# REVISING ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION CONSTRUCT IN A SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

**Marzena Starnawska**[1]

## Abstract

*Entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial orientation (EO) have received significant scholarly attention in entrepreneurship and management research, but mainly in the commercial context. However, some attempts discussing such behavior and EO among non-profit organizations, but limited in the social enterprise context. The literature argues that EO is higher in such contexts (Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum & Shulman, 2009; Lumpkin, Moss, Grass, Kato & Amezcua, 2013). Also, some new EO dimensions are proposed, at the same time existing EO dimensions are redefined. Based on this limited literature, the author undertakes an overview of existing work on EO dimensions and analyses how EO can be reconstructed and redefined in the social enterprise context. New, additional EO dimensions are compiled and discussed: cooperation capacity, agility, and persistence. In the light of anecdotal, empirical efforts on EO construct and relationship to performance among social enterprises, it seems that EO needs more revision and theoretical discussion, combined with inductive and qualitative studies. This change can provide more insights into the nature of individual dimensions and their relevance for social and business performance of social enterprises. It also poses the question whether EO dimensions should go beyond the split between what is commercial and social in social enterprises, and encompass both or whether focus separately on each of the two.*

**Keywords:** *entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneurial behavior, social entrepreneurship, social enterprise.*

## 1. Introduction

The social enterprise activities, manifested in a variety of organizational forms, have spanned the socio-economic landscape, and are claimed to resemble a social enterprise ZOO (Young, Searing & Brewer, 2016). These range from social movements, grass root activities to professional enterprises, as well as corporate responses to the markets at the bottom of the pyramid. There is, indeed, a plethora of different organizations

1 Marzena Starnawska, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Entrepreneurship and Business Law, Gdansk University of Technology, 11/12 Narutowicza St., 80-233 Gdańsk, e-mail: mstarnaw@zie.pg.gda.pl.

across cultures and contexts, set either within a particular sector – public sector, third sector, private sector, or, most often on the crossing point between these sectors.
These models drive towards both business and social performance. However, in the entrepreneurship field, the emphasis has been put on the entrepreneurial efforts mainly in commercial context, on individual or organizational level. In social entrepreneurship, multiple actors and organizations perform entrepreneurial functions, and there is a strong focus on incorporating the involvement and interests of different stakeholders in social entrepreneurship process (Starnawska, 2017). This emphasis can potentially make the evaluation of entrepreneurial behavior more complex. As social enterprises operate in ambiguous environments and relate to a variety of different stakeholders, with different expectations, under different sectors and their institutional logics, their entrepreneurial processes together with antecedents and outcomes are diverse (Morris, Coombes, Schindehutte & Allen, 2011; Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2016, p. 4). Customers and beneficiaries do not pay for the service delivery; therefore, the way an organization gathers resources is a process detached from provision of service to beneficiaries. Such organizations are pluralistic, follow multiple objective and the power within them is diffused (Denis, Langley & Rouleau, 2007; Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2016, p. 4). The increasing social demands, competition for human and financial resources, drive social enterprises to be more entrepreneurial (Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2014, p. 3). This push calls for the review of existing entrepreneurial behavior construct such as EO. So far, existing conceptual and empirical efforts have employed EO construct in its classic form, in the context of commercial entrepreneurship, among for-profit organizations. The scholarly output on EO in social context has been limited to non-profit settings (Coombes, Morris, Allen & Webb, 2011; Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2016; Morris et al., 2007; Morris, Webb & Franklin, 2011; Pearce, Fritz & Davis, 2010). Therefore, relevant for advancement of EO dimensions is required and the aim of this paper is to explore the entrepreneurial orientation construct in the social context. We ask how entrepreneurial behavior can be analyzed and we do so by making attempt at translating EO construct into a social enterprise context. At the same time, we are aware that the discussion on EO construct should be, in further conceptual and empirical efforts, extended to different social enterprises in different sectors, fields of activity and markets.

The paper is structured as follows. In the first part, we overview the EO construct and related dimensions in the light of existing literature. Further on we discuss the construct in the social entrepreneurship context. At the end of the paper we draw conclusions, and propose suggestions for future research.

