said (Carragher et al., 2015) Dees (1998) saw social entrepreneurs as individuals who serve as change agents or world changers that have a clear mission, take action,

are involved in active education and innovation related to that mission, are not limited by the resources they currently possess and have a sense of accountability to those served and the outcomes created in terms of the fulfilment of their missions. Each of these facets may be related in different ways to the outcomes and success for social entrepreneurs and should be explored empirically in future research.

5 Conclusion

In the current study, we use a sample of social entrepreneurs and general entrepreneurs in order to examine the reliability and validity of a new measure of social entrepreneurship. We find support for the convergent and divergent validity of the instrument as well as differences between social entrepreneurs and general entrepreneurs. We also find very good levels of internal consistency for the scale. Social entrepreneurship is an important field for research. The Social Entrepreneurship instrument can provide a useful standardised instrument for researchers. Future research should test the instrument in different countries and under different conditions to further develop the validity and reliability of the instrument.

References

- Ahmed, Z.U., Zgheib, P.H., Carraher, S.M. and Kowatly, A.K. (2013) 'Public policy and expatriate entrepreneurs', *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.42–53.
- Allport, G.W., Vernon, P.E. and Lindzey, G. (1960) *Study of Values*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Brayfield, A.H. and Rothe, H.F. (1951) 'An index of job satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp.307–311.
- Buckley, M., Fedor, D., Veres, J., Wiese, D. and Carraher, S.M. (1998) 'Investigating newcomer expectations and job-related outcomes', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp.452–461.
- Buckley, M., Mobbs, T., Mendoza, J., Novicevic, M., Carraher, S.M. and Beu, D. (2002) 'Implementing realistic job previews and expectation lowering procedures: a field experiment', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61, No. 2, pp.263–278.
- Campbell, D.R. and Fiske, DW. (1959) 'Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitraitmulti-method matrix', *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp.81–105.
- Carraher, S.M. (2011) 'Turnover prediction using attitudes towards benefits, pay, and pay satisfaction among employees and entrepreneurs in Estonia, Latvia, & Lithuania', *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.25–52.
- Carraher, S.M. (2012) 'Social entrepreneurship: interviews, journal surveys, and measures', *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.364–367.

- Carraher, S.M. (2013) 'ISI, social entrepreneurship, and research', *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 19, No. 1, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jmh.2013.15819aaa.001>.
- Carraher, S.M. and Buckley, M.R. (1996) 'Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 1, pp.102–109.
- Carraher, S.M., Buckley, M. and Cote, J. (1999) 'Multitrait-multimethod information management: global strategic analysis issues', *Global Business & Finance Review*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.29–36.
- Carraher, S.M., Buckley, M. and Cote, J. (2000) 'Strategic entrepreneurialism in analysis: global problems in research', *Global Business & Finance Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.77–86.
- Carraher, S.M., Crocitto, M.M. and Sullivan, S.E. (2014) 'A kaleidoscope career perspective on faculty sabbaticals', *Career Development International*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.295–313.
- Carraher, S.M., Parnell, J. and Spillan, J. (2009) 'Customer service-orientation of small retail business owners in Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Slovakia, and Slovenia', *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp.251–268.
- Carraher, S.M., Sullivan, S.E. and Crocitto, M. (2008) 'Mentoring across global boundaries: an empirical examination of home- and host-country mentors on expatriate career outcomes', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 8, pp.1310–1326.
- Carraher, S.M. and Van Auken, H. (2013) 'The use of financial statements for decision making by small firms', *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp.323–336.
- Carraher, S.M. and Welsh, D.H.B. (2015) *Global Entrepreneurship*, 2nd ed., Kendal Hunt Publishing, Dubuque, IA.
- Carraher, S.M., Welsh, D.H.B. and Svilokos, A. (2015) 'Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship', *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 16, No. 11, pp.133–141.
- Castellanos, R.M.M., del Campo, J.D. and Pardo, I.P.G. (2015) 'Linking corporate social responsibility and financial performance in Spanish firms', *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.368–383.
- Castro, I. and Cepeda, G. (2015) 'Social capital, absorptive capacity and entrepreneurial behavior in an international context', *European Journal of International Management*.
- Cattell, R.B. and Eber, H.W. (1969) *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF)*, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Incorporated, Champagne, IL.
- Certo, S.T. and Miller, T.L. (2008) 'Social entrepreneurship: key issues and concepts', *Business Horizons*, Vol. 51, pp.267–271.

Christie, M.J. and Honig, B. (2006) 'Social entrepreneurship: new research findings', *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.1–5.

Cook, B., Dodds, C. and Mitchell, W. (2003) 'Social entrepreneurship – false premises and dangerous forebodings', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp.57–72.

Crocitto, M., Sullivan, S. and Carraher, S. (2005) 'Global mentoring as a means of career development and knowledge creation: a learning based framework and agenda for future research', *Career Development International*, Vol. 10, Nos. 6/7, pp.522–535.

