

Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice

Important Theory Question from Entrepreneurship Development | 6th Sem | Prashant YT | CTEVT | Entrepreneurship Exit Exam Question With Explained Answer REB | S5| ENTREPRENEURSHIP | Unit 5 :Business growth and development Entrepreneurship MCQ | Entrepreneurship Development MCQ | Venture Capital MCQ | Entrepreneurship Final Exam |Dbu Entrepreneurship Final Exam ACCA | Strategic Business Leader (SBL) Revision Class | September 2024 Exam \ "GENES ARE NOT THE BLUEPRINT FOR LIFE\ " | Denis Noble What is Entrepreneurship? definition, characteristics and entrepreneurial process HOW TO PASS Tu BBS 4TH YEAR //ENTREPRENEURSHIP//CHAPTER QUESTION EXAM mistakes while writing theory paper 1st Sem M.Com. Accounting Theory Question Paper June-2022! What Is an Entrepreneur?

Entrepreneurship Research in Europe

Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Essentials of Business Research Methods

Oswaal CBSE Accountancy, English Core, Business Studies & Economics Class 12 Question Bank (Set of 4 Books) (For 2024 Board Exam)

Social Innovation and Social Enterprises

Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship

Enterprising Africa

Entrepreneurial Resourcefulness

Enterprise, Business-Process and Information Systems Modeling

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship and Innovation

The Entrepreneurial Process

Women Entrepreneurship in Family Business

Entrepreneurial Orientation

Researching Entrepreneurship

Urbanizing the Regional Sector to Strengthen Economy and Business to Recover from Recession

The Challenges of Ethics and Entrepreneurship in the Global Environment

Business Research Methods

Entrepreneurial Decision-making Under Risk

Family Business Studies

Proceedings of the 2023 3rd International Conference on Enterprise Management and Economic Development (ICEMED 2023)

Handbook of Research On Entrepreneurship

PMP Project Management Professional Practice Tests

Entrepreneurship in Theory and Practice

Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice

OMB No. 5894801695673 edited by

RAMOS JOYCE

[Entrepreneurship Research in Europe](#) Oswaal Books

In a world defined by increasing uncertainty and complexity, understanding the concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) is of critical importance.

This volume convenes some of the world's leading experts on EO to provide readers with an overview of the current state of EO research and set a compelling agenda for its future.

[Innovation and Entrepreneurship](#) Routledge

The strength of this book is: It is pitched at a level suitable for students. . . who just want to go out and found their own businesses (or think that they do); it is written in a very friendly, supportive, non-intimidating style in which the authors empathise with the student indeed, empathy is an interesting subtheme of some of the things they suggest about the successful entrepreneur. ð Mark Casson, University of Reading, UK

Entrepreneurship in Theory and Practice is not your typical textbook in entrepreneurship. The authors have taken a very creative look at the seeming contradictions that make up the creation of a new business venture. Their use of current research as well as thought provoking cases to illustrate behaviors such as opportunity recognition make this book one that both professors and would be entrepreneurs should read. ð Alan L.

Carsrud, Ryerson University, Canada This unique textbook on entrepreneurship, aimed primarily at undergraduate students, provides the reader with a broad overview of the entrepreneurship phenomenon. It focuses on the emergence, evaluation and organizing of entrepreneurial opportunities in various organizational contexts. Each chapter kicks off with a real-life international case story by high-profile entrepreneurship scholars, including William B. Gartner, Saras Sarasvathy, Alain Fayolle, Kevin Hindle, Thomas Cooney, Anita Van Gils and Ann Clarke. Theories of entrepreneurship are embedded with tensions and dilemmas, which this book presents as a collection of paradoxes for each theme and chapter. The book challenges the reader to be critical and to take a stand on the many paradoxical situations entrepreneurs encounter on their entrepreneurial journey. The authors present theory and knowledge unique to the paradoxical world of entrepreneurship. Including international cases, student involvement, theory, paradoxes, actions, and exercises, all undergraduate students with or without prior entrepreneurship education can enjoy the many benefits, puzzles, and insights the book has to offer.

Essentials of Business Research Methods Academic Conferences Limited

Social Entrepreneurship is a global phenomenon that impacts the lives of citizens by using innovative approaches to solving social problems. This book offers a comprehensive examination of this growing area of research and provides an excellent introduction to social entrepreneurship theory and a framework for future research.

Oswaal CBSE Accountancy, English Core, Business Studies & Economics Class 12 Question Bank (Set of 4 Books) (For 2024 Board Exam) Emerald Group Publishing

This textbook is intended for use in introductory Entrepreneurship classes at the undergraduate level. Due to the wide range of audiences and course approaches, the book is designed to be as flexible as possible. Theoretical and practical aspects are presented in a balanced manner, and specific components such as the business plan are provided in multiple formats. Entrepreneurship aims to drive students toward active participation in entrepreneurial roles, and exposes them to a wide range of companies and scenarios.

SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

Psychology Press

In this vital new book, leading international scholars highlight the unique characteristics and rich variety of European research in entrepreneurship. They pursue several different perspectives and focus on the key issues and most significant developments in the field.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2ND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Routledge

This product covers the following: ♦ Fresh & Relevant with 2024 CBSE SQP- Fully Solved & Analysed ♦ Score Boosting Insights with 500+Questions & 1000+ Concepts ♦ Insider Tips & Techniques with On-Tips Notes, Mind Maps & Mnemonics ♦ Exam Ready to Practice with 10 Highly Probable SQPs with Actual Board Answer- sheets

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Routledge

This research addresses the question of why some people become entrepreneurs whereas others do not. The debate has been going on for decades

in entrepreneurship. In this dissertation, I address this question by decomposing it into two related questions. The first question is whether entrepreneurs make different decisions compared to non-entrepreneurs when they are facing the same opportunities under risk. The second question is whether these differences in decision-making (if any) are due to the natural proclivity of entrepreneurs themselves. To identify the differences of entrepreneurial decision-making between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs, this study investigates the nexus between entrepreneurs and opportunities from both aspects simultaneously. From an entrepreneur's aspect, based on dual-process theory, I examine how different styles of entrepreneurial thinking influence their decision-making. Considering an opportunity itself, based on prospect theory, I test how different types of opportunity framing influence entrepreneurial decision-making. The results indicate that entrepreneurs have lower evaluations than non-entrepreneurs do when they are facing the same opportunities under risk. The opportunities in a loss frame have higher evaluations than those in a gain frame. The evaluations are higher in System 2 thinking than in System 1 thinking. The findings suggest that entrepreneurs do make different decisions than non-entrepreneurs and that these differences are more likely due to the natural proclivities of at least some entrepreneurs. These findings provide new insights for the entrepreneurial decision-making literature and enlighten some promising future research.

Enterprising Africa Routledge

Four different types of ventures created by entrepreneurs are explored in *What Do Entrepreneurs Create?: survival, lifestyle, managed growth and aggressive growth*. The concept of a balanced venture portfolio is introduced to guide public policy formulation and the development of entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Entrepreneurial Resourcefulness Springer

This book provides an exhaustive, critical analysis of the challenges and opportunities associated with social enterprises and social innovation. More specifically, it addresses questions such as: What is a social innovation? Which are the best theories that explain how social innovations are generated and propagated in the global society? What is a social enterprise? Which are the theoretical perspectives that best describe the functioning of Social Enterprises, the threats and opportunities? How do social enterprises deal with the profit and non profit worlds and how these interactions affect their capability to be social innovators? The most recent literature has focused on strategies integrating conflicting logic, organizational practices or processes. In all these cases, the hybrid nature of the organization is implemented and sustained through original business models, new organizational arrangements and governance and novel strategies. We believe that the hybrid and institutional perspectives are just one of the many theoretical lenses that can be used to frame social innovation and social enterprises. Along this line, some have highlighted the inherent ethical nature of these phenomena, the critical role played by ethical values whose advancement go well beyond what expected by the corporate social responsibility, business ethics and institutional theorizing. This book follows these perspectives exploring the link between social innovation and social enterprises, presenting them as a new possible field of research that support new ways to understand and theorize individual, organizational and community behaviors.

ENTERPRISE, BUSINESS-PROCESS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS MODELING

Routledge

As business schools expand their entrepreneurship programs and organizations seek people with entrepreneurial skills, it has become clear that the skills and mindset of an entrepreneur are highly valued in all business contexts. This latest edition of *Entrepreneurial New Venture Skills* continues to focus on helping students develop entrepreneurial skills, whether they seek to become entrepreneurs or employees. Focusing on the entrepreneurial start-up process, the third edition of *Entrepreneurial New Venture Skills* takes the reader through the steps of selecting, planning, financing, and controlling the new venture. The authors cover multiple forms of new ventures, as well as ways to utilize entrepreneurial skills in other contexts, encouraging students to engage with the material and apply it to their lives in ways that make sense for them. Skill development features include: Entrepreneurial profiles of small business owners Personal applications for students to apply questions to their new venture or a current business Global and domestic cases Elevator pitch assignments, which put students in the venture capitalist position Application exercises and situations covering specific text concepts Business plan prompts to help students construct a business plan over the course of a semester Featuring pedagogical tools like review questions and learning outcomes, and a full companion website that expands upon skill development and offers instructor resources, the third edition of *Entrepreneurial New Venture Skills* is the perfect resource for instructors and students of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship Springer Nature

Enterprising Africa explores the future opportunities, challenges, growth areas and key themes that will shape entrepreneurship in the African continent over the next decade. Entrepreneurship can be the key to unlock resilient growth, but only if it is driven by both socially productive and growth-oriented new businesses. The book considers entrepreneurship as an enabler for socio-economic growth and development in Africa, especially in the context of youth unemployment and increasing youth population for which the traditional, and indeed emerging, industrial sectors will not be able to produce sufficient jobs to meet demand. Organised around three thematic parts, Part I covers the notion of inclusive growth and the role that entrepreneurs can play supporting this. Part II considers the dynamic between entrepreneurs and the environment since social, economic and environmental concerns need to build upon each other rather than vie for recognition. Finally, Part III offers chapters exploring policy contexts and the wider institutional ecosystems that need to be developed and enhanced to ensure a strong and vibrant environment for the future entrepreneurs of Africa to thrive. Edited and authored by leading experts in the field, this fascinating text will be of interest to academics as well as students of International, Transformational and Social Entrepreneurship, and International and African Business.