## 2. Entrepreneurial orientation in entrepreneurship field

Entrepreneurship research has not been growing dynamically and steadily. There is limited agreement what is the core of entrepreneurship due to the diversity of entrepreneurship, highlighted by different authors (see more Wasilczuk, 2017). A major stream of research has acknowledged entrepreneurial orientation (EO), as one of the key measurements and concepts for entrepreneurial behavior. EO has its roots associated with a strategic orientation of an enterprise. EO dimensions were developed on the basis of strategy making and entrepreneurship research (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin & Freese, 2009). They identify more than 100 studies of EO, what proves acceptance of the concept and its relevance for research progress. Despite variation in results on how EO affects business performance (Rauch et al 2009), many studies show that entrepreneurial orientation is strongly linked to business performance (e.g., Covin & Slevin, 1986; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005; Dyduch 2008) or try to verify this relationship. Entrepreneurial orientation, as a category, is based and developed on primary Miller's (1983) work on 'entrepreneurial firm' and is characterized by product/market innovation; undertaking risky ventures; acting proactively in introducing innovation. Covin and Slevin (1989) put forward these three EO dimensions such as risk taking, proactiveness, innovativeness, that have been complemented by Lumpkin and Dess (1996) who added another two: autonomy and competitive aggressiveness. All these dimensions manifest the internal logics and mindset dominant within an organization. The former three are the most recognized and empirically tested EO dimensions. **Innovativeness** shows the disposition of an organization to get engaged in new ideas, experimenting, creative processes, which can result in new solutions, services, or products. It displays the interest in moving beyond the current state of matters (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Another dimension, **proactiveness**, refers to prospective, forward looking approach to introducing new products or services. As a dimension of EO, it is relevant in reference to competitors. Here organizational actions are aimed to move ahead of the competition and are focused on anticipation of future demand (Rauch et al., 2009). Next dimension of EO is **risk taking**, which incurs borrowing money, committing significant resource amounts into ventures with uncertain outcomes. Another two dimensions, which Lumpkin and Dess (1996) added to EO construct are competitive aggressiveness and tendency toward autonomous action. **Competitive aggressiveness** shows enterprise propensity to direct and aggressive actions towards competition, how they react to competitors' actions. This aggressiveness requires unconventional behaviors, nonconforming to the existing norms that can surprise competitors, and is a reaction to other party's action. Rauch et al. (2009) consider aggressiveness as a manifestation of proactiveness. Whereas **autonomy** – is the willingness and ability of enterprise

team or leader to actindependently, without conforming to external pressures, with interest of the actors involved in learning about the results oftheir undertaking. For some researchers, autonomy is an important determinant of entrepreneurial climate that is why it should be treated as an antecedent rather that dimension of EO (Karpacz, 2016; Wójcik- Karpacz, 2016; Lumpkin et al., 2009). We do not discuss these in more depth, as the social entrepreneurship literature has remained silent about these two dimensions.

## 3. Entrepreneurial orientation in social enterprise context

The scholarly contribution to understanding entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial orientation puts forward two ways of looking at what is 'entrepreneurial' in the social entrepreneurship, particularly in social enterprise context. The first approach is derived from EMES network research approach, which has put forward nine ideal type of social enterprise criteria in the Weberian sense, divided into two groups (social, economic-entrepreneurial) (Defourny & Nyssens, 2008). At the later stages of EMES research efforts, the criteria are grouped into economic, social, governance dimensions (see more: Defourny & Nyssens, 2012). EMES provides these for comparative purposes, across different institutional contexts. The first EMES research efforts have been set in the European context, where most of the social enterprise initiatives have taken place in the third sector (neither private nor public), among non-profit organizations (Defourny, 2014, p. 18). Actually, in its original version, Defourny and Nyssens (2008) speak about 'economic and entrepreneurial' dimension and later describe them solely as 'economic.' The social dimensions refer to social enterprise's explicit aim to benefit the community. The social enterprise is an initiative launched by a group of citizens and has a participatory nature, which means involvement of various parties affected by the activity but its decision making power is not based on capital ownership (see more: Defourny & Nyssens, 2012). Among these, they propose four criteria. The first is '*continuous activity such as producing goods and/or providing services*' that serves as one of the main rationales for the existence of the social enterprise. Here, an enterprise does solely perform advocacy role or engages in redistribution of financial flows (in associations and foundations respectively), but gets involved in manufacturing or service provision on a regular basis. The next one is '*high degree of autonomy*' that reflects autonomous project undertaken independently by particular parties, which are not directly or indirectly managed by other organizations. The third one refers to '*minimum amount of paid work'* to show the difference from non-profit organizations which mainly rely on volunteer work, intake of donations and other gifts. The last thing includes '*significant level of*

