

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

International Journal of Innovation Studies

journal homepage: <http://www.keaipublishing.com/en/journals/international-journal-of-innovation-studies>

The social as the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship: An emerging area or an old crossroads?

Ricardo Grilo ^a, António Carrizo Moreira ^{a, b, c, *}^a Department of Economics, Management, Industrial Engineering and Tourism, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, 3810-193, Portugal^b GOVCOPP, Department of Economics, Management, Industrial Engineering and Tourism, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, 3810-193, Portugal^c INESC TEC-Institute for Systems and Computer Engineering, Technology and Science, Porto, 4099-002, Portugal

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 28 September 2021

Accepted 23 March 2022

Available online 31 March 2022

Keywords:

Social innovation

Social entrepreneurship

Social value creation

Business model

Responsible innovation

Social

And systematic literature review

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to contribute to the conceptual debate on the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, considering the role of the 'social' within this connection. Supported by a systematic literature review (SLR) with an in-depth analysis of 34 articles from Scopus-indexed and Web of Science databases journals, this paper identifies, analyzes and describes the difficulties and opportunities in the social innovation and social entrepreneurship literature. Little is known about the link between both concepts and the influence of the 'social' in their development and implementation. This SLR was conducted to identify and describe definitions and patterns. Results show that the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship is in its take-off phase, but it still is a fragmented field with a huge lack of consensus. Thus, it will be important to see where the field will head, as this paper aims to be a first step in the understanding of social innovation and social entrepreneurship through a collective and integrated perspective, providing an elucidation of the different perspectives of the literature.

© 2022 China Science Publishing & Media Ltd. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co. Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Interest from the academic, business and civil society in social innovation and social entrepreneurship literature is growing rapidly (Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Eichler and Schwarz, 2019; Munshi, 2010) since social value creation and social innovation were considered vital to the social entrepreneurship phenomenon (Austin et al., 2006). Following this perspective, Campopiano and Bassani (2021) argue that social innovation has been conceptualized as interfacing innovation and social entrepreneurship literature. However, although there has been growing interest in academic publications on social innovation or social entrepreneurship – the aim of which is to respond to various challenges of the current world – it is possible to claim that there is a lack of consensus among researchers on what exactly social innovation and social entrepreneurship really are in this emergent research field (Andersson and Ford, 2016; García-Jurado et al., 2021; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). The advent of organizations with the desire to “change the world” and the apparent inability of governments to solve environmental and social problems increased interest in social innovation and social entrepreneurship (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Andersson and Ford, 2016). This context may give the idea that social enterprises outcomes or impacts

* Corresponding author. Department of Economics, Management, Industrial Engineering and Tourism, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal.
E-mail address: amoreira@ua.pt (A.C. Moreira).

are connected with the idea of fixing social and environmental problems. Nevertheless, according to [Adro and Fernandes \(2021\)](#), it is difficult to analyze the real extension of how social innovation and social entrepreneurship can help develop sustainable, strong responses to meet the economic, social, and environmental challenges arising in the twenty-first-century world. This is an important academic debate if one considers the various effects generated by the process of capturing social and economic value, especially when social innovations are focused on solving ecological, social, or economic problems ([Boons and Lüdeke-Freund, 2013](#); [Guerrero et al., 2020](#)).

As knowledge production within the business research continues to grow, its fragmentation is also accelerating, with several research gaps and academic debates being identified: (1) defining social enterprises is still considered a challenge ([Young and Lecy, 2014](#)); (2) social entrepreneurship and social innovation literature and academic research are in its infancy ([Bacq and Janssen, 2011](#); [Campopiano and Bassani, 2021](#); [Farinha et al., 2020](#)); (3) it is hard to keep up with state of the art ([Adro and Fernandes, 2021](#)); (4) how socially oriented organizations strategies define their business model innovations to capture social and economic value ([Yunus et al., 2010](#)); (5) understanding the role of innovation in the context of social enterprises ([Campopiano and Bassani, 2021](#)); and (6) the use social innovation and social entrepreneurship as interchangeable terms ([Eichler and Schwarz, 2019](#); [Morris et al., 2020](#)). Furthermore, when an enterprise or individual engages in activities that create social value and address social problems, but the approach is not innovative, it is still doubtful whether can we talk about social entrepreneurship ([Campopiano and Bassani, 2021](#); [Phillips et al., 2015](#); [Witkamp et al., 2011](#)).

Academic research on social entrepreneurship has emphasized the social outcome of business activities that aim at value creation beyond profit maximization ([Campopiano and Bassani, 2021](#); [Del Gesso, 2020](#)). Therefore, as social innovation is often seen as the opportunity for social enterprises to significantly invest in the creation of social outcomes to address people's needs, can we claim that the term 'social' is at the heart of the relationship between social innovation and social entrepreneurship? In other words, since social innovation is "a concept which must recognize an essential commitment of the people for whom the change seeks to contribute" ([Phillips et al., 2015](#), p. 16), are social innovation and social entrepreneurship connected in the attempt to identify an opportunity in addressing a social problem? This would mean that both kinds of literatures are focused on generating benefits for people in organizations, communities, and society through directly and indirectly achieving greater social good ([Dawson and Daniel, 2010](#); [Morris et al., 2020](#)).

Although most scholars agree that social innovation is not social entrepreneurship ([Phillips et al., 2015](#)), the main question still remains: how are social innovation and social entrepreneurship understood? On the one hand, some state that the distinctiveness of social innovation is in the attempt to meet social needs through changing circumstances in terms of innovation outcomes and processes, as innovation and the inherent processes can give rise to different solutions to a problem ([Cui et al., 2017](#); [Lettice and Parekh, 2010](#)). On the other hand, social entrepreneurship is focused on overcoming obstacles and generating opportunities for the development and diffusion of innovation ([Morris et al., 2020](#)) as, in contrast to profit-seeking entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurs are concerned with the creation of societal or social added value or with the identification of solutions to social challenges ([Cagarman et al., 2020](#); [Mort et al., 2003](#)). That said, as claimed by [Morris et al. \(2020, p. 5\)](#), it is questionable "whether or not social innovation is a necessary component of social entrepreneurship." As such, this lack of clarity is the main reason for a systematic literature review (SLR).

Considering all these questions and doubts regarding the social innovation and social entrepreneurship literature, the aim of this paper is to understand the role of the term "social" as the interface or heart of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship. To this end, an SLR will be carried out to answer the following research question: "Is the social as the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship an emerging area or an old crossroads?"

An SLR can be useful and relevant for identifying theoretical perspectives or creating an avenue for further research ([Snyder, 2019](#)). Thus, the current research provides a comprehensive overview of the scholastic literature using both concepts in empirical and conceptual studies, identifying gaps in the current knowledge, examining the nature of research and synthesizing key findings.

The paper is organized in seven sections. After the introduction, section 2 presents the literature review covering social innovation and social entrepreneurship. Section 3 addresses the methodology implemented and section 4 depicts the results found. Section 5 incorporates the discussion, section 6 presents the conclusions and finally, section 7 deals with the limitations and further research.

2. Literature review

2.1. Social innovation

The academic discussion about the conceptualization of social innovation is hectic, driven by dissatisfaction with the resolution of social issues ([Bacq and Janssen, 2011](#); [Lubberink et al., 2018](#)). The academic challenge to provide a conceptual framework has followed multiple directions ([Fahrudi, 2020](#); [Morris et al., 2020](#)). According to [Phillips et al. \(2015\)](#), the earliest reference to social innovation appears at the end of the twentieth century, in [Kanter's \(1998\)](#) recognition of the "move by private organizations away from corporate social responsibility toward corporate social innovation" (p. 442). This move was perceived as an opportunity for the social sector, or the third sector for some, to generate ideas and produce innovations that provide added value to the target communities ([Phillips et al., 2015](#)). However, [Moulaert et al. \(2005\)](#) carried out one of the first attempts to expand the debate on the meaning of social innovation, proposing three interacting dimensions: (a) fulfillment of unmet human needs; (b) changes in social relations; and (c) empowerment in the form of increasing access to

resources and socio-political capabilities. This is the beginning of the sociological conceptualization of social innovation (van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016) that will guide the current SLR.

