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Abstract
Social entrepreneurship is widely recognized as a mechanism for generating social and economic value. In recent years, social entrepreneurship activity has surged tremendously and promoted the integration of social capital, culture, history, politics, and traditional business activity. However, social entrepreneurship theory lags far behind the practice. For instance, how opportunities are discovered, a basic question in traditional entrepreneurship research, has not been examined specifically in social entrepreneurship research. To help address the gap, we delineate six distinct conceptual aspects from prior work and develop four theoretic propositions useful to scholars interested in undertaking theory-driven research on the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurial opportunities. We emphasize the integration of entrepreneurial discovery with the concepts of corporate social responsibility and sustainability. By examining the roles of those concepts in social entrepreneurial discovery, we offer a contribution to the development of distinct social entrepreneurship theory.
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Social entrepreneurship has been duly recognized in the business world as a driver of positive change in social and economic contexts (Gendron, 1996: 37). As contemporary commerce transcends an increasing number of boundaries, the linkages between culture, history, politics, nations, social capital, and traditional economic considerations have become stronger than ever before (Roper & Cheney, 2005). Social entrepreneurship activity thrives in this evolutionary context as a distinct form of entrepreneurship based on well-defined constituencies and communities (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). Social entrepreneurial ventures conduct their business while achieving socially-purposeful objectives. The range of these objectives is vast, and includes agriculture innovation, loans for foster youth, waste management, affordable eye care, rural land reform, and many other missions intended to have sustained, positive effects on
Generating social value is not divorced from the generation of financial value. Indeed, there are clear indicators that social purpose adds value in for-profit business contexts. For example, the Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes (sic: indices) include dimensions gauging and evaluating the environmental and social value generated by companies (Cerin & Dobers, 2001; Kolk, 2003). Many for-profit companies thrive as they help non-profit firms around the world become viable through corporate alliances. Moreover, corporations do well in business when they articulate and implement strategies to generate social value to the common good. In fact, some companies invest in socially purposeful activity in order to increase their traditional market value (Mackey, Mackey, & Barney, 2007). Expansion in the social sector and growth in not-for-profit organizations and activity increased by 31% in the 1990s, exceeding even the 26% growth rates in traditional entrepreneurship sectors amidst the dot-com boom (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). These facts beg questions of how and why social purpose matters in business, and reflect the potential for theories explaining its role.

Entrepreneurship scholars usually agree that social entrepreneurship differs from traditional entrepreneurship. However, very little research has taken formal steps to articulate the conceptual space or theoretic boundary conditions of the former. Moreover, the field of entrepreneurship has not offered conceptual insights aside from what already applies to traditional entrepreneurship. Thus, there is need for a more distinct conceptualization of social purpose in entrepreneurship (Austin et al., 2006). Our purpose in this paper is to help address that need using influential concepts from the field of business ethics. We engage one principal question: what are some of the conceptual linkages between corporate social responsibility
Social Entrepreneurial Discovery

We focus on the area of entrepreneurship theory seeking to explain the emergence and existence of entrepreneurial opportunities (Eckhardt & Shane, 2003). Our contribution is unique because it examines the entrepreneurial discovery phenomenon in the context of socially-purposeful business, CSR, and sustainability. Our paper will be useful to scholars undertaking research on the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurial opportunities.

Conceptual Background

Social entrepreneurship entails the discovery and creation of novel means to achieve positive and constructive social change, including the application of those means. Social entrepreneurs are the individuals who procure and configure resources to achieve socially purposeful business objectives (Dees, 1998) and their level of success as such is based on the degree to which those objectives are achieved (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). Although social entrepreneurial ventures are not usually for-profit enterprises, this designation is not a requirement. As such, CSR and sustainability are germane to social entrepreneurship.

In business, CSR and sustainability underlie the notion of doing well by doing good. In domain of business studies, CSR is regarded as a proactive orientation based on specific intent (Davis, 1973; McWilliams & Segal, 2001). It involves a firm not knowingly acting in ways that affect stakeholders or constituents negatively and, whenever such negative effects are discovered, taking immediate action to resolve them (Campbell, 2007). A business venture demonstrates CSR to the degree it chooses voluntarily to contribute to the betterment of society and demonstrably does so in its operations (De la Port, Poche, & Room, 2001). Sustainability, a related concept, is reflected by firms using less resources than possessed and offering the excess resources back to the environment in constructive ways. It entails operations that meet the needs
of stakeholders and constituents while also protecting and enhancing the human and natural resources that will be needed by society in the future (Brown, 2001: 78). Like CSR, sustainability entails actions intended to promote social welfare beyond the economic, technical, and legal interests of the firm (Campbell, 2007: 951). Sustainable firms thus support themselves while generating natural capital, enhancing societal welfare, and contributing to economic and technological development (Sharma, 2002).

