



Social Entrepreneurship Education Literature: An Ecological Narrative Review

Julie Solbreux¹ and Sophie Pondeville

Institut de Recherche en Didactiques et Éducation de l'Université de Namur (IRDENA), Université de Namur, Belgium

Julie Hermans

Louvain Research Institute in Management and Organization (LouRIM), UCLouvain, Belgium

Abstract. In this paper, we provide a narrative review of thirteen years of literature about Social Entrepreneurship Education (SEE). To grasp its controversies, the main topics of interest and evolutions across time and space (i.e., influences from other communities), we build on a socioecological view of ecosystems and their underlying resilience processes. We find that researchers and educators from the SEE ecosystem imported concepts from other communities to flesh out the three challenges identified by Tracey and Phillips in 2007: managing accountability; managing the double bottom line and managing identity. We contribute to unveiling the tacit paradigms of the SEE ecosystem and their origins: the teaching objectives and the tools that are deemed adequate to achieve them, while remaining critical of the origin of such elements. This exercise highlights possible vulnerabilities that SEE educators could address in the future as well as promising research opportunities.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, education, narrative literature review, socio-ecological system.

1. Introduction

In 2007, Tracey and Philips published a seminal paper on teaching social entrepreneurship in higher education and called for a dedicated scientific conversation. They identified three main challenges: managing accountability about social impact, dealing with the double bottom line and its associated tensions, and managing students' identity through leadership (Tracey and Phillips, 2007). Since then, social entrepreneurship education (SEE) has been gaining momentum (Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017), notably influenced by students' requests (Worsham, 2012). Researchers and educators have developed their own concepts, tools, and methods nourished by inputs from adjacent communities. Inputs from mainstream entrepreneurship education (Rae, 2010),

1. Corresponding author: Julie Solbreux, Institut de Recherche en Didactiques et Éducation de l'Université de Namur (IRDENA), Université de Namur,

education for sustainability (Klapper and Farber, 2016) or education on innovation (Weber, 2012) are adapted or transformed for appropriation inside SEE. Indeed, theoretical, methodological and pedagogical inputs in SEE are never entirely new but may be learned from different communities of practices (Capella-Peris et al., 2020). For instance, Kickul et al. (2010) show how the conversation quickly evolved from managing the double bottom line to a triple bottom line, calling for more attention to environmental challenges and sustainability issues. It means that eco-entrepreneurship education, or learning about and for ventures addressing environmental progress in their core business (Schaltegger, 2002), is often implicitly included in social entrepreneurship courses (Fichter and Tiemann, 2018). Tools and inputs developed in other communities, such as sustainability education, are adopted and shaped to fit social entrepreneurship programs.

However, this appropriation might have consequences. As SEE scholars — both educators and researchers — import teaching intentions and tools from other fields of education, misfit may arise (Mirabella and Young, 2012). A market-based solution influenced by mainstream EE may conflict with the expectations of students who are seeking alternative models (Roundy, 2017). This is important since social entrepreneurship may draw on different streams and ideologies (Jarrodi et al., 2019). Consequences include limited transformation potential or even its dilution into mainstream ways of doing things (Driver, 2012). Thus, it is time to identify the influences that helped SEE researchers and educators in structuring the field and to identify its specificities and remaining controversies.

Thirteen years after the contribution of Tracey and Phillips, we perform a narrative literature review (Hakala et al., 2020; Snyder, 2019) that provides an overview of SEE evolution through its interactions with other research traditions, thereby hinting at the specificities of the field as well as its vulnerabilities. We explore the following questions: “Which teaching practices and paradigms have emerged from 13 years of building the SEE research community?” and “what are the key legacies from parent research ecosystems and their possible vulnerabilities?”.

To grasp the SEE literature, its main topics of interest and evolutions across time and space (i.e., influence from other communities), we build on a socioecological view of ecosystems and their underlying resilience processes (Folke, 2006; Holling, 2001; Lans et al., 2014). Specifically, the SEE literature provides cues about the ability of the researchers and educators to absorb changes and to develop their own solutions, i.e., new teaching ideas, methods and concepts, through adaptive cycles. As such, we describe the SEE ecosystems as a learning network with its own resilience capacity (Manring, 2014). Moreover, we mobilize an extension of the adaptive cycle model, called “panarchy” (Holling and Gunderson, 2002), which explores the interrelations between ecosystems. Indeed, the adaptive cycle model is a dynamic representation of the resilience capacity of an ecosystem when “disturbances” unbalance its equilibrium (Folke,


2006; Holling, 2001), and the panarchy model considers the origin of such disturbances.

In the next sections, we first describe the conceptual framework that allows us to examine the interrelations between related ecosystems. Then, we explain how we applied this framework to collect and analyse papers on SEE through a narrative review. Next, we synthesize the findings, in formulating six teaching objectives that the SEE community identifies as consistent in a curriculum and three arenas of institutionalisation: the university, the business school and the faculty members. We discuss our results about how key legacies from parent research ecosystems influence the field and we highlight key challenges for future research as well as for educators involved in SE courses. We finally conclude this narrative review by some recommendations for policy makers.

2. Conceptual Model

The adaptive cycle model was first developed by Holling (2001) to explain the resilience of ecosystems through their ability to absorb disturbances. While the original application was environmental ecosystems, such as the Amazonian forest, the model was quickly applied to human collectives as “socioecological systems” (Folke et al., 2002; Holling and Gunderson, 2002) in which some agents resist disturbances while others act as agents of change, devising strategies to bring them forward. As an example, Westley et al. (2013) use this model to describe the resilience of the Canadian Great Bear Rainforest (CGBF) ecosystem and how it evolved from a situation of intensive deforestation to more environmentally friendly practices. We use this case as an illustration to better understand resilience via the four phases of the adaptive cycle model: conservation, release, reorganization and exploitation (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Adaptive cycle model and its four phases (adapted from Holling and Gunderson, 2002; Westley et al., 2013)



In the conservation phase, disturbances appear in the ecosystem and question its status quo. While most members of the ecosystem resist changes and novelty, so-called agents of change “*pursue a strategy that involves anticipating, preparing for, and helping to create disturbances*” (Westley et al., 2013: p. 11). For instance, Westley et al. (2013) describe the conservative position of Canadian west coast authorities who continued with their intensive deforestation of the CGBF despite scientists’ arguments. However, new agents of change steadily increased disturbance as NGOs regrouped and strategized other ways to disrupt the logging operations.

Next, in the release phase, the ecosystem begins to accept the disturbances. The agents of change pursue convening and sense-making strategies to develop common interpretations and visions with the other stakeholders of the ecosystem. In the example of CGBF, activists worked to bring all parties together, to reduce hostilities and to encourage partnerships. Gradually, new collaborations and common objectives emerged between stakeholders (Westley et al., 2013).


In the reorganization phase, agents take one more step towards the transformation of their ecosystem. In this phase, agents of change build on the recombination of resources, shared vision and expertise to engage in “*bricolage*” (Baker and Nelson, 2005). They build networks of partners and leverage pooled resources to experiment with innovative ideas and shape them into viable configurations (Westley et al., 2013). Sometimes they borrow established practices from other fields (Manring, 2014) to address practical issues. This

results in the emergence of a more integrated set of ideas that some authors call dominant design (Westley et al., 2013). It also brings the inevitable dismissal of loose ideas that do not pass the release phase (Westley, 2013). In the CGBF example, the solution that emerged was a collective set of measures in the form of a five-point agreement that encompassed the objectives of the different stakeholders.

Finally, in the exploitation phase, the ecosystem generalizes the dominant design that emerges from the reorganization phase to enter a new conservation phase in which agents of change develop leveraging strategies to establish the new set of ideas as the “new normal” (Lewis et al., 2017). They accumulate resources and search for institutional and political support. In the CGBF example, financial resources were collected to support social and environmental objectives. Stakeholders (activists and industry) entered into difficult negotiations with the provincial government to turn their five-point agreement into new laws (Westley et al., 2013).

With the CGBF, we illustrate the temporal dimension (Holling, 2001) of the adaptive cycle model (see Figure 1), from initial disturbances caused by environmental activists and scientists to the stabilization of the cycle. Indeed, as the propositions of stakeholders are institutionalized into new regulations, the scene arises for a new conservation phase. However, ecosystems rarely evolve in isolation. To consider the interactions between ecosystems, Holling (2001) extends the adaptive cycle model to the “panarchy” framework (Allen et al., 2014). The panarchy shows how changes in a particular ecosystem may trigger disturbances in other ecosystems that are physically or socially distant (see Figure 2), thus integrating the resilience of an ecosystem into a spatial dimension. Two types of interconnections are considered: the revolt and the remember effects (Holling, 2001).

Figure 2. Panarchy, a model of nested adaptive cycles adapted from Holling and Gunderson (2002)



Assimilated to creative destruction, the revolt effect occurs when a critical change in the release phase of an ecosystem creates disturbances in the conservation phase of another ecosystem, which we refer to as the focal ecosystem. Imagine that some activists succeed in engaging in dialogue against the use of insecticides in their local community. In doing so, they incidentally start to question the policies and practices of general forest management. This was not their initial objective, but, by convening and sense-making in one ecosystem, they disturb another ecosystem (Holling, 2001). The revolt effect explains the origin of novel ideas that challenge the status quo in the focal ecosystem. Agents might first resist these novel ideas and ignore their themes and recommendations. After a while they might begin to embrace them and start a new release phase.