This sociologically-oriented framework to approach social innovation includes a common understatement within the concept: it refers to new ways of creating and implementing social change, i.e., a paradigm responsible for the revitalization of the social aspects related to any kind of innovation. This encourages the reconfiguration of how social goals are accomplished, as they are social practices created from collective, intentional, and goal-oriented actions (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). Ruiz and Parra (2013) define social innovation from a sociological and economic perspective, delimiting it as a process of disseminating new social practices and policies with the goal of promoting change in the social organization of people without forgetting the importance of economic ends. Callon (2007) gives a social and political definition, highlighting the connections between the economy and society.

Although the term social innovation has been extensively used, there is still an ongoing debate regarding its definition, with various explanations available involving new ideas, processes, products or services to meet social needs (Caroli et al., 2018; Lubberink et al., 2018; Mulgan, 2006; Murray et al., 2010; Nicholls and Murdock, 2012). Among the most cited definitions, reference can be made to the following: “a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals” (Phills et al. (2008, p. 39); or “innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need” (Mulgan, 2006, p. 146).

Social innovations aspire to meet human social needs, have a cultural focus (Phillips et al., 2015), and promote collaboration between social actors (Edwards-Schachter et al., 2012; Edwards-Schachter and Wallace, 2017), including social entrepreneurs and social enterprises (Phillips et al., 2015). The key element is to create social value, for example through corporate social responsibility initiatives. In other words, the plethora of types of social innovation lies in a distinctive element: meeting social needs achieved by the change of circumstances in terms of innovation outcomes (Cui et al., 2017) and processes (Lettice and Parekh, 2010).

The existing literature shows a research topic in its infancy (Bacq and Janssen, 2011; Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Farinha et al., 2020; Novak, 2021) and an exciting stream involving several research fields, including social entrepreneurship, social movements and community development (Farinha et al., 2020). Social innovation faces the difficulty of giving a simplified definition to academics and practitioners (Novak, 2021). However, its essence is evident: it relies on providing positive transformations and changes to society, enhanced by voluntary social engagement (Bosworth et al., 2016; Mulgan, 2006; Rogelja et al., 2018). Furthermore, it is possible to claim that social innovations seek to respond to societal challenges offering outcomes on societal well-being, which is in harmony with the strategy of the European Union of using social innovation to tackle contemporary social and environmental problems (Moulaert et al., 2005; Polman et al., 2017; Rogelja et al., 2018).

Although the popularity of social innovation is increasing (Caroli et al., 2018; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016), it is not easy to plan or predict it (Novak, 2021). The motivational impetus has been identified as a key element to generate social innovation, as actors may be motivated by dissatisfaction with the status quo, generating novel ideas that contribute to the resolution of a social problem (Novak, 2021). Although the phenomenon of social innovation has been familiar for centuries, as a concept it is relatively recent (Farinha et al., 2020). This popularity is driven by the possibility of simultaneously creating social benefits and economic opportunities. However, there is still a knowledge gap regarding the social change that social innovation brings (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014), and its connection with social entrepreneurship. In light of this, social innovation remains relatively under-researched with obvious unexploited business opportunities.

2.2. Social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship literature has highlighted the importance of considering the social outcome of the actions of enterprises that aim at creating value beyond profit maximization (Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Del Gesso, 2020; Farinha et al., 2020; Lumpkin et al., 2013; Morris et al., 2020), implying entrepreneurial activity with a social mission (Austin et al., 2006). In other words, it is normally a business activity with a central social purpose and is mainly attributed to the nonprofit sector, also known also as the social sector (Morris et al., 2020). This approach is what Novak (2021) identifies as being the perspective of numerous scholars that support the possibility of transcending the economic interpretation of the entrepreneurial function, and argue that entrepreneurship may be defined as a generalized set of improvisational acts by individuals motivated by the pursuit of social, non-profit-based gains. That said, several authors consider social entrepreneurship a phenomenon of great relevance promoted by social entrepreneurs who, contrary to profit-based entrepreneurship, pursue the goal of creating solutions to social challenges or providing social and/or societal added value (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Cagarman et al., 2020; Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Munshi, 2010).

Mair and Marti (2006) define social entrepreneurship as a process that pursues opportunities to address social needs and/or catalyze social change, adding economic outcomes to the social mission of social entrepreneurs. This represents a huge challenge as the benefits of their activities need to satisfy more stakeholders than commercial entrepreneurs. The academic debate on social entrepreneurship and the development of social entrepreneurship is extremely multifaceted (Cagarman et al., 2020). The term ‘social’ has become an essential part of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship has been gaining importance as a relevant economic issue on a global scale (Dacin et al., 2010). It has led to new business models and

industries, and augmented the availability of resources for neglected social issues, enhancing social wealth (Zahra et al., 2009).

García-Jurado et al. (2021) emphasize the maximization of social gain and utility through a social business model that is financially viable and that enables the generation of sustainable change and social transformation (García-Jurado et al., 2021). The concept of social entrepreneurship has also received fragmented yet complementary definitions involving the identification, evaluation and exploitation of opportunities aiming at social value creation (Bacq and Janssen, 2011, p. 374), the distribution of social and economic wealth (Zahra et al., 2009) and the adoption of creative ideas that positively impact people's quality of life (Pol and Ville, 2009). However, although social entrepreneurship has become part of the everyday lexicon in the last 40 years (Morris et al., 2020; Phillips et al., 2015), it still remains ambiguous, as there is a debate about whether it is even a field or a sub-field of mainstream entrepreneurship (Morris et al., 2020).

2.3. Social: the heart of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship

Given the many social problems that the world faces, opportunities for social innovation and social entrepreneurship can be found in many streams of society (García-Jurado et al., 2021). On the one hand, social innovation is inherently engaged with people and is undertaken by social entrepreneurs, entities within civil society, and economic and political enterprises (Novak, 2021). On the other hand, social entrepreneurship is asserted as employing a high degree of inclusivity and creativity in dealing with societal problems (Aquino et al., 2018). In this light, innovation is crucial for the ability of social entrepreneurs to create social value (Phillips et al., 2015). In sum, social innovation relies on social entrepreneurs' activities and social entrepreneurs use innovation to address social needs.

There is a debate rooted at the heart of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, based on: the different meanings of the concept 'social', the vagueness of social innovation, the subjectivity of social value; and betterment within social entrepreneurship. In other words, two questions can be raised: (1) What is the relevance of entrepreneurship to social innovation outcomes? (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Campopiano and Bassani, 2021); and (2) What do social innovations look like? (Morris et al., 2020). That said, we can also ask what the relationship is between social enterprises and their social context. Frequently, social enterprises choose their social mission within the context they operate in and according to their specific difficulties and needs (Morris et al., 2020). Social innovations emerge as being directly related to the nature of social enterprises, and are a relevant tool to generate social value or significant social changes – a key condition for social innovation, according to Lubberink et al. (2018). The concept of social entrepreneurship is considered too complex and fragmented to be explained with a simple definition (Morris et al., 2020), with the social dimension of the concept being interpreted in three different ways: (1) in terms of social outcomes or benefits to society of a new approach (Pol and Ville, 2009); (2) in terms of social interactions, or new ideas (Morris et al., 2020); and (3) through the normative, cultural, or regulative changes in society (Heiskala, 2007). Also, the social sense of the term innovation (Nicholls and Murdock, 2012) multiplies the types of innovation included in the main definition used in the literature (Caroli et al., 2018).

