

# Differences between Social Entrepreneurs and Social Managers in Israel

Hilla Cohen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kaye Academic College of Education, Be'er Sheva, Israel  
hillahc@gmail.com

## Abstract

This study examines differences in personality characteristics and background variables between social entrepreneurs and managers of a social enterprise in Israel. Questionnaires were administered to 104 social entrepreneurs and 86 social managers. Regarding personality differences, social entrepreneurs are more extroverted and open to new experiences. Differences were found in their relationships with their parents and in their background characteristics. For the first time, this study compares social entrepreneurs and social managers of a social enterprise and describes their profiles and why they are important. The practical contribution of this research is in identifying, understanding, and cultivating social entrepreneurs and managers of a social enterprise. This research may also help in planning training programs that fit social entrepreneurs' and managers' social enterprise needs and attributes. The study limitations and recommendations for further studies are discussed.

**Keywords:** Social entrepreneurship, Social Management, Social Entrepreneur, Big five, Personality, Family relationship.

## Differences between Social Entrepreneurs and Social Managers in Israel

*"A social entrepreneur is like someone looking for parking in a crowded place, but when he finally finds it, he gives his parking space to someone else."*

Josh, pseudonym, a social entrepreneur

*"A manager is like someone hanging at the treetop. You are at the top, which suffers most of the shocks, and thus, one can easily fall; nevertheless, you are at the top of the world. Still, one needs to be careful not to fall."*

David, pseudonym, a manager

## 1. Introduction

The establishment of a social enterprise is important in promoting social issues. Nevertheless, many social enterprises fail to sustain themselves, thus failing to fulfill their purpose. Kamaludin, Xavier & Amin (2024) suggest that social entrepreneurship is sustainable by fulfilling both social goals and economic gains. In general, however, new entrepreneurial ventures have a high chance of failure: as many as 40% of all new social initiatives and programs are not sustainable beyond the first few years after their conception and initial funding (Gimmon & Spiro 2013). The primary explanations for such failure are lack of managerial experience, social ties, and of institutional resource support (Aldrich & Martinez, 2007, Rajput & Chopra, 2014).

Given the social importance of social enterprises, this high rate of failures and the low percentage of sustainability of social enterprises require deeper understanding and finding ways to promote sustainable and successive social ventures (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear 2010).

Abebe et al (2020) defines four types of social entrepreneurs and associate this typology with the optimal type of social entrepreneur successful in his or her enterprise. The first is named *Seasoned Champions* which are social entrepreneurs that have extensive professional career experiences in the public not-for-profit sectors, mostly as senior managers. The second type is the *Local Pragmatists*, which are social entrepreneurs passionate about solving socioeconomic and environmental issues affecting their families, relatives, neighbors, and the local community. They can be residents (ordinary citizens), community organizers, college students, and stay-at-home parents. The third type, *Corporate Veterans*, are social entrepreneurs who have extensive career experience in business organizations (corporations), often at senior managerial/executive levels. They enjoy a comfortable lifestyle with high social status and earnings. In

many respects, they are considered successful and accomplished by prevailing societal standards. *The fourth type* is the *Social Activists* who strive to tackle socioeconomic and environmental challenges through *cause-based (large-scale)* social ventures that broadly focus on communities across ethnic and socioeconomic categories. They are passionate about broader social and environmental challenges such as economic inequality, access to quality education and healthcare, climate change, social justice, and environmental protection.

Based on this typology Abebe et al (2020) claim that entrepreneurs categorized as *Corporate Veterans* are in the best possible position to grow their social ventures compared to other categories of social entrepreneurs, since they have strong organizational and managerial skills (Lee, 2019), especially in later stages of the social enterprise.

The importance of different characteristics and skills in different stages of the social enterprise can be understood in terms of person and work environment fit theory (Kristof-Brown et al 2023). Person–environment fit refers to the compatibility between the individual and work environment characteristics (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). The dimensions of fit are wide and include a match between personal interests and vocational characteristics; a fit between individual values and organizational culture; a similarity between personality characteristics and job demands, and more (Kristof-Brow., & Guay 2011). The fit can be between the person and the organization (P-O Fit, Vav-Vianen, 2000) between the person and the job (P-J Fit, Kristof, 1996) and more (Kristof-Brown et al 2023).

The unique characteristics of the entrepreneur are important in the early stages of the social enterprise (e.g passion and dedication to solving social issues, openness to experience, extroversion, inner locus of control, and leadership – Mayr et al., 2021).

However, to sustain the social enterprise, other managerial skills and personality traits are required, which are not necessarily those characterizing the social entrepreneur. Thus, a different person is needed to accompany the social entrepreneur, which could be a manager. Since they operate in the same organization, the manager should be similar to the entrepreneur in some characteristics (e.g possess an enthusiasm for social issues, P-O fit -- Roth et al 2022). However, since they have different goals and a different job, the manager should be more emotionally detached and be able to make hard decisions, sometimes sacrificing social goals to preserve the social enterprise in the long run (P-J fit – Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003).

Therefore, the characteristics of the social entrepreneur and those of the one managing the social enterprise may be different. Thus, the current study examines the differences between social entrepreneurs and managers of social enterprises.

Both social entrepreneurs and managers of social enterprises, as seen above, pursue social change. However, significant differences exist between them. The quotations above suggest that social entrepreneurs act aggressively on behalf of other people and their social welfare and, therefore, the professional challenges, motivating forces, and maybe even the personality structure of social managers may differ from those of social entrepreneurs. The most common theoretical frameworks used to study entrepreneurs and managers are personality theories (Nga and Shamuganathan, 2010), learning theories (Bandura 1977), and psychoanalytic theories (Pines et al. 2002; Zaleznik 1991). These frameworks address the relationships with parents and the motivations that drive entrepreneurs and managers. Some scholars claim that entrepreneurs are characterized by the propensity for risk-taking and innovation (Brandstätter 2011; McGrath et al. 1992; Shane and Venkataraman 2000), while managers act in an orderly manner and preserve the status quo (Amihud and Lev 1981; Pettigrew, 1973); thus, entrepreneurs and managers are different in their fundamental characteristics. However, others claim that managers, especially in modern organisations, need to possess "entrepreneurial" characteristics (Covin and Lumpkin 2011).