The second effect is called the remember effect. It facilitates the reorganization phase of the focal ecosystem by drawing on the potential accumulated and matured solutions in the conservation phase of other ecosystems. Specifically, focal ecosystem agents address their problems using ideas and practices established by other communities. For example, the institutionalization of global climate change measures, developed at a worldwide ecosystem level, has ultimately been used by local initiatives and regional regimes facing environmental challenges (Walker et al., 2004). In other words, these local ecosystems took the opportunity of an institutionalized solution from another ecosystem to address their own specific issues.

In the next section, we describe how we mobilize the four phases of the adaptive cycle and the panarchy model to analyse the evolution of ideas and recommendations published in the SEE literature.

3. Methodology

The typical purpose of a narrative review is to provide an overview of a research area by tracking how a topic has developed over time and across research traditions (Snyder, 2019). It contrasts with traditional systematic literature reviews and meta-analysis that seek to synthesize evidence in an additive way (Taylor and Spicer, 2007). Building on the thematic analysis of research articles, it helps unveiling the key themes and scientific puzzles in the literature (Hakala et al., 2020). It is especially useful for topics that have evolved from various communities of researchers and educators with different disciplinary backgrounds (McColl-Kennedy et al., 2017; Snyder 2019), which fits with the aim of this article. Indeed, we want to explore “which teaching practices and paradigms have emerged from 13 years of building the SEE ecosystem?” and “what are the key legacies from parent research ecosystems and their possible vulnerabilities?”.

Even though narrative reviews do not necessarily take a systematic approach (Snyder, 2019; Wong et al., 2013), we wanted to draw a rich re-representation of the literature (Gond et al., 2020; Hakala et al., 2020) and thus opted for a tool-supported (Gaur and Kumar, 2018; Vázquez-Carrasco and López-Pérez, 2013) systematic method. We used QSR NVivo 12 as the qualitative data analysis software and data management tool, Endnote X9 as the personal reference database program and Adobe Acrobat Reader DC 2019 to read, search and index contents.

3.1. Data Collection

For our data collection, we looked for relevant peer-reviewed articles (in English) in the Scopus database (containing > 20,500 journals from 5,000 publishers) up to 2020. We selected keywords to restrict our literature review to articles that specifically and explicitly state SEE as their main research topic. As a result, our search aimed at papers focusing on both education and SE. In line with Saebi et al. (2019) as well as other literature reviews in entrepreneurship (Grégoire et al., 2011; Nabi et al., 2017), we searched for articles containing [“education”, “teaching” or “pedagog*”] and [social entrepr* or social business or social venture] in their title, abstract, or keywords. This resulted in 412 hits in Scopus (last search the 31th August 2021).

At this stage, and still in line with Saebi et al. (2019), we kept relevant journals for SEE in business schools using the Academic Journal Guide 2018 by the Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS). The ABS List is useful for this research as it focuses on journals deemed relevant for business schools and because it considers a large variety of disciplines that might inform SEE (psychology, economics, public administration, entrepreneurship, education,

etc.). While Saebi et al. (2019) only selected articles from rank 4*, 4 and 3 journals, we decided to relax this criterion by including all indexed journals in the ABS List. Doing so, we enlarged our dataset to articles that ambition a significant contribution in management education and/or entrepreneurship. It allows us to select articles in line with our research goal: draw meta-narratives about SEE from the perspective of business school researchers and educators and identifying the parent communities that influenced them. The resulting list of journals (available on request) includes Academy of Management Learning & Education, Journal of Business Ethics, Business & Society, Journal of Enterprising Culture, International Review of Entrepreneurship, etc. This represented 189 articles.

Then, we screened the articles to make sure that they focus on SEE. For instance, a paper such as Sadick et al. (2019) about social enterprises with “education” as their social mission would have been selected in the first round but it would have been dismissed from our final set as the focal is not about SEE. In other dismissed articles, authors addressed education as part of their recommendations or as a control variable. For those reasons, we ended up with a rejection rate greater than in traditional systematic literature reviews and built a set of 85 relevant articles that we uploaded respectively in a dedicated Endnote library and a new Nvivo project.

3.2. Data Analysis

Next, we entered the main analysis task. According to Wong et al. (2013: p. 10), reviewers engaging in a narrative review “*seek to identify and map out specific meta-narratives (that is, unfolding stories of research traditions over time)*”. Guided by our conceptual framework, we looked for narrative cues (extracts in the collected articles) that reflected the four phases of the adaptive cycles and the panarchy effects (Holling, 2001). We focused on the teaching proposals (concepts and practices deemed adequate to teach SEE) employed within these studies as well as the arguments used by the authors to introduce them. Building on Westley et al. (2013) as well as Walker et al. (2004), we created a coding grid that provides a definition and examples for each phase of our conceptual model (see Table 1).

Table 1. Panarchy analysis grid for the SEE literature

Cycle phase	Conservation	Release	Reorganization	Exploitation
Illustrations (verbatim)	<i>“Every faculty member had a research director who had to approve their new projects, including the development of new courses. My research director thought it might be “career suicide” to go down this road.”</i> (Worsham, 2012: p. 445) <i>“There were only a few business schools with any form of engagement, including Case Western Reserve, Yale, Northwestern, and Stanford. Thus, while there was some inside and outside interest, there was no imperative for action.”</i> (Austin and Rangan, 2019: p. 3)	<i>“a second catalytic element was the Dean’s recognition of the potential value of the opportunity and the criticality of leadership to its realization”.</i> (Austin and Rangan, 2019: p. 3) <i>“The high school administrators saw this as an incredible learning opportunity for their socially conscious students. The graduate–high school student mentoring relationship required in the Social Entrepreneurship & Community leadership course differentiates our service-learning project from those discussed to date in the literature.</i> (Litzky et al., 2010: pp. 144-145)	<i>Most of the research on SE pedagogy (e.g. Frank, 2005; Schlee et al., 2009) has studied the use of case studies, live projects and the development of business plans. Since social entrepreneurs have similarities with mainstream entrepreneurs (Harding, 2006), it can be assumed that some of the skills needed and appropriate learning methods are similar (Rae and Carswell, 2000). Thus, opportunity-centred learning (Rae, 2003) may be an appropriate pedagogic approach for SE as it has been shown to be for ‘normal’ entrepreneurs”.</i> (Chang et al., 2014a: p. 460)	<i>“To be a change maker university like Ashoka institutions, and really be engaged in the external community, an endowment or some sort of long-term financing needs to be centered on social entrepreneurship. You need someone to help with administration, student start-up funding, adjunct or guest-speaker pay, field trips, etc. The other option would be to get money through tuition by charging students for a program like in a study abroad option, but then you limit your impact because not all students can afford to participate.”</i> (Thomsen et al., 2018: p. 217)
Disturbances	Unconventional pedagogical proposals appear and question the status quo. Can come from the release phase of another ecosystem, thereby reflecting a <i>revolt effect</i>.	Pedagogical proposals disrupt or complement the ongoing practices. Can be at the origin of a <i>revolt effect</i> in the conservation phase of another ecosystem .	Pedagogical proposals are adapted or transformed to be synthesized in a coherent set of ideas .	Pedagogical proposals become the new normal and are generalized across the ecosystem.

Agent of change strategies	Disturbing strategies that anticipate, prepare for, and help to create disturbances - Questioning anterior publications - Critical essay - Unexpected recommendations.	Convening and sense-making strategies: - Encouraging stakeholder participation - Looking for common interpretations - Searching for meaningful visions.	Recombination strategies: - Facilitating partnerships - Building networks - Mobilizing resources and expertise.	Leveraging and accumulation strategies: - Searching for institutional and political support - Generalizing the new normal.
Ecosystem behavior	Build on a mature dominant design of expertise and practices. Strengthen its structure, which makes it also resistant to change and novelty.	Accept disturbances and proliferation of suggestions: - New interpretations of existing topics - Emergence of new topics - Deepening of associated concepts.	Work on a new dominant design: - Experimenting with a promising idea - Articulating a coherent set of ideas - Abandoning loose ideas. Can borrow inspiration in the conservation phase of other ecosystems, creating a <i>remember effect</i> .	Embrace the new normal: - Mobilization and optimization of resources - Partnerships that strengthen the ecosystem resilience.

First, the conservation phase is characterized by the appearance of new pedagogical proposals in an ecosystem resistant to changes and novelty. Three types of narrative cues are considered to support this coding (see Table 1): excerpts about the nature of the disturbances (e.g., the authors present their proposal as unconventional), about the strategies mobilized by the authors of the disturbance (e.g., the authors question extant methods), and about the general behavior of the ecosystem (e.g., the authors suggest that they had to struggle with peers when developing their proposal). Accordingly, we identified proposals that are considered as disturbances and that question the status quo. As an example, we suggest that Greg Dees experienced a phase of conservation in the early nineties when he proposed teaching social entrepreneurship at Harvard Business School (Worsham, 2012). At that time, the school was resistant and flatly rejected the proposal - a “career suicide”, according to Dees’ research director (Worsham, 2012: p. 445). Therefore, this narrative passage was coded as evidence of a conservation phase (time) in the mainstream EE ecosystem (space) in which members resist new teaching proposals about social enterprises. When those disturbances are triggered by a conversation in another field, as referenced by the authors, we coded the disturbance as a “revolt” effect.