The creation of social value is the inherent drive and the necessary condition for social entrepreneurship (Choi and Majumdar, 2014; Phillips et al., 2015). We can also argue that social entrepreneurship further refers to processes and activities taken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities to enhance social wealth (Zahra et al., 2009), whereas social innovation offers a new solution that addresses a social problem more effectively *vis-à-vis* other existing solutions (Phillips et al., 2008). Consequently, both concepts are concerned with the identification of problem-solving opportunities, further sharing common overlaps in the process of meeting social needs (Phillips et al., 2015).

Within social entrepreneurship, social innovation takes many forms, including new services, products, business models, and conceptualizations, among others (Morris et al., 2020; Pol and Ville, 2009). Thus, in both kinds of literature there is no consensus about the idea of the common good and what creating social value or meeting social needs really means (Lubberink et al., 2017, 2019). Therefore, the understanding of what social really means in the innovation outcomes of social entrepreneurs can be discussed and contested. Defining 'social' is problematic as we are talking about a political process that is inhabited by several values (Choi and Majumdar, 2014). Given this, the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship connection is ill-defined (Lubberink et al., 2017, 2019) as, for example, various social entrepreneurs create their solutions around values that they consider to be social. The social aspect of both concepts can be questioned in all their dimensions (Peredo and McLean, 2006; Witkamp et al., 2011): (1) What can be considered new opportunities to serve the social mission?; (2) How can a process of social innovation be developed?; and (3) What is a social goal? If all these questions remain unanswered, the consequences regarding the meaning of social entrepreneurship as an innovative approach to dealing with complex social needs remain unaddressed (Peredo and McLean, 2006; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017).

Despite the academic interest in social innovation and social entrepreneurship, there is hardly any consistent definition of either concept (Choi and Majumdar, 2014; Peredo and McLean, 2006; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017). For Choi and Majumdar (2014), for example, social innovation is one of the key elements of social entrepreneurship. In other words, social entrepreneurship creates social innovation, aiming at addressing societal problems and enacting social change (Bacq and Janssen, 2011; Choi and Majumdar, 2014; Mair and Marti, 2006). On the other hand, others consider that social innovation is not confined to for-profit or non-profit enterprises, social entrepreneurship, or governmental organizations, as it can be directly related to society (Lubberink et al., 2018; Phillips et al., 2015).

To conclude, different attempts have been made, and are being made, doing justice to the heterogeneity of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, with the ‘social’ coming up as a related sub-concept that can be considered the heart and the challenge of both streams.

3. Methodology

We conducted an SLR on the interface or the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship articles. Consequently, we searched for both conceptual and empirical literature to provide a critical appraisal of the topic. The SLR definition of [Grant and Booth \(2009\)](#) is at the heart of this paper, as we worked to enhance the quality, transparency, and reproducibility of the review process and its findings. To this end, the aim was to capture the essence of the research according to the research question initially posed. There are five different stages that need to be followed, based on [Denyer and Tranfield's \(2009\)](#) protocol, namely: formulation of research questions; locating studies; selecting and evaluating the studies; analyzing and synthesizing the content; reporting the results.

As referred to in the introduction, the aim of this article is to answer the following research question: “Is the social at the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship an emerging area or an old crossroads?” For this purpose, the Scopus database was chosen as it is considered one of the largest curated databases ([Baas et al., 2019](#)) covering peer-reviewed journals among other documents and has a higher number of journals ([Singh et al., 2021](#)).

The search strategy of this paper seeks to provide an overview of the articles published in Scopus-indexed journals based on the following criteria: (1) the relevance to the understanding of the role of the ‘social’ in the intersection of social innovation and social entrepreneurship; (2) the conceptualization of both streams; (3) the challenges and opportunities within the connection between both theoretical frameworks. SLRs identify articles using objective search criteria, and systematic, reproducible and explicit methods to examine relevant literature ([Gough et al., 2012](#)). This analysis of Scopus-indexed journals covered articles until the end of March 2021.

To identify the articles, the following terms were used: “social innovation” or “theories of social innovation” or “social dimension of innovation” and “business ethics” or “social entrepreneurship.” The strategy was to hit the search word in the article title, abstract, and keywords. To narrow down the scope of the search, the following inclusion criterion was applied: only journal articles written in English were included in the SLR.

A total of 197 publications were initially found, published between 1989 and 2021. Subsequently, the subsequent information of each article was downloaded: authors, title, abstract, year, source title and keywords. Titles and abstracts were read and their content analyzed as recommended by ([Silva and Moreira, 2019](#)). All the papers that did not match the aim of this study were excluded. As such, those addressing specific topics such as urban planning, collective consumer innovation, social finance, entrepreneurial ecosystem, social media, and supply chain management or which were exclusively concerned with only one of the two concepts were excluded. When the abstract was not available, the full version of the paper was read to confirm its eligibility and inclusion for further analysis. Applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria resulted in the exclusion of 170 articles. Full paper analysis was carried out on the remaining 27 articles, as they were considered useful and relevant according to the current SLR aim.

The 27 articles retained for full analysis (see [Appendix 1](#)) were analyzed based on source title, year of publication, keywords, topics, perspectives of the interface of social innovation and social entrepreneurship, the relationship between both concepts, gaps in knowledge, and opportunities for future research.

4. Results

The field of studying the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship gained significant academic interest from 2017 onwards as shown in [Table 1](#), covering almost 80% of all studies.

Table 1
Evolution of articles over time.

| Year of publication | Number of articles | Percentage of total articles | Cumulative percentage |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2021 | 4 | 14,81% | 14,81% |
| 2020 | 7 | 25,93% | 40,74% |
| 2019 | 2 | 7,41% | 48,15% |
| 2018 | 5 | 18,52% | 66,67% |
| 2017 | 3 | 11,11% | 77,78% |
| 2016 | 1 | 3,70% | 81,48% |
| 2015 | 1 | 3,70% | 85,19% |
| 2014 | 1 | 3,70% | 88,89% |
| 2013 | 1 | 3,70% | 92,59% |
| 2012 | 0 | 0,00% | 92,59% |
| 2011 | 1 | 3,70% | 96,30% |
| 2010 | 1 | 3,70% | 100,00% |

Table 2
Main Journals used.

| Journal | Number of articles | % of Total |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| Sustainability (Switzerland) | 3 | 11.11% |
| Journal of Social Entrepreneurship | 3 | 11.11% |
| Technological Forecasting and Social Change | 2 | 7.41% |

The 27 journal articles were published in 22 different outlets. Only three journals published two or more articles: *Sustainability (Switzerland)* and *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, with three papers each, and *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* with two papers. These three outlets cover 30% of the output of the articles analyzed, as shown in [Table 2](#).

The sample of 27 articles analyzed covered 71 different (co)authors who have accrued 939 total global citations. In order to analyze the importance of the articles, the total global citations (TGC) and the total local citations (TLCs) scores are used. TGC reports information on the number of times an article has been cited on the SCOPUS database and gives information regarding the interdisciplinary nature of the paper analyzed ([Alon et al., 2018](#)). On the other hand, TLC gives more specific information than TGC, as it reports the number of times an article has been cited within the same literature covered by a specific analysis (in this paper it is the number of times cited by the 27 papers): clearly, the TLC complements information provided by the TGC.

[Table 3](#) shows the quality of the publications that had the greatest impact on the literature covered, based on TGC and LGC, TGC/t and TLC/t. TGC/t denotes the total global citation per year and TLC/t denotes the total local citation per year. [Table 3](#), which provides information only for the top 10 articles, is ordered taking into account the TGC source. It is possible to conclude that Van der Have and Rubalcaba are the two most important authors, with 241 overall citations and an average of 60.25 citations per year. However, on analyzing the number of TLC and TLC/y, it is possible to conclude that [Phillips et al. \(2015\)](#) is the most important article analyzing the social interconnectedness of social innovation and social entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, the TLC scores are very low for both papers when compared to the TGC score.