*economic risk'* reflected in the efforts of individuals – workers or/and members, securing resources and taking risks incumbent in the use of these resources. The overview of these dimensions, provides more understanding of what enterprising and entrepreneurial behavior looks like in the third sector, non-profit organizations, in social enterprises in particular. While embarking on 'enterprising,' these organizations start using market tools, business practices and earn revenues to pursue their social aims. And this is how the 'entrepreneurial' behavior is manifested in these organizations. Although the basis of the criteria above was not the result of the review or EO construct, EMES approach gives more context and understanding to social enterprises in the European context.

While undertaking the discussion on the EO in the social enterprise context, the following questions emerge:

- whether new relevant dimensions can be added and old irrelevant ones deleted;
- how existing EO dimensions can be revised;
- whether the performance of social enterprises can be revised;
- and whether antecedents of EO can be revised.

Also, important theoretical questions arise on how relevant EO in social enterprise can be developed. As can be seen in the following section, the literature on entrepreneurial orientation in social entrepreneurship has been limited to 'non-profit' organizations' context (Morris et al., 2007; Morris et al., 2011; Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2016; Kusa 2016) or 'social' (Lumpkin et al., 2013) contexts. Entrepreneurial orientation in the context of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship has been mainly discussed in non-profit context, which implies a lack of research on social enterprise that combines the elements of commercial and social aims and logics. In their work on non-profit organizations, Morris et al. (2011) analyze entrepreneurial orientation, based on propositions of Covin and Slevin (1989) who employed **innovativeness**, **proactiveness,** and **risk taking** in their scales. These authors posit that these three salient dimensions are much more complex in the social context than commercial context. There are also claims made that social mission enhances EO of organizations (Zahra et al., 2009; Lumpkin et al., 2013).

So far, the scant literature has tried to revise the existing EO construct in two ways: either to extend, revise each of EO dimensions and adapt it to social context or to change the number of existing EO dimensions. The evaluation of social enterprise EO may also require the employment of both: EO classic construct with its dimensions and social entrepreneurial orientation construct with its own, special dimensions. Social enterprises, with better or worse outcomes and performance, serve a dual mission and pursue multiple goals: economic and social in their activity, yet it is arguable whether such EO

construct should be universal for both social and commercial enterprises or whether some specific differences should exist.

**Innovativeness** is a necessary entrepreneurial dimension, which can refer to both social and economic aspects of social enterprise. Lurtz and Krutzer (2016) discuss innovativeness in reference to new methods of funding and new methods of value creation. Similarly, for Morris et al. (2011) social enterprises display their innovativeness for the purpose of securing financial stability and increasing social impact. In an economic sense, many different innovations can be made to increase revenues, reduce organizational costs, and find new ways of financing an enterprise (Syrjä, Puumalainen, Sjorge, Soininen & Durst, 2011). Whereas in the social context, innovations do not only encompass processes and operations but also changes in the mission (Morris et al., 2011) of social enterprises. These authors propose to put forward a separate sub-dimension of innovativeness that leads to financial performance and social mission achievement at the same time. The innovativeness as EO dimension is somehow imprinted in organizational culture as intrapreneurship. **Proactivity**, in line with innovativeness, refers to future oriented efforts in creating solutions for social problems (Lumpkin, 2011). Proactive manner refers to both: type of innovation and towards whom this is directed (Morris et al., 2011). In pursue innovations, proactivity may be displayed through social innovation generation, in finding new means of financing and ways to sustain financial performance. But more importantly, other organizations that occupy the same market and stakeholders come to the forefront in this dimension. Proactiveness in social enterprises also means the efforts in meeting and understanding expectations of different stakeholders, their needs, as they constitute an important element of SE environment (Lumpkin, 2011). Within such a diverse group with diverse aims and expectations, significant entrepreneurial effort needs to be made to listen to, and meet these stakeholders' expectations. The anticipation of these expectations resembles the innovations and solutions offered by social enterprises. It seems that proactivity understood in this way, is more important for the driving rationale of social entrepreneurship than being on the lookout to be ahead of competitors. Lurtz and Kreutzer (2016) distinguish upstream (provision of resources) and downstream (product or service delivery) processes in EO dimensions analysis, as potential areas for distinction. Proactiveness in service delivery is different than proactiveness in search for financing, and for resources. They find that the proactiveness is limited in downstream processes and not in line with the logic of service delivery, whereas marketing processes and resource finding require significant proactiveness. As for the **risk taking**, as an EO dimension, in case of social entrepreneurship, the literature distinguishes two kinds of risks: financial and non-financial (non-pecuniary) risk (Balan-Vnuk