Based on the adaptive cycle model, the general behavior of the ecosystem can evolve from resisting to embracing changes (Holling, 2001). The release phase is thus about emergent topics and ideas for the learning community. It includes new recommendations for educators as well as proposals about the way to reinterpret existing topics. As an example, teaching leadership in SEE was already recommended by Tracey and Phillips (2007), but its meaning steadily evolved

towards community and transformational leadership in the early 2010s (Litzky et al., 2010) and subsequently to servant leadership (Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017). Extracts discussing the concepts and their importance for SEE are considered cues of sense-making and convening by agents of change (see Table 1). Moreover, sense-making inside the SEE ecosystem can trigger new disturbances in others, which can be considered revolt effects. See, for instance, Rae (2010), who suggests that mainstream EE could also benefit from a conversation on “social value creation”.

Note that we considered sense-making excerpts as “release cues” when the verbatim reflects convening at a conceptual level. Once it includes actual practices and experimentation with learners, we coded the verbatim as part of the reorganization phase, which is about attempts to articulate an inchoate curriculum into a more coherent whole through recombination strategies: experimentation with promising ideas, the search for expertise and resources and the dismissal of loose ideas (Allen et al., 2014; Westley et al., 2013). Typical cues include descriptions of teaching experiments and the emergence of partnership. Inputs coming from other communities are coded as remember effects. As an example, Parris and McInnis-Bowers (2017) show how innovation labs were adopted by SE teachers as learning environments where SE students could work on their empathy skills. The outcome of our analysis is thus the emerging teaching objectives of the SEE community.

Finally, the exploitation phase is about leveraging strategies from agents of change. We looked for cues about resource accumulation as well as efforts to secure institutional and political support in the service of the “new normal”. See, for instance, Thomsen et al. (2018), where the authors call for a more authentic transition of universities as a way to provide SE students with a meaningful environment.

Through this analysis, we can grasp the evolution of the SEE research community. We searched for disturbances (conservation), emergent topics and concepts (release), experimentation and elaboration of practices (reorganization) and finally recommendations to institutionalize these changes (exploitation). Likewise, we looked for potential revolt or remember effects, thereby pinpointing interrelations and influences between ecosystems. In the next section, we present our findings.

4. Results

The results are organized as follows. First, we narrate the emergence of relevant themes from the SEE literature. For each emerging theme, we explore the scientific conversation around its release and its reorganization in terms of teaching objectives and associated learning practices. Then, we briefly describe SEE leveraging strategies in the exploitation phase, revealing the way members

of the ecosystem are attempting to institutionalize their practices inside universities and business schools.

4.1. Emergent Topics and Reorganization

At the heart of our approach lies the idea that the SEE research community got together to become a resilient ecosystem in the grip of disturbances. Our analysis suggests that this ecosystem was born out of a revolt effect coming from the literature in mainstream EE. This occurred when Tracey and Phillips (2007) noted that the *Academy of Management Learning and Education* (AMLE) special issue on entrepreneurship education omitted the inclusion of social entrepreneurship as a key topic. The authors produced a disturbance by questioning the status quo in the EE ecosystem — in this case, the absence of publication about SEE in AMLE. Their article signaled that SEE scholars, already practicing to meet students' demands (Worsham, 2012), had to develop their own research ecosystem and elaborate their own paradigms. This action shed light on authors' voices about their SEE practices. It transforms initial rejection by the mainstream EE ecosystem — such as the rejection experienced by Greg Dees (Worsham, 2012) — into a window of opportunity for developing their own community (Westley et al., 2013).

In response to the initial disturbance by Tracey and Phillips (2007), the SEE community began to federate and engage in a scientific conversation about its three key challenges, namely, managing accountability, double bottom line and identity (Tracey and Phillips, 2007).

4.1.1. Managing Accountability & Stakeholders

Tracey and Phillips (2007) recommend focusing on managing accountability by encouraging students to develop positive relationships with a wide variety of stakeholders. Based on our analysis, we found that authors in our dataset translated this concern into two main topics: impact measurement through system thinking and gaining legitimacy through partnerships.

System thinking quickly gains traction in the literature. Authors such as Weber (2012) and Ebrahim (2012) stress the importance of system thinking to help them understand how to make a real impact and keep track of it. This perspective recognizes that structural and institutional factors play a role in social injustice by marginalizing certain groups of people (Neal, 2017). Furthermore, it urges lecturers to develop students' critical thinking to help them better grasp and address those macro-level factors (Driver, 2012; Kwong et al., 2012). It encourages students to not simply take actions in favor of a minority but to change the system that led to social injustice. Specifically, it is about acquiring a change-

maker mindset (Alden Rivers et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2012) that favors impact through collective actions and helps in deconstructing the myth of the “heroic entrepreneur” (Fowler et al., 2019; McCarver and Jessup, 2010; Pache and Chowdhury, 2012). This system thinking approach also influenced authors such as Parris and McInnis-Bowers (2017) who suggest to reframe “competition” into “replication” at the service of a greater impact at the system level (Elmes et al., 2012; Rae, 2010). Mueller et al. (2011) even suggest a revolt effect targeting the mainstream EE ecosystem and urge their colleagues from EE to enlarge their definition of value creation by taking the whole system into consideration.

To reorganize teaching around those emerging topics, educators invite students to experiment with various pedagogical practices, such as reading inspiring books (Miller et al., 2012), practicing individual internal deliberation on personal values/beliefs and social concerns, engaging in collective debates, facilitated dialogues, challenging discussions and collective problem explorations (Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010), experimenting practical methods to create and evaluate environmental/social mission metrics (Smith et al., 2012), watching video showcases or other material created by field actors (Zietsma and Tuck, 2012), and interacting in interdisciplinary teams (Thomsen et al., 2021) with the use of simulation activities (Klapper and Farber, 2016). In the field, students also learn by observing volunteer work and activist groups (Scheiber, 2016), by working in teams on real-world problems or by acting as consultants on service-learning programs. Through these field practices, they collect data and develop learning about social impact and its measurement (Jensen, 2014; Terjesen et al., 2016).

Given the convening about “system thinking” and its reorganization in terms of reflexivity, we formulate the 1st objective as follows:

Teaching Objective 1: Raise Students’ Awareness about Complex Processes Leading to Social Injustice and Environmental Degradation

The conversation about managing accountability also triggered the emergence of another theme: the study of partnerships to generate legitimacy for social entrepreneurs, thus enabling impact and accountability. Some authors recommend a culture of dialogue, emotional intelligence, and meaningful engagement in a community (Kickul et al., 2010; Litzky et al., 2010). Other authors such as Howorth et al. (2012) or Plaskoff (2012) discuss the added-value of situated learning (Lave and Wenger, 1991), where learning takes place in a context and among and through other people. They focus on the importance of active listening skills as well as humility (Miller et al., 2012; Obrecht, 2016; Worsham, 2012). Related concepts are the need for an environment of trust (Howorth et al., 2012; Nandan and London, 2013), multidiscipline (Kickul et al., 2012a; Lans et al., 2014) and multicultural competencies (Kwong et al., 2012; Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010).

To address those emerging themes, the SEE literature suggests that both team assignment and constructive collaboration with communities should be central.

Through SE team projects, students learn to deal with a diversity of views (Kickul et al., 2010) and may integrate other disciplines (Jensen, 2014). To guide them, educators may propose exercises that work on emotional intelligence (Worsham, 2012) as well as use peer assessment (Zhu et al., 2016). To interact with local communities, teachers experiment with different tools associated with situated learning: service learning, problem-based approaches, consulting projects, community observations, taskforce meetings, interview and social entrepreneur shadowing, mentorship by community leaders, social business incubation sessions, social business plan competitions and empathy safari internships (Chang et al., 2014a; 2014b; Mueller et al., 2011; Ngui et al., 2017). In these learning contexts, students develop self-expression, self-actualization, interpersonal skills and meaningful engagement in their communities (Litzky et al., 2010). They are trained in normative competences (Halberstadt et al., 2019), where respectful listening and humility are success factors to build on what emerges from the collective (Worsham, 2012). This also allows the construction of a community of practice by sharing norms, tools, and field stakeholders' traditions (Jensen, 2014).

To prepare this fieldwork and to help students better understand the norms, values and predominant practices for each sector (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012), courses may include ecosystem mapping exercises (Kickul et al., 2012a), deep analysis of stakeholders, role-playing exercises (Kickul et al., 2012b), storytelling (Lawrence et al., 2012; Plaskoff, 2012) and live and video meetings with external stakeholders and partners (Hockerts, 2018; Thomsen et al., 2018). Then, students share their creative solutions with the community to see how the social businesses respond to their proposal (Plaskoff, 2012), thereby triggering dialogue with members of the community.