Although the conceptualizations of social innovation and social entrepreneurship are still in their infancy ([Bacq and Janssen, 2011](#); [Campopiano and Bassani, 2021](#); [Farinha et al., 2020](#); [Novak, 2021](#)), academic debate is still intense regarding their definitions and connections (see [Tables 4 and 5](#)) and are growing over time ([Caroli et al., 2018](#); [Mulgan, 2006](#); [Rogelja et al., 2018](#)). For example, [Bacq and Janssen \(2011\)](#) alone offer twelve definitions of social entrepreneurship. Researchers continue to add new definitions, and this disparity may be the result of the various disciplines represented in the discussion, as well as different interpretations associated with the definitions ([Morris et al., 2020](#)).

To accomplish the aim of the current SLR, it is vital to understand the relevance and use of the term 'social' and how it has been used when dealing with social innovation and social entrepreneurship. This relevance is supported by the fact that the essence of numerous definitions of social innovation is in bringing positive change and transformations to society ([Bosworth et al., 2016](#); [Mulgan, 2006](#); [Rogelja et al., 2018](#)). That said, social innovation is normally associated with "the reconfiguring of social practices, in response to societal challenges" ([Polman et al., 2017](#)). Also, social entrepreneurship has emphasized the importance of considering the social outcome of the activities of enterprises that aim at value creation beyond profit

Table 3
Ranking of top-10 articles.

| Rank | Authors and Year | Title | Source title | TGC | TGC/ t | TLC | TLC/ t |
|------|---|--|---|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|
| 1 | van der Have and Rubalcaba (2016) | Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies? | Research Policy | 241 | 60.25 | 5 | 1.25 |
| 2 | Phillips et al. (2015) | Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review | Group and Organization Management | 216 | 43.2 | 8 | 1.6 |
| 3 | Maclean et al. (2013) | Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy | International Small Business Journal | 82 | 11.71 | 2 | 0.28 |
| 4 | Witkamp et al. (2011) | Strategic niche management of social innovations: The case of social entrepreneurship | Technology Analysis and Strategic Management | 73 | 8.11 | 1 | 0.11 |
| 5 | Tracey and Stott (2017) | Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating | Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice | 70 | 23.33 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Rao-Nicholson et al. (2017) | Social innovation in emerging economies: A national systems of innovation based approach | Technological Forecasting and Social Change | 53 | 17.66 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Newth and Woods (2014) | Resistance to social entrepreneurship: How context shapes innovation | Journal of Social Entrepreneurship | 47 | 7.83 | 2 | 0.29 |
| 8 | Dwivedi and Weerawardena (2018) | Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct | Journal of Business Research | 46 | 23 | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | Eichler and Schwarz (2019) | What sustainable development goals do social innovations address? A systematic review and content analysis of social innovation literature | Sustainability (Switzerland) | 35 | 35 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | Aquino et al. (2018) | A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development | Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management | 32 | 16 | 0 | 0 |

Table 4
Definitions of social innovation.

| Author/year | Definition |
|--|--|
| (Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Mulgan, 2006; Munshi, 2010) Novak (2021) | Refers to innovative activities and services created and disseminated by organizations with a social or environmental mission. A contributing factor toward social change, unfolding through time. Does not preclude the involvement of economic and political actors in helping to deliver solutions to perceived social problems. |
| (Guerrero et al., 2020; Rabadjeva and Butzin, 2019) | Understood as ideas, products, programs or initiatives oriented to reducing social challenges or to improving systems of values/beliefs. |
| (Fahrudi, 2020; Jeong and Alhanaee, 2020; Morris et al., 2020; Phills et al., 2008; Pol and Ville, 2009) | New ideas that improve the quality and quantity of life. Provides a novel solution to a social problem that is more efficient, effective, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals. |
| (Caroli et al., 2018; Nicholls and Murdock, 2012; Pol and Ville, 2009) | A product (a novel output that solves unmet or unsatisfied needs) or a process (a new way of engaging players to solve specific needs) that emerges when the failure of conventional paradigms is evident, when the basic routines, resources or beliefs change inside a social system, or when institutional changes take place. |
| Lubberink et al. (2018) | New ideas (products, services and models) that meet social needs and create new social relationships. Innovations that are good for society and enhance society's capacity to act. |
| Slimane and Lamine (2017) | Targets a particular social problem and a population group excluded from access to a product or service deemed essential for the survival or the dignity of the individual. It can use commercial transactions to solve social problems. A form of social problem resolution. Its essence is in bringing positive change and transformations to society. |
| (Bosworth et al., 2016; Rogelja et al., 2018) Cajaiba-Santana (2014); Farinha et al. (2020); Neumeier (2012); van der Have and Rubalcaba (2016) | Expressed in changes in perceptions, behaviors or attitudes that can result in new social practices. Addressed as new forms of organizing workplaces, business or companies, to lead to the generation and implementation of new ideas on how to achieve common goals. |
| Phillips et al. (2015) | The locus of innovation is not within the social entrepreneur or social enterprise, but within the social system that both inhabit. |
| Dawson and Daniel (2010) | There are four parts: people, challenges, processes (by which the challenge is negotiated and understood) and goals (resolution of challenges with the objective of achieving increased well-being). |
| Callon (2007) | New ways of interactions between economy and society, where new innovation regimes boost new roles for the social and political dimensions in economy. |
| Moulaert et al. (2005) | Three dimensions of SI in interaction are proposed: satisfaction of human needs that are presently unmet; changes in social relations; and an empowerment dimension in the form of increasing socio-political capability and access to resources. |

maximization (Del Gesso, 2020; Lumpkin et al., 2013). Hence, both concepts are closely related as they are concerned with the identification of opportunities to meet a social need or to address societal challenges (Phillips et al., 2015).

Table 6 shows 18 terms with 'social' at the heart of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship studies. The most popular concepts with social concerns in the literature (excluding social innovation and social entrepreneurship) are: social value creation, social change, and social outcome.

5. Discussion

This article shows that there is growing interest in academia connecting social innovation and social entrepreneurship. For example, dealing with this topic, García-Jurado et al. (2021) identified three trends: (1) venture philanthropy – dealing with the process of investing in social enterprises that have a social impact to maximize financial and social return; (2) measuring social impact – to develop a set of metrics used to quantify the effectiveness and efficiency of the impact of social actions carried out by enterprises and organizations; and (3) hybrid organizations – for instance, social enterprises with the aim of achieving their social mission and being financially sustainable. These authors concluded that there is a new approach to social entrepreneurship that comes from social entrepreneurs – and not from organizations or entities – who create and implement new ways to address current and future social problems.

van der Have and Rubalcaba (2016), analyzing social innovation literature from 1986 until 2013, claim that the take-off of this concept field emerged around 2002/2003. However, for García-Jurado et al. (2021) the take-off phase occurred after 2010. According to our results, the evolution of the publications over time shows that the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship gained significant academic interest from 2017 onwards (Table 2). Given this, it is possible to conclude that the connection between both concepts, with the social as the interface for this relationship, is under-researched, with almost all literature reviews, meta-analyses and case studies focused on one of the concepts or, in the better scenarios, giving a general framework for one of them in order to understand the other.

It is clear that social innovation is a very broad concept, encompassing, on the one hand, societal, environmental, economic problems or transformations that embrace socio-political-economic transformations and, on the other hand, the provision of services, products and solutions that enhance societal capacities and problems. As such, those social innovations can fall either within or outside the organization, as shown in Table 4.