& Chalmers, 2012). In case of the former, it means the potential financial loss, whereas, in the event of latter, it is the risk of potential loss in achieving social impact (Morris et al., 2011, p. 960). The reduced ability to achieve social aim can result, for example, from too much emphasis placed on income generation, where business performance rationale may preclude or reduce beneficiaries' possibility to receiving sufficient amount or level of support. Also, when the scale of a social enterprise is growing to make an impact, it may distract social enterprise from its core mission. The financial risk faced by SEs determines their survival (Morris et al., 2011). Behind this risk, there is not much of equity financing. This risk can be caused by the extensively growing social impact not supported by parallel financing. Another type of risk refers loss in stakeholder support, because of loss of trust and reputation. The risk of reputation loss is in line with the findings of a single exploratory case study by Lurtz and Kreutzer (2016). Also, Constanzo et al. (2014) make a point that social enterprises face significant risks regarding the 'authenticity' of their social purpose while making efforts to balance multiple expectations of different stakeholders. Risk bearing commonly means investing large financial assets into unknown ventures. However, these assets do not have to be only financial ones; they also include human resources and time. These resources can also be borrowed (debt capital), or acquired from the environment (Lurtz & Kreutzer, 2016, p.3). Also, resources acquired through relationships with different stakeholders, raise different expectations about risk taking. Many of resources they offer such as donations, or volunteer work are not welcome to be put at risk (Lumpkin, 2011). It is because those who offer their resources for free are more likely to be on the watch for how their support is utilized and managed, if it is wasted or not, and how it is appreciated or acknowledged. Similarly, Balan-Vnuk and Chalmers (2012) propose multidimensionality of risk in social context. They go beyond financial risk and identify a number of non-pecuniary risks such as reputation, brand image, relationships, leadership, key people in the organization, time and effort devoted to social enterprise. Tactics involved in this risk mitigation aim at maintaining legitimacy and positive relationships with stakeholders. This aim, in line with risk taking sub-dimension, is proposed by Morris et al. (2011) on the role of constituencies to support the social enterprise through resource provision, knowledge, access to networks, support, where trust and reputation play a key role. Some qualitative evidence provided by Syrja and authors (2011) shows that actors involved in social entrepreneurship are willing to undertake personal financial risk. With this importance in social entrepreneurship, there is a distributed variety of constituencies and stakeholders, where the leaders of these organizations devote their assets for these ventures. The same evidence shows risk-aversions when it comes to any action that may reduce the social impact. In their in-

depth single case study, Lurtz and Kreutzer (2016) propose 'risk outsourcing' toge4ther with 'collaboration' as a substitute for 'risk taking,' They find that the tolerance for social risk is quite high, as people are used to working within developmental areas and contexts. Social enterprises are financial risk averse, regarding the developmental, relief oriented organization's mission. What explains this risk aversion is the volunteer nature of involvement of board management, which does not display entrepreneurial behavior and demonstrate fear of venturing into uncertain areas. Also, the donors as stakeholders, having entrusted their money into the organization, are averse to hear about the waste of their donations. For Lurtz and Kreutzer (2016), seeking alternative financing common for SEs works as an example of outsourcing financial risk. Overall, the key challenge in social risk is related to risk that an organization will fail to meet its social mission.