Although most entrepreneurship studies acknowledge issues related to social purpose in business, research has not formally addressed them as a means for developing distinct social entrepreneurship theory. We will emphasize entrepreneurial discovery, which has been described as the most basic and important phenomenon underlying entrepreneurship (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). As entrepreneurial discovery is a concept of central importance to nascent entrepreneurship, it marks the origin of the conceptual differences between social and traditional entrepreneurship. In what follows we examine entrepreneurial discovery in the context of the social entrepreneurship’s distinct aspects.

*The Nature of Social Ventures*

Social entrepreneurship combines social mission with business discipline. Business publications regularly describe for-profit corporations that have social purposes built into what they do strategically (Johnson, 2002). However, it has not been noted explicitly in the entrepreneurship literature that many successful and thriving social ventures have purely financial-oriented purposes built into their operations, as wholly-owned for-profit subsidiaries (Fowler, 2000). To be sure, those aspects of a social venture are intended to help it survive economically, with income beyond what sustains the venture supporting its social objectives. Making management decisions that balance social and business concerns in these ventures
promotes alignment between social and economic factors (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). Though such ventures are growing in prevalence, the linkages between the generation of financial and social value are unclear (Johnson, 2002). One opportunity to elaborate this relation is in the development of measures of social value, in the spirit of the triple-bottom line, as there is usually a need for social ventures to satisfy the transparency expectations of donors (Edelson, 2004). However, the value propositions of social ventures are idiosyncratic and not usually directly measurable in terms of a standard format. Thus, the process of social value generation is a key point of departure from traditional entrepreneurship. As such, social entrepreneurship theory stands to make bold statements the recognition of opportunities to generate such value in order to help guide future research of the specific mechanisms.

Socially purposeful entrepreneurial activity transcends industry sector and can adopt various organizational forms. The literature on social ventures cites three principal sectors: (1) not-for-profit, (2) for-profit, and (3) hybrid (Johnson, 2002; Peredo & McLean, 2005; Roper & Cheney, 2005). Not-for-profit ventures have objectives of private or public interest and non-commercial operations. Their purposes are almost always socially oriented. These ventures can possess cash and considerable assets as well as generate profits but cannot issue stock or pay dividends. The level of income they generate and the use of profits is restricted by governmental or policy guidelines. Not-for-profit firms are typically funded by donations and a wide range of revenue streams (e.g., service fees, government grants, contracts) and tax exempt as a legal business entity. For-profit ventures, whether they are sole-proprietorships, partnerships, or public/private limited companies, have the common goal of generating financial profits. Whereas social ventures tend to focus on long-term social change and are not “owned” in the traditional sense, for-profit ventures frequently have exit plans an can be bought and sold via a
variety of mechanisms such as initial public offerings, management buyouts, and mergers with or acquisitions by other firms. Socially conscious venture activity can and does occur in both of these sectors, although it is more common in not-for-profit contexts.

The third sector in which entrepreneurial venture activity occurs is hybrid. These operations of these firms exhibit dual aspects of not-for-profit and profit ventures. The prevalence of hybrid ventures demonstrates that social mission does not replace the necessity of financial capital for firm sustainability. Indeed, profit objectives are included in the strategic operations of social ventures despite their emphases on social responsibility and sustainability. Many large for-profit organizations also demonstrate sustainability by addressing opportunities that are clearly socially responsible but also strategically beneficial to their for-profit operations (Mackey et al., 2007; Mair & Mart, 2005). Moreover, many for-profit businesses can fulfill social purposes via innovative organizational designs. For example, donated equity enables profit-oriented firms to share their profits with their communities by investing cash or marketable securities in not-for-profit ventures. Donated equity generates future value as a fund that does not depend on operating revenues but supports socially purposeful ventures financially. Such tax-deductible donations (stock options are deductible once they are exercised) exemplify the definition of sustainability.