Dees, J.G. (1998) *The Meaning of 'Social Entrepreneurship'*, Unpublished paper funded by the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, Kansas City, Missouri.

Dees, J. and Anderson, B. (2003) 'Sector-bending: blurring lines between nonprofit and for-profit', *Society*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp.16–27.

DeLeon, L. (1996) 'Ethics and entrepreneurship', *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.495–510.

Drayton, B. (2005) 'Everyone a changemaker', *Peer Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.8–11.

Eysenck, H.J. (1991) 'Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3? – Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm', *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 12, No. 8, pp.773–790.

Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981) 'Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error', *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.39–50.

Forsyth, D.R. (1980) 'A taxonomy of ethical ideologies', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp.175–184.

Fowler, A. (2000) 'NGDOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation?', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp.637–654.

Grimmer, L., Miles, M.P. and Grimmer, M. (2015) 'The performance advantage of business planning for small and social retail enterprise in an economically disadvantaged region', *European Journal of International Management*.

Harding, R. (2004) 'Social enterprise: the new economic engine?', *Business Strategy Review*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp.39–43.

Hemphill, J.K. (1956) *Group Dimensions, a Manual for Their Measurement*, Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

- Herman, R. and Rendina, D. (2001) 'Donor reactions to commercial activities of nonprofit organizations: an American case study', *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.157–169.
- Hibbert, S., Hogg, G. and Quinn, T. (2005) 'Social entrepreneurship: understanding consumer motives for buying the big issue', *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp.159–172.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) 'Culture and organizations', *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp.15–41.
- Hough, L.M. (1992) 'The "big five" personality variables – construct confusion: description versus prediction', *Human Performance*, Vol. 5, Nos. 1/2, pp.139–155.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (Eds) (2004) *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Huntington, S.P. (1993) 'The clash of civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp.22–49.
- Inglehart, R. (1997) *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*, Vol. 19, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Lasprogata, G. and Cotton, M. (2003) 'Contemplating "enterprise": the business and legal challenges of social entrepreneurship', *American Business Law Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.67–113.
- Lee, S.H., Peng, M.W. and Barney, J.B. (2007) 'Bankruptcy law and entrepreneurship development: a real options perspective', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp.257–272.
- Lee, S.H., Yamakawa, Y., Peng, M.W. and Barney, J.B. (2011) 'How do bankruptcy laws affect entrepreneurship development around the world?', *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 26, pp.505–520.
- Letaifa, S.B. (2015) 'How social entrepreneurship emerges, develops and internationalizes during political and economic transitions', *European Journal of International Management*.
- Mair, J. and Marti, I. (2006) 'Social entrepreneurship research: a source of explanation, prediction, and delight', *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.36–44.
- Mair, J., Robinson, J. and Hockerts, K. (2006) *Social Entrepreneurship*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Mas-Tur, A. and Bolufer, J.S. (2015) 'Different innovation policies for different types of social innovative companies?', *European Journal of International Management*.

- Memili, E. and Welsh, D.H.B. (2013) 'Towards a theory of nonfamily employees' organizational identification and attachment in family firms', *Journal of Technology Management in China*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.255–269.
- Miller, T.L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. and Vogus, T.J. (2012) 'Venturing for others with heart and head: how compassion encourages social entrepreneurship', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp.616–640.
- Mort, G.S., Weerawardena, J. and Carnegie, K. (2003) 'Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualization', *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.76–88.
- Peng, M.W. (2001) 'How entrepreneurs create wealth in transition economies', *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.95–108.
- Peng, M.W., Hill, C.W. and Wang, D.Y. (2000) 'Schumpeterian dynamics versus Williamsonian considerations: a test of export intermediary performance', *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp.167–184.
- Peng, M.W., Lee, S.H. and Hong, S.J. (2014) 'Entrepreneurs as intermediaries', *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 49, pp.21–31.
- Peng, M.W., Mutlu, C., Sauerwald, S., Au, K. and Wang, D. (2015) 'Board interlocks and corporate performance among firms listed abroad', *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp.257–282.
- Peng, M.W., Yamakawa, Y. and Lee, S.H. (2010) 'Bankruptcy laws and entrepreneur-friendliness', *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp.517–530.
- Peredo, A.M. and McLean, M. (2006) 'Social entrepreneurship: a critical review of the concept', *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41, pp.56–65.
- Roberts, D. and Woods, C. (2005) 'Changing the world on a shoestring: the concept of social entrepreneurship', *University of Auckland Business Review*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp.45–51.
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The Nature of Human Values*, Free press, New York, NY.
- Scarpello, V. and Carraher, S.M. (2008) 'Are pay satisfaction and pay fairness the same construct? A cross-country examination among the self-employed in Latvia, Germany, the UK, and the USA', *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.23–39.
- Schmid, S., Wurster, D. and Dauth, T. (2015) 'Internationalisation of upper echelons in different institutional contexts: top managers in Germany and the UK', *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp.510–535.