The following three dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation construct: **cooperation**, **persistence**, and **agility** have been additionally developed, as a result of qualitative inquiry and conceptual discussions. The entrepreneurship literature on EO does not recognize cooperation capacity as one of the dimensions. Given the complexity and diversity of social enterprises, and the necessity to work with various stakeholders, the limited empirical evidence on EO recognizes the importance of collaboration. The question is to what extent it can be considered as a separate dimension. The role of social relations and strategic collaborative agreements have been recognized as important antecedents of entrepreneurial behavior and entrepreneurial orientation (Yang & Dess, 2007) and social entrepreneurship. The understanding of local problems and their context is required at different stages of the entrepreneurial process. It is different when social movement, informal, initiatives are started. And it is different at later stages, when an organization needs resources and legitimacy in the environment, what has been partly highlighted in the discussion on reputational risk. The resources are delivered on the informal and formal basis, through volunteer, private, individual support or organizational support, and through a variety of ways of resource provision. Similarly, Lurtz and Kreutzer (2016) offer 'collaboration' dimension as the ability to engage in 'collaborative behavior,' for the purpose of resource and knowledge transfer from other enterprises, foundations, and organizations.

An additional dimension, '**persistence**' is reported in some evidence based on qualitative research (Syrjä et al., 2011; Puulmalainen, 2014) on social entrepreneurship. These authors claim that social entrepreneurs display persistence in adhering to the course of action in the face of arising difficulties and risks, which is strongly displayed in adverse circumstances. The social mission can be a strengthening motivational factor in entrepreneurial persistence. It might be due to the strongly desired social impact and also

related need of organizational and financial sustainability of the venture. Also. the dedication of personal assets such as time and other resources can increase this persistence and commitment. Persistence can be strengthened by the fact that there are many social problems and issues at stake, including the fate of organizations' beneficiaries, which reflects social risks embedded in such enterprises.

There is another dimension put forward by Fricke (2016) who offers '**agility**' dimension of EO construct while referring to Bernardes and Hanna's (2009) concept of agility. Agility is different from flexibility. Flexibility means the capacity to be flexible in the environment with pre-established parameters, expected changes, potential actions to be undertaken; whereas agility displays capacity to act in response to both expected and unexpected changes. This example shows how organizations may react to the capricious and complex environment because of the constant change. Although agility displays reactive action, it is important for social enterprise sustainability. Agility denotes: '*Ability to quickly react to a stimulus and reconfigure quickly and skillfully*' (Fricke, 2014, p.66). He emphasizes that this dimension is incorporated into the discussion on EO with regards to the nature of the organizational environment. For example, it might be different in dynamically changing environments, especially dynamic market changes, where the pursuit of opportunities is harsh, and competitive forces strong.

## 4. Conclusions

The overview provided in this paper shows that inclusion of social mission in entrepreneurship setting can impact entrepreneurial orientation and requires relevant revision of the EO construct. Not only this generates changes in particular EO dimensions but also offers new EO dimensions that can be useful in social entrepreneurship research. The literature on EO in social entrepreneurship context does not discuss neither the competitive aggressiveness nor the autonomy, as separate dimensions. There is no doubt that some inductive, qualitative research approaches are necessary (George & Marino, 2011; Miller, 2011) to explore new EO dimensions, revise existing ones, but also to analyze how these revised dimensions impact upon social and business performance.

The need to study social enterprises leads to some suggestions on how EO dimensions could be revised. These organizations undertake different risks related to uncertainty and expected returns. These, in turn, refer to economic and organizational sustainability. There is also an additional, interesting dimension of risk related to the fate of social enterprise beneficiaries which depends on enterprise efficiency and sustainability. Also, we propose that

social enterprises are particularly susceptible to political risk, where political actors make decisions about resource access and provision of assets, but may not welcome the advocacy and lobbying efforts of social enterprises. The third type of risk that is put forward is reputation loss that can impact authenticity and sustainability of the social enterprise. In the area of innovativeness and proactivity, the literature proposes that social enterprises display efforts in replicating existing solutions to social problems, solutions they have delivered themselves or solutions offered by others. These solutions are contradictory to classic approach to competitiveness and innovativeness, where innovative attitudes and efforts need to lead to novel solutions, ahead of the competition. They also show increased innovativeness and proactivity in changing the institutional setting. Some other proposals of an additional dimension such as cooperation capacity are analyzed in more in-depth when compared with existing work in this respect. Social enterprises display not only organizational interest in establishing collaborative relationships with other parties but also these relationships and partnerships need to be of high relevance for the operation and existence of social enterprises.