In this context, one type of entrepreneurship has attracted attention: social entrepreneurship and the characteristics of social entrepreneurs (e.g., Carnegie et al. 2003; Author, 2019). However, as far as is known, no study compares social entrepreneurs and social managers. This study addresses this gap by investigating The differences between social entrepreneurs and social managers in personality and background variables.

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1 Social Entrepreneurship

The expression “social entrepreneurship” emerged in the 1990s in the US and the UK (Bornstein, 2004; Dees, 1998; Leadbeater, 2001). In 2009, social entrepreneurship accounted for 1.8% of the total market activity in 49 countries (Bosma and Levie, 2010). In recent years, this term has become extremely popular (Bruyat and Julien 2000), However, “social entrepreneurship” still lacks a widely accepted and

precise definition (Danna and Porche, 2008; Van Ryzin *et al.* 2009; Sullivan and Weerawardena 2006). In addition, “entrepreneurship” is a vague and self-contradictory concept (Llewellyn and Wilson, 2003): some interpret it narrowly as business-founding only, while others interpret it broadly as individual and personality characteristics that lead to entrepreneurial behaviour (Bridge *et al.* 2002).

According to one definition, “entrepreneurship” is the act of establishing one’s own business, which requires personal sacrifice, innovations, and risk-taking for creating something valuable (Greenhaus *et al.* 2010). Social entrepreneurship has also been defined as the act of implementing effective strategies to develop innovative ways for dealing with social problems and finding solutions to these challenges, thus achieving social change (Zahra *et al.* 2009).

The area in which social entrepreneurs operate includes non-profit organisations as well as for-profit organisations (Austin *et al.* 2006; Bosma and Levie, 2010; Dees 1998; Huybrecht *et al.* 2017; Lortie and Cox 2018). Social entrepreneurship combines social passion with innovative and efficient practice (Author, 2016). According to studies on the backgrounds of social entrepreneurs, they are mostly members of ethnic minorities (Bornstein, 2007; Yunnus, 2007), have a medium or low socioeconomic status (Lee and Gordon 2005), various educational backgrounds (Kidder 2004), and diverse occupational histories (Bornstein 2007; Author, 2019).

However, research in this field is new and preliminary. The literature on social entrepreneurship mostly describes social entrepreneurs in an anecdotal way (e.g., Bornstein 2007 Van-Ryzin *et al.* 2009). Most studies are in the field of social entrepreneurship and its boundaries, scarce studies are interested solely in entrepreneurs, and some investigate their personalities (e.g. Author 2019; Nga and Shamuganathan 2010). Others focus on what motivates them (Author, 2016). In addition, their background and family influences have been investigated from a psychoanalytic point of view (Pines *et al.* 2002; Zaleznik 1991). Thus, the next sections will discuss the personality and background of social entrepreneurs and managers, including their similarities and differences.

#### *2.1.1 Social Entrepreneurs Personality*

Personality plays a fundamental role in shaping the values, points of view, choices, and behaviours of individuals (Llewellyn and Wilson 2003), particularly entrepreneurs (Frank *et al.* 2007; Zhao and Jung, 2018). According to career choice theories, individuals tend to choose careers that match their personalities (e.g., Holland 1997; Kristof-Brown *et al.* 2005). One of the most widely used personality models is the Big Five model (McCrae and Costa 2004), which proposes five main personality dimensions: openness to new experiences, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Neuroticism is associated with poor emotional adjustment and manifests as stress, anxiety, and depression. Extraversion is the tendency to be sociable, dominant, and positive, and seek stimulation (Watson and Clark, 1992).

Openness is associated with seeking and enjoying new experiences and creative ideas. Individuals characterised by openness are flexible, curious, and unconventional (McCrae 1996). Agreeableness is the tendency to be compassionate, kind, gentle, trusting, trustworthy and warm, and to seek a cooperative, team-oriented, and conflict-free workplace (Judge and Cable 1997). Conscientious individuals are self-disciplined, achievement-oriented, dependable (Barrick and Mount 1991), orderly, and deliberate (Costa and McCrae 1992). Therefore, they seek an organised, predictable, and outcome-focused working environment (Judge and Cable 1997).

In terms of the personality characteristics of social entrepreneurs, they are emotionally stable and stress-resistant (Caballero *et al.* 2013). Social entrepreneurs are described as pioneers (Light, 2009), value creators (Bruyat and Julien 2000), opportunity attentive (Martin and Osberg 2007), and alliance creators (Leadbeater and Oakley 2001). They are also depicted as inspirational, capable of building trustful social networks (Austin *et al.* 2006), ethical, professional, and personally invested (Carnegie *et al.* 2003; Drayton 2005).

Entrepreneurs are often described as highly open to new experiences (Zhao *et al.* 2018). Social entrepreneurs are also probably extremely open: establishing a social enterprise requires innovative methods and interest in social issues (Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Being open to new experiences may assist social entrepreneurs in finding innovative methods for addressing social issues. Openness is often associated with interest in social matters (Bering *et al.* 2004), and the core of social entrepreneurship is the dedication to social matters and social obligation (Bornstein 2004). Social entrepreneurs are extremely open to changing values (self-direction and stimulation) (Bargsted *et al.* 2013). In summary, social entrepreneurs are expected to be open to new experiences.

Social entrepreneurs are also highly extroverted (Author, 2019). Extraversion is associated with the perception of control, power, and persuasion, which may help social entrepreneurs attract potential investors (McCarthy 2003). Social entrepreneurs are required to be social leaders (Leadbeater 2001), and social leadership is related to extraversion (Judge and Bono 2000). Thus, social entrepreneurs are expected to be extroverted.

It is reasonable to assume that social entrepreneurs are highly conscientious since they are characterized by responsibility, engagement, and perseverance (Ciavarella et al. 2004). The origin of social entrepreneurship is, in a sense, social persistence (Bornstein 2007). These characteristics are inherent to entrepreneurial activity. In addition, conscientiousness seems to be correlated with social entrepreneurship components (Shamuganathan and Nga 2010). Thus, social entrepreneurs are expected to be highly conscientious.