Schwartz, S.H. (1994) 'Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values?', *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp.19–45.

Selladurai, R. and Carraher, S.M. (2014) *Servant Leadership: Research and Practice*, IGI Global, Hersey, PA.

Sethi, V. and Carraher, S.M. (1993) 'Developing measures for assessing the organizational impact of information technology: a comment on Mahmood and Soon's paper', *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 24, pp.867–877.

Sfeir-Younis, A. (2002) 'The spiritual entrepreneur', *Reflections*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.43–45.

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

Smothers, J., Hayek, M., Bynum, L.A., Novicevic, M.M., Buckley, M.R. and Carraher, S.M. (2010) 'Alfred D. Chandler, Jr.: historical impact and historical scope of his works', *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.521–526.

Soriano, D.R., Martin, M.A.G. and Mendez-Picazo, M.T. (2015) 'Drivers of social entrepreneurship', *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 9, No. 6, pp.766–779.

Spais, G.S. and Beheshti, H.M. (2015) 'The evolution of social marketing and social entrepreneurship education in business and management schools: conceptions, misconceptions and trends', *European Journal of International Management*.

Stallworthy, G., Boahene, K., Ohiri, K., Pamba, A. and Knezovich, J. (2014) 'Roundtable discussion: what is the future role of the private sector in health?', *Globalization & Health* (serial online), Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.1–9.

Stan, C.V., Peng, M.W. and Bruton, G.D. (2014) 'Slack and the performance of state-owned enterprises', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp.473–495.

Sturman, M. and Carraher, S. (2007) 'Using a Random-effects model to test differing conceptualizations of multidimensional constructs', *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.108–135.

Sullivan, S.E., Carraher, S.M., Baker, L., Cochrane, D. and Robinson, F. (2009a) 'The entrepreneurial dilemma: grow or status quo?: A real case', *Journal of Applied Management & Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp.37–53.

Sullivan, S.E., Forret, M., Carraher, S.M. and Mainiero, L. (2009b) 'Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes', *Career Development International*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp.284–302.

Thompson, J., Alvy, G. and Lees, A. (2000) 'Social entrepreneurship – a new look at the people and the potential', *Management Decision*, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp.328–338.

Toynbee, A.J. (1946) *A Study of History: Abridgement of Volumes I–VI* (edited by D.C. Somervell), Oxford University Press, New York.

Van Auken, H. and Carraher, S. (2013) 'Influences on frequency of preparation of financial statements among SMEs', *Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 1, No 1, pp.143–157.

Voss, R.S. and Murphy, J.P. (2011/2012) 'Civilization shock: factoring civilization identity into expatriate national-culture training', *Journal of International Business*, Vols. 3/4, Nos. 2/1, pp.75–105.

Waddock, S. and Post, J. (1991) 'Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp.393–401.

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

Welsh, D.H.B. (2014) *Creative Cross-Campus Entrepreneurship: A Practical Guide to a Campus-wide Program*, Palgrave-MacMillan, New York.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Al-Fahim, I. (2006) 'Shopping for sunglasses at the Burjman Center: the case of the shady buyer', *International Journal of Family Business*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.98–99.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Carraher, S.M. (2009) 'An examination of the relationship between the mission of the university, the business school, and the entrepreneurship center: an application of Chandler's strategy and structure hypothesis', *Journal of Applied Management & Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp.25–36.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Carraher, S.M. (2011) *Case Studies in Global Entrepreneurship*, Kendall Hunt Publishing, Dubuque, IA.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Krueger, N. (2009, July/August) 'Defining social entrepreneurship', *BizEd*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp.36–37.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Krueger, N.F. (2013) 'The evolution of entrepreneurship: what have we learned?', *Journal of Technology Management in China*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.270–290.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Pendleton, Y. (2006) 'Direct selling worldwide: the Mary Kay cosmetics story', *International Journal of Family Business*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.61–68.

Welsh, D.H.B., Raven, P.V. and Al-Bisher, F. (2006) 'The case of the elegant shoplifter Shuwaikh, Kuwait', *International Journal of Family Business*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.79–80.

Welsh, D.H.B. and Tullar, W. (2014) 'A model of cross campus entrepreneurship and assessment', *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp.95–115.

Williams, M.L., Brower, H.H., Ford, L.R., Williams, L.J. and Carraher, S.M. (2008) 'A comprehensive model and measure of compensation satisfaction', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 4, pp.639–668.

Winfield, I. (2005) 'Fostering social entrepreneurship through liberal learning in the social sciences', *Peer Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp.15–17.

Yamakawa, Y., Khavul, S., Peng, M.W. and Deeds, D.L. (2013) 'Venturing from emerging economies', *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 7, pp.181–196.

Zietlow, J. (2002) 'Releasing a new wave of social entrepreneurship', *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.85–90.