

Table A.1: Defining the Social Entrepreneur (selected examples)

Characteristics/ Authors	Risk-taking	Innovativeness	Opportunity recognition	Resourcefulness	Visionary	Social change agents	Moral agency	Social value Creation
Bornstein (1998:37)		powerful new idea			visionary	possessed by vision for change	strong ethical fiber	
Catford (1998:96)			sees opportunities		visionary insight		ethical fiber	
Dees (1998:3)	acting boldly	engaging in continuous innovation	relentlessly pursuing new opportunities	without being limited by resources		change agent		create social value
Alvord et al. (2004: 262)		creates innovative solutions		mobilizes resources		sustainable social transformations		address social problems
Austen et al. (2006)		innovative						social value creation
Sharir & Lerner (2006)				without being limited by resources		change agent		create and sustain social value
Peredo & McLean (2006:64)	tolerate risks	employing innovation	recognizing & exploiting opportunities	declines to accept limitations in available resources				creates social value
Zahra et al. (2009:519)		creates new ventures/ manages existing org. in innovative manner	discovers, defines, & exploits opportunities					enhances social wealth

Table A.2: Defining the Social Enterprise (selected examples)

Authors	Definition
Thompson (2002)	...“Enterprises set up for a social purpose but operating as businesses and in the voluntary or non-profit sector”
Miller et al. (2012)	...“hybrid venture that creates social value through market-based methods”
Dees & Battle Anderson (2006)	“A full range of business models available to social entrepreneurs, from purely philanthropic to purely commercial, with many variations in between.”
Austin et al. (2006:2)	... “innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, business and-or public-government sectors”
Dorado (2006: 327)	Non-profit, for-profit or cross-sector social entrepreneurial ventures are social because they aim to address a problem, the private sector has not adequately addressed
Zografos (2007: 38)	“Social enterprises are businesses with primarily social objectives that reinvest their surplus in the community rather than seeking to maximise profit for shareholders”
Mair & Schoen (2007)	“addresses social needs and or catalyses social transformation. Its primary objective is the creation of social value, while economic value creation is a necessary but not sufficient condition”
Yunus et al. (2010)	Social business: “It is a no-loss, no-dividend, self-sustaining company that sells goods or services and repays investments to its owners, but whose primary purpose is to serve society and improve the lot of the poor. Here it differs from NGOs, most of which are not designed to recover their total costs from their operations, and are therefore obliged to devote part of their time and energy to raising money. As it seeks self-sustainability, a social business only relies on its investors at the beginning of a development project”.
Doherty et al. (2014: 420)	Social enterprise “differ from organizations in the private sector that seek to maximize profit for personal gain by prioritizing social change above private wealth creation: typical social objectives include reducing poverty, inequality, homelessness, carbon emissions and unemployment“

Table A.3: Defining Social Entrepreneurship as a Process (selected examples)

Authors	Definitions
Leadbeater (1997:3)	...“a vast array of economic, educational, research, welfare, social and spiritual activities engaged in by various organizations”
Fowler (2000: 649)	... “creation of viable socioeconomic structures, relations, institutions, organizations and practices that yield and sustain social benefits”
Mair & Martí (2006:37)	... “as a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyse social change and/or address social needs”
Seelos & Mair (2005:243)	... “creates new models for the provision of products and services that cater directly to basic human needs that remain unsatisfied by current economic or social institutions” (p. 243)
Mair & Noboa (2006:122)	...“the innovative use of resource combinations to pursue opportunities aiming at the creation of organizations and/or practices that yield and sustain social benefits”
Austin et al (2006)	Innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, business, and/or public/government sectors
Nicholls (2008: 23)	... “is a set of innovative and effective activities that focus strategically on resolving social market failures and creating new opportunities to add social value systemically using a range of resources and organizational formats to maximize social impact and bring about change.”
Peredo & McLean (2006: 56)	...“is exercised when “some person or persons (1) aim either exclusively or in some prominent way to create social value of some kind and pursue that goal through some combination of (2) recognizing and exploiting opportunities to create this value, (3) employing innovation, (4) tolerating risk, and (5) declining to accept limitations in available resources”
Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort (2006: 22)	... “is a bounded multidimensional construct that is deeply rooted in an organization’s social mission, its drive for sustainability and highly influenced and shaped by the environmental dynamics”
Nicholls (2010:16)	... “a process of change in the delivery of public goods and social or environmental services”
Bacq & Janssen (2011: 376)	... “as the process of identifying, evaluating and exploiting opportunities aiming at social value creation by means of commercial, market-based activities and of the use of a wide range of resources”