Similarly, social entrepreneurs are expected to be emotionally stable. Cohen and Katz (2016) find that both traumatic histories and resilience, as well as the resolution of past issues, are related to entrepreneurial work. Entrepreneurs have a significant ability to recover from failures (Bennet and Dann 2000). In addition, social entrepreneurs in Peru were shown to have low neuroticism and high stability and stress endurance (Farber et al. 2015). High emotional stability has also been associated with the propensity of social entrepreneurs to develop social networks (Shamuganathan and Nga 2010). Thus, social entrepreneurs are expected to have high emotional stability.

Thus far the personality of social entrepreneurs has been discussed. Social entrepreneurs are also driven to develop their enterprises. Social entrepreneurs are ideologically motivated. The ideological motivation inherently defines social entrepreneurs (Author, 2019; Martin and Osberg 2007; Peredo and McLean 2006; Shamuganathan and Nga 2010). Social entrepreneurs seem to be motivated by the passion to reform the whole system (Drayton 2005). A social entrepreneur strives to promote social change; thus, his/her motivation is primarily ideological (Austin et al. 2006; Migliore et al. 2015). Most social entrepreneurs are characterised by idealism and may be naïve dreamers (Roberts and Woods 2005). Furthermore, social entrepreneurs often work with limited economic returns (Dempsey and Sanders 2010; Stephan and Drencheva 2017).

#### *2.1.2 Family relationship and background of social entrepreneurs*

It is important to understand the background of social entrepreneurs which has been rarely addressed in the literature (Van-Ryzin et al. 2009; Author, 2019). A few studies have been conducted based on social entrepreneurs' biographies and using data published by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) (Bosma and Levie 2010).

Entrepreneurs are mostly firstborn children (Dann 2000; Kaplan 2007), have high educational qualifications and diverse educational backgrounds (Schwartz and Pines 2007; Kidder 2004; Yunus 2007), various occupational backgrounds (Bornstein, 2004), and are from ethnic, cultural, or religious minorities (Bornstein 2004; Yunus 2007). The higher their educational qualifications, the more opportunities are available to them, and the less risk they face (Bosma and Levie 2014).

A study conducted by Van Ryzin *et al.* (2009) found that the typical US social entrepreneur is a young non-Caucasian woman, who has high educational qualifications, resides in a big city, and comes from a low-to-medium socioeconomic background. Those entrepreneurs report being happy, pluralistic, and interested in politics. Levie and Hart (2011) compared the background characteristics of social and business entrepreneurs in Britain and found that social entrepreneurs tend to be younger, and the tendency for social entrepreneurship increases with their education level.

In Israel, most entrepreneurs have a military command background (Avrahami, and Lerner, 2003; Pines and Schwartz, 2006), large social networks (Dashti et al. 2018), and managerial or business experience (Boden and Nucci, 2000; Robert, 2000). In addition, entrepreneurs in Israel, as well as worldwide, have fathers who are mostly self-employed or are entrepreneurs who have served as role models (Asarkaya and Keles Taysir 2019; Drennan et al. 2005; Pines and Schwartz 2008). Globally, the range age of social entrepreneurs who turn to entrepreneurship is between 25 and 35 years (between 55 and 64 years for a few), while a decline in entrepreneurial activity is observed around 35 years of age (Bosma and Levie 2014). Most entrepreneurs are married and have at least one child (Author, 2019) and reside in big cities. A small number are new immigrants (Van-Ryzin et al. 2009). Preliminary studies on social entrepreneurs in Israel in the 1990s found that their characteristics are diverse. They mostly come from medium-to-high



socioeconomic backgrounds, reside in big cities, are from Jewish Ashkenazi ethnicity,<sup>1</sup> and have high educational qualifications (Bar-Shalom and Sarel 2011; Bin-Nun 2009; Oliver-Lumerman et al. 2013; Weiman-Cocton 2006).

## 2.2 Management

Management is the process of coordinating organisational activities to achieve desired outcomes through individuals assigned to the job. Management involves efficiently achieving organisational goals (Robbins and Coulter 2003). In recent years, management has been widely studied in related disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, and economics. This multidisciplinary overview deals with issues such as what management is (Minzberg 2004), the manager's personality characteristics (Tett and Burnett 2003), and his/her background (Kaspi-Baruch 2013; Author 2016).

### 2.2.1 Managers Personality

In terms of personality, managers, compared to employees who are not managers, have higher levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, openness, assertiveness, customer service orientation, optimism, and work drive (Lounsbury et al. 2016). In addition, emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness positively correlate with managerial characteristics (Moutafi et al. 2007). Managers also show lower neuroticism and higher conscientiousness levels compared to employees (Palaïou and Furnham 2014).

From the psychoanalytic perspective, managers are self-confident, need admiration and attention, and seek power (Kets De Vries 2004). According to Kets De Vries (2004), the excessive need for power is probably a result of insecurity and helplessness in childhood, which are often related to a missing or emotionally unavailable father. Kets De Vries (2004) proposes three characteristics of managers. The first is narcissism, expressed as a lack of confidence regarding achievements, driving the manager to success. This occurs because managers often have fathers who are never been satisfied with their achievements, which drives them to be in constant pursuit of and hunger for success. The second characteristic is an absent or emotionally unavailable father since the manager's father is either deceased or busy with his career. The third characteristic is a supportive mother who serves as an important role model, especially for male managers. Therefore, in contrast to the never-satisfied-and-unavailable father, the mothers of managers are perceived as supportive. Nevertheless, the father serves as an important influential character and a strong driving force for managers.

### 2.2.2 Family relationship and background of managers

In terms of background, managers mostly come from well-functioning structured families, in which hierarchy and rules exist and are enforced (Yaffe-Yanai et al. 2007). Managers usually have a father who was a manager (Kaspi-Baruch 2013). Along with the mother, the father takes an active role in preparing the child for their future management role. Psychoanalytically speaking, the father was not satisfied with his child's achievements, and the manager was constantly pushed, as a child, to produce better results (Yaffe-Yanai et al. 2007). According to Zaleznik (1991), although managers experience helplessness and have an absent father, they perceive their childhood as positive and secure. Management is a "rebirth," and lets managers compensate for the lack of control and the father's absence in their childhood, which serves as a healing experience, allowing them to feel in control by becoming the "father" of the organisation and, in a sense, their own father (Zaleznik 1991). Ket De Vries (2004) mentions that the fathers of managers are characterised by self-confidence, need for attention, power, and control. The profound need for power that managers have is a result of a lack of control, which is common in the case of an absent or insensitive father.