Table 5
Definitions of social entrepreneurship.

| Author/year | Definition |
|--|---|
| (Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Del Gesso, 2020; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006) Lubberink et al. (2019); Peredo and McLean (2006). | Multi-dimensional, whereby social entrepreneurs, similar to for-profit counterparts, display behavioral characteristics of innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk management. Exercised by a group or person that: (1) aim(s) at creating social value; (2) show(s) a capacity to identify and use opportunities to create that value; (3) employ(s) innovation, to create and/or distribute social value; (4) is/are willing to accept an above-average degree of risk in generating and disseminating social value; and (5) is/are unusually resourceful in being undaunted by scarce assets in pursuing their social venture. |
| (Dees, 1998; Farinha et al., 2020; Peredo and McLean, 2006; Tan et al., 2005) | Six key elements: identification and exploitation of new opportunities to serve the social mission; engaging in a process of innovation; acting without being limited by resources currently in hand; capacity to endure risk; the aim is to create social value of some kind. |
| (Mair and Marti, 2006; Newth and Woods, 2014) | Process of combining resources in innovative ways for the pursuit of opportunities for the creation of social and economic value evident in new initiatives, services, products, programs, or organizations. |
| Phillips et al. (2015) | Describes the work and structures of community, voluntary, and public organizations and private firms working to solve social issues. |
| Witkamp et al. (2011) | Social entrepreneurship, as a new way of doing business and achieving social goals simultaneously, is one such potentially radical innovation. |
| Pol and Ville (2009) | A form of 'social innovation', or the adoption of creative ideas that have the potential to positively impact people's quality of life. |
| Light (2006) | Involves pattern-breaking change or innovation. |
| Austin et al. (2006) | Business activity with a central social purpose. |

Social entrepreneurship emerges as a way to address social problems that are deeply connected and interdependent with social innovation. In other words, social entrepreneurship can be understood as being generated by entrepreneurs tuned to social problems or opportunities outside the organizations and are synchronized with the entrepreneur's goals, missions and commitment to those social problems or opportunities. This special environment creates and adds social value to these businesses that must also be concerned with generating not only social but also financial returns. This gives social entrepreneurship an inside-out perspective in which entrepreneurs follow a (non)profit business-like perspective to address those social problems they desire to address. However, the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, the differences and the interdependences among them are still under-developed, fragmented and blurred as if the complementarities of both are inexistent.

It is possible to claim that journals covering the interconnectedness of social innovation and social entrepreneurship are quite scattered, as the 27 articles were published in 22 different journals. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* and *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* are the most frequently used outlets.

As a result of the lack of a generally agreed definition for social innovation and social entrepreneurship (Choi and Majumdar, 2014; Peredo and McLean, 2006; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017), both concepts are extremely discussed and fragmented (Bacq and Janssen, 2011; Morris et al., 2020; Phillips et al., 2015; Pol and Ville, 2009). Following Lubberink et al. (2018), it seems that social innovations are always embedded in social change. In a different vein, social entrepreneurship has the potential to turn novel ideas into innovative solutions that help to solve societal problems or to meet social needs. However, this is not mandatory as social entrepreneurship, as well as the solutions, may not always be tuned to solving societal problems (Lubberink et al., 2018). This lack of consensus, even if not explicit, also exists regarding the interconnectedness between both concepts. Morris et al. (2020) state that most scholars agree that social innovation is not social entrepreneurship. In this light, the term 'social' provides a new context for general innovation and entrepreneurship, offering solutions for social needs or problems. Morris et al. (2020) suggest that one way to circumvent the controversies might be to define what social entrepreneurship is not, identifying the following elements: (1) it is not a synonym for social innovation; (2) it is not charity; and (3) it is not non-profit business. Social value seems to be at the heart of both frameworks, as it is concerned with the identification of a problem-solving opportunity (Phillips et al., 2015). Despite all organizations being able to generate social value, this is the core of the social innovation mission. However, social value and social good are seen as subjective and malleable (Choi and Majumdar, 2014), creating challenges for the literature on both ideas (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014), especially considering that there is a growing interest in creating social value (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Farinha et al., 2020).

Adro and Fernandes (2021) state that the definitional problems of social entrepreneurship (see Table 5) have consequences, including obstacles for future research and the establishment of social entrepreneurship as a coherent research stream. Moreover, another obstacle could be added: the difficulty in framing the state-of-the-art perception of social

Table 6
Social terms within the concepts of social innovation and social entrepreneurship.

| Author/year | Term | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| (Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Morris et al., 2020) | Social Good | Concerned with social relationships and change. Addresses the societal needs that are not met by the marketplace or government programs. |
| (García-Jurado et al., 2021; Munshi, 2010; Novkovic, 2008; Phillips et al., 2015; Rogelja et al., 2018; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016; Witkamp et al., 2011) | Social Change (Process) | To challenge the social systems that created the problems social entrepreneurs address. They act as change agents in society. Reconfiguration of how social goals are achieved. |
| (Fahrudi, 2020; Munshi, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015) | Social Needs | Achieved by the voluntary engagement of civil actors resulting in a change of practices that benefit wider society. Social entrepreneurship and social innovation identify a problem-solving opportunity to meet a social need. Form of social problem/need resolution. |
| Slimane and Lamine (2017) | Social Problems/Issues | Linked to the exclusion of a group from the framework of formal transactions; barriers are related to culture and education, poverty and problems of access. |
| (Aquino et al., 2018; Fahrudi, 2020; Guerrero et al., 2020; Lubberink et al., 2019; Morris et al., 2020) | Societal Problems | Social innovation and social entrepreneurship have the right impacts on society (e.g. benefit social justice, gender equality, human rights, quality of life, protection of the environment, among others). Change of cultural, normative, or regulative structures in society. |
| (Farinha et al., 2020; Rogelja et al., 2018) | Social Practices Reconfiguration | The intentional process of change of behaviour and actions of various actors, creating new products, services, relationships, institutions, and/or organizational forms. |
| (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Cagarman et al., 2020; Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Lubberink et al., 2018; Morris et al., 2020; Munshi, 2010; Newth and Woods, 2014; Slimane and Lamine, 2017) | Social Value Creation | Generated from following the organization's mission as social entrepreneurs look for novel ways to solve societal issues. The value for society that is generated by solving a societal problem or responding to pressing social needs and is a necessary condition for social entrepreneurship. Beyond profit maximization. |
| (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Aquino et al., 2018; Fahrudi, 2020; Jeong and Alhanaee, 2020; Phillips et al., 2015; Rogelja et al., 2018) | Social Enterprise | The organizational form of social innovation. Designation for social entrepreneurship venture. Not the same as a social business: if under pressure, the first tends to skew more toward social objectives; the second tends to skew more towards commercial objectives. Give sustainable solutions to solve societal problems. |
| (Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Guerrero et al., 2020) | Social Purpose Organizations | Adoption of business models designed to create social value while generating economic benefits. Create surpluses that are used to deliver economic and social outcomes. Found at the intersections of the work of non-profit organizations and cooperatives. |
| Slimane & Lamine (2017) | Social Actors | Goal: distribute social and economic wealth more evenly among the individuals involved in their processes and the wider community. |
| (Adro and Fernandes, 2021; Campopiano and Bassani, 2021; Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Jeong and Alhanaee, 2020; Lubberink et al., 2018; Phillips et al., 2015; Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Witkamp et al., 2011) | Social Objectives, Goals, Outcomes or Performance | Three key elements: focus on social, cultural or environmental purpose; generates income from primarily business activities; aim for the benefit of something beyond private wealth creation. Distinguishable from commercial organizations as a result of their social mission, which guides all activities. |
| (Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Lubberink et al., 2018; Mair and Marti, 2006; Munshi, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015) | Social wealth/welfare | Enterprises, associations, universities, public structures, non-governmental organizations, among others. |
| Slimane & Lamine (2017) | Social Business Model | Products, technologies, services, business models, production processes, or a combination of all. Delivered by social enterprises. To solve social problems. |
| Dwivedi and Weerawardena (2018) | Social Sector | Good for society and enhance society's ability to act. Establishes a firm's long-run sustainability. |
| (Aernoudt, 2004; Sansone et al., 2020) | Social Incubators | Allows measuring the impact of social innovation in order to ensure that the needs are being met, as it is concerned with the creation of social outcomes to address clients/users' social needs. The key foundation of creating social value creation must be combined with economic logic. Generated when social entrepreneurs exploit a problem-solving opportunity to meet a social need. |