Zahra et al., (2009: 519)	“the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner”
Miller et al., (2012: 617)	“the process of launching a hybrid organizational form that creates social value through market-based methods”
Luke& Chu (2013: 766)	... “entrepreneurial activity undertaken for a social purpose, changing the way that social needs are addressed”
Acs et al. (2013: 786)	... “includes possibilities for commercial entrepreneurship in the creation of social value in addition to economic value” (p. 786)

Table B: Prosocial Motivation and Engagement in SE (selected examples)

Antecedent	Moderating / Mediating	Outcome	Method	Authors	Findings
Moral agency & values	n.a.	Corporate SE engagement	Conceptual	Hemingway (2005)	Argues that moral agency and personal values are catalysts for corporate social entrepreneurship.
Prior experience with SE	Empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy & perceived support	SE intentions	Survey data	Hockerts (2017)	Finds that prior experience with SE predicts intention to engage in SE. This effect is mediated by the antecedents suggested by Mair and Noboa (empathy, moral obligation, self-efficacy & perceived support).
Openness, agreeableness, extroversion, neuroticism & conscientiousness	n.a.	Social vision, sustainability, social networks, innovation, financial returns	Survey data	Koe Hwee Nga & Shamuganathan (2010)	Agreeableness positively influences all dimensions of SE, whereas openness exerts a positive influence on social vision, innovation and financial returns.
Compassion	cognitive & affective processes	SE engagement	Conceptual	Miller et al. (2012)	Compassion (a prosocial emotion) encourages individuals to establish a social venture through cognitive & affective processes (integrative thinking, prosocial judgments, and commitment to alleviate others' suffering).

Compassion	n.a	SE engagement	Conceptual	Arend (2013)	Contrary to Miller et al. (2012), Arend disagrees that compassion is an appropriate driver to encourage social entrepreneurship, and that future theorizing should take into account other explanatory variables.
Compassion	n.a	SE engagement	Conceptual	Grimes et al. (2013)	Discuss the role of compassion in the origins of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs as an embedded agent with individual motivations.
Rationalities	n.a.	SE engagement	Case studies	Mody et al. (2012)	Findings indicate that there exists a dynamic interplay between the formal and substantive rationalities that underlie the behavior of social entrepreneurs.
Sympathy & empathy	n.a.	Prosocial motivation	Multiple case studies	Ruskin et al. (2016)	Emotions, such as entrepreneurial passion and frustration, lead to self-oriented motives, while sympathy and empathy are precursors for other-oriented motivations, such as altruism and social justice).
Aspiration	n.a.	Vision / Action	Multiple case	Waddock & Steckler (2016)	Explores the pathways from the aspiration to make a difference in the world to vision and action of social entrepreneurs. Contrasts deliberate versus emergent pathways.
Identity	n.a.	n.a.	Single case study	Lewis (2016)	‘Identity capital’ refers to set of strengths and psycho-social skills that are deployed by individuals to both define themselves and represent how others define them. Explores how identity is accumulated, deployed, and exchanged in social entrepreneurs.
Sameness, otherness, & identity centrality and salience	n.a.	Identity and passion	Multiple case studies	Yitshaki & Kropp (2016a)	Compares entrepreneurial passion and identity in high-tech entrepreneurs versus social entrepreneurs. SE passion is characterized in terms of enthusiasm, excitement, and a desire to make a mark.
Prosocial motivation	n.a.	SE engagement	Case studies	Campin et al. (2013)	Many micro-business owner-operators support their local communities and are thus driven by more than profit.
Prosocial motivation	Novelty	SE engagement		Renko (2013)	Prosocial motivation decreases the likelihood of firm emergence, and even more so when the product offering of the emerging venture is new to the markets.
Prosocial motivation	National strategy	SE engagement	Case studies	Mottiar (2016)	Examines the motivations of social entrepreneurs. Case findings show that motivation for SE action can be prompted by a national strategy.

Table B (cont.)