Entrepreneurship and Innovation Edward Elgar Publishing

The importance of this volume is that it addresses the major pedagogical issues that inevitably arise in the context of entrepreneurship education. It represents a valuable source for those involved in the training and development of entrepreneurial skills and initiative. *Economic Outlook and Business Review* Can entrepreneurship be taught? Is it an art or a science? How is entrepreneurship learned? Another masterpiece by the European masters Fayolle and Klandt, this volume based on the 2003 Grenoble Conference will be useful for years to come, among educators and policymakers

alike, especially those open to the emerging paradigm. Léo-Paul Dana, University of Canterbury, New Zealand This book discusses paradigmatic changes in the field of entrepreneurship education in response to economic, political and social needs, and the consequential need to reassess, redevelop and renew curricula and methods used in teaching entrepreneurship. Traditional and new questions and concerns are addressed, including: the development of business schools towards entrepreneurship education best-practice methods of learning and teaching entrepreneurship both inside and outside the classroom the design of effective teaching frameworks and tools the development of entrepreneurial behaviours and attitudes in students teaching the design and launch of new businesses. The issue of assessing the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education is also raised. A theoretical and methodological framework is used to measure the impact and effectiveness of entrepreneurship education programmes on the attitudes and behaviours of students. Now more than ever, the book argues, research in the field of entrepreneurship education has to be encouraged and facilitated, and should drive the activity of entrepreneurship education providers. As such, this fascinating book aims to provide researchers, practitioners, teachers and advanced students engaged in the field of entrepreneurship with relevant and up-to-date insights into international research programmes in entrepreneurship education.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS

Routledge

Explores the theme of "resources" in entrepreneurship, and examines entrepreneurs that persevere in uncertain times to build new businesses. The different perspectives gathered in this volume present new ways of thinking about how entrepreneurs acquire, borrow, and make use of resources in seemingly impossible environments.

Women Entrepreneurship in Family Business Springer Science & Business Media

. . . this is a single-authored book; a series of academic papers (some original, some fairly recently published), neatly set around a unifying theme and tied into a comprehensive argument. . . once you have shared Davidsson's insights, stumblings, joys, and humor over some 240 pages, it feels as if he were part of your family. The book sets off with a very clear and helpful introduction that lays out the entrepreneurship phenomenon. . . This book is value adding for a fairly wide academic audience: essentially all those interested in diverse areas of entrepreneurship and innovation, or in questions of methodology, research design and interpretation of, ultimately, any complex, fast paced behavioural and social realities. It does not give us all the answers, thank heavens, but it certainly asks some excellent questions. . . the novice scholar, will find some welcome foothold and guidance. . . this book is simply fun to read; when could you last say that of a research methodology book? Jacqueline Fendt, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* Unquestionably, Per Davidsson can be considered a leading voice of authority on the study of entrepreneurship as an academic discipline. . . From the initial introduction through to the latter discussions, one aspect of this textbook that immediately makes itself apparent to the reader is Davidsson's markedly personal and deeply engaging writing style. The *Entrepreneurship Research Challenge* is notably distinct from many of the generic business research methods texts in that it does not attempt to portray an objective toolbox of methodological choices. Instead, the style is such that the reader feels that Davidsson truly wishes for his audience to learn from his unique experiences, opinions and even mistakes. . . the practical advice provided is both insightful and useful. . . this text is not simply about how to go through the motions of the research process. Instead, it makes a very well reasoned attempt to form a basis for the discipline as a whole as well as to address methods to overcome unique challenges while promoting research output that is useful. For these reasons it should be considered essential reading for any entrepreneurship scholar, and in particular, for those at the early stages of their research career. Russell Matthews, *International Small Business Journal* Entrepreneurship is an emerging, dynamic and to a considerable extent, unpredictable phenomenon. Thus, it makes for a challenging research subject. In this book, one of the most experienced empiricists in the field has collected some of his most important ideas on how improved conceptualization and research design can make this challenge more manageable. Per Davidsson addresses questions such as: What precisely is entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship research? What unique contribution can it make compared with research in other fields? Conversely, how can scholars with different disciplinary backgrounds best contribute to the study of entrepreneurship? What does the emergent and highly diverse nature of entrepreneurship imply for research design? And what is required from entrepreneurship researchers and practitioners in order for the research to make strong contributions to business and policy practice? This comprehensive, in-depth account of how the emergence of new entrepreneurial activity can be studied will be warmly welcomed by researchers and academics in the areas of entrepreneurship, innovation and methodology and research design.

Entrepreneurial Orientation Springer Nature

This book provides an understanding of 'opportunity recognition' as a catalyst and crux of the entrepreneurial process. Grounded in research, it introduces the key concepts at the heart of entrepreneurship theory and practice and demonstrates how entrepreneurship differs from management in language, priorities and practice. The book's central framework is mapped around 'seeing and seizing opportunities', where the entrepreneur enters a situation, eventually sees an opportunity and takes it through a process of idea development into an actionable entrepreneurial initiative. This captures the book's four core elements: person(s), environment, opportunity and process. The *Entrepreneurial Process* is unique in its explanation of how key concepts are related and how they can be applied practically to business models, plans and action. Case studies from real-life organizations, reflective questions and short exercises throughout encourage student learning and enable true engagement with the subject matter, building students' entrepreneurial efficacy. A 'one-stop shop' of key theoretical perspectives on entrepreneurship, opportunity recognition and business modelling, this textbook is essential for undergraduate and postgraduate students on introductory entrepreneurship and enterprise courses. Its practical and applied nature also makes it suitable for MBA and executive education. Online resources include chapter-by-chapter PowerPoint slides and a test bank of questions.

Researching Entrepreneurship Edward Elgar Publishing

Entrepreneurship is a growing field of research, attracting researchers from many different disciplines including economics, sociology, psychology, and management. The concept of entrepreneurship, and research in the field, is becoming institutionalized, increasingly oriented by influential trends,

theories and methods, following the mainstream and being shaped accordingly. The objective of this book is to move beyond mainstream approaches and assumptions which are dominating the field, and to raise questions about the nature and process of entrepreneurship research. Over twelve chapters, leading international thinkers in the field debate the impact and the consequences of institutionalization. Taking key research orientations including multidisciplinary, international entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, and ethics, it takes a critical and constructive and sometimes controversial posture and encourages a re-examination of the way we look at the social and economic phenomenon of entrepreneurship. This book is vital reading for entrepreneurship researchers and educators, advanced students and policy-makers in Entrepreneurship, Economics, Sociology and Psychology.