Given the conversation about accountability and the central role of community engagement at the service of this emerging theme, we formulate the 2nd objective as follows:

Teaching Objective 2: Reinforce Students' Culture of Dialogue and Potential for Networking

4.1.2. Managing the Double Bottom Line & Tensions

Tracey and Phillips (2007)'s second recommendation is about managing the double bottom line and the associated tensions between social and commercial goals. We observed that the SEE literature makes sense of this challenge by convening on two complementary topics: managing the triple bottom line and innovation.

First, the topic rapidly shifted from the double to the triple bottom line (Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010) by including both social and environmental concerns (Kickul et al., 2010). However, this shift did not change the early focus on tensions that dominated the conversation. From 2007 to 2012, this topic was associated with dark concepts such as mission drift, business failure and crisis (Mueller et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2008). Then, authors such as Miller et al. (2012) explicitly called for a more optimistic attitude. They suggested that hybridity is the distinctive challenge of SEE (Al Taji and Bengo, 2019; Mitra et al., 2019) and should be considered an opportunity to develop specific learning objectives for SE students, such as developing optimism and hopefulness.

Accordingly, issues about conflicting logics are turned into a focus on hybridity and bridging logics (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012): adopting an abundance mentality (Smith et al., 2012) as well as harmonious systems of contained conflicts (Zhu et al., 2016). Interestingly, we observed that the controversy about tensions vs. bridging logics also favors revolt effects towards mainstream EE. See, for instance, Rae (2010), who calls upon EE researchers to better integrate social and environmental goal pursuit in their curriculum.

To address the triple bottom line in the classroom, Sara Harris invited students to engage in narrative practices such as storytelling and role-playing (Plaskoff, 2012). According to her, narratives are powerful tools to prepare students to manage the “triple bottom line” because they engage students’ minds, rational understanding and hearts in an immersive learning experience. Indeed, preparing students’ bridging skills is crucial before sending them into the field (Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017; Howorth et al., 2012). This is in line with Toledano (2020) who uses religious parables to teach dilemmas for social entrepreneurs. See also Shockley and Frank (2010: p. 769) who use the mythical figure of Aeneas to put “*into fictional and imaginative practice elements of Schumpeterian and Kirznerian entrepreneurship theory*” while at the same time illustrating the community orientation and private sacrifice for public benefit that, according to them, characterized SE.

Furthermore, students may experiment with facilitated discussion, reflective exercises (Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017) and divergent thinking exercises to acknowledge that there are multiple solutions to a problem (Smith et al., 2012). Teachers use both scientific reading and practitioners’ case studies (see, for instance, Caseplace.org by the Aspen Institute) (Chang et al., 2014a; Miller et al., 2012) to sustain an abundance mentality and learn about paradoxical thinking: accepting, differentiating and integrating competing demands (Smith et al., 2012). Successful case studies illustrate innovative hybrid strategies, while failures are associated with the incapacity of bridging logics (Chang et al., 2014b; Pache and Chowdhury, 2012).

Case studies are also opportunities for the development of moral imperative and ethics (Hockerts, 2018) as students question their beliefs about others’ behaviors (Baden and Parkes, 2013). Then, by going “on the field” through

service learning, entrepreneur shadowing, volunteering days and internships, students have the opportunity to experiment with logic combinations (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012) and to internalize their moral compass in professional settings. However, authors acknowledge difficulties when students are confronted with real-life struggles and recommend sharing an “optimistic attitude”, notably by helping students overcome obstacles and by communicating hopefulness (Kummitha and Majumdar, 2015; Miller et al., 2012).

Given the convening on the triple bottom line, which shifted from tension to hybridity, as well as the importance of internalizing a moral compass when managing said hybridity, we formulate a 3rd teaching objective:

Teaching Objective 3: Train Students to Shift Rapidly from Analytical Modes to Emotional Modes that Engage their Feelings and Value System

As SEE members attempted to make sense of the triple bottom line, another key challenge emerged: developing an empathic entrepreneurial intention (Hockerts, 2018; Zhu et al., 2016) and avoiding a paternalistic posture that could be more destructive than constructive (Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017). To better understand how empathy can be put at the service of a SE project, educators turn to social innovation (Weber, 2012), effectual principles (Yusuf and Sloan, 2015) and design thinking (Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017).

Some authors even called for partnership with other ecosystems to develop social and sustainable innovative projects. As expressed by Frances Westley, “*Some aspects of innovation theories are directly transferable from technical to social innovation including aspects of creation and diffusion*” (Weber, 2012: p. 417). Answering her call, members of the SEE ecosystem turned to innovation studies (García-Morales et al., 2020; Rozenes and Kukliansky, 2014), the environmental sciences (Lans et al., 2014) and the public sector (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012) to reorganize their teaching practice and to empower students with creativity and innovation.

Students learn to craft solutions that support communities (Jensen, 2014; Kickul et al., 2010) by combining technological competences and soft skills. Remember effects from these ecosystems reinforce the importance of interdisciplinarity for social innovation (Weber, 2012). Innovation labs and design-thinking courses are experimented with as learning environments where students suspend judgment and develop their empathy skills to envision new possibilities of action (Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017). These teaching proposals inspired by other ecosystems are then combined with extant resources of the SEE ecosystem. As an example, Kickul et al. (2012a) show how students can continue to develop their ideas by collaborating with social innovation incubators. Likewise, Yunus Center, workshop and labs are presented as key partners for the education of young social entrepreneurs (Lawrence et al., 2012). Of course, traditional EE is also a source of inputs to sustain creativity and

innovation. In particular, effectual principles (see Sarasvathy, 2001) are presented as key in the early phases of a student project (Kummitha and Majumdar, 2015; Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017; Yusuf and Sloan, 2015), while causal principles are applied to make decisions about the system, structure and process (Kummitha and Majumdar, 2015).

Given the importance of creativity and innovation as tools for managing teams and for elaborating a social business model, we formulate the 4th objective as follows:

Teaching Objective 4: Empower Students with Creativity and Innovation to Open up New Possibilities of Action

4.1.3. Managing Identity & Leadership

Finally, Tracey and Phillips (2007) suggested that managing identity was a key topic for the nascent SEE community and recommended focusing on leadership.

We observe that the conversation first convened about what scholars meant by “identity”. Identity was framed as a duality, such as the “commercial” vs. “social” enterprises (Smith et al., 2008) or even the professional vs. personal identity (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012) of the social entrepreneurs. It slowly turned to a more complex understanding of the social entrepreneur’s identity, which is based on a continuum of personal moral values, beliefs and sense of ethics in a professional situation (Plaskoff, 2012). Researchers such as Jensen (2014) or Zhu et al. (2016) called for social identity theory (see Tajfel and Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (see Turner et al., 1987) to nudge students towards an SE identity via reflective thinking.

To support students in understanding and shaping their emerging identity as social entrepreneurs (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012), the SEE ecosystem has experimented with various tools, from the selection of like-minded students (Smith et al., 2008) and team-building events (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012) to more elaborate methods such as the use of reflective journals (Litzky et al., 2010; Zhu et al., 2016), wikis and reflective logs (Chang et al., 2014b), alone or in groups (Nandan and London, 2013; Spais and Beheshti, 2016). Building on effectuation theory, authors suggest that projects are more effective if students elaborate their opportunities based on their own personality, competences and networks (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012; Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017). According to Chang et al. (2014b), reflective tools allow for the questioning of student thinking and motivations and keeping written traces of this reflective process. By doing so, students analyse their ability to apply the course concepts to other contexts and consider how their entrepreneurial encounters transformed their lives, careers and opinions about both SE itself and the prospect of becoming a social entrepreneur (Baden and Parkes, 2013; Chang et al., 2014a).

Behind identity transformation lies the development of self-efficacy as a key element of identity (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). Several authors such as Plaskoff (2012), Tiwari et al. (2017) and Cadenas et al. (2020) have explored how students can learn to act as social entrepreneurs and gradually perceive their self-efficacy (see Bandura, 1997) through a transformative learning process (Spais and Beheshti, 2016). They observe that the likelihood of project success and its observable social impact both positively influence the student's self-efficacy. This is tricky since societal problems might be perceived as so immense that students may question their ability to have an impact (Hockerts, 2015; 2018). Likewise, emotional bonds with the project and personal experience with the problem tackle have a stronger influence on identity perception and self-efficacy (Hockerts, 2017). As such, consulting projects may not be the most effective way to improve identity and self-efficacy, but they are considered a good starting point for new instructors in SEE (Smith and Woodworth, 2012).

Interestingly, writing biographies of social entrepreneurs also helps in sustaining identity work by deepening students' identity repertoire (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). Narrative practices encourage students to identify the salient attributes that characterize the members of this community. In other words, students build a prototypical vision of the community as a social category. If this exercise includes interviews, it also provides students with opportunities to be introduced to a legitimate member in the SEE community (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). This is in line with Pache and Chowdhury (2012), who suggest that the community facilitates identity work by sending positive feedback through kick-off and closing seminars, regular social events and networking with alumni. Beyond simply having a vicarious experience, students become legitimate practitioners by engaging in the negotiation of shared repertoires with more experienced community members via storytelling and socialization processes (Plaskoff, 2012).