Antecedent	Moderating / Mediating	Outcome	Method	Authors	Findings
Sympathy	Distressing experiences	SE engagement	Survey data	Yiu et al. (2014)	Past distressing experiences (including limited educational opportunities, unemployment experience, rural poverty experience, and startup location hardship) amplify feelings of sympathy, thus motivating SE engagement.
Power, subjectivity & freedom	n.a.	SE engagement	Conceptual	Dey & Steyaert (2016)	Identifies power, subjectivity, and practices of freedom as neglected but significant antecedents of SE.
Intention of social value creation	n.a.	SE Identity	Empirical	Bacq et al. (2016)	The intention and dominance of perceived social value creation over economic value creation is what characterizes social entrepreneurs.
Perceptions and motivations	n.a.	SE scaling	Conceptual	Smith et al. (2016)	A social entrepreneur's perception of moral intensity of the social problem, coupled with their personal desire for control, can significantly influence scaling decisions.
Cultural values & gender	n.a.	Type of value creation	Empirical	Hechavarría et al. (2017)	Examines entrepreneurs' economic, social, and environmental goals for value creation for their new ventures. Findings show that gender and cultural values of post-materialism significantly impact the kinds of value creation emphasized by entrepreneurs.

Table C: The Processes of Forming Social Ventures (selected examples)

Research focus	Authors	Method	Main contributions / findings
(1) Opportunity recognition & discovery in SE	Zahra et al. (2009)	Conceptual	Offer a typology of entrepreneurs' search processes that lead to the discovery of opportunities for creating social ventures.
	Murphy & Coombes (2009)	Conceptual	Conceptualizes social entrepreneurial discovery as mobilization, timing, and resource convergence.

	Corner & Ho (2010)	Empirical	Data reveals multiple, not individual, actors, dynamically engaged in interactions that nudge an opportunity into manifestation.
	Perrini et al. (2010)	Empirical	Explores SE processes designed to exploit innovation that explicitly addresses complex social problems. Elaborates on the characteristics of the process and on the dimensions intervening on how SE opportunities are identified, evaluated, exploited and scaled up.
	Marshall (2011)	Conceptual	Proposes characteristics of “international for-profit social entrepreneurs” and discusses dimensions of mindset, opportunity recognition, social networks, and outcome.
	Lumpkin et al. (2013)	Empirical	Assesses the relationship between four antecedents (social mission/motivation, opportunity identification, access to resources/funding, and multiple stakeholders) and three outcomes (social value creation, sustainable solutions, and satisfying multiple stakeholders) to the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation.
	Yitshaki & Kropp (2016b)	Multiple case studies	Argue that different types of motivation (push versus pull factors) lead to different types of opportunity recognition. Pull factors (prosocial behaviors based on past or current life events) and push factors (job dissatisfaction and a search for meaning).
	González et al. (2017)	Empirical	Proposes a conceptual framework for the opportunity identification process in social entrepreneurship. Develops scales for opportunity discovery and opportunity creation and finds that opportunity discovery and opportunity creation are mutually exclusive constructs.
(2) Resource utilization	Meyskens et al. (2010)	Multiple case study	Shows how social ventures collaborate with other organizations in a network to fulfill resource requirements. Social entrepreneurs, when viewed through a resource-based lens, demonstrate similar internal operational processes in utilizing resource bundles as commercial entrepreneurs.
	Montgomery et al. (2012)	Empirical	Identify resource utilization approaches and three associated sets of activities that illustrate the work of collective social entrepreneurs- framing, convening, and multivocality.
(3) Bricolage	Sunduramurthy et al. (2016)	Empirical	Successful social entrepreneurs engage in similar bricolage processes in three domains of value creation: they refuse limitations imposed by the environment, utilize resources in new and innovative ways, and engage a wide range of stakeholders as partners.

	Di Domenico et al. (2010)	Empirical	Argues that current theorizations of bricolage need refinement, and identifies three further constructs associated with SE: social value creation, stakeholder participation, and persuasion.
	Haugh, H. (2007)	qualitative	Identifies the stages of venture creation: (1) opportunity identification, (2) idea articulation, (3) idea ownership, (4) stakeholder mobilization, (5) opportunity exploitation, and (6) stakeholder reflection.