URBANIZING THE REGIONAL SECTOR TO STRENGTHEN ECONOMY AND BUSINESS TO RECOVER FROM RECESSION

Springer Nature

Volume 25 focuses on challenges and visions in entrepreneurship and ethics. The contributors have provided the latest perspectives on how ethics is impacted by or impacting the field. With a combination of theoretical and conceptual papers, the scholars have created a framework for the ethical challenges in today's global environment.

The Challenges of Ethics and Entrepreneurship in the Global Environment John Wiley & Sons

Entrepreneurship is essential for international social and economic well-being, as new ventures are the dominant source of job creation, market innovation, and economic growth in many societies. In this book, a noted group of researchers use findings, methods, and theories of modern psychology as the basis for gaining important, new insights into entrepreneurship-and into the hearts and minds of the talented, passionate professionals who create new business ventures. The Psychology of Entrepreneurship, a volume in the SIOP Organizational Frontiers Series, is the first book written about the psychology of entrepreneurship, and includes over 60 research questions to guide industrial organizational psychology, organizational behavior, and entrepreneurship research about entrepreneurs. It seeks to answer questions such as, how and why do some people, but not others, recognize opportunities, decide to start new ventures, and organize successful, rapidly growing new ventures? Some topics addressed include: methods to help researchers explore the domain of entrepreneurship research; the entire process of starting a new business; characteristics of the individual entrepreneur; the history of entrepreneurship education; the cross-cultural effects of entrepreneurship; and the viewpoints of seasoned psychologists who analyze current entrepreneurship research methods. This book will appeal to teachers, students, and researchers in the areas of industrial organizational psychology, organizational behavior, entrepreneurship, and management.

Business Research Methods WSB-NLU

Social entrepreneurship³, as a field of research, has gained enormous interest of academics in management and entrepreneurship literature for almost 30 years now. Also, scholars in other intellectual domains like economics, finance, marketing, political science, sociology and few others, have found it fascinating. As a term, it is common in public discourses and has found interest among policy makers, corporations, media, different groups of practitioners and professionals. As a phenomenon it is not new, although the SE term has been only recently coined (Banks, 1972; Drucker, 1979). For far more than two centuries great individuals and groups have tried to tackle the societal challenges, using economic means, such as the Rochdale Pioneers who inspired cooperative ideals, and Florence Nightingale – an English nurse and social activist, who changed the patient care landscape (Nicholls, 2006). Many of the ventures and actions of social initiatives can be traced to the earlier, medieval or even ancient times. Today, social initiatives and social enterprise have emerged in particular countries and regions as a result of their historical institutional trajectories, and “social enterprise landscape ZOO” (Young & Brewer, 2016) has become very heterogeneous. The interest of management and entrepreneurship research into the phenomenon has resulted in an unprecedented increase in scholarly output. The historical analysis of SE research (Moss, Lumpkin & Short, 2017) published in key journals and databases shows an increase from one paper to 45 papers published per year between 1990 and 2010. SE centers established in universities like Oxford, Harvard and Cambridge have designed degree programmes, dedicated textbooks, and separate SE conferences, special journals like Social Enterprise Journal, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and many more have been introduced for educational and publication purposes. SE has become popular as a response to the inabilities of governments and business to solve pressing social problems, including poverty, social exclusion, and environmental issues. All of the above are manifested in the diversity of different SE initiatives. Thus, we express our interest to explain and predict SE and social enterprise as phenomena, to identify related antecedents and outcomes, but also to look into the box of SE processes. This special issue attempts to respond to this interest. Diverse methodological approaches including descriptive, explanatory or exploratory ones are included in the papers in this issue. SE phenomenon is studied on an individual, organizational, and even a macro level. Different data is employed: current or archival data, primary or secondary, referring to different country settings such as Taiwan, Poland, Italy and England. Through the inclusion of such diverse perspectives and context, this issue works as a holistic approach to the phenomenon under analysis. In the following sections of this paper, we first provide a succinct overview of SE as a phenomenon and research field. We summarize the definitional debate and point to valuable theoretical frameworks for studying SE. Next, we introduce individual authors' contributions to the issue and, finally, we propose further suggestions for future research. Theoretical and analytical approaches in social entrepreneurship and social enterprise studies SE and social enterprise research is strongly practice (i.e., phenomenon) driven and based on anecdotal evidence as the majority of studies are based on exemplary case studies (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2014; Mair & Marti, 2006; Starnawska, 2016a). Most research is descriptive and not contextualized in theory (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011), with the exception of some theoretical frameworks we propose further. Many studies evidence small sample cases (Perrini & Vurro, 2006; Tracey & Jarvis, 2007; Sharir & Lerner, 2006; Weerawardena & Mort, 2006). However, large sample studies are rare. For example, Shaw and Carter's (2007) study is an exception based on a large sample of interviews, and there are two large panel and population studies like Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) or Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics (PSED). There is no doubt about the lack of large-scale studies and databases of social enterprise and social entrepreneurs too (Dacin et al., 2011). Hockerts and Wustenhagen (2010) call for more longitudinal, even long-term retrospective studies, paralleling to the need for studies on more common large sample research empirical studies. Research infrastructure on SE is weak (Lee, Battilana & Wang, 2014). This is the result of the lack of databases on social enterprise and social entrepreneurs.