Given the elaboration about identity work through reflexive practices, we formulate the 5th objective as follows:

Teaching Objective 5: *Develop Students' Reflective Capacity about their Identity and Identity Transformation*

In parallel, the community convened about Tracey and Phillips (2007)'s call to study leadership. Its position balanced between a prerequisite to SE (Kickul et al., 2012b), to an associated topic (for instance, a "Social Entrepreneurship & Leadership" course, see Litzky et al., 2010), and even to a specific topic in the SEE courses (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012; Worsham, 2012). Many suggestions were made, such as a focus on community leadership, transformational leadership (Litzky et al., 2010), paradoxical leadership (Smith et al., 2012), servant leadership (Parris and McInnis-Bowers, 2017) and responsible leadership

(Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017), which enlarged leaders' influence by considering all external stakeholders.

However, very few examples of practices have been documented so far, suggesting that reorganization might still be a work in progress. As an exception, Litzky et al. (2010) show how they simulated hierarchical positions by mixing teams of high school and graduate students in the context of service-learning projects.


Interestingly, the SEE literature also mentions extant resources that are available inside the ecosystem, thereby providing a fruitful basis for reorganization. As an example, Kickul et al. (2012b) describe how the Grameen Creative Lab Workshop can provide leadership training. Likewise, Parris and McInnis-Bowers (2017) suggest using U Theory and tools and resources developed by the Presencing Institute (presencing.org) to achieve this objective. Awaysheh and Bonfiglio (2017) also describe how students have access to programs such as the Emzingo group, where students interact with peers, beneficiaries, social entrepreneurs and potential investors to develop their leadership skills (Hockerts, 2018).

As such, we conclude that the conceptual conversation about leadership turned into relatively poor experimentations and practices. Instead, SE educators invite students to build on collective resources to work together to reach their goals. For this reason, we formulate the 6th objective as follows:

Teaching Objective 6: *Engage Students to Mobilize Collective Effort to Produce Social and Environmental Changes*

In Fig. 3, we present a synthetic view of the six overarching teaching objectives emerging from our analysis and reflecting the reorganization of the SEE literature around convened themes. Next, we turn to the exploitation phase, i.e. the leveraging strategies that agents devise to establish the emerging set of ideas as the “new normal” (Westley et al., 2013).

Figure 3. Overarching teaching objectives emerging from the reorganization of the SEE literature



4.2. Optimization of Resources and Institutionalization in the Exploitation Phase

Because the SEE ecosystem is born out of a revolt effect and might continue to encounter multiple challenges (Austin and Rangan, 2019), we also looked for cues about the accumulation of resources and the search for institutional and political support. As synthesized in Table 2, we found evidence of three different arenas of institutionalization: the university, the business school and the faculty members.

Table 2. Main leveraging strategies in the exploitation phase

Exploitation phase	
Level	Main Leveraging Strategies
University	To develop external and internal partnerships.
Business school	To change the meta message in hidden curricula. To be open to other field paradigms.
Faculty members	To apply self-examination and question their assumptions about their practices. To develop meaningful teaching by engaging in collaboration with others.

4.2.1. Looking for Institutional Support at the University Level

The university (and its leadership) has an important role in facilitating the success and long-term viability of SEE educators' initiatives. SEE authors acknowledge this issue and address recommendations to universities. For instance, Thomsen et al. (2018) call for a more authentic engagement of universities as a way to provide SE students with a meaningful environment. Austin and Rangan (2019) highlight the importance of leadership succession to make sure that extant initiatives are not depleted.

Another major theme is the negotiation for the university's commitment to develop partnerships (Kickul et al., 2012a; Plaskoff, 2012), both internally and externally. First, SEE members look for university support to promote internal partnership and, in particular, the organization of multidisciplinary courses (Elmes et al., 2012). Students' engagement in cross-disciplinary work is identified as a driver to consolidate the collaboration of all actors in the university. Student energy is characterized as contagious and an excellent bottom-up leverage to break silos (Thomsen et al., 2018). Second, external partnerships are called for as it echoes the collaborative stance advocated in SEE, thereby providing increased legitimacy. Stronger partnerships between the university and external stakeholders would put educators in a better position to address their teaching mission (Cinar, 2019; Moss and Gras, 2012). As an example, Kickul et al. (2012a) argue that building strong partnerships improves the quality of students' immersion while learning by doing in the field.

However, it means that lecturers may have to give less priority to their personal agendas and focus on their partners' needs (Zamora, 2012). This is tricky because some partners might have hidden agendas or favor a paternalistic posture rather than a truly empathic entrepreneurial intention (Worsham, 2012). Indeed, an issue highlighted by Spais and Beheshti (2016) is the difficulty for students to apply "system thinking" in practice and to grasp the complex relationships that influence their SE project. They make two important suggestions. First, the authors call for revealing the hidden agendas that could influence students' initiatives. Second, they recommend teaching about multiscale governance and the way each level of governance (local, regional, national) influences the others. By offering institutionalized support, the university would help educators

carefully select partners and fields of experimentation, which requires time investment and multidisciplinary competencies, such as conventional teaching, coaching, and business liaison (Chang et al., 2014a).

4.2.2. Looking for Institutional Support at the Business School Level

In a business school context, SE students might experience negative emotions related to their entrepreneurial identity. As an example, SEE students must shift from a business school paradigm of an individualistic, positivistic, rational learning philosophy to build their own communities of practices, notably with regard to bridging logics (Plaskoff, 2012). Likewise, students might face peer pressure, the initial expectations of their family, societal expectations (see, for instance, the Financial Times ranking of business schools, which includes the yearly earnings by young graduates) and even their own doubts when managing the various norms and values that coexist in SE (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012).

As such, Hockerts (2018) recommended that if business schools want to improve students' sense of moral and societal responsibility, they must change the meta message in their hidden curricula because these messages convey implicit and embedded norms. As an illustration, a business school background encourages students to be confident, assertive, analytical, action oriented and problem solvers, while dealing with field communities requires the opposite: listening, empathy and humility (Worsham, 2012). This adaptation of the general context in business schools is also an important signal for its partners outside and within the university.

4.2.3. Looking for Institutional Support among Peers

Two main topics are discussed in terms of efforts to facilitate SEE practices among business school faculty members. The first focuses on the difficulties of finding teaching material about creative models and solutions (Moss and Gras, 2012). As shown in the previous sections, some authors have already started to respond to this request by developing more case studies (Austin and Rangan, 2019) and encouraging educators to develop collaborations with other fields such as innovation, sustainable development education, and field practitioners (Chand and Misra, 2009; Weber, 2012). Because collaborations are still the exception rather than the norm, authors such as Thomsen et al. (2018) are still calling for its generalization.


Second, some authors call for more reflective practices by teachers themselves. Indeed, SE educators' self-examination, along with the questioning of their own assumptions and practices, could be seen as a prerequisite for educators who help students grasp complex societal factors. Again, collaborations

between fields should facilitate this process (Kummitha and Majumdar, 2015; Spais and Beheshti, 2016).

5. Discussion

As suggested by Snyder (2019), narrative reviews can contribute to the literature by providing a historical overview of the topic and, thereby, detecting themes, theoretical perspectives and common issues within the emerging scholarship. Furthermore, by using the “panarchy” model as an ecological prism for our narratives, we re-present scientific productions as patterned and unique outcome variations that emerge through context-based interactions between communities. This prism highlights not only the “what” of scientific development (emerging themes) but also “how” those themes emerged. Therefore, our contribution is twofold. First, we bring a methodological contribution by elaborating on a socio-ecological view of research communities and proposing the ecological narrative review as a promising method for literature review. Our analysis grid can help researchers operationalize a narrative exploration of their literature in entrepreneurship and beyond. Second, we contribute to the literature on SEE with the identification of a consistent SEE curriculum around six teaching objectives, as well as three arenas of institutionalization: the university, the business school and the faculty members (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. A literature review of SEE and its resilient cycle in four phases



In this discussion, we take stock of the controversies that remain salient in SEE and suggest a few paths to address them. We also reflect on our methodological contribution by drawing its limits.

First, we claim that an important controversy focuses on the scope of the SEE ecosystem (Bridge, 2015). On the one hand, some authors, such as Rae (2010) and Mueller et al. (2011) suggest that SEE is no longer a distinct ecosystem. In particular, Mueller et al. (2011) encourage entrepreneurship researchers to enlarge their conception of value creation, to generalize impact measurement and, more broadly, to question the boundaries between the two ecosystems as a way to “rethink” mainstream business and economics.

On the other hand, some authors consider the boundaries still relevant but suggest that some learning targets, such as emotional intelligence, empathy, creativity, communication and interpersonal skills, are prerequisites to SEE (Zhu et al., 2016) and thus are not central or specific to it (Kickul et al., 2012a). Instead, authors seem to converge on bridging skills as the key distinctive feature of SEE (Mitra et al., 2019), which we formulated as “Teaching objective 3 - Train students to shift rapidly from analytical mode to emotional mode that engages their feelings and value system” (Spais and Beheshti, 2016). In line with this central objective, Miller et al. (2012) suggest that optimism and hopefulness are keys for balancing multiple imperatives and rationalities inside social ventures. As a result, we suggest that an important challenge in SEE will be to deepen our understanding of hopefulness and optimism in relation to hybrid organizing. By elaborating on the specific role of hope in SEE, authors might clarify the boundaries of the ecosystem.