## 2.3 Social Entrepreneurship vs. Social Management

Some studies suggest that managers and entrepreneurs differ in personality characteristics. Entrepreneurs are risk takers (McGrath et al. 1992) and socially open (Brandstätter 2011), while managers are more conservative (Amihud and Lev 1981), follow the norms of the organisation (Pettigrew 1973), and are more professionally oriented and predictable in their decision style (Hofer and Schendel 1978). Nevertheless, research suggests openness to new experiences differences between managers and entrepreneurs are insignificant (Obschonka Fisch and Boyd 2017). In addition, entrepreneurs use more heuristics and suffer from biases in decision-making compared to managers (Busenitz and Barney 1997). In a meta-analysis, Brandstätter (2011) reports some personality differences between entrepreneurs and

---

<sup>1</sup> Jewish Ashkenazi originated in European and western countries.

managers. Entrepreneurs are characterised by higher openness to new experiences and extroversion. Lower neuroticism and lower agreeableness compared to managers (Zhao and Seibert 2006). They also have, and higher risk-propensity (Stewart and Roth 2001).

Pines *et al.* (2002) compare the personalities of entrepreneurs and managers and suggest a typology of entrepreneurial versus managerial personalities. The entrepreneurial personality is characterised by emotional stability, openness to experience, and the achievement motivation components of conscientiousness, extraversion, and risk propensity (Brandstätter 2011; Pines *et al.* 2002).

The analysis of the relationship between the personalities of managers and entrepreneurs indicates significant differences in four personality dimensions. Entrepreneurs show higher extroversion and openness to experience and lower neuroticism and agreeableness. No difference was found in conscientiousness.

Some studies examine the differences between managers and entrepreneurs, focusing on difficult childhood experiences. For instance, Pines *et al.* (2002) find that the difficult childhood experiences of managers are associated with a lack of emotional availability of the manager's father or his physical absence. The choice to be a manager reflects an unconscious aspiration for power and influence and a need to be recognised by the organisation, as a compensation for the lack of acknowledgment from the manager's father. Similarly, the entrepreneur also has an unavailable father, but unlike the manager, s/he does not admire him and does not identify with him. The choice to be an entrepreneur occasionally reflects a negative identification with the father. The entrepreneur does not wish to be like their father and rejects the organisational values or the values she represents. Thus, entrepreneurs seek a career that helps them express their individualism. Managers, on the other hand, are driven by the need to influence (Pines *et al.* 2002). Studies comparing entrepreneurs and managers have also found that entrepreneurs have a much poorer relationship with their fathers, greater identification with their work, are more willing to take risks, and have a higher level of initiative and independence (Pines *et al.* 2002).

However, a study conducted in Turkey found that social entrepreneurs report that their fathers serve as role models to them (Asarkaya *et al.* 2019). Turkey is characterised by relatively collectivist values (Hofstede 2001; 2011); since the collective is in the centre, family values are strong and family cohesiveness is very important (Inglehart *et al.* 2014), and the parents, especially the father, which is an authority figure, are central as role models. Thus, the identification with the father, as for social entrepreneurs is high.

In terms of family and background differences, most managers have employed or managers fathers. Entrepreneurs have self-employed or entrepreneur fathers (Neely

2003). Most managers come from medium to high socioeconomic status and high educational backgrounds (Macmillan *et al.* 2015). Social entrepreneurs also come from medium-to-high socioeconomic status (Bar-Shalom and Sarel 2011; Bin-Nun 2009) and, like managers, come from a high, somewhat more diverse, educational background (Kidder 2004; Yunus 2007) and various occupational backgrounds maybe because it is a less structured field, (Bornstein 2004). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that managers and social entrepreneurs will come from similar family economic backgrounds and educational backgrounds.

It is important to mention that although some studies indicate that entrepreneurs and managers are different, other conceptualizations suggest that they are and should be alike. These point to the concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) and claim that an organisation should constantly pursue an entrepreneurial disposition toward management activities (Covin and Lumpkin 2011; Covin and Wales 2018; Wales 2016). One conceptualization of EO was suggested by Anderson *et al.* (2015). It refers to EO in terms of entrepreneurial behaviours and managerial attitude. This notion implies that a manager should be like an entrepreneur, and, thus, managers and entrepreneurs might share similar characteristics.

Thus far, these concepts have been reviewed in the global as well as Israeli context. This study focuses on the Israeli arena of social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is an extremely popular and esteemed career choice in Israel, aligned with the image of a Startup Nation (Senor and Singer 2011). Entrepreneurial culture in Israel is supported by core values of Israeli society, including an entrepreneurial spirit, dedication, courage, risk taking, excellence, and nonconformity. This culture refers mainly to business entrepreneurship, but Israeli norms also support community life, solidarity, helping one another and providing for the needy (Senor and Singer 2011). These values may serve as a foundation for the development of social entrepreneurship. As a result of the review above, the following hypotheses are developed.

### 3. Hypotheses

H1: Significant personality differences exist between social entrepreneurs and managers: social entrepreneurs show higher openness, extraversion, and consciousness, and lower neuroticism and agreeableness.

H3: Managers have better relationships with their fathers and mothers compared to social entrepreneurs.

H4: Social entrepreneurs and managers are similar in their educational and economic status backgrounds.

### 4. Method

#### 4.1 Participants

A total of 104 social entrepreneurs and 86 managers participated in the study, all Israeli citizens. The sample is relatively small since the population of social entrepreneurs in Israel is small and since their availability to participate in such a study is scarce. The social entrepreneurs' average age is 41 ( $M=41.3$ ,  $SD=11.5$ ), and the managers' average age is 40 ( $M=40$ ,  $SD=10.0$ ). Out of 104 social entrepreneurs, 60% (63) are men, 40% (41) are women, and out of 86 managers, 39% (34) are men, and 60% (52) are women.

#### 4.2 Instruments

The short version of the Big Five Inventory was used (Rammstedt and John, 2007). The questionnaire includes 10 items, two for each dimension: extraversion (e.g., "I am outgoing, sociable"), neuroticism ("I am calm – reverse item"), agreeableness ("I am sympathetic"), conscientiousness ("I am organised"), and openness to experience ("I am open to new experiences"), respectively. The Cronbach alphas of the variables are as follows: extraversion ( $\alpha = .81$ ),

neuroticism ( $\alpha = .82$ ), agreeableness ( $\alpha = .73$ ), conscientiousness ( $\alpha = .70$ ), and openness ( $\alpha = .70$ ).