Also, there is still a lack of coherent, clear and universal research methods that encompass the SE phenomenon. There are some discussions about the subject of SE field of research. Dacin and authors (2011) argue that “defining social entrepreneurship through individual-level characteristics, processes will inevitably lead to more discussion and debate about how these characteristics should be.” Therefore, although individual level analysis is a universal subject of research, for outlining the scope of the SE phenomenon, the study of entrepreneurs individual features may lead again, like in conventional entrepreneurship research, to unresolved debate about what constitutes the core of SE. The majority of individual-level studies in this field focus on entrepreneurial intentions, which are conducted in the GEM project and north-American PSED. The studies on entrepreneurial personality or specific social entrepreneurial traits are limited (Stephan & Drencheva, 2017). There is also limited work on values, motives, identity or skills of these. Stephen and Drencheva (2017) suggest that this is due to practitioners narratives of “hero” social entrepreneurs who manage to combat multiple barriers (Borstein, 2004; Leadbeater, 1997). Also, organizational level studies, lead to confusion. As mentioned earlier, there are various SE operation models, specific for particular countries and regions, determined by historical and institutional trajectories (Defourny & Nyssens, 2012; Ciepielewska-Kowalik, Pielniński, Starnawska & Szymańska, 2015). Therefore, the heterogeneity of SE is omnipresent, and it is impossible to approach the “social enterprise zoo” (Young & Brewer, 2016) like a homogenous population of organizations. The overview of research infrastructure provided by Lee and authors (2014) shows that the majority of key texts in academic literature is focused on an organizational level (76%) whereas only 16 % employ an individual level. These two distinct streams in the SE literature reflect the two groups of studies undertaken in the SE field. The former individual level focused work is characteristic for mature intermediate studies. Lee and authors (2014) employ this category from Edmondson and McManus (2007) explaining that such studies build on existing research and constructs, and therefore allow for testing causal patterns. Whereas organization-level work belongs to a nascent studies group which treats the studied subject as novel, not explained and makes an effort to explore new constructs and patterns. There are some research opportunities as theoretical contexts are concerned. It is suggested for the SE field to incorporate network related theories, institutional theory and structuration theory (Mair & Marti, 2006; Dacin et al., 2011; Short, Moss & Lumpkin, 2009). The network theories include social capital and stakeholder theory. Social enterprise embeddedness in the local community is more pronounced when compared with commercial entrepreneurship (Starnawska, 2017). The importance of building relationships and relying on a social network of entrepreneurs is essential for leveraging resources and building legitimacy across different sectors and different logics. It is also visible that the SE community is being strengthened by many global Foundations, like Ashoka or Skoll, which aim to support them. Moreover, in the end, a network approach can help to explain the potential for generating social impact. The institutional approach suggestion helps to provide insights into the need of SE legitimation as a separate field or sub-field of entrepreneurship practice and research. This theoretical framework also responds to the institutional barriers entrepreneurs face, and this is of particular importance for SE organizations that are set between conflicting logics. This includes the emergence of social enterprise in a variety of settings and can be, for example, explained by a social movement's theory. Also, it helps to add to the understanding of the institutionalization of SE as a field of research and practice, and what powers and institutional actors are at play. Moreover, social innovations generate institutional change, and social entrepreneurs can be analyzed as institutional entrepreneurs (Mair & Matri, 2006; Starnawska, 2017). The focus on the concept of a social entrepreneur as an institutional agent is in line with the structure-agency debate and provides opportunities for discussion on the transformative, change the potential of SE. The institutional and social capital approaches, provide arguments for more engagement of the academic community to employ more interpretivist lenses, through social constructionist approaches, which requires more in-depth and more longitudinal data collection and analysis, with more qualitative approaches, to study the complex and contextual phenomenon of SE (Starnawska, 2016b, 2018). Research streams in social entrepreneurship and social enterprise There are two streams of thought in the current SE research field which are not explicitly distinguished by the academic community. There is a growing pressure to make it a distinct and legitimate field of inquiry. Nicholls (2010) finds SE as at a pre-paradigmatic stage and therefore the SE field of research and practice is undergoing a process of maturation (Nicolopoulou, 2014). Other researchers seem not to follow this way of thinking and do not regard the SE field as a domain of its own right, with its own theories (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011). This latter, critical approach stems from the already existing fragmentation of the entrepreneurship field, and it questions what additional value to the theory can be provided by studying another, separate field of SE. Most of the current SE research has focused so far on the definitional debate (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010), especially in terms of scope and purpose as a subject of activity (Nicolopoulou, 2014). As Dacin and others (2010) summarize, the common issue in all SE definitions is the social aim, but it is still debatable what the “social” element in the concept of SE is (Nicholls, 2006), and there is still some discussions about what is meant by the “entrepreneurship” element. The very juxtaposition of the “social” and “entrepreneurship” generates some essentialist debates between relevant homo politicus and homo economicus (Nyborg, 2000). A high number of definitional debates have been determined by geographical, political and social antecedents, acknowledging the key role of institutional and historical contexts for social enterprise and SE emergence. These contexts vary between countries, regions, continents. Overall, three main academic schools of thought on social enterprise have developed (Dees & Anderson, 2006; Defourny & Nyssens, 2012): social innovation, earned income, and the EMES approach. The first school deals mainly with the notion and phenomenon of social entrepreneurship, whereas the second and the third with the notion and phenomenon of social enterprise. Social innovation focuses on social innovators as individual heroes, change makers and leaders. Here the discourses are focused on “change agency” and “leadership” (Baron, 2007; Nicolopoulou, 2014) and reflect entrepreneurship approaches dominant in the mainstream literature. A lot of this discussion is generated thanks to the Ashoka Foundation promoting its fellows and similar other foundations promoting the discourse on individual change makers (Bornstein, 2004). In this area, there is intense academic work referring to SE (social entrepreneurship). The second school, on “earned income,” emphasizes the capability of social enterprise to achieve social aims through earned income. This approach also has roots in America, where in the late 80's there was a need for non-profit organizations to generate revenues to realize their own social mission and to survive in the market at the same time (Dees & Anderson, 2012). This approach has also dominated the UK agenda of social enterprise, working on non-profits to move away from grant dependency (Tracey, Philips & Haugh, 2005). Following the effort of scholars from different countries, an EMES project under the leadership of Defourny and Nyssens (2013) put forward nine Weberian “ideal type” criteria, reflecting: social, economic and governance dimensions of an “ideal social enterprise” which altogether constitute a constellation of guiding directions for comparative purposes. The EMES spin-off project called