Second, and in spite of Miller et al. (2012)’s call, we observed that few research looks at the role of emotions in the development of bridging skills. Extant studies focus primarily on empathy (Bacq and Alt, 2018; Tiwari et al., 2022) as a driver of social entrepreneurship intention. However, other prosocial emotions might be at play such as hope, (self-focused) anger and (other-focused) outrage. Especially, anger is sometimes considered as an irrational emotion that we should dismiss when making decisions. However, anger is also a cue that something important is at stake, hinting towards the values of the individual. We thus call for a better understanding of anger and outrage as contributing to the development of bridging skills. Here, we identify two possible paths of action. First, there is an opportunity to draw on the psychology of collective action and emotions (Bouchat et al., 2020; Landmann and Rohmann, 2020; Rimé et al., 2020; Thomas et al., 2009; 2020). Second, we call for more studies about narrative practices that help to contextualize struggles for the individual and their teams (see Lawrence and Maitlis, 2012). However, it also calls for developing support for students (and training for teachers) as such practices could be emotionally burdensome. Here, teaching practices from sustainable development education would certainly help (see for instance Brower, 2011).

Third, we identify a controversy about the management of identity through leadership. Our analysis proposes that the rich conceptual conversation about leadership turned into relatively poor experimentations and practices, as if researchers were stuck in the release phase. To explain this phenomenon, we suggest that the conversation about identity largely engaged with the topics about system thinking (social entrepreneurs as “change maker” inside a system) but missed the opportunity to engage with identity work at the organizational level. We also observed that the concepts used to discuss identity and leadership often focus on individualistic concepts such as self-efficacy rather than communal and/or collective constructs.

As an example, organizational identity is absent from the SEE scientific conversation despite its salience for hybrid organizing (Dentoni et al., 2018). Exceptions are Smith et al. (2008) and more recently Mitra et al. (2019), who suggest that reflecting on the venture’s identity and dual mission is a distinctive challenge for social entrepreneurs. By exploring the role of team identity, researchers and educators could unpack new leadership skills. Likewise, self-efficacy is highlighted as the key concept in managing students’ identity, even though work in collective action suggests that team or collective efficacy might be relevant (Thomas et al., 2020). By focusing on self-efficacy alone, the SEE ecosystem might be missing some important insights related to the regulation of collectives (Landmann and Rohmann, 2020). In short, we suggest that SEE researchers did not perfectly break away from their mainstream entrepreneurship legacy and missed opportunities to learn from other ecosystems. We thus call for a new release phase that makes sense of the role of individuals inside hybrid teams (and systems) and for a subsequent reorganization of relevant teaching practices.

Beyond these controversies, our analysis brings to light a global vision of the heritages and influences that feed the six objectives of SEE. Thereby, we hope to open a critical discussion on the methods and contents used or not by SEE. The six objectives highlighted and put on paper are emerging from years of experimentations as currently found in the scientific literature and we expect that in light of them some researchers and educators will be challenged and will complement, discuss and renegotiate our contribution.

To conclude the discussion, we also consider the limits of this review. We follow Gond et al. (2020) who suggest that literature reviews are performative tasks, which entail a dual movement of “re-presenting” (building our own account of the literature) and “intervening” (adding to this literature and eventually proposing a trajectory for its evolution). Using Gond et al. (2020) as a guideline, we reflected on our choices and identified the following limits.

First, we decided to consider the SEE research community as a single ecosystem. While our analysis highlights rich influences from interconnected communities, it also contributes to the reification of SEE as a separate entity from, for instance, non-profit management education (Mirabella and Young,

2012) or sustainable and eco-entrepreneurship education (Lans et al., 2014). Consequently, it might also contribute to its invisibilization. Through another representation of the literature that focuses specifically on non-profit management education, the triple-bottom line or eco-entrepreneurship, we might have been able to better narrate the frictions, synergies or neglects coming from the confrontation of business, social and environmental goals.

Second, we decided to narrate the evolution of SEE from the perspective of business schools, as reflected in our research questions and design. It allows us to identify the sources of inspiration that researchers and educators drew upon and thus its possible vulnerabilities. However, this choice keeps in the dark other research traditions that might stimulate interesting development and are not part of the ABS list. See for instance the interesting work in nursing education (Berland, 2017) and social worker education (Berzin, 2012). We thus call for future work that fully engages in that endeavour. Likewise, we acknowledge that using only English papers (together with using the ABS list as quality control) excludes rich scholar traditions, notably research published in Spanish and French. We call for meta-narratives that unpack cultural differences stemming from our various communities.

Finally, we focused on a “re-presentation” of the teaching practices in SEE and their related — sometimes implicit — objectives. According to Biggs (2003), constructive alignment would also take into account the assessment of such objectives, for instance in terms of competence acquisition. However, we have to acknowledge that, up until recently, only few articles are focusing on the operationalization of SE skills and competences. Instead, SE self-efficacy and intention seem to be the overarching indicators of performance, just like in mainstream entrepreneurship education (Nabi et al., 2017). Recent exceptions are Capella-Peris et al. (2020) and García-González and Ramírez-Montoya (2020) about SE competencies as well as Mora et al. (2020) about digital skills needed for social businesses. We thus call for alternative “re-presentations” focusing on constructive alignment (Biggs, 2003) as well as more empirical work on the evaluation techniques mobilized in SEE.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we provide an overview of the SEE literature since Tracey and Phillips (2007)’s “revolt” from mainstream entrepreneurship education and call for action. Our contribution is twofold. First, we present the ecological narrative review as a promising method for literature review. We provide researchers and educators with an original analysis grid that might help them to grasp controversies, main topics of interest and evolutions across time and space in their research communities and found in the literature. Second, we identify a consistent

SEE curriculum around six teaching objectives, as well as three arenas of institutionalization: the university, the business school and the faculty members.

We find that researchers and educators from the SEE ecosystem imported elements from other ecosystems, such as “system thinking” and “multidisciplinary teamwork” from environmental sciences, “design thinking” from innovation studies and “effectual principles” and “self-efficacy” from mainstream EE. In other words, we narrate how scholars fleshed out the three challenges of SEE identified by Tracey and Phillips (2007): managing accountability, managing the double bottom line, and managing identity.

In doing so, we also highlight the possible vulnerabilities in the SEE curriculum that researchers and educators could address further through new release phases and the reorganization of the dominant design. Our analysis suggests that teaching the organisational level of SE offers opportunities for future contributions. When managing identity, we call for a renewed focus on collective efficacy and collective identity. When managing hybridity, we call for the exploration of emotions such as hope, anger and outrage as drivers of collective action and educational levers for SEE. Because talking about emotions touches on the sensibilities of our students and teaching staffs, we also encourage studies that would focus on the transformational intent of SEE and its possible adverse effects on teachers and students alike.

Finally, we suggest some ideas and recommendations to support the institutionalisation of SEE. Our analysis contributes to unveiling leveraging strategies where agents are trying to set a “new normal” (Westley et al., 2013) for SEE. We found recommendations for universities to develop external and internal partnerships, for business schools to introspect their core message and open up to new paradigms, and for faculty members to be reflexive and collaborative. We now draw the attention of policy makers to the fact that their voice is underrepresented in the ecosystem narrative (Thomsen et al., 2018). We invite them to consider certain initiatives they could take on the issues at stake. For instance, to enable students to benefit from what can be learned through SEE, public authorities should consider supporting its institutionalisation. Regarding partnership in developing SE learning-by-doing initiatives, funding programs could reward both parties for the time spent to bridge educational and field collaborations. To extend the development of a meaningful learning environment, they could convey discourses and actions that reinforce the use of SEE paradigms in people and organisations’ lives. An example will be to take into account the triple bottom line when incubators select projects. Policies could also promote a collaborative vision of society where, from an early age, students’ SE initiatives would find a place to take part in the challenge of building tomorrow’s society.