*Relationships with the parents* were measured by a single item asking about the degree of relationships to the parents (father and mother, separately).

*Background demographics*, such as age, gender, education level and economic status.

#### 4.3 Procedure

Questioners were filled by phone interviewing, because of the special participant's characteristics; in addition, phone interviewing was found to be effective in studying social entrepreneurs (Authors). Data collection was conducted by the first author and with the assistance of four research assistants, B.A Psychology students were trained systematically once a week and more by the first author. All the questions were answered through phone interviews. The interviews lasted 45 minutes at least. All the participants signed an informed consent form. The data was collected systematically between October 2012 to October 2017.

### 5. Results

The first hypothesis regarding the existence of significant personality differences between social entrepreneurs and managers is partially confirmed. Social entrepreneurs present higher extroversion and openness to new experiences. No differences are found in conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness between social entrepreneurs and managers.

The means and standard deviations of the variables of interest are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

		Social Entrepreneurs N=104		Managers N=86		t	Sig.
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Big 5 personality traits	Openness	6.30	0.80	5.30	1.10	53.71	**
	Extraversion	4.90	1.60	4.10	1.50	10.70	**
	Conscientiousness	5.70	1.00	5.70	0.90	0.03	
	Agreeableness	3.40	1.10	3.30	1.00	0.30	
	Neuroticism	3.70	1.90	3.40	1.40	1.70	

\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$

The second hypothesis regarding the differences between social entrepreneurs and managers in terms of their background and identification with their parents was confirmed. Managers' report better relationships with both their fathers and mothers compared to social entrepreneurs.

The third hypothesis was not confirmed, social entrepreneurs and managers come from different backgrounds: social entrepreneurs' educational level is higher compared to managers, however, managers come from a better economic status of their family of origin. However, the importance of education was significantly different.

The means and standard deviations of the variables of interest are presented in Table 2

Table 2. Descriptive statistics: relationships with parents and background

		Social Entrepreneurs N=104		Managers N=86		t	Sig.
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Relationships with parents	Identification with the Father	3.60	1.50	4.20	1.40	-3.03	**
	Identification with the Mother	3.90	1.50	4.30	1.00	-2.40	**
background	Education level	1.95	1.20	1.50	1.00	2.70	**
	Economic status of the family	1.80	1.00	2.30	1.00	-3.50	**
	Education importance	5.50	1.80	6.00	1.30	-2.30	**

\*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$

## 6. Discussion

This study compares social entrepreneurs and managers of social enterprises in Israel. In terms of personality differences, social entrepreneurs are more extroverted compared to managers. This is not surprising since social entrepreneurs are social leaders (Leadbeater 2001) and, as such, are expected to be more extroverted (Judge and Bono, 2000). Social entrepreneurs need to be socially oriented and create social connections for their venture creation. They need to persuade investors to invest in their venture, convince individuals to be assisted by their social enterprise, and persuade employees to work in their venture (McCarthy 2003). Thus, social entrepreneurs need to be highly extroverted. Managers, on the other hand, work within the boundaries of an existing venture created by the entrepreneurs. Although they do need to be extroverted since they negotiate and communicate with the entrepreneur, shareholders, and employees, they operate in a narrower context compared to the entrepreneur. Thus, they are less extroverted.

This result confirms the finding that extroverted individuals tend to have external cognitive thinking (Zhang 2006) and are innovative and more adaptive in their cognitive style (Von Wittich and Antonakis 2011). Extroversion is reflected in social and emotional contexts in the ability to display dominance and emotions (Judge and Bono 2000). Although the findings contradict Zhao and Seibert's (2006) findings, that no difference is found in extroversion, they are consonant with the fact that social entrepreneurs meet investors, convince them, and possibly turn to their emotions and social needs to achieve their goals. Being more extroverted is necessary to function efficiently as an entrepreneur (Zhao and Seibert 2006). These qualities are especially important for social entrepreneurs, who often need to blaze a trail. Social entrepreneurs need to be extroverted to create wealth and social capital, which establish the grounds for social enterprise. Social capital is intangible and refers to the interconnections among individuals, social networks, norms, and trust (Putnam 1995).

In addition, as this study indicates, social entrepreneurs are more open to new experiences compared to managers. Openness to new experiences reflects the tendency to be autonomous, unconventional, curious, and creative (Judge and Bono 2000). This result is not surprising since the creation of a venture requires an open mind, as the entrepreneur is creating something new. This is in line with social entrepreneurs having to be more innovative and flexible to identify market needs and challenges, and adjust themselves to a dynamic reality, compared to managers. They are more often than managers required to create a venture from scratch, orient themselves to social challenges, and demonstrate flexibility and



adaptability, whereas managers are required to develop and preserve an existing system. Creating a social venture requires even more openness since this is not a conventional business in which one makes a profit; rather, it is a type of entrepreneurship that involves bringing about a social change using business methodology.

Social entrepreneurship is so different that some laymen do not even know how to define it (Dees 2017). The fact that social entrepreneurs are more open to new experiences is in line with previous findings that describe them as pioneers and leaders (Light 2008). To be a pioneer, one needs to be open to new possibilities and new experiences. Although previous studies have found that managers are relatively open (Lounsbury et al. 2016), they are less open compared to social entrepreneurs because they are required to preserve the status quo and follow the entrepreneurs' system of values and goals.

Contrary to expectations, social entrepreneurs and managers are not significantly different in their conscientiousness levels. Conscientiousness is associated with responsibility, obligation, and perseverance (Ciavarella et al. 2004). Although conscientiousness is correlated with essential components of social entrepreneurship (Shamuganathan and Nga 2010), managers may be also dedicated to a social cause and obligated to the enterprise, like social entrepreneurs are. In addition, Thus, both managers and social entrepreneurs in Israel may be similar in their conscientiousness levels since they are similar in obligation commitment and responsibility taking. In addition, according to ASA Schneider (1992) the field of social entrepreneurship attracts similar individuals who feel responsible for correcting social injustice. This sense of responsibility reflects their obligation. Since conscious individuals are characterised by high responsibility and obligation, it is reasonable that such individuals show high in conscientiousness. This explains why social entrepreneurs are highly conscious, but since the managers in our sample manage social entrepreneurship, it is possible that they, too, are characterised by the same obligation as their social entrepreneur colleagues. This is consistent with Schneider's claims that individuals who choose the same field of action are characterised by certain personality characteristics.