International Comparative Social Enterprise Models (ICSEM) has gathered together researchers from more than 50 countries worldwide who have proposed social enterprise models for their countries, to consider their institutional trajectories⁴. A recent attempt at universal typology of social enterprise models has been recently proposed by Defourny and Nyssens (2016) as a key finding from the ICSEM project: entrepreneurial non-profit organizations, social business, social cooperative and public sector social enterprise. Both schools, the second and the third, refer to social enterprise as a notion referring to different types of social enterprises, employing it as an “umbrella” concept encompassing a diverse population of organizations set in different institutional contexts. Some scholars claim that the literature needs to link the gap between “social” and “entrepreneurship” (Chell, 2007) whereas others consider SE as a version of entrepreneurship (Martin & Osberg, 20007; Nicolopoulou, 2014). There is no agreement on the domain (field of research), boundaries, and definitions (Short, Moss & Lumpkin, 2009; Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Peredo & McLean, 2006). The challenges in theory development lie in SE discourses which are conventional and propose idealistic visionary narratives (Steyaert & Dey, 2010). Thus, moving away from exemplary cases of social enterprise and their leaders, may lead researchers to more critical and advanced approaches to the studies in the field, including the examples on the borders and the margins of the practice field, but also discovering “unsuccessful stories.” What is also problematic is that there is a widespread positive image of SE as a phenomenon in academic literature (Dey, 2010, p.121) and the existence of a “high profile” SE with its roots in entrepreneurship studies, as pursued in business schools, feeding on business rhetoric and practices, and emphasizing scaling and vision, as important elements (O’Connor, 2010, pp. 79-82). Contributions The papers in this special issue provide insights into SE and social enterprise across different institutional contexts and countries while employing different methodological approaches and different theoretical frameworks. They help us understand the diversity of the SE phenomenon, and their methodological approaches manifest a richness of research methods that can be applied in the SE field. All of the authors recognize the unique contextualization of social enterprise and SE development in the field of practice and research The first paper authored by Lamberto Zollo, Ricardo Rialti, Cristiano Ciappei and Andrea Boccardi (2018) “Bricolage and social entrepreneurship to address emergent social needs: A “deconstructionist” perspective” employ Derrida’s (1976, 1988) deconstructionist approach to provide insights into bricolage in a SE context. The researchers employ a retrospective longitudinal case study of an Italian SE organization which is one of the oldest non-profit organizations in the world, yet it still impacts upon the social and healthcare landscape in Italy – Misericordia. This organization exemplifies how everyday emergencies are dealt with, which makes it a suitable setting for studying social entrepreneurial solutions and social bricolage as a response manner. The case is chosen as an extreme one (Pettigrew, 1990) against the background of the exploratory nature of the study and the limited research on bricolage in an SE context. They make attempts to see if the bricolage concept can be applied in the SE context. This exploratory case analysis is done through the usage of historical and current data from archival sources, current literature including magazines, reports, communication tools, and transcripts from semi-structured interviews held with Misericordia people. The authors provide a conceptual typology of social bricolage as an entrepreneurial solution to social needs. Five strategies are identified: a rigid efficient arrangement, a flexible and effective arrangement, an inertial momentum arrangement, an elusive arrangement and a structural delay arrangement; as different institutional and entrepreneurial solutions to social needs. The findings show how Misericordia employs these strategies. The contribution of this paper is a conceptual framework on the bricolage approach in addressing emerging social needs. The paper deepens our understanding of possible applications of the bricolage concept in SE studies. It broadens the literature on entrepreneurship and, in particular, SE working with the application of a bricolage approach. The second paper by Tanja Collavo (2018) – “Unpacking social entrepreneurship: Exploring the definition chaos and its consequences in England” focuses on the organizational level factors determining definitional confusion in SE and social enterprise. Also, the paper aims to explore what the consequences of this state of the art are for social entrepreneurs, social investors, social enterprises and policy makers. The study setting is England, where the SE sector has had a long tradition and has been subject to influences from different actors and organizations in the USA and the EU. The author makes efforts to empirically find out what the long-term effects of this definitional diversity are on multiple stakeholders. The paper uses an exploratory case study approach, where England is treated as a case. For this purpose the author analyses historical secondary data, taken from the period 1995-2016, including archival data such as newspapers, magazines, academic papers, reports produced by government and national think-tanks, to trace the development of the sector in England and factors leading to the current definitional debate. This historical approach is further employed in a complementary analysis of archives and content from 69 archived interviews held with different stakeholders from the sector such as employees of sector intermediaries, representatives of charities, social entrepreneurs, academics, and representatives of businesses. The findings help the author to outline three dominant schools of thought in practitioner’s discourse: one school on social enterprises as businesses, another on social entrepreneurs as innovators and the last as a community-related phenomenon. These are in line with the 3 schools of thought suggested in the literature on social enterprise (Defourny & Nyssens, 2013) who, apart from social innovation and the “earned income” school, put forward the aforementioned EMES approach. However, it is interesting to see that the model proposed for England represents an “earned income” school approach (Tracey, Philips & Haugh, 2005; Teasdale, 2012). In further findings, the author resumes 3 categories of opinions on how the definitional debate impacts the sector. For some, this debate brings opportunities, as it generates inclusiveness and interest in social enterprise. For others, it is a negative phenomenon, as it generates disagreements in the sector, hardens access to funding and creates confusion in making public policies. The study shows that the definitional debate in England raises discussions in practice, and shows that research and practice face similar challenges. The next paper by Huei-Ching Liu, Ching Yin Ip and Chaoyun Liang (2018) “A new runway for journalists: On the intentions of journalists to start social enterprises” focuses on the entrepreneurial intentions of present and former journalists towards starting a social enterprise. The authors set their hypotheses in the context of the similarities between entrepreneurs and journalists, and analyze how personal traits, creativity and social capital determine the entrepreneurial intentions of journalists. Their research is based on an on-line survey run in social media groups for journalists and covers valid answers from a sample of 401 participants. The findings show no significant influence of personality traits, and the authors explain that this is due to the construction of the research hypotheses based on classic entrepreneurship literature. Another important finding is that creativity and bridging social capital has a positive significant influence on social entrepreneurial intentions. The latter is an essential message as creativity is vital in overcoming the institutional barriers (Dacin et al., 2010) that SE faces. Also, social capital is an important element in SE development, which itself is more strongly emphasized in SE literature, recognizing the role of