The opportunities that entrepreneurs recognize to undertake social ventures emerge and exist in a distinct context. In the next section we delineate some aspects of that context based on existing research on social entrepreneurs. Then we build on these aspects in order to formulate some propositions useful to future research on the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurial opportunities.
To have any kind of entrepreneurial venture, socially purposeful or otherwise, the
discovery of an opportunity to do so is necessary (Venkataraman, 1997). How to explain the
emergence, existence, and discovery of opportunities is fundamental question in the field
(Eckhardt & Shane, 2003). The research on entrepreneurial discovery cites relationships with
potential customers, the relevance of professional experience, and the presence of episodic
knowledge as critical to the discovery of opportunities (Bhave, 1994; Murphy & Shrader, 2004;
Shane, 2000). By contrast, the opportunities that underlie social entrepreneurial ventures depend
on the basic and longstanding needs of a social system or community (Austin et al., 2006). Thus,
the findings and implications of research emphasizing traditional profit-oriented ventures do not
always apply to contexts where issues of CSR and sustainability are critical (Dees, Emerson, &
Economy, 2001). Entrepreneurial discovery research has not distinguished effectively between
the discovery of traditional versus social venture opportunities.

Almost all entrepreneurial contexts encompass the undertaking of a venture based on
unique vision. Yet, social entrepreneurial contexts tend to be distinct in additional and important
ways. First, social entrepreneurial activity is not typically reducible to the enrichment of just one
or few stakeholders, which is common in traditional entrepreneurship. Highly successful
traditional entrepreneurial ventures can and do change the lives of the individuals who found
them. However, successful social ventures are likely to have transformational effects on not only
their founders and key stakeholders, but also their clients. Social ventures are intended to benefit
whole classes of people or communities that are sometimes very large (Peredo & Chrisman,
2006). Second, the notion of customer satisfaction is not usually a critical area of conscious
strategic focus, as in other entrepreneurial contexts. The individuals that stand to benefit from
the product or service offering of a social venture, such as members of inner city slums, do not
usually choose from among several ventures based on customer experience. Positive and constructive social change outcomes, such as including helping a disadvantaged population raise financial literacy or assisting an elderly population with companionship, are deeply meaningful to customers as well as the entrepreneurs undertaking the venture (Johnson, 2002). Thus, when venture objectives are not achieved, customers are likely to help social ventures improve and give them a chance to do so than they are to abandon the venture.

Third, social entrepreneurs usually aim to make permanent and lasting social changes with their ventures. They do not aim for “quick hits” over short life cycles of value generation followed by an entrepreneurial exit (Dees, 2001). The objectives they intend to achieve, such as the empowerment of poor families, are usually large in scale and do not change easily. Fourth, the ramifications of successful social entrepreneurship lead to outcomes in contexts that are not typically commercial, such as the empowerment of widows or prison reform. Moreover, these objectives are ones that have been historically addressed by social sector or government institutions that are highly bureaucratic and inefficient compared to small or medium-sized enterprises (Fowler, 2000). Fifth, social entrepreneurs frequently have an especially high understanding of the needs and values of the constituencies they assist (Catford, 1998). Many times a profound connection exists because the entrepreneur was previously (or still is) a member of the same disadvantaged population. Finally, though all kinds of ventures gain from an entrepreneur’s strong and clear vision plus a drive to make the vision work, the driving forces of a social entrepreneurs typically reflect higher levels of passion and emotion, coupled with a strong social justice orientation despite severely limited resources (Henton, Melville, & Walesh, 1997a; 1997b).
Table 1 digests these distinct aspects of social entrepreneurship. The list is intended to be extensive but not exhaustive. We expect future theory-driven research to elaborate and build on this conceptual foundation. We take a first step to that end by offering initial propositions that state relations between constructs of relevance to social entrepreneurial discovery.

Social Entrepreneurial Discovery: Review and Propositions

The relation between socially responsible and for-profit ventures is an area of social entrepreneurship theory wanting of elaboration. The difference between social and traditional entrepreneurship has already been viewed as a continuum ranging from social to economic (Austin et al., 2006). The model holds that social activity must reflect some economic value, whereas economic activity must reflect some social value. However, this framing of a continuum (i.e., its forced tradeoff) can be elaborated into a more flexible conceptualization that allows concurrent roles for social and economic aspects that derive from the original entrepreneurial discovery. Though the combined generation of financial and social resources is described in models of strategic management (Barney, 1991; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), theorizing along these lines in social entrepreneurship holds promise for delineating organizational forms amenable to mutually reinforcing social and economic value generation. New theory would help explain how social ventures can thrive when the all of the resources they manage are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable strategic enablers. Of course, the future value of all such resources is the content of what is recognized when an opportunity is discovered (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Social entrepreneurial discoveries thus lead to
hybrid ventures, not just not-for-profit ventures. Therefore, how social entrepreneurs recognize opportunities to undertake ventures intended to generate value based on all kinds of resources (e.g., financial and social) is important to research and theory on social entrepreneurial discovery.