(continued on next page)

Table 6 (continued)

| Author/year | Term | Definition |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | | Offer the same services as other incubators, but with a different mission: support and stimulate the creation and continuity of companies employing people with low employment skills (Aernoudt, 2004). |
| Dwivedi and Weerawardena (2018) | Social Mission | Support social entrepreneurs (Sonne, 2012). |
| | Orientation | Behavioral tendency of devotion to addressing social needs. Engages with targeted communities. |
| Jeong and Alhanaee (2020) | Prosocial motivation | Desire to have a positive impact on other people or social collectives or to promote the well-being of others. Combining intrinsic and extrinsic prosocial motivation represents a mindset of wanting to help and drives individuals to take the perspective of others. |
| Adro and Fernandes (2021) | Social Structure | The interplay of actors and their organizations motivated to operate in accordance with different ordering principles. |

innovation and social entrepreneurship. Because of the lack of clarity in the connection between these ideas, it is hard to understand and explain the extent to which they can help develop sustainable responses to meet the social challenges that the twenty-first-century world is facing.

The aim of this paper was to understand the role of the 'social' as the heart of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, trying to answer the question: "The social as the heart of social innovation and social entrepreneurship: an emerging area or an old crossroads?" Thus, this study confirms the increasing attention given by academia to social innovation and social entrepreneurship, with the 'social' at its heart; however, it also confirms that this is a subject that needs in-depth analysis (see Table 6). In fact, 18 concepts with the term 'social' were identified among the 27 articles analyzed in depth, although not always clearly and objectively defined. Given this, it is possible to claim that the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship is still scarce. This is also evident in the lack of reviews focused on the connection between the two concepts and on the role and meaning of the 'social' within them.

In sum, social innovation and social entrepreneurship connections can be described as being hybrid. Why? To be able to implement innovative solutions to generate social value or to develop social change, it is important to consider two elements: (1) the opportunities available to build a better world in terms of social outcomes; and (2) the need to create institutions with social goals and missions. As such, the 'social' seems to be the intersection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, with the creation of social value (Cagarman et al., 2020; Dwivedi and Weerawardena, 2018; Light, 2006; Lubberink et al., 2018; Slimane and Lamine, 2017) as the ultimate goal and consequence for both concepts. Despite the evident role of the 'social' in the actions of both concepts, the reality is that a lack of consensus and controversies define what social entrepreneurship and social innovation are (and are not). These are the two major challenges for academic researchers.

6. Conclusions and implications

6.1. Conclusions

The nascency of research into social entrepreneurship and social innovation highlights the need to develop a shared understanding not only of the term "social innovation" but also its relationship with social entrepreneurship. Although debates rage regarding linkages between social innovation and social entrepreneurship, few interrelationships between the two different strands of social innovation and social entrepreneurship have been made (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010). This SLR was stimulated by a need to assemble common ground for the different insights of social innovation and social entrepreneurship in order to consider the general evidence. From societal problems, social concerns or social needs, it is possible to conclude that a necessary and clear relationship between social innovation and social entrepreneurship is mandatory, where the goal is to create and add social value through useful solutions for the community. It is also important to claim that financial sustainability is a must for the success of social businesses. Moreover, the plural perspective of the term 'social' does not facilitate a clear interpretation of the subject under analysis. Finally, when we talk about social innovation and social entrepreneurship, we are not talking about charity or non-profit organizations since social value includes financial gains while also targeting social problems opportunities.

Although the phenomenon of both concepts has been familiar for quite a long time in terms of social, business and research activity, it seems that each of them follows an independent path that leads to a lack of common ground that grows when the connection between them is explored. Considering the results of the current literature review, it can be argued that there is still a long way to go to create social, political and environmental conditions to promote social entrepreneurship

actions that become social innovations and social innovation systems that create social entrepreneurs. In light of this, it is also important to highlight that there is a lack of clarity about the idea of the common good and the means to create social value or to meet social needs. As such, the dynamic complementarities between social innovation and social entrepreneurship are still held at bay. That said, there is a need to understand what the 'social' in the innovation outcomes of social entrepreneurs really means. Therefore, there is still a lot of work to be done regarding the conceptualization of social entrepreneurship and social innovation as, on the one hand, social entrepreneurs seek to address some business opportunities to address social problems and, on the other hand, social innovation is normally addressed as the need to create social value. As such, those fragmented, blurred paths do not follow integrative frameworks.

The current SLR provides an approximate state of the art to which the interrelationship between social innovation and social entrepreneurship is addressed, considering the social context. The results clearly describe challenges and difficulties that are not exclusively related to each of the concepts under analysis, since the social is at the heart of several academic theories, concepts and streams. Regarding the research question posed, the conclusion is that theory building and empirical evidence are necessary to overcome the limitations found. As such, the social context of innovation and entrepreneurship is an old crossroads that can be considered an emerging area given all the challenges it raises.

This study has two main implications for the field of the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship. The first is the variety of definitions of both concepts, revealing the fragmentation between them. This is clear when one analyzes the number of authors and the total local citations. The second is the partial explanations of the term 'social' within the examined articles. They need to be addressed in order to pave the way forward for more specific reviews. In sum, this SRL shows that the intersection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship is indispensable to creating businesses with the ability to solve social problems and add social value. If academic acumen on one hand, and guidelines to practitioners and policy makers on the other hand, about social entrepreneurship and social innovation are to be achieved, more empirical research about this subject is mandatory to identify social opportunities or problems and to create profitable businesses as answers to those opportunities.

7. Limitations and future research

This SLR has some limitations. Firstly, the focus of this review is narrow and concentrated on a specific element of the literature, excluding other dimensions that might be important. Secondly, the quality of SLRs relies on the search terms selected. As such, future research using other search terms is mandatory. Thirdly, the quality of the abstracts and the proximity to the research questions were two criteria used for the selection of the articles, which are subject to interpretive bias from the reader's point of view. Fourthly, we only considered articles indexed in the SCOPUS database.

As the concepts of social innovation and social entrepreneurship have the power to advance each other's research and the field of social value/social good, understanding the value of social good for both concepts is in fact a key opportunity for future research.

Another future avenue of research for the topic under analysis could be to try to reach a clear and objective concept framework for both concepts separately and collectively. Or, in other words, define what both concepts are not and also describe what this connection is not. With this perspective it would be possible to understand the real intersection between the two concepts and how social entrepreneurs depend on social problems to generate social innovation, for example using different social systems and geographies. It would also be important to promote more empirical studies to test premises and examine the interaction between both strands. A crucial point for future research would also be the effects and influence of digitalization on the role of social goals within the outcomes of the connection between the two concepts.

In conclusion, the rapid growth of scholarly and civil society interest in social innovation and social entrepreneurship literature gives us the perfect opportunity to use it in order to find solutions to some of the most complex societal problems. So, for the connection between social innovation and social entrepreneurship to move to the next level of study, social entrepreneurs and innovators need to be embedded in their community context and consider disciplines such as social change, political negotiation, and community mobilization.