Table D: The Growth and Performance of Social Venture (selected examples)

Outcome	Authors	Method	Contribution / Findings
(1) Funding of social ventures	Miller & Wesley (2010)	Empirical	Building on organizational identity theory, examines how the dual identity of social ventures influences social venture capitalists' decisions to invest.
	Calic & Mosakowski (2016)	Empirical	Shows that a venture's sustainability orientation positively affects entrepreneurs' ability to acquire financial resources through crowdfunding, and that this relationship is mediated partially by project creativity and third party endorsements.
	Parhankangas, & Renko (2017)	Empirical	Demonstrates important role of linguistic styles for acquiring funding for social campaigns through crowdfunding.
	Lehner (2014)	Empirical	Success of crowdfunding for social ventures depends on social capital of the entrepreneurial teams, while the actual transformation into economic capital is moderated by cultural and symbolic capital that is being built up through the process.
	Gutiérrez-Nieto et al. (2016)	Conceptual	Presents a credit score system for socially responsible lending (micro-financings). The model evaluates social and financial aspects of the borrower and know-how of the lender.
	Scarlata & Alemany (2010)	Empirical	Discusses “Philanthropic venture capital” (PhVC) as a financing option for social enterprises that includes an ethical dimension aiming at maximizing the social return on the investment.
	Bhatt & Ahmad	Empirical	Studies the role of contextual drivers and conditions that gave rise to a unique form of impact investment in

	(2017)		India, a financial social innovation – developmental venture capital (DVC).
	Smith et al. (2012)	Empirical	While nonprofit organizations increasingly turn to social enterprise in the hopes of funding their social missions, the introduction of a social enterprise can negatively affect individual donations. This effect can be mitigated when the social enterprise is perceived as mission consistent and competent.
	Woods (2012)	Empirical	Data from a survey evaluating six SE ventures (three social and three technological) shows personality influences a person's tendency to support innovative SE venture: Openness underlies support of technological innovations, and empathy underlies support of social innovations. This is mediated by people's perceptions of how much change the venture will make.
(2) Use of rhetoric	Ruebottom (2013)	Empirical	Social entrepreneurs face difficulties in building legitimacy that compromises their ability to create sustainable institutional change. Case studies of 10 social enterprises reveal that rhetorical strategy aims to overcome this barrier.
	Waldron et al. (2016)	Conceptual	Explores how social entrepreneurs use rhetoric to persuade industry members to adopt new, socially focused, industry practices.
	Parkinson & Howorth (2008)	Discourse analysis	Analyses the micro discourses of social entrepreneurs, showing a preoccupation among interviewees with local issues, collective action, geographical community and local power struggles.
(3) Scaling of social venture	Bloom & Chatterji (2009)	Conceptual	Discusses the role of conceptual modeling (i.e. staffing, communications, alliances, lobbying, replication) in scale the social impact.
	VanSandt et al. (2009)	Empirical	Explored alternate methods of expansion, scaling and replication of the social venture, including potential catalysts (i.e. effectual logic, appropriate reporting metrics, information technology) which facilitate attaining goals of social improvement.
	Smith & Stevens (2010)	Conceptual	Explains how variance in the geographic focus of different types of SE affects embeddedness in social networks, and thus may affect the measurement and scaling of social value.
	Ghuri et al.	Empirical	Explores how employing corporate SE and developing a network of relationships with NGOs can support and

	(2014)		contribute towards the internationalization of service firms into the BoP in emerging markets.
	Rey-Martí et al. (2016)	Empirical	Investigates how contingent factors of social enterprises (i.e. training, educational attainment, experience, family history, and financial support) influence size of the venture (i.e., the outcome in the research model).
(4) Performance of social venture	Liu, et al. (2015)	Empirical	Investigates how marketing capabilities influence social enterprise performance. Findings suggest that social entrepreneurs should develop their marketing capabilities selectively according to their specific performance objectives.
	Scarlata et al. (2016)	Empirical	Results indicate that philanthropic venture capital firms perform best when the founding team has high levels of commercial experience and low levels of social experience.
	Sharir & Lerner (2006)	Empirical	Identifies factors affecting the success of social ventures (i.e. social network, dedication, capital base acceptance of the venture idea, composition of the venturing team, long-term cooperation, market test, and previous managerial experience)
	Gras & Mendoza-Abarca (2014)	Empirical	Performance largely depends on the extent to which nonprofits focus on market-based opportunities. Find support for a U-shaped relationship indicating that low to moderate levels of market-based income decrease the likelihood of firm exit, whereas high levels increase this likelihood.
	Felício et al. (2013)	Empirical	By evaluating the role of socioeconomic context as the moderating variable, the results confirm the strong influence of SE on social value and the effects of SE and transformational leadership on organizational performance.
	Bridgstock (2016)	Empirical	Explores the important role of diversity management in enabling social enterprises to maximize innovation and business performance.
	Grimes (2010)	Multiple case study	Argues that organizations within the social sector employ performance measurement not just as a means of accountability, but also as a tool for making sense of SE as an organizational identity.
	Katre & Salipante. (2012)	Multiple case study	Explores start-up behaviors of 23 social ventures and their influence on success.