*Proposition 1. The financial and social value objectives germane to a recognized social entrepreneurial opportunity are not mutually exclusive or contradictory. Rather, they can coexist and each can enable the other.*

Social ventures are frequently designed to address social issues related to injustice or assist disadvantaged groups. Unfortunately, the application of enterprise as a tool to stimulate economic development in poor regions has achieved only middling results, especially when cultural values are not aligned with traditional modes of business (Cornwall, 1998). When traditional entrepreneurial activity (e.g., generating profits or financial rents) does not conflict strongly with social or cultural values entrepreneurship is more likely to add value in the form of prosperity, ownership, and job creation (Ashoka, 2006; Peterson, 1988). However, research has shown that social entrepreneurship expands the normal range of activities involved with undertaking a viable venture (Van Slyke & Newman, 2006). Thus, an important step toward generating social value but remaining sustainable for social ventures is taking careful stock of the (1) values of the business in the context of (2) values upheld by the society in which the venture is embedded. Lack of alignment between both sets of values is quite salient when a business model entails activities or demonstrable intentions that are at odds with social customs. For example, strong social values related to anti-disclosure and general distrust of the legal system were perceived clearly by the founder of a venture promoting gender equity in South Africa as soon as she recognized the opportunity. Recognition of this incongruity guided her strategizing from that point forward in order to make her venture sustainable (Ashoka, 2006, p. 61). Imbalance between the two value sets can hinder venture sustainability, but the recognition of an
opportunity to undertake a social venture usually includes expected interrelations with the cultural context in which it will be embedded. Therefore, the viability and sustainability of a social venture is promoted when the values of its business align with those of its social and cultural context, and that relation is recognized at the time of entrepreneurial discovery.

**Proposition 2. Perceptions of the future relation between values of a social venture and those of the culture and context in which it will be embedded, critical to venture sustainability, are recognized with the initial entrepreneurial discovery.**

Compared to most traditional entrepreneurial ventures, social entrepreneurial ventures are more frequently undertaken in response to identified inefficiencies in public policy or state and governmental institutions (Johnson, 2002). The benefits of having such needs met by entrepreneurial ventures include the reduction of bureaucratic processes and response time, and also the opportunity for constituents of a disadvantaged community to take action on behalf of their community (Shaw, 2004). Social system inefficiencies affect specific, well-defined populations on local levels, thus creating a local opportunity for improvement. All kinds of entrepreneurs have long been known to be alert to the recognition of opportunities and inefficiencies in market and economic systems (Kirzner, 1973: 35). Research on entrepreneurial alertness shows that it distinguishes entrepreneurs from other market actors (Gaglio & Katz, 2001). Entrepreneurial alertness derives from relevant experience, relations with key customers, social forces, market demands (Gaglio, 1997), as well as unique insights, skills, and aptitudes (Venkataraman, 1997). Interestingly, the same opportunity recognition process appears to apply to social entrepreneurs, who are alert to opportunities to undertake ventures based on their backgrounds and specialized knowledge.

However, whereas the means of entrepreneurial discovery are similar in social and traditional entrepreneurial contexts, the ends are almost always different (Shaw, 2004). Though
both kinds of entrepreneurs exhibit external alertness when recognizing opportunities, a key point of departure is the local nature of social entrepreneurial opportunities. That is, the value generated by social entrepreneurial activity is intended for a well-defined group, even if that group is very large. This “targeted value” is a demarcation from traditional entrepreneurship because those ventures are intended to generate financial value that translates into liquid, exchangeable, or highly convertible forms of capital that generalize. As such, social entrepreneurial alertness is liable to lead to discoveries that are more context-specific than those of traditional entrepreneurs. For example, the idea of a venture promoting the education of women to help them procure professional jobs, generate income, or start businesses is clearly intended to benefit a specific group. By contrast, the value proposition of a venture that produces and sells plastic buckets, towels, or a similar offering is of more general relevance to many different kinds of customers and constituents.