stakeholders in social enterprise, and a strong pronouncement of embeddedness of social enterprise in a social context. The study throws light on social entrepreneurial intentions among journalists, whom themselves constitute an interesting population. Assigning the role of social entrepreneurs to journalists leads to advocacy functions for many societal challenges. It can influence social impact thanks to potentially higher media coverage of social issues. Although the main findings are in line with the mainstream literature on entrepreneurial intentions towards conventional entrepreneurship, the subject and setting of the study in Taiwan is a very inspiring and interesting context, when discussing who social entrepreneurs are. The last paper by Katarzyna Bachnik and Justyna Szumniak-Samolej (2018) “Social initiatives in food consumption and distribution as part of sustainable consumption and sharing economy” aims to describe and characterize social initiatives in food consumption and distribution in Poland. They present their study on the purposive sample of social initiatives in food consumption and the distribution area. In particular, reference is made to goals, operating models (“ways of acting”) and their linkages to sustainable consumption and sharing economy. Four mini-cases of social initiatives in this area, established between 2013- 2016 and located in two main cities in Poland: Cracow and Warsaw, are purposively chosen as the subject of the study. These initiatives are chosen in accordance with sustainability and sharing economy criteria, presented in the paper. The authors use existing secondary data together with related social media and website content material for the case analysis. The described social ventures are grass-roots initiatives, resulting from the bottom up activity of individuals and groups. The key findings of this paper show a variety in their organizational and legal forms, varying from an initiative undertaken by volunteers, a project undertaken by students, to an informal group that set up a non-profit organization. Also, the evidence shows diverse linkages to sustainable consumption and sharing economy across the mini cases. These are involved in purchases of healthy food, promotion of responsible food consumption, being sensitive to food waste issues, motivations to care for the greater good and for nature and for others. The sharing economy dimension is visible not only through sharing food with others but also sharing on the level of building trust and community. The authors plan to undertake a study of organizational and individual behaviors in further quantitative research followed by in-depth interviews with representatives of initiatives in sustainable consumption and sharing economy, to provide more generalizable conclusions. Their mini-case study of secondary data shows the urging need for more empirical, wider scale studies. However, it needs to be emphasized that many of these initiatives are novel ones, and reflect new social movements, and are not significant in numbers. Therefore, it comes as no surprise why some research on social enterprise is still anecdotal and SE organizations and ventures are slowly occupying the SE landscape in Poland, i.e., moving towards a variety of sustainability and responsibility related initiatives, beyond a pure welfare focus. When, in western European countries, social cooperative enterprise initiatives have become quite abundant, representing new-movements in food, environmental, cultural, educational spheres, in many central and eastern European countries, the rebirth of civil society into social initiatives and social enterprise needs more time for development (Ravensburg, Lang, Poledrini & Starnawska, 2017). Future research In this part of the paper, we deliver summarizing suggestions for future research directions while recognizing the research gaps identified by authors in this issue. We aim to propose new ideas that can deliver insights into the SE phenomenon. The papers provide findings and conclusions relevant to the practice and research field, and emphasize the value of retrospective case studies; employing the analysis of historical data; the ongoing need of case- and small-scale studies of SE ventures and organizations in contexts where the SE phenomenon is not common; the potential of large-scale studies on individuals and their social entrepreneurial intentions; and the strong potential in the qualitative content analysis of practitioners’ discourses as a methodological tool in studying the SE phenomenon. In their work, Zollo, Rialti, Ciappei and Boccardi (2018) propose a theoretical framework encompassing the typology of social bricolage, depending on social needs and the institutions entrepreneurs cope with, and depending on entrepreneurial and institutional solutions to these social needs. This framework is studied in exploratory, longitudinal case analysis. This study has relevance for SE researchers as it provides a systematic overview of social bricolage approaches to emerging social needs. The chosen exploratory retrospective approach is also a valuable example of how archival data can be employed in a complementary manner with current primary data while studying social enterprise with long traditions. For further research, it is required to validate the proposed framework in other SE organizations and to study the assumption that bricolage is a significant opportunity for social entrepreneurs to address emergent social needs. This paper also works as an exemplary work of retrospective, longitudinal studies on SE organizations. The arguments put forward by Hockerts and Wüstenhagen (2010) regarding the need for such studies, may refer to work on historical and current data as well. Covallo (2018) shows how qualitative analysis of existing secondary data can contribute to the understanding of the complexity of SE. This methodological approach is rather uncommon and it shows that analyses of current texts of narratives, discourses and, rhetoric, can provide a deeper understanding of the SE phenomenon, as socially constructed. This can also show the power and interplays between a variety of institutional actors (Nicholls, 2010). A new stream of literature is emerging and this work is an exemplary example of how narrations of social enterprise can shape SE culture. For tracing the nature of the SE phenomenon, narratives from different actors could be heard to understand the complexity of the studied subject. In this sense, the recognition of practitioners’ voices broadens the spectrum of studied populations. It is of particular importance, as social enterprise has not been legally framed in many institutional country contexts. For many countries, social enterprise models have been recognized (Defourny & Nyssens, 2013), but Covallo (2018) takes a parallel step to analyze practitioners’ and other stakeholders’ discourses on what social enterprise is. Additionally, T. Covallo’s work serves as an exciting example of how qualitative content data analysis can be employed in future studies, in the light of the scarcity of widely available data on SE, and interesting and valuable findings can be generated thanks to the existing discourses and narratives. The research of Liu, Ip and Liang (2018) confirms existing mainstream literature on conventional entrepreneurship. Their evidence from the journalist community in Taiwan shows that personal traits have no significant impact upon social entrepreneurial intentions. However creativity and bridging social capital are recognized as significant variables. The research is of particular interest, as it does not refer to entrepreneurial intentions among students or graduates or general populations, but is limited to the population of active and former journalists. Further research could potentially explain social entrepreneurial intentions in other professions and be next stage research leading to comparative analyses. The results of this research show the importance of bridging social capital which has practical implications at policy and practitioner level. To extend the SE community, other professional groups can become more and more involved in the societal challenges, which in the end can lead to higher start-up rates of social enterprises, but also strengthen many of them with professional expertise. The findings also confirm the need to employ more network related theories for SE future studies. Bachnik and Szumniak-Sulej (2018) provide insights into