Table E: Impact of Social Ventures (selected examples)

Research focus	Authors	Method	Contribution / Finding
(1) Poverty alleviation	Bloom (2009)	Conceptual	Discusses the potential of SE to contribute to poverty alleviation, highlighting the roles of marketing thinking and academic research in supporting SE initiatives to combat poverty.
	Tobias et al. (2013)	Multiple case study	Illustrates how entrepreneurship may catalyze prosperity as well as peace in entrenched poverty–conflict zones.
	Alvarez et al. (2015)	Conceptual	Questions the effectiveness of SE to address poverty. Instead advocates the role of international industrialization on poverty alleviation.
(2) Institutional change	Waddock & Post (1991)	Single case study	Discusses role of SE in the public domain and as a catalyst for change.
	Nicholls (2010)	Conceptual	Presents Fair Trade as a form of social entrepreneurship that can bring about institutional change
	Sakarya et al. (2012)	Multiple case study	Highlights the potential of incremental contributions of social alliances in social transformation in subsistence market places by exploring six social alliance cases.
(3) Capability building at BoP	Ansari et al. (2012)	Conceptual	Business initiatives at the base of the pyramid (BoP) should be evaluated on whether it advances capability transfer and retention by (a) enhancing the social capital between a particular community and other more resource rich networks, and (b) preserving the existing social capital in the community.
(3) Inclusive growth	Azmat et al. (2015)	Multiple case study	Explores how two social ventures utilize their unique circumstances and resources at a micro level to facilitate the creation of shared value at the meso-level, leading to inclusive growth at a macro level in the context of subsistence marketplaces.
(4) Regional development	Friedman et al. (2010)	Conceptual	Proposes that integrating social entrepreneurship and conflict engagement impacts regional development by redefining inter-group relationships, enhancing social networks, activating social capital, leveraging diversity and challenging existing power structures.
(8) Sustainable tourism	Peng & Lin (2016)	Multiple case study	Explores the potential of SE to innovate rural tourism in a sustainable manner that could benefit four types of stakeholders (tourists, business, community and government).
	Laeis & &	Single case	Assesses the impact of SE in tourism on creating economic benefits and sustainable livelihoods.

	Lemke (2016)	study	
	McCarthy (2012)	Conceptual	Discusses the role of social entrepreneurs and resource mobilization to develop cultural tourism in regional Ireland.
(9) Empowerment	Datta & Gailey (2012)	Single case study	Explores the impact of SE on empowering women in three ways: economic security, development of entrepreneurial behavior, and increased contributions to the family.

Table F: The Role of (formal / informal) Institutions in SE (selected examples)

Authors	Method	Contribution / Finding
Korosec & Berman (2006)	Mixed methods	Municipalities can help social entrepreneurs by increasing awareness of social problems, and by helping them to acquire resources, coordinate with other organizations, and implement programs.
Hall et al. 2012	Empirical	Examines the role of how entrepreneurship policies can lead to socially inclusive growth at the BOP. Weak institutions coupled with alert entrepreneurs are found to encourage destructive outcomes, especially if entrepreneurship policies are based solely on economic indicators.
Terjesen et al. (2016)	Conceptual	Discusses how public policy can advance high-growth, female and social entrepreneurs.
Wang et al. (2016)	Empirical	The study proposes a new conceptual framework for studying SE by adapting structuration theory, providing recommendations to policymakers for improving mechanisms to increase social services through social enterprises.
Garrigós Simón et al. (2017)	Empirical	Policies to enhance social development through the promotion of SME and social entrepreneurship in the Colombian construction industry. Analyses a set of policies to enhance social development; policies interfering economic freedom and free trade receive the lowest rates in the criteria considered.
Rivera-Santos et al. (2015)	Empirical	Shows how contextual dimensions (acute poverty, informality, colonial history, and ethnic group identity) influence the way social ventures perceive themselves and on their choice of activities.
Stephan et al. (2015)	Empirical	Investigates which national contexts facilitate SE. Findings indicate the important roles of formal regulatory (government activism), informal cognitive (postmaterialist cultural values), and informal normative (socially supportive cultural norms, or weak-tie social capital) institutions on SE.