Shifts in environmental factors such as sociocultural values and demographics affect the value proposition of entrepreneurial ventures at local levels. However, the sustainability of a social venture derives its core operations being linked particularly tightly to specific, enduring aspects of local markets and communities (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006; Weerawardena & Sullivan-Mort, 2001). This difference means that entrepreneurial discovery in social entrepreneurial contexts implies a market niche that objectively exists. In other words, the recognized social needs guarantee a sufficient market size (Austin et al., 2006). Social entrepreneurial opportunities are thus unlike the fleeting shadow options recognized by entrepreneurs in traditional market systems (McGrath, 1999; 2001). And because the existence of the recognized inefficiency is usually not in question, entrepreneurial discovery has less to do with perceptions of whether or not an opportunity is “there” (Gaglio & Katz, 2001) and more to
Social Entrepreneurial Discovery is not about whether or not an opportunity exists per se - it is based on responses to recognized opportunities and the resources and actions accompanying those responses. By contrast, in traditional entrepreneurship a new venture can sometimes create its own market where there was previously no market (Murphy & Long, 2006). The inefficiencies a social entrepreneurial opportunity is intended to resolve tend to be more apparent to more people (i.e., the opportunity is more objective) than the inefficiencies underlying traditional entrepreneurial opportunities.

**Proposition 3:** Social entrepreneurial discoveries are based on inefficiencies that many individuals already recognize, whereas traditional entrepreneurial discoveries are initially recognized by fewer individuals.

Social entrepreneurial ventures are embedded in social contexts more so than traditional for-profit ventures. Because these ventures are so inherently social, in the course of normal operations they engage in continuous social exchanges (Foa & Foa, 1974) and local acts of reciprocity with individuals and communities (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). The give-and-take of these social exchanges and interactions raise interest, commitment, and passion among stakeholders and constituencies that helps sustain a social venture. Traditional entrepreneurial ventures also depend on networking, to be sure, but not as intensely as social entrepreneurial ventures. This engagement is integral to its networks and social capital, which serve as important entrepreneurial resources. Indeed, a considerable depth of community engagement in the targeted niche of a successful social venture is endemic to its core operations.

Because social capital is so important to the sustainability of a social venture, relations with constituents and advocates in the earliest stages have an affect on the entrepreneurial discovery process. In line with the socially purposeful nature of social ventures social capital
provides them with a variety of important resources. One important and unique resource for social ventures, which derives from engagement with local communities, is the degree to which those resources are mobilized. The notion of mobilization refers to shared orientation and high levels of motivation among stakeholders and in the market that a social venture serves (Johnson, 2002). Customers of traditional ventures can represent a wide range of intentions and reasons for patronage based on their own particular circumstances. However, in social contexts, there is less variance in perception about the value proposition of a venture offering. What the successful social venture actually does as a going concern is understood and endorsed by stakeholders and constituents. The shared orientation among all participants fosters mobilization. When it comes to procuring resources, continuous social exchanges between a social venture and its community based on a shared worldview are very important. Mobilization touches the very structure of social entrepreneurial opportunities. It underlies the existence of an opportunity for social entrepreneurs to undertake a social venture.

Social entrepreneurship research must examine how community mobilization affects the discovery of venture opportunities. The underpinnings of mobilization include social and macro-level factors such as demographic shifts and governmental policy changes. It has also been described in terms of social aspects of a marketplace, where consumers are motivated to patronage based on feelings of guilt or empowerment (Hibbert, Hogg, & Quinn, 2005). Thus, in addition to consumer characteristics and external social system inefficiencies, the mobilization of social resources is important to the emergence and existence of viable social entrepreneurial opportunities.

*Proposition 4. Mobilization of individuals and social resources is important to the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurship opportunities.*
This section reviewed existing literature and developed four propositions for further examination social entrepreneurship research. Table 2 presents the propositions, which are intended to facilitate direction in future theory-driven research. Future work should also seek to generate findings of relevance to practice. Our final major section thus addresses how studies can make theoretic contributions to social entrepreneurship but also generate actionable information for social entrepreneurs. In discussing these implications, we give due emphasis to our research question pertaining to how social entrepreneurs discover opportunities.