The key limitation of this paper is that the social enterprise and social entrepreneurship context has not been tested or modified as a result of empirical research. Also, there are many models of social enterprise, tackling different social problems and challenges, involving their beneficiaries and target groups in various ways. Therefore, one of the key areas for further studies of EO in social entrepreneurship context is to go deeper into these models, like in the work of Starnawska (2017) in her study on work and social integration enterprises in Poland. Entrepreneurial orientation could also be revised in reference to two contexts: start-up social ventures and existing social entrepreneurship organizations. This is in line with claims that innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk taking reflect entrepreneurial behavior (Geogre & Marino, 2011; Lurtz & Kreutzer 2016); whereas other dimensions (competitive aggressiveness, autonomy) are adequate for initial phases of the entrepreneurial process such as start-up.

While this discussion is not focused on exploring the concept of social enterprise performance, future research needs to be made in this direction to link EO dimensions with the relative performance measures. However, the performance in social entrepreneurship context is a complex concept, and it needs to be developed. Scholarly research shows varying approaches on the social entrepreneurship outcomes and impact, so similarly it can be challenging to agree on performance measures. The task can become easier while social enterprises studied are limited to one organizational field or similar area of activity like work and social integration of the disadvantaged groups. For improving the revision of EO in social context, other authors (Morris

et al., 2011) discuss the time reference for the construct. Innovativeness dimension in EO is analyzed within the period of last fiveyears of enterprise activity. These authors challenge appropriateness of the time frame in this dimension with regards to social impact. Also, they recall the need for more universal and standardized measures in entrepreneurship research, suggesting the standardized score for both contexts: commercial and social one, for comparison of for-profit and non-profit sectors.

**Acknowledgments**

The work on this project has been partly financed by National Science Centre, decision no DEC-2011/03/D/HS4/04326.
The author would like to express her gratitude for the insightful suggestions and comments of anonymous reviewers.

**References**

Aiken, M., & Spear, R. (2005). Work integration social enterprises in the United Kingdom. *EMES Working Paper,* 05/01, Liege: EMES European Research Network.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational identity. In: B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*: *Vol. 7* (pp. 263–295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Alvord, S.H., Brown, L.D., & Letts, C.W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *40*(3), 260-282.

Balan-Vnuk, E., & Chalmers, D.M. (2012). Risking more than money? Entrepreneurial orientation in the social context. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, *32*(19), 1-2.

Constanzo, L.A., Vurro, C., Foster, D., Servato F., & Perrini, F. (2014). Dual-mission management in social entrepreneurship: Qualitative evidence from social firms in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *52*(4), 655-677.

Coombes, S.M.T., Morris, M.H., Allen, J.A., & Webb, J.W. (2011). Behavioral orientations of non-profit boards as a factor in entrepreneurial performance: Does governance matter? *Journal of Management Studies*, *48,* 829-856.

Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D.P. (1986). The development and testing of an organizational-level entrepreneurship scale. In R. Ronstadt, J.A. Hornaday, R. Peterson, & K.H. Vesper (Eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 628-639). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.

Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal, 10,* 75-87.

Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M.T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *24*(3), 37-57.

Defourny, J. (2014). From third sector to social enterprise. In J. Defourny, L. Hulgĺrd & V. Pestoff (Eds.), *Social Enterprise and the Third Sector* (pp.17-41). London and New York: Routledge.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2008). Social enterprise in Europe: recent trends and developments. *EMES Working Paper*, *08*/01, Liege: EMES European Research Network.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2012). The EMES Approach of Social Enterprise in a Comparative Perspective. *EMES Working Paper, 12/*03, Liege: EMES European Research Network.

Denis, J.L., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2007). Strategizing in pluralistic contexts: Rethinking theoretical frames. *Human Relations*, *60*, 179-215.

Dyduch, W. (2008). *Pomiar Przedsiębiorczości Organizacyjnej*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Karola Adamieckiego w Katowicach.