As social innovation and social entrepreneurship have the same heart (promoting social change), it is time to study both concepts from a more integrated perspective. Finally, we cannot forget that without social entrepreneurship, social innovation will not happen.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix 1

Table 1

27 Scopus-indexed Articles retained for in-depth analysis

| Authors (Years) | Journal | Title |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Campopiano and Bassani (2021) | Journal of Cleaner Production | Social innovation: Learning from social cooperatives in the Italian context |
| Garcia-Jurado et al. (2021) | Sustainability (Switzerland) | A new approach to social entrepreneurship: A systematic review and meta-analysis |
| Novak (2021) | Review of Austrian Economics | Social innovation and Austrian economics: Exploring the gains from intellectual trade |
| Adro and Fernandes (2021) | Innovation | Social entrepreneurship and social innovation: looking inside the box and moving out of it |
| Guerrero et al. (2020) | International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research | Intermediaries and social entrepreneurship identity: implications for business model innovation |
| Jeong and Alhanaee (2020) | Social Science Quarterly | Prosocial Motivation as a Driver of Social Innovation in the UAE |
| Çağarman et al. (2020) | Sustainability (Switzerland) | Social entrepreneurship on its way to significance: The case of Germany |
| Sansone et al. (2020) | Technological Forecasting and Social Change | Are social incubators different from other incubators? Evidence from Italy |
| Farinha et al. (2020) | International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing | Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: discovering origins, exploring current and future trends |
| Fahrudi (2020) | Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal | Alleviating poverty through social innovation |
| Morris et al. (2020) | Small Business Economics | The great divides in social entrepreneurship and where they lead us |
| Lubberink et al. (2019) | Journal of Responsible Innovation | Responsible innovation by social entrepreneurs: an exploratory study of values integration in innovations |
| Eichler, G.M., & Schwarz, E.J. (2019) | Sustainability (Switzerland) | What sustainable development goals do social innovations address? A systematic review and content analysis of social innovation literature |
| Aquino et al. (2018) | Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management | A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development |
| Rogelja et al. (2018) | Forest Policy and Economics | Implications of policy framework conditions for the development of forestry-based social innovation initiatives in Slovenia |
| Caroli et al. (2018) | Journal of Social Entrepreneurship | Exploring Social Innovation Components and Attributes: A Taxonomy Proposal |
| Dwivedi and Weerawardena (2018) | Journal of Business Research | Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct |
| Lubberink et al. (2018) | Journal of Social Entrepreneurship | Innovation for Society: Towards a Typology of Developing Innovations by Social Entrepreneurs |
| Slimane and Lamine (2017) | International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation | A transaction-based approach to social innovation |
| Rao-Nicholson et al. (2017) | Technological Forecasting and Social Change | Social innovation in emerging economies: A national systems of innovation based approach |
| Tracey and Stott (2017) | Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice | Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating |
| van der Have and Rubalcaba (2016) | Research Policy | Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies? |
| Phillips et al. (2015) | Group and Organization Management | Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review |
| Newth and Woods (2014) | Journal of Social Entrepreneurship | Resistance to Social Entrepreneurship: How Context Shapes Innovation |
| Maclea et al. (2013) | International Small Business Journal | Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy |
| Witkamp et al. (2011) | Technology Analysis and Strategic Management | Strategic niche management of social innovations: The case of social entrepreneurship |
| Munshi (2010) | Journal of Asia-Pacific Business | Value creation, social innovation, and entrepreneurship in global economies |

References

- Adro, F. D., & Fernandes, C. (2021). *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation: Looking inside the Box and Moving Out of it*. Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2020.1870441>
- Aernoudt, R. (2004). Incubators: tool for entrepreneurship? *Small Bus. Econ.*, 23, 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SBEJ.0000027665.54173.23>
- Alon, I., Anderson, J., Munim, Z. H., & Ho, A. (2018). A review of the internationalization of Chinese enterprises. *Asia Pacific J. Manag.*, 35, 573–605. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-018-9597-5>
- Andersson, F. O., & Ford, M. R. (2016). Social entrepreneurship through an organizational ecology lens: examining the emergence and evolution of the voucher school population in Milwaukee. *Voluntas Int. J. Voluntary Nonprofit Organ.*, 27, 1760–1780. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-95760>
- Aquino, R. S., Lück, M., & Schänzel, H. A. (2018). A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development. *J. Hospit. Tourism Manag.*, 37, 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.09.001>

- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different or both? *Enterpren. Theor. Pract.*, 30(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x>
- Baas, J., Schotten, M., Plume, A., Cote, G., & Karimi, R. (2019). Scopus as a curated, high-quality bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(1), 377–386.
- Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: a review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Enterpren. Reg. Dev.*, 23(5–6), 373–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2011.577242>
- Boons, F., & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2013). Business models for sustainable innovation: state-of-the-art and steps towards a research agenda. *J. Clean. Prod.*, 45, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.007>
- Bosworth, G., Rizzo, F., Marquardt, D., Srijker, D., Haartsen, T., & Thuesen Aagaard, A. (2016). Identifying social innovations in European local rural development initiatives. *Innovat. Eur. J. Soc. Sci. Res.*, 29(4), 440–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2016.1176555>
- Cagarman, K., Kratzer, J., von Arnim, L. H., Fajga, K., & Gieseke, M. J. (2020). Social entrepreneurship on its way to significance: the case of Germany. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 8954. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218954>
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014). Social innovation: moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 82(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.008>
- Callon, M. (2007). L'innovation sociale: quand l'économie redevient politique. In J.-L. Klein, & D. Harrisson (Eds.), *L'innovation sociale. Emergence et effets sur la transformation des sociétés* (pp. 17–42). Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- Camposiano, G., & Bassani, G. (2021). Social innovation: learning from social cooperatives in the Italian context. *J. Clean. Prod.*, 291, 125253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.125253>
- Caroli, M. G., Fracassi, E., Maiolini, R., & Carnini Pulino, S. (2018). Exploring social innovation components and attributes: a taxonomy proposal. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(2), 94–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1448296>
- Choi, N., & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 29(3), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.05.001>
- Cui, M., Pan, S. L., Newell, S., & Cui, L. (2017). Strategy, resource orchestration and e-commerce enabled social innovation in rural China. *J. Strat. Inf. Syst.*, 26(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2016.10.001>
- Dacin, P., Dacin, M., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.*, 24(3), 37–57. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2010.52842950>
- Dawson, P., & Daniel, L. (2010). Understanding social innovation: a provisional framework. *Int. J. Technol. Manag.*, 51(1), 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.2010.033125>
- Dees, J. G. (1998). *The Meaning of 'Social Entrepreneurship'. Draft Report for the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: convergences and divergences. *J. Soc. Entrepreneur.*, 1(1), 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053>
- Del Gesso, C. (2020). An entrepreneurial identity for social enterprise across the institutional approaches: from mission to accountability toward sustainable societal development. *Int. J. Bus. Manag.*, 15(1), 16–35. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v15n1p16>
- Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In D. Buchanan, & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods* (pp. 671–689). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Dwivedi, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2018). Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct. *J. Bus. Res.*, 86, 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.01.053>
- Edwards-Schachter, M., & Wallace, M. L. (2017). 'Shaken, but not stirred': sixty years of defining social innovation. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 119, 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.012>
- Edwards-Schachter, M. E., Matti, C. E., & Alcántara, E. (2012). Fostering quality of life through social innovation: a living lab methodology study case. *Rev. Pol. Res.*, 29(6), 672–692. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2012.00588.x>
- Eichler, G. M., & Schwarz, E. J. (2019). What sustainable development goals do social innovations address? A systematic review and content analysis of social innovation literature. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 522. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020522>
- Fahruddin, A. N. L. I. (2020). Alleviating poverty through social innovation. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 14(1), 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v14i1.7>
- Farinha, L., Sebastião, J. R., Sampaio, C., & Lopes, J. (2020). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: discovering origins, exploring current and future trends. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 17(1), 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-020-00243-6>
- García-Jurado, A., Pérez-Barea, J. J., & Nova, R. (2021). A new approach to social entrepreneurship: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2754. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052754>
- Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2012). Clarifying differences between review designs and methods. *Syst. Rev.*, 1(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-28>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Inf. Libr. J.*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Guerrero, M., Santamaría-Velasco, C. A., & Mahto, R. (2020). Intermediaries and social entrepreneurship identity: implications for business model innovation. *Int. J. Entrepreneurial Behav. Res.*, 27(2), 520–546. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-10-2020-0679>
- Heiskala, R. (2007). Social innovations: structural and power perspectives. In T. J. Hamalainen, & R. Heiskala (Eds.), *Social Innovations, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (pp. 52–79). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Jeong, S. S., & Alhaneed, D. W. T. A. (2020). Prosocial motivation as a driver of social innovation in the UAE. *Soc. Sci. Q.*, 101(7), 2450–2464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12913>
- Kanter, R. M. (1998). From spare change to real change: the social sector as beta site for business innovation. *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 77, 122–132.
- Lettec, F., & Parekh, M. (2010). The social innovation process: themes, challenges and implications for practice. *Int. J. Technol. Manag.*, 51(1), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.2010.033133>
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Soc. Innovat. Rev.*, 4, 47–51.
- Lubberink, R., Blok, V., van Ophem, J., & Omta, O. (2017). Lessons for responsible innovation in the business context: a systematic literature review of responsible, social and sustainable innovation practices. *Sustainability*, 9(5), 721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9050721>
- Lubberink, R., Blok, V., van Ophem, J., van der Velde, G., & Omta, O. (2018). Innovation for society: towards a typology of developing innovations by social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 52–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2017.1410212>
- Lubberink, R., Blok, V., van Ophem, J., & Omta, O. (2019). Responsible innovation by social entrepreneurs: an exploratory study of values integration in innovations. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 6(2), 179–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2019.1572374>
- Lumpkin, G., Moss, T. W., Gras, D. M., Kato, S., & Amezcuea, A. S. (2013). Entrepreneurial processes in social contexts: how are they different, if at all? *Small Bus. Econ.*, 40(3), 761–783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9399-3>
- Maclean, M., Harvey, C., & Gordon, J. (2013). Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy. *Int. Small Bus. J.*, 31(7), 747–763. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242612443376>
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: a source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *J. World Bus.*, 41(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
- Morris, M. H., Santos, S. C., & Kuratko, D. F. (2020). The great divides in social entrepreneurship and where they lead us. *Small Bus. Econ.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00318-y>