References:

- Al Taji, F.N.A. and Bengo, I. (2019), "The Distinctive Managerial Challenges of Hybrid Organizations: Which Skills Are Required?", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10(3): 328-345.
- Alden Rivers, B., Armellini, A. and Nie, M. (2015), "Embedding Social Innovation and Social Impact across the Disciplines: Identifying 'Changemaker' Attributes", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 5(3): 242-257.
- Allen, C.R., Angeler, D.G., Garmestani, A.S., Gunderson, L.H. and Holling, C.S. (2014), "Panarchy: Theory and Application", *Ecosystems*, 17(4): 578-589.
- Austin, J. and Rangan, V.K. (2019), "Reflections on 25 Years of Building Social Enterprise Education", *Social Enterprise Journal*, 15(1): 2-21.
- Awaysheh, A. and Bonfiglio, D. (2017), "Leveraging Experiential Learning to Incorporate Social Entrepreneurship in MBA Programs: A Case Study", *International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2): 332-349.
- Bacq, S. and Alt, E. (2018), "Feeling Capable and Valued: A Prosocial Perspective on the Link between Empathy and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(3): 333-350.
- Baden, D. and Parkes, C. (2013), "Experiential Learning: Inspiring the Business Leaders of Tomorrow", *Journal of Management Development*, 32(3): 295-308.
- Baker, T. and Nelson, R.E. (2005), "Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3): 329-366.
- Bandura, A. (1997), *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Berland, A. (2017), "A 'Do-It-Yourself' Approach to International Nursing Education", *American Journal of Nursing*, 117(10): 56-60.
- Berzin, S.C. (2012), "Where Is Social Work in the Social Entrepreneurship Movement?", *Social Work*, 57(2): 185-188.
- Biggs, J. (2003), "Aligning Teaching for Constructing Learning", *Higher Education Academy*, 1(4): 1-4.
- Bouchat, P., Rimé, B., Van Eycken, R. and Nils, F. (2020), "The Virtues of Collective Gatherings: A Study on the Positive Effects of a Major Scouting Event", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 50(3): 189-201.
- Bridge, S. (2015), "Is Enterprise Education Relevant to Social Enterprise?", *Education + Training*, 57(8-9): 1009-1019.
- Brower, H.H. (2011), "Sustainable Development through Service Learning: A Pedagogical Framework and Case Example in a Third World Context", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1): 58-76.
- Cadenas, G.A., Cantú, E.A., Lynn, N., Spence, T. and Ruth, A. (2020), "A Programmatic Intervention to Promote Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, Critical Behavior, and Technology Readiness among Underrepresented College Students", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116: article 103350.
- Capella-Peris, C., Gil-Gómez, J., Martí-Puig, M. and Ruiz-Bernardo, P. (2020), "Development and Validation of a Scale to Assess Social Entrepreneurship Competency in Higher Education", *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 18(2): 219-228.
- Chand, V.S. and Misra, S. (2009), "Teachers as Educational-Social Entrepreneurs: The Innovation-Social Entrepreneurship Spiral", *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 18(2): 219-228.
- Chang, J., Benamraoui, A. and Rieple, A. (2014a), "Learning-by-Doing as an Approach to Teaching Social Entrepreneurship", *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 51(5): 459-471.
- Chang, J.Y.C., Benamraoui, A. and Rieple, A. (2014b), "Stimulating Learning About Social Entrepreneurship through Income Generation Projects", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 20(5): 417-437.
- Cinar, R. (2019), "Delving into Social Entrepreneurship in Universities: Is It Legitimate Yet?", *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 6(1): 217-232.
- Dentoni, D., Pascucci, S., Poldner, K. and Gartner, W.B. (2018), "Learning 'Who We Are' by Doing: Processes of Co-Constructing Prosocial Identities in Community-Based Enterprises", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(5): 603-622.

- Driver, M. (2012), "An Interview with Michael Porter: Social Entrepreneurship and the Transformation of Capitalism", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 421-431.
- Ebrahim, A. (2012), "Enacting Our Field", *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(1): 13-28.
- Elmes, M.B., Justo, S., Whiteman, G., Hersh, R. and Guthey, G.T. (2012), "Teaching Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation from the Perspective of Place and Place Making", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(4): 533-554.
- Fichter, K. and Tiemann, I. (2018), "Factors Influencing University Support for Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Insights from Explorative Case Studies", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 175: 512-524.
- Folke, C. (2006), "Resilience: The Emergence of a Perspective for Social-Ecological Systems Analyses", *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3): 253-267.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C.S. and Walker, B. (2002), "Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations", *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, 31(5): 437-440.
- Fowler, E.A., Coffey, B.S. and Dixon-Fowler, H.R. (2019), "Transforming Good Intentions into Social Impact: A Case on the Creation and Evolution of a Social Enterprise", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(3): 665-678.
- García-González, A. and Ramírez-Montoya, M.S. (2020), "Social Entrepreneurship Competency in Higher Education: An Analysis Using Mixed Methods",
- García-Morales, V.J., Martín-Rojas, R. & Garde-Sánchez, R. (2020),
- Gaur, A. and Kumar, M. (2018), "A Systematic Approach to Conducting Review Studies: An Assessment of Content Analysis in 25 Years of IB Research", *Journal of World Business*, 53(2): 280-289.
- Gond, J.-P., Mena, S. and Mosonyi, S. (2020), "The Performativity of Literature Reviewing: Constituting the Corporate Social Responsibility Literature through Re-Presentation and Intervention", *Organizational Research Methods*, forthcoming. First published online 9 July 2020.
- Grégoire, D.A., Corbett, A.C. and McMullen, J.S. (2011), "The Cognitive Perspective in Entrepreneurship: An Agenda for Future Research", *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(6): 1443-1477.
- Hakala, H., O'Shea, G., Farny, S. and Luoto, S. (2020), "ReStorying the Business, Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Concepts: The ModelNarrative Review Method", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(1): 10-32.
- Halberstadt, J., Timm, J.-M., Kraus, S. and Gundolf, K. (2019), "Skills and Knowledge Management in Higher Education: How Service Learning Can Contribute to Social Entrepreneurial Competence Development", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(10): 1925-1948.
- Hockerts, K. (2015), "The Social Entrepreneurial Antecedents Scale (Seas): A Validation Study", *Social Enterprise Journal*, 11(3): 260-280.
- Hockerts, K. (2017), "Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1): 105-130.
- Hockerts, K. (2018), "The Effect of Experiential Social Entrepreneurship Education on Intention Formation in Students", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(3): 234-256.
- Holling, C.S. (2001), "Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems", *Ecosystems*, 4(5): 390-405.
- Holling, C.S. and Gunderson, L.H. (2002), "Resilience and Adaptive Cycles". In: Gunderson, L.H. and Holling, C.S. (Eds.), *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems* (pp. 25-62). Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Howorth, C., Smith, S.M. and Parkinson, C. (2012), "Social Learning and Social Entrepreneurship Education", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 371-389.
- Jarrodi, H., Byrne, J. and Bureau, S. (2019), "A Political Ideology Lens on Social Entrepreneurship Motivations", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 31(7-8): 583-604.
- Jensen, T.L. (2014), "A Holistic Person Perspective in Measuring Entrepreneurship Education Impact — Social Entrepreneurship Education at the Humanities", *International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3): 349-364.

- Kickul, J., Griffiths, M. and Bacq, S. (2010), "The Boundaryless Classroom: Extending Social Innovation and Impact Learning to the Field", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17(4): 652-663.
- Kickul, J., Janssen-Selvadurai, C. and Griffiths, M.D. (2012a), "A Blended Value Framework for Educating the Next Cadre of Social Entrepreneurs", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 479-493.
- Kickul, J., Terjesen, S., Bacq, S. and Griffiths, M. (2012b), "Social Business Education: An Interview with Nobel Laureate Muhammad Yunus", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 453-462.
- Klapper, R.G. and Farber, V.A. (2016), "In Alain Gibb's Footsteps: Evaluating Alternative Approaches to Sustainable Enterprise Education (SEE)", *International Journal of Management Education*, 14(3): 422-439.
- Kummitha, R.K.R. and Majumdar, S. (2015), "Dynamic Curriculum Development on Social Entrepreneurship — A Case Study of TISS", *International Journal of Management Education*, 13(3): 260-267.
- Kwong, C.C., Thompson, P. and Cheung, C.W. (2012), "The Effectiveness of Social Business Plan Competitions in Developing Social and Civic Awareness and Participation", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 324-348.
- Landmann, H. and Rohmann, A. (2020), "Being Moved by Protest: Collective Efficacy Beliefs and Injustice Appraisals Enhance Collective Action Intentions for Forest Protection Via Positive and Negative Emotions", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 71: article 101491.
- Lans, T., Blok, V. and Wesselink, R. (2014), "Learning Apart and Together: Towards an Integrated Competence Framework for Sustainable Entrepreneurship in Higher Education", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 62: 37-47.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991), *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, T., Phillips, N. and Tracey, P. (2012), "From the Guest Editors: Educating Social Entrepreneurs and Social Innovators", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 319-323.
- Lawrence, T.B. and Maitlis, S. (2012), "Care and Possibility: Enacting an Ethic of Care through Narrative Practice", *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4): 641-663.
- Lewis, S.C., King, A.D. and Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S.E. (2017), "Defining a New Normal for Extremes in a Warming World", *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 98(6): 1139-1151.
- Litzky, B.E., Godshalk, V.M. and Walton-Bongers, C. (2010), "Social Entrepreneurship and Community Leadership: A Service-Learning Model for Management Education", *Journal of Management Education*, 34(1): 142-162.
- Manring, S.L. (2014), "The Role of Universities in Developing Interdisciplinary Action Research Collaborations to Understand and Manage Resilient Social-Ecological Systems", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 64: 125-135.
- McCarver, D. and Jessup, L. (2010), "Khmer Kraits: A Case Study of Integrating Social Entrepreneurship in Cambodia with Entrepreneurship Education in America", *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 23(2): 225-236.
- McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Snyder, H., Elg, M., Witell, L., Helkkula, A., Hogan, S.J. and Anderson, L. (2017), "The Changing Role of the Health Care Customer: Review, Synthesis and Research Agenda", *Journal of Service Management*, 28(1): 2-33.
- Miller, T.L., Wesley, C.L. and Williams, D.E. (2012), "Educating the Minds of Caring Hearts: Comparing the Views of Practitioners and Educators on the Importance of Social Entrepreneurship Competencies", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 349-370.
- Mirabella, R. and Young, D.R. (2012), "The Development of Education for Social Entrepreneurship and Nonprofit Management: Diverging or Converging Paths?", *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(1): 43-57.
- Mitra, P., Kickul, J., Gundry, L. and Orr, J. (2019), "The Rise of Hybrids: A Note for Social Entrepreneurship Educators", *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 17(2): 107-126.