In contrast with expectations, social entrepreneurs and managers are not significantly different in their neuroticism (emotional stability) levels either. This result seems to contradict previous findings indicating that social entrepreneurs are more prone to take risks (Lee et al. 2011) and, thus, more emotionally stable. However, social entrepreneurs are found to be emotionally stable (Farber et al. 2015), and high emotional stability is associated with the propensity of social entrepreneurs to develop social networks (Shamuganathan and Nga 2010). Entrepreneurial personality includes emotional stability (Brandstätter 2011; Pines et al. 2002). However, the managers of a social enterprise may be emotionally stable because they are required to be realistic and calm as they face a dynamic field, still in the process of formation.

In contrast to what was hypothesised, social entrepreneurs and managers are not significantly different in their agreeableness levels. This contradicts previous studies indicating that entrepreneurs have lower levels of agreeableness compared to managers (Brandstätter 2011). However, it is possible that the profile of a social entrepreneur is somewhat different from that of a common entrepreneur. Since social entrepreneurs are driven by the wish to achieve social change and are sensitive to social issues, they may be more service-oriented, and, thus, not significantly different from managers in their agreeableness levels. In addition, it is possible that agreeableness is inherent to social entrepreneurs since it is their way of raising resources, as clients expect them to be agreeable and pro-social. Social entrepreneurs may also be required to work with weak individuals and disadvantaged populations, thus needing "soft" social skills.

In terms of identification with their parents, the findings of this study support the expectations. Managers' report better relationships with their fathers, compared to social entrepreneurs. These findings are in line with psychoanalytic studies (Kets De Vries 2004; Pines et al. 2002) indicating that, although both entrepreneurs and managers are characterised by an absent father, managers perceive their father more positively compared to entrepreneurs. Managers choose a career in management to compensate for the absent father; however, they positively identify with their father. In terms of psychoanalytic theory, choosing a career in management allows them to gain power and control to compensate for the helplessness they feel due to a missing father. Social entrepreneurs also compensate for the missing father experience by choosing a career in entrepreneurship, which helps them gain control; however, unlike managers, social entrepreneurs do not identify with their fathers and want to create a "new father" in the shape of their venture. Therefore, they are rejecting authority and creating their organisations.

In addition, managers also report better relationships with their mothers compared to social entrepreneurs. A possible explanation is given by Kets De Vries (2004) and Popper (2000), who claim that

managers, especially male ones, have supportive mothers. The mother is an important role model and helps develop their self-efficacy (Popper 2000). Therefore, managers recognize that their mother plays a significant role, more than social entrepreneurs do.

In terms of educational background, it was found that social entrepreneurs have obtained a higher level of education compared to managers. This finding matches previous findings regarding social entrepreneurs' high educational qualifications (Schwartz and Pines 2007; Kidder 2004; Yunus 2007). Moreover, social entrepreneurs are seen as ground breakers, and as such they need a wider perspective that allows an analysis of the social situation, an understanding of power resources, and a boundary-spanning practice that is adapted to diverse populations. One of the means of doing so is by acquiring informal education (Chell 2007) and therefore social entrepreneurs are characterised as broadminded. Furthermore, social entrepreneurs lead a social agenda of social mobility, and inclusion of certain populations. Since education is one of the means of social mobility, it is possible that this is the social entrepreneur's way of tracking a personal and social change (Shaw and Carte 2007).

Managers' economic status is higher than social entrepreneurs. The former's wealthier economic background may suggest that they come from families in which money plays an important role and this may be one of the reasons their economic motivation is higher. This finding matches the fact that many entrepreneurs come from low-to-medium economic backgrounds (Gordon 2005). Managers are mostly descendants of managers (Kaspi-Baruch 2013) thus it is plausible that their economic condition is stable, and that values of status and wealth are emphasised in their families and affect their occupational choices and paths.

It is important to mention that although differences exist between social entrepreneurs and social managers, several similarities are also found. For instance, no differences exist between their personalities in terms of conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness. This may be because both social entrepreneurs and the managers of a social enterprise come from similar backgrounds and are driven by the desire to achieve social change. Social managers operate in the social enterprise arena; hence, they may be different from the managers of a business organization. In this sense, they may be like social entrepreneurs. Both social entrepreneurs and the managers of a social enterprise share a common interest in disadvantaged populations.

The practical contribution is in identifying, understanding and cultivating social entrepreneurs. It may also help in planning training programs that fit social entrepreneurs' needs and attributes.

### Limitations and Future Studies

The present study is subject to several limitations; therefore, the findings should be interpreted with caution. The study involved an Israeli sample, with its unique context, which constrains its generalisability. The sample also refers to a specific kind of social entrepreneurship (a social enterprise for a business purpose), thus the validity is undermined. Further, since the Israeli social entrepreneur and manager population is relatively small, the sample size was limited. Future studies could use larger samples to explore similar variables within an internationally comparative context.

### References

- Autor (2016) Reference removed for blind review.
- Abebe, M.A., Kimakwa, S. and Redd, T. (2020), "Toward a typology of social entrepreneurs: the interplay between passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27, 4, 509-530. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-08-2019-0279>
- Asarkaya, C., and N. Keles Taysir 2019. "Founder's background as a catalyst for social entrepreneurship." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 30 (1): 155-166.
- Amihud, Y. and B. Lev. 1981. "Risk reduction as a managerial motive for conglomerate mergers", *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 12 (2): 605-617.
- Anderson, B.S., Kreiser, P.M., Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S. and Y. Eshima. 2015. "Reconceptualizing entrepreneurial orientation", *Strategic Management Journal*. 36(10), 1579-1596.
- Austin, J.E., Leonard, H., Reficco, E. and Wei-Skillern, J. 2006, "Social entrepreneurship: it's for corporations too", in *"Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change"*, Edited by Nicholls, A., Oxford University Press, USA, pp. 169-180.
- Avrahami, Y., and Lerner, M. 2003. "The effect of combat service and military rank on entrepreneurial careers: The case of Israeli MBA graduates", *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 31(1), 97-118.
- Barendsen, L. and Gardner, H. 2004, Nicholls, A. 2004, "Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader?" *Leader to Leader*, (34), 43-50.