Implications

Social and traditional entrepreneurs invest limited resources to generate future returns on those resources. Yet, their entrepreneurial discovery processes to do so differ in important ways. Though both kinds of entrepreneurs deal with customers, suppliers, barriers to entry, rivalry, and the operations and economics of a venture, one entrepreneur recognizes opportunities to generate financial value whereas the other recognizes opportunities to generate social value (Oster, 1995). The value that social entrepreneurs generate leads to the creation of jobs and revitalization of disadvantaged sectors of society on levels that surpass those of the largest companies (Kuratko, 2005). To be sure, social entrepreneurship research enjoys high practical relevance. Yet, all entrepreneurship processes begin with opportunities to generate value (Eckhardt & Shane, 2003). Social entrepreneurial opportunities are structurally similar to traditional ones, but their intended outcomes entail the generation of social value that can be used to reduce poverty, ignorance, or hunger. In this paper we have reviewed past social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial
discovery research in order to delineate distinct aspects and propositions related to social entrepreneurial discovery. In this final section of our paper we will address some of the implications of our undertaking.

Because resources are usually scarce in the nascent entrepreneurial process, entrepreneurship research emphasizes opportunities before resources. Examination of social entrepreneurial opportunities reveals convergences of business models, constituents, and organizational forms that rely a wide variety of resources (e.g., Ashoka, 2006). For example, social ventures help immigrants assimilate into the culture of a new home country through community-based education. They assist provide home loans to foster youth with favorable and non-standard lending terms. They provide jobs to homeless city residents with novel management and incentive programs designed to encourage upward mobility. Therefore, although the opportunities to undertake these ventures come first, those opportunities depend on resources entailing social exchanges, mobilization, and strong community engagement.

Some of the conceptual aspects of social entrepreneurial discovery lead to new research questions. For example, does being from a particular community, and thereby knowing its needs personally, always make one more alert to venture opportunities to serve that community? Recent work suggests that whereas social entrepreneurs who are members of a disadvantaged community do have incomparable insight into that community’s needs, they may not not always able to procure resources to launch a social venture intended to address them (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). If so, the social entrepreneurial discovery phenomenon may prove to entail theoretic boundaries that transcend the community the eventual venture is intended to serve.

Perhaps the best venue for examining social entrepreneurs and the underpinnings of their entrepreneurial discoveries is the contemporary university entrepreneurship center. In the
entrepreneurship centers at our universities, which are two of the most active in the USA, approximately 15% of the entrepreneurial affiliates have explicit social purposes embedded into their venture operations. Those ventures are always willing to share the message and purpose of what they do, and why they do it, in detail. If not amenable to traditional cross-sectional large sample tests of mean differences, such samples are convenient for social entrepreneurial discovery data via case studies (Shane, 2000) or grounded theory research (Fischer & Reuber, 2004; Suddaby, 2006). By contrast, highly successful and established social ventures that have developed substantially since being founded will be less accessible and founders will have fewer purviews on early operational stages. Thus, the considerable numbers of nascent and growth stage social ventures seeking assistance from entrepreneurship-oriented business schools and entrepreneurship centers are accessible. They offer a convenient application for development of theory about how social entrepreneurs make their discoveries.

This paper is a conceptual and theoretic contribution to the social entrepreneurship area. It is unique in that it integrates aspects of CSR and sustainability with the basic phenomenon of entrepreneurial discovery in social venturing contexts. We intend for it to serve as a prelude to an increasing body of theory-driven research seeking to explain the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurial opportunities.
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TABLE 1
DISTINCT ASPECTS OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP THEORY

1 Generation of value is less reducible to one or few primary stakeholders in social entrepreneurial ventures.
2 Broader social impact is more central to social venturing than satisfaction of individual customers or clients.
3 Social entrepreneurs intend to make lasting social changes rather than profits over shorter timeframes.
4 Social ventures frequently add value in niches targeted by social sector / government institutions.
5 Social entrepreneurs frequently have especially high understanding of the constituencies they serve.
6 Passion and commitment to social venture opportunities are usually higher than in traditional venturing.

TABLE 2
PROPOSITIONS FOR SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL DISCOVERY RESEARCH

1 The financial and social value objectives germane to a recognized social entrepreneurial opportunity are not mutually exclusive or contradictory. Rather, they can coexist and each can enable the other.
2 Perceptions of the future relation between values of a social venture and those of the culture and context in which it will be embedded, critical to venture sustainability, are recognized with the initial entrepreneurial discovery.
3 Social entrepreneurial discoveries are based on inefficiencies that many individuals already recognize, whereas traditional entrepreneurial discoveries are initially recognized by fewer individuals.
4 Mobilization of individuals and social resources is important to the emergence and existence of social entrepreneurship opportunities.