Frické, P.H. (2016). *Entrepreneurial orientation of social entrepreneurs in developing economies. The case study of Cambodia*, thesis submitted for MSc Sustainable Development, University of Utrecht.

George, B.A., & Marino, L. (2011). The epistemology of entrepreneurial orientation: Conceptual formation, modelling, and operationalization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *35*, 989-1024.

Karpacz, J. (2016). Autonomia w kontekście orientacji przedsiębiorczej: Wymiar organizacyjny i indywidualny. *Organizacja i Kierowanie, 4*(174), 28-37.

Kusa, R. (2016). Measuring entrepreneurial orientation in the social context. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review, 4*(3), 117-129.

Lumpkin, G.T., & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 135-172.

Lumpkin, G.T., Moss, T.W., Grass, D.M., Kato S., & Amezcua, A.S. (2013). Entrepreneurial processes in social contexts: How are they different, if at all? *Small Business Economics, 40,* 761-783.

Lurtz, K., & Kreutzer, K. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and social venture creation in nonprofit organizations: The pivotal role of social risk taking and collaboration. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 46*(1), 92-115.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 36-44.

Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science, 29*(7), 770-791.
Miller, D. (2011). Miller (1983) revisited: A reflection on EO research and some suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *35,* 873-894.
Morris, M.H., Coombes, S., Schindehutte, M., & Allen, J. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of entrepreneurial orientation in a non-profit context: Theoretical and empirical insights. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 13*(4), 13-39.
Morris, M.H., Webb, J.W., & Franklin, R.J. (2011). Understanding the manifestation of entrepreneurial orientation in the nonprofit context. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35*(5), 947-971.
Nyssens, M. (Ed.), 2006, *Social Enterprise: At the Crossroads of Markets, Public Policies and Civil Society*. London: Routledge.
O'Reilly, A. (2004). The right to decent work of persons with disabilities. *IFP/ Skills Working Paper*, 14, Geneva: International Labour Organization.
Pearce, J.A., Fritz D.A., & Davis, P.S. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of religious congregations as predicted by rational choice theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *34*, 219-248.
Puumalainen, K. (2014). Entrepreneurial Orientation in Firms with a Social Mission - a Multiple Case Study. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2490720
Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin G.T., & Freese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *33*(3), 761–787.
Starnawska, M. (2017). *Revising Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) in social entrepreneurship, qualitative evidence from Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISEs) from Poland*. Paper presented at 17th EURAM Conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
Syrjä, P., Puumalainen, K., Sjögre, H., Soininen J., & Durst, S. (2013). *Entrepreneurial orientation in social entrepreneurship*. Paper presented at The XXIV ISPIM Conference – Innovating in Global Markets: Challenges for Sustainable Growth, Helsinki, Finland.
Wasilczuk, J.E. (2017). Research on entrepreneurship – forms of entrepreneurship. *Studia i Materiały Wydziału Zarządzania UW*, forthcoming.
Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach. Journal of Business Venturing, 20(1), 71-89.
Wójcik-Karpacz, J. (2016). Orientacja przedsiębiorcza a sukces przedsiębiorstwa. Ustalenia literaturowe. *Journal of Management and Finance*, 14(2/1), 483-496.

Yang, H., & Dess, G.G. (2007). Where do entrepreneurial orientations come from? An investigation on their social origin. In J.A. Katz & G.T. Lumpkin (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Strategic Process, Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth. Volume 10* (pp. 223-247). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research—Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Young, D.R., Searing, E.A.M., & Brewer C.V. (Eds.) (2016). *The Social Enterprise Zoo.* Cheltenham UK and Northampton MS, USA: Edward Elgar.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O., & Shulman, J.M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.

## Biographical note

**Marzena Starnawska,** (Ph.D.), assistant professor at the Department of Entrepreneurship, Gdansk University of Technology. Her research is focused on entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial behavior, social capital in entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, small business collaboration. She has served as a reviewer for different international and domestic journals, as well as an expert for National Science Centre and National Centre for Research and Development, also for Bureau of Research for Polish Parliament. She has been involved in several externally funded basic research, and research-practice oriented projects on a local and international scale (ICSEM, National Science Centre – 3 projects, Erasmus and BSR