- Bargsted, M., Picon, M., Salazar, A. and Rojas, Y. 2013, "Psychosocial characterization of social entrepreneurs: A comparative study", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4 (3), 331-346.
- Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. 1991, "The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis", *Personnel Psychology*, 44 (1), 1-26.
- Bar-Shalom, Y.A and Sarel, U. 2011. *Change by Doing*. Jerusalem: Carmel Publishing
- Basow, S. A. 1992. *Gender: Stereotypes and roles*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Bennet, R. and Dann, S. 2000. "The Changing Experience of Australian Female Entrepreneurs Gender", *Work and Organization*, 7 (2), 75-83.
- Berings, D., De Fruyt, F. and Bouwen, R. 2004, "Work values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36 (2), 349-364.
- Bianchi, S.M. and Milkie, M.A. 2010, "Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 705-725.
- Bin-noon, M. R. 2009. The demographic and social composition of social entrepreneurs in Israel: founders' characteristic. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.
- Boden Jr, R. J., and Nucci, A. R. 2000. "On the survival prospects of men's and women's new business ventures". *Journal of business venturing*, 15(4), 347-362.
- Bornstein, D. 2004, *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Bosma, L., and Levie, J. 2010. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM): Executive Report*. Babson Park, MA: Babson College, London Business School.
- Brandstätter, H. 2011, "Personality aspects of entrepreneurship: A look at five meta-analyses", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51 (3), 222-230
- Bridge, S, O'Neill, K. and Cormier S. 2002, *Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, London: Macmillan Business, Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK.
- Bruyat, C. and Julien, P, A. 2000, "Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16 (2), 165-180.
- Busenitz, L.W. and Barney, J.B. 1997, "Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12 (1), 9-30.
- Caballero, S., Fuchs, R.M. and Prialé, M.A. 2013, La influencia de los rasgos de la personalidad en la creación de una empresa social: El caso de los emprendedores sociales peruanos, EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers, No. LG13-07 (ESP), paper presented at 4th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise, 1 July-4 July, Liege, available at: <http://academiab.org/la-influencia-de-los-rasgos-de-la-personalidad-en-la-creacion-de-una-empresa-social-el-caso-de-los-emprendedores-sociales-peruanos/> (accessed 8 April 2019).
- Chell, E. 2007. "Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process". *International small business journal*, 25(1), 5-26.
- Ciavarella, M.A., Buchholtz, A.K., Riordan, C.M., Gatewood, R.D., and Stokes, G.S. 2004, "The Big Five and venture survival: Is there a linkage?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19 4), 465-483.
- Costa, P.T. and McCrae, R.R. 1992, "four ways five factors are basic", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13 (6), 653-665.
- Covin, J.G. and Lumpkin, G.T. 2011, "Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 855-872.
- Chodorow, N. J. 1999. *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Univ of California Press.
- Covin, J.G. and Wales, W.J. 2018, "Crafting High-Impact Entrepreneurial Orientation Research: Some Suggested Guidelines", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43 (1), 3-18.
- Danna, D. and Porche, D. 2008, "Establishing a nonprofit organization: a venture of social entrepreneurship", *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, 4 (10), 751-2.
- Dashti, Y., Schwartz, D. and Malach-Pines, A. 2018, "High technology entrepreneurs, their social networks and success in global markets: The case of Israelis in the US market", in *Current Topics in Management, Global Perspectives on Strategy, Behaviour, and Performance*, Edited by Afzalur Rahim, M., Vol. 13, Piscataway, New Jersey, pp. 131-144.
- Dees, J. G. 1998. "Enterprising non-profits". *Harvard business review*, 76, 54-69.

- Dees, J.G. 2017, "The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship", in *Case Studies in Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainability*, Edited by Hamschmidt, J. and Pirson, M., Routledge, London, UK, pp. 34-42.
- Dempsey, S.E., and Sanders, M.L. 2010, "Meaningful work? Nonprofit marketization and work/life imbalance in popular autobiographies of social entrepreneurship", *Organization*, 17 (4), 437-459.
- Drayton, B. 2005, Where the Real Power Lies, *Alliance*, 1 March, 29-30.
- Drennan, J., Kennedy, J., and Renfrow, P. 2005, "Impact of childhood experiences on the development of entrepreneurial intentions." *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(4), 231-238.
- Fagenson, E.A. 1993, "Personal value systems of men and women entrepreneurs versus managers", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8 (5), 409-430.
- Farber, V.A., Caballero, S., Priale, M.A. and Fuchs, R.M. 2015, "Social enterprises in Lima: concepts and operational models", *Journal of Entrepreneurship, and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 1 (1), 56-78.
- Frank, H., Korunka, C., Lueger, M. and Mugler, J. 2005, "Entrepreneurial orientation and education in Austrian secondary schools", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12(2), 259-273.
- Greenhaus, J.H., Callanan, G.A. and Godshalk, V.M. 2010, *Career Management*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, USA.
- Hofer, C.W. and Schendel, D.E. 1978, *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*(The West Series in Business Policy and Planning), West Group, St. Paul, MN.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Sage publications.
- Hofstede, G. 2011. Dimensionalizing cultures:" The Hofstede model in context". *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2(1), 8.
- Holland, J.L. 1997, *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Vocational Personalities and Work Environments* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition), Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Inglehart, R., C. Haerpfer, A. Moreno, C. Welzel, K. Kizilova, J. Diez-Medrano, M. Lagos, P. Norris, E. Ponarin and B. Puranen et al. (eds.). 2014. World Values Survey: Round Six - Country-Pooled Datafile Version: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV6.jsp>. Madrid: JD Systems Institute.
- Judge, T.A. and Bono, J.E. 2000, "Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- Judge, T.A. and Cable, D.M. (1997), Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction, *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2), 359-394.
- Kamaludin, M. F., Xavier, J. A., & Amin, M. (2024). Social entrepreneurship and sustainability: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 26-49.
- Kan, M.Y., Sullivan, O. and Gershuny, J. 2011, "Gender convergence in domestic work: Discerning the effects of interactional and institutional barriers from large-scale data", *Sociology*, 45(2), 234-251.
- Kaplan, G. 2007, Serial high-tech entrepreneurs, and managers in Israel: background and personality, in *Career Choice in Management and Entrepreneurship: A Research Companion*, (pp. 157-172). Edited by M., Özbilgin, M. and A., Malach-Pines, A. Pines, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.
- Kaspi-Baruch, O. 2013, "Parents' occupation and difficult childhood experiences of managers", *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 22 (1), 29-35.
- Kets de Vries, M. 2004, "Organizations on the Couch: A Clinical Perspective on Organizational Dynamics", *European Management Journal*, 22 (2), 183-200.
- Kidder, T. 2004, *Mountains Beyond Mountains: The Quest of Dr. Paul Farmer, A Man Who Would Cure the World*, New York: Random House, New York, NY.
- Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D. and Johnson, E.C. 2005, "Consequences of individuals' fit at work: a meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit", *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.
- Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person-environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization (pp. 3-50). American Psychological Association.
- Leadbeater, C. 2001, *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*, London: Demos, London, UK, available at: <https://www.demos.co.uk/files/theriseofthesocialentrepreneur.pdf> (accessed 8 April 2019).
- Leadbeater, C. and Oakley, K. 2001, *Surfing the long wave: Knowledge entrepreneurship in Britain*, Demos, London, UK, available at: <https://www.demos.co.uk/files/Surfingthelongwave.pdf> (accessed 8 April 2019).