- Mora, H., Pujol-López, F.A., Mendoza-Tello, J.C. and Morales-Morales, M.R. (2020), "An Education-Based Approach for Enabling the Sustainable Development Gear", *Computers in Human Behavior*, 107: article 105775.
- Moss, T.W. and Gras, D. (2012), "A Review and Assessment of Social Entrepreneurship Textbooks", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 518-527.
- Mueller, S., Nazarkina, L., Volkmann, C. and Blank, C. (2011), "Social Entrepreneurship Research as a Means of Transformation: A Vision for the Year 2028", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 2(1): 112-120.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N. and Walmsley, A. (2017), "The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2): 277-299.
- Nandan, M. and London, M. (2013), "Interdisciplinary Professional Education: Training College Students for Collaborative Social Change", *Education + Training*, 55(8-9): 815-835.
- Neal, M. (2017), "Learning from Poverty: Why Business Schools Should Address Poverty, and How They Can Go About It", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1): 54-69.
- Nga, J.K.H. and Shamuganathan, G. (2010), "The Influence of Personality Traits and Demographic Factors on Social Entrepreneurship Start up Intentions", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2): 259-282.
- Ngui, K.-S., Voon, M.-L. and Lee, M.-H. (2017), "Integrating Community Engagement with Management Education: A Case Study of ENT30014 Social Innovation Internship", *Education + Training*, 59(6): 579-589.
- Obrecht, J.-J. (2016), "Sustainable Entrepreneurship Education: A New Field for Research in Step with the 'Effectual Entrepreneur' ", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 29(1): 83-102.
- Pache, A.-C. and Chowdhury, I. (2012), "Social Entrepreneurs as Institutionally Embedded Entrepreneurs: Toward a New Model of Social Entrepreneurship Education", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 494-510.
- Parris, D.L. and McInnis-Bowers, C. (2017), "Business Not as Usual: Developing Socially Conscious Entrepreneurs and Intrapreneurs", *Journal of Management Education*, 41(5): 687-726.
- Plaskoff, J. (2012), "Building the Heart and the Mind: An Interview with Leading Social Entrepreneur Sarah Harris", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 432-441.
- Rae, D. (2010), "Universities and Enterprise Education: Responding to the Challenges of the New Era", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17(4): 591-606.
- Rimé, B., Bouchat, P., Paquot, L. and Giglio, L. (2020), "Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Social Outcomes of the Social Sharing of Emotion", *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31: 127-134.
- Roundy, P.T. (2017), "Social Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Complementary or Disjoint Phenomena?", *International Journal of Social Economics*, 44(9): 1252-1267.
- Rozenes, S. and Kukliansky, I. (2014), "An Innovative Design Approach to New Service Development Learning Processes", *International Journal of Information Systems in the Service Sector (IJISSS)*, 6(4): 27-39.
- Sadick, M.A., Li, W., Ibn Musah, A.-A., Akeji, A.A.-R.A. and Ud din Khan, H.S. (2019), "The Role of Development Oriented Non-Governmental Organizations in Creating Shared Value in the Educational Sector of Ghana: The Mediating Role of Basic Needs", *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(6): 1297-1318.
- Saebi, T., Foss, N.J. and Linder, S. (2019), "Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises", *Journal of Management*, 45(1): 70-95.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2001), "Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency", *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2): 243-263.
- Schaltegger, S. (2002), "A Framework for Ecopreneurship: Leading Bioneers and Environmental Managers to Ecopreneurship", *Greener Management International*, 38: 45-58.
- Scheiber, L. (2016), "How Social Entrepreneurs in the Third Sector Learn from Life Experiences", *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4): 1694-1717.

- Shockley, G.E. and Frank, P.M. (2010), "Virgil's Aeneas as the Quintessential Social Entrepreneur: Juxtaposing Selections from Epic Poetry and Entrepreneurship Theory to Teach Social Entrepreneurship", *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 23(sup1): 769-784.
- Smith, B.R., Barr, T.F., Barbosa, S.D. and Kickul, J.R. (2008), "Social Entrepreneurship: A Grounded Learning Approach to Social Value Creation", *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 16(4): 339-362.
- Smith, I.H. and Woodworth, W.P. (2012), "Developing Social Entrepreneurs and Social Innovators: A Social Identity and Self-Efficacy Approach", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 390-407.
- Smith, W.K., Besharov, M.L., Wessels, A.K. and Chertok, M. (2012), "A Paradoxical Leadership Model for Social Entrepreneurs: Challenges, Leadership Skills, and Pedagogical Tools for Managing Social and Commercial Demands", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 463-478.
- Snyder, H. (2019), "Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines", *Journal of Business Research*, 104: 333-339.
- Spais, G.S. and Beheshti, H.M. (2016), "The Evolution of Social Marketing and Social Entrepreneurship Education in Business and Management Schools: Conceptions, Misconceptions and Trends", *European Journal of International Management*, 10(4): 422-454.
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979), "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict". In: W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007), "Time for Space: A Narrative Review of Research on Organizational Spaces", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 9(4): 325-346.
- Terjesen, S., Bosma, N. and Stam, E. (2016), "Advancing Public Policy for HighGrowth, Female, and Social Entrepreneurs", *Public Administration Review*, 76(2): 230-239.
- Thomas, E.F., McGarty, C. and Mavor, K.I. (2009), "Transforming 'Apathy into Movement': The Role of Prosocial Emotions in Motivating Action for Social Change", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(4): 310-333.
- Thomas, E.F., Zubielevitch, E., Sibley, C.G. and Osborne, D. (2020), "Testing the Social Identity Model of Collective Action Longitudinally and across Structurally Disadvantaged and Advantaged Groups", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(6): 823-838.
- Thomsen, B., Muurlink, O. and Best, T. (2018), "The Political Ecology of University-Based Social Entrepreneurship Ecosystems", *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 12(2): 199-219.
- Thomsen, B., Muurlink, O. and Best, T. (2021), "Backpack Bootstrapping: Social Entrepreneurship Education through Experiential Learning", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(2): 238-264.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A.K. and Tikoria, J. (2017), "The Role of Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy on Social Entrepreneurial Attitudes and Social Entrepreneurial Intentions", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(2): 165-185.
- Tiwari, P., Bhat, A.K. and Tikoria, J. (2022), "Mediating Role of Prosocial Motivation in Predicting Social Entrepreneurial Intentions", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 13(1): 118-141.
- Toledano, N. (2020), "Promoting Ethical Reflection in the Teaching of Social Entrepreneurship: A Proposal Using Religious Parables", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164(1): 115-132.
- Tracey, P. and Phillips, N. (2007), "The Distinctive Challenge of Educating Social Entrepreneurs: A Postscript and Rejoinder to the Special Issue on Entrepreneurship Education", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2): 264-271.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D. and Wetherell, M.S. (1987), *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R. and Kinzig, A. (2004), "Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-Ecological Systems", *Ecology and Society*, 9(2): article 5.
- Vázquez-Carrasco, R. and López-Pérez, M.E. (2013),
- Weber, J.M. (2012), "Social Innovation and Social Enterprise in the Classroom: Frances Westley on Bringing Clarity and Rigor to Program Design", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 409-418.

- Westley, F. (2013), "Social Innovation and Resilience: How One Enhances the Other", *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11(3): 28-39.
- Westley, F.R., Tjornbo, O., Schultz, L., Olsson, P., Folke, C., Crona, B. and Bodin, Ö. (2013), "A Theory of Transformative Agency in Linked Social-Ecological Systems", *Ecology and Society*, 18(3): article 27.
- Wong, G., Greenhalgh, T., Westhorp, G., Buckingham, J. and Pawson, R. (2013), "Rameses Publication Standards: MetaNarrative Reviews", *BMC Medicine*, 11: article 20.
- Worsham, E.L. (2012), "Reflections and Insights on Teaching Social Entrepreneurship: An Interview with Greg Dees", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 442-452.
- Yusuf, J.-E. and Sloan, M.F. (2015), "Effectual Processes in Nonprofit Start-Ups and Social Entrepreneurship: An Illustrated Discussion of a Novel Decision-Making Approach", *American Review of Public Administration*, 45(4): 417-435.
- Zamora, V.L. (2012), "Using a Social Enterprise Service-Learning Strategy in an Introductory Management Accounting Course", *Issues in Accounting Education*, 27(1): 187-226.
- Zhu, Y., Rooney, D. and Phillips, N. (2016), "Practice-Based Wisdom Theory for Integrating Institutional Logics: A New Model for Social Entrepreneurship Learning and Education", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15(3): 607-625.
- Zietsma, C. and Tuck, R. (2012), "First, Do No Harm: Evaluating Resources for Teaching Social Entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3): 512-517.