Polish social initiatives in food consumption and distribution, against the background of the understudied nature of the phenomenon. The authors select a purposive sample of diverse cases of such initiatives and provide a descriptive overview of their goals, organization, and links with sustainable consumption and sharing economy. The paper works as exemplary evidence, that the majority of social venture studies are based on small samples of anecdotal evidence, as highlighted at the beginning of the paper. Therefore, having based their research on secondary data, the authors call for further research including primary data collection and more longitudinal observation. As these initiatives are still novel and grass-roots ventures, further qualitative and exploratory approaches would be required. As the authors claim, the responsible consumption and sharing economy have become very popular in digital community, and consumer attitudes have a significant impact upon the sustainability of such initiatives. The work presented in this issue confirms the need for more insightful qualitative studies set in varied institutional contexts, and at the same time for more large-scale studies on populations of nascent or existing social entrepreneurs or social enterprises. In the case of the former, more constructivist and network related approaches can be of further value (Starnawska, 2016a, 2018). In the case of the latter, researchers from different institutional contexts could make attempts at setting the foundations of comparative studies across countries (e.g., Ravensburg et al., 2017) but on large social enterprise populations. Also, with the growing legitimacy of SE in an educational setting (Starnawska, 2018), there lies great potential in evaluating social entrepreneurial attitudes among students and graduates and other populations such as different professions. In parallel, the work presented in

this issue shows excellent opportunities in analyzing historical data, since SE is not a novel phenomenon.

ENTREPRENEURIAL DECISION-MAKING UNDER RISK

The Entrepreneurship Research Challenge

This book contains the refereed proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Business Process Modeling, Development and Support (BPMDS 2011) and the 16th International Conference on Exploring Modeling Methods for Systems Analysis and Design (EMMSAD 2011), held together with the 23rd International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE 2011) in London, UK, in June 2011. The 22 papers accepted for BPMDS were selected from 61 submissions and cover a wide spectrum of issues related to business processes development, modeling, and support. They are grouped into sections on BPMDS in practice, business process improvement, business process flexibility, declarative process models, variety of modeling paradigms, business process modeling and support systems development, and interoperability and mobility. The 16 papers accepted for EMMSAD were chosen from 31 submissions and focus on exploring, evaluating, and enhancing current information modeling methods and methodologies. They are grouped in sections on workflow and process modeling extensions, requirements analysis and information systems development, requirements evolution and information systems evolution, data modeling languages and business rules, conceptual modeling practice, and enterprise architecture.

Related with Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice:

© [Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice Family History Mysteries Buried Past](#)

© [Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice Family Dollar Assistant Manager Assessment Test Answers](#)

© [Exam Questions Entrepreneurship Theory Process And Practice Family History Pancreatic Cancer Icd 10](#)