Table F: (Cont.)

Authors	Method	Contribution / Finding
Haugh & Talwar (2016)	Empirical	Discusses how social and cultural norms impact the extent to which women in developing countries engage with, and accrue the benefits of, entrepreneurial activity. Frames emancipatory social entrepreneurship as processes that empower women and contribute to changing the social order in which women are embedded.
Sud et al. (2009)	Conceptual	Argues that SE by <i>itself</i> cannot solve social problems on a large scale, and thus needs to act in concert with other social institutions to address social ills effectively.
Zhao & Lounsbury (2016)	Empirical	Explores how institutional forces shape the acquisition of resources by social ventures. While strong market logic enhances both commercial and public capital acquired by microfinance ventures, whereas religious diversity decreases the availability commercial capital for microfinance ventures.
Ault (2016)	Empirical	Discusses the relative effectiveness of commercial vs non-profit methods of building inclusive markets for the poor. Institutions influence not only the number of entrepreneurs found in a particular location but also the social impact of entrepreneurial strategies and actions.
Leputre et al. (2013)	Empirical	Develops a methodology to measure population-based social entrepreneurship activity (SEA) prevalence rates and tests institutional and individual drivers of SEA. Countries with higher rates of traditional entrepreneurial activity are found to also have higher rates of social entrepreneurial activity. Provides a categorization of SE in terms of social mission, revenue model, and innovativeness.
Estrin et al. (2013)	Empirical	Find that both social and commercial entrepreneurial entry is facilitated by certain formal institutions, namely strong property rights and (low) government activism, albeit the latter impacts each of these types of entrepreneurship differently.
Desa (2012)	Survey data	Examines how regulatory, political, and technological institutions affect resource-mobilization (bricolage) in social ventures. In turn, bricolage can act as a legitimating mechanism for institutional change.
Pathak & Muralidharan (2016)	Three sets of survey data	Shows how societal collectivism and societal trust facilitate or constrain the emergence of SE versus and commercial entrepreneurship (CE) Societal collectivism decrease the likelihood of CE but to increases that of SE. Further, while societal trust influences both SE and CE positively.

Table F: (Cont.)

Authors	Method	Contribution / Finding
Muñoz & Kibler (2016)	Survey data	Findings demonstrate that local authorities are a dominant condition; yet combinations of other complementary local institutions need to be in place to promote the development of SE.
Hoogendoorn (2016)	Empirical	Findings indicate beneficial role of public sector expenditure, regulatory quality a society's level of self-expression values.
Irani & Elliman (2008)	Conceptual	Using institutional theory, article discusses how SE can be promoted and developed in the public sector (local government).
Dorado & Ventresca (2013)	Conceptual	Explore the institutional conditions that frame the likelihood of entrepreneurial engagement. Identifies two sets of crecive conditions: those that can stir up actors' motivations to engage and those that can alter their decision making logic.
Waddock (2010)	Empirical	Focuses on social institutions and their role in social change as well as the creation of social enterprises that cross public, private and governmental divides.
Liu et al. (2016)	Empirical	Discusses the creation and legitimating process of a charity foundation in China. Shows that the coexisting and competing relationship among state, civil society, social mission, and market logics provides impetus for organizational change and innovation.

APPENDIX**Appendix 1: Breakdown of Search Results**

	Scopus	Web of Science
Searching for: “social entrepreneur*”, “social enterprise”, “social venture” or “social business” in abstract, title or keywords of peer-reviewed journals	2,507 hits	1,126 hits
Only including publications ranked as ABS 3-4	394 hits	403 hits
Final sample (i.e. excluding duplicates)	479 hits	
Excluding articles on Education (n=23), book reviews/summaries/interviews, etc. (n=28) and articles where SE is not mentioned/treated marginally (n= 33)	395 hits (final sample)	

Notes: Search conducted June 2018, limited to articles appearing in English, peer-reviewed journals.

Individual search hits in Scopus: “social entrepreneur*” (1,209 hits), “social enterprise” (1,119 hits), “social venture” (109 hits), “social business” (208 hits).

Individual search hits in Web of Science: “social entrepreneur*” (698 hits), “social enterprise” (446 hits), “social venture” (36 hits), “social business” (84 hits).

The individual search hits do not account for overlap between the search terms, thus adding up the individual search hits generates a higher number than the sum reported in the first row of the table.