- Mort, G. S., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *Int. J. Nonprofit Voluntary Sect. Mark.*, 8(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.202>
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Gonzalez, S. (2005). Towards alternative model(s) of local innovation. *Urban Stud.*, 42(11), 1969–1990. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500279893>
- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 1(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.145>
- Munshi, N. V. (2010). Value creation, social innovation, and entrepreneurship in global economies. *J. Asia Pac. Bus.*, 11(3), 160–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2010.500569>
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The Open Book of Social Innovation*. London: The Young Foundation.
- Neumeier, S. (2012). Why do social innovations in rural development matter and should they be considered more seriously in rural development research? - proposal for a stronger focus on social innovations in rural development research. *Sociol. Rural.*, 52(1), 48–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00553.x>
- Newth, J., & Woods, C. (2014). Resistance to social entrepreneurship: how context shapes innovation. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 192–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2014.889739>
- Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). The nature of social innovation. In A. Nicholls, & A. Murdock (Eds.), *Social Innovation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230367098_1
- Novak, M. (2021). Social innovation and Austrian economics: exploring the gains from intellectual trade. *Rev. Austrian Econ.*, 34(1), 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-020-00503-y>
- Novkovic, S. (2008). Defining the co-operative difference. *J. Soc. Econ.*, 37(6), 2168–2177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2008.02.009>
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a critical review of the concept. *J. World Bus.*, 41(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007>
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: a systematic review. *Group Organ. Manag.*, 40(3), 428–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114560063>
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Soc. Innovat. Rev.*, 6(4), 34–43.
- Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: buzz word or enduring term? *J. Soc. Econ.*, 38(6), 878–885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2009.02.011>
- Polman, N., Slee, B., Klavánková, T., Dijkshoorn, M., Nijnik, M., Gezik, V., & Soma, K. (2017). Classification of social innovations for marginalised rural areas. Report D2.1. In *Deliverable of the Project Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas (SIMRA)*. Retrieved 30th of April 2021: <https://research.wur.nl/en/publications/classification-of-social-innovations-for-marginalized-rural-areas>.
- Rabadjeva, M., & Butzin, A. (2019). Emergence and diffusion of social innovation through practice fields. *Eur. Plann. Stud.*, 28(5), 925–940. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1577362>
- Rao-Nicholson, R., Vorley, T., & Khan, Z. (2017). Social innovation in emerging economies: a national systems of innovation based approach. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 121, 228–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.013>
- Rogelja, T., Ludvig, A., Weiss, G., & Secco, L. (2018). Implications of policy framework conditions for the development of forestry-based social innovation initiatives in Slovenia. *For. Pol. Econ.*, 95, 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.07.011>
- Ruiz, C., & Parra, C. (2013). *New Forms of Organization in Knowledge-Based Societies: Social Innovation*. New York, N.Y: Routledge.
- Sansone, G., Andreotti, P., Colombelli, A., & Landoni, P. (2020). Are social incubators different from other incubators? Evidence from Italy. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 158, 120132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120132>
- Silva, P., & Moreira, A. C. (2019). A systematic review of the literature on industrial divestment. *Baltic J. Manag.*, 14(3), 443–461. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-01-2018-0040>
- Singh, V., Singh, P., Karmakar, M., Leta, J., & Mayr, P. (2021). The journal coverage of Web of Science, Scopus and dimensions: a comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, 126, 5113–5142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03948-5>
- Slimane, K. B., & Lamine, W. (2017). A transaction-based approach to social innovation. *Int. J. Enterpren. Innovat.*, 18(4), 231–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750317741879>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: an overview and guidelines. *J. Bus. Res.*, 104(7), 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sonne, L. (2012). Innovative initiatives supporting inclusive innovation in India: social business incubation and micro venture capital. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 79(4), 638–647. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.06.008>
- Tan, W. L., Williams, T., & Tan, T. M. (2005). Defining the 'social' in 'social entrepreneurship': altruism and entrepreneurship. *Int. Enterpren. Manag. J.*, 1(3), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-005-2600-x>
- Tracey, P., & Stott, N. (2017). Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating. *Innovat. Manag. Pol. Pract.*, 19(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2016.1268924>
- van der Have, R. P., & Rubalcaba, L. (2016). Social innovation research: an emerging area of innovation studies? *Res. Pol.*, 45(9), 1923–1935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.06.010>
- Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: a multidimensional model. *J. World Bus.*, 41(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.001>
- Witkamp, M. J., Raven, R. P. J. M., & Royakkers, L. M. M. (2011). Strategic niche management of social innovations: the case of social entrepreneurship. *Technol. Anal. Strat. Manag.*, 23(6), 667–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2011.585035>
- Young, D. R., & Lecy, J. D. (2014). Defining the universe of social enterprise: competing metaphors. *Voluntas*, 25(5), 1307–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9396-z>
- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building social business models: lessons from the Grameen experience. *Long. Range Plan.*, 43(2/3), 308–325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.12.005>
- Zahra, S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 24(5), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>

Ricardo Grilo is a PhD student in marketing and strategy at the University of Aveiro, University of Minho and University of Beira Interior, Portugal. His research interests are in cause-related-marketing, social marketing, brand activism and consumer behaviour.

António Carrizo Moreira is Associate a professor at the University of Aveiro, Portugal. His research interests are: competitiveness, innovation, entrepreneurship and sustainability.