- Lee, L., Wong, P.K., Der Foo, M. and Leung, A. 2011," Entrepreneurial intentions: The influence of organizational and individual factors", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 124-136.
- Lee, Y.J. and Wilkins, V.M. 2011." More similarities or more differences? Comparing public and nonprofit managers' job motivations". *Public Administration Review*, 71 (1), 45-56.
- Lee, Y., and Gordon, R.H. 2005," Tax structure and economic growth", *Journal of Public Economics*, 89 (5-6), 1027-1043.
- Levie, J. and Hart, M. 2011." Business and social entrepreneurs in the UK: Gender, context, and commitment". *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 3(3). 200-217.
- Light, P.C. 2009," Social entrepreneurship revisited", *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 7 (3), 21-22.
- Llewellyn, D.J. and Wilson, K.M. 2003," The controversial role of personality traits in entrepreneurial psychology", *Education + Training*, 45(6), 341-345.
- Lounsbury, J.W, Sundstrom, E.D., Gibson, L.W., Loveland, J.M. and Drost, A.W. 2016," Core personality traits of managers", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(2), 434-450.
- Lortie, J., and Cox, K. C. 2018. " On the boundaries of social entrepreneurship: A review of relationships with related research domains". *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 14(3), 639-648.
- Macmillan, L., Tyler, C. and Vignoles, A. 2015," Who gets the top jobs? The role of family background and networks in recent graduates' access to high-status professions", *Journal of Social Policy*, 44 (3), 487-515.
- Martin, R.L. and Osberg, S. 2007. *Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition* (Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 28-39). Stanford, CA: Stanford social innovation review.
- Mayr, S., Mitter, C., Kücher, A., & Duller, C. (2021). Entrepreneur characteristics and differences in reasons for business failure: evidence from bankrupt Austrian SMEs. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 33(5), 539-558.
- McCarthy, B. 2003," Strategy is personality-driven, strategy is crisis-driven: insights from entrepreneurial firms", *Management Decision*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 327-339.
- McClelland, D.C., and Boyatzis, R.E. 1982." Leadership motive pattern and long-term success in management". *Journal of Applied psychology*, 67 (6), 737.
- McCrae, R.R. 1996," Social consequences of experiential openness", *Psychological Bulletin*, 120 (3), 323-337.
- McCrae, R.R. and Costa Jr, P.T. 2004," A contemplated revision of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(3), 587-596.
- McGrath, R.G., MacMillan, I.C. and Scheinberg, S. 1992. " Elitists, risk-takers, and rugged individualists? An exploratory analysis of cultural differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs". *Journal of business venturing*, 7 (2), 115-135.
- Migliore, G., Schifani, G., Romeo, P., Hashem, S. and Cembalo, L. 2015." Are farmers in alternative food networks social entrepreneurs? Evidence from a behavioural approach", *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 28 (5), 885-902.
- Mintzberg, H. 2004, *Managers, Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Oakland, CA, USA.
- Mohammed Faiz Kamaludin, Jesrina Ann Xavier & Muslim Amin (2024) Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainability: A Conceptual Framework, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 15:1, 26-49, DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2021.1900339
- Moutafi, J., Furnham, A. and Crump, J. 2007," Is managerial level related to personality?" *British Journal of Management*, 18(3), 272-280.
- Neely, G. S. 2003." Small business and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business and Finance Librarianship*", 8 (3-4), 271-280.
- 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.
- Obschonka, M., Fisch, C., and Boyd, R. 2017. " Using digital footprints in entrepreneurship research: A Twitter-based personality analysis of superstar entrepreneurs and managers". *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 8, 13-23.
- Oliver-Lumperman, A., Zilber, T. B., and De Shalit, A. 2013. *Social leaders in Israel*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Press.

- Özbilgin, M. F., Küskü, F., and Erdogmus, N. 2004. A comparative analysis of influences on career choice of MBA students in Britain, Greece, Israel and Turkey, *paper presented at the American Psychological Association*, August, Honolulu.
- Palaïou, K. and Furnham, A. 2014, "Are bosses unique? Personality facet differences between CEOs and staff in five work sectors", *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 66 (3), 173-196.
- Peredo, A.M. and McLean, M. 2006, "Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept", *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Pines, A.M. 2002, "The Female Entrepreneur: Burnout Treated Using Psychodynamic Existential Approach". *Clinical Case Studies*, Vol 1, pp 170-180.
- Pines, A, M, Sadeh, A., Dvir, D. and Yafe-Yanai, O. 2002, "Entrepreneurs and managers: Similar yet different", *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10(2), 172-190.
- Popper, M., Mayseless, O. and Castelnovo, O. 2000. "Transformational leadership and attachment", *Leadership Quarterly*, 11 (2), 267-289.
- Putnam, R.D. 1995, "Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 28 (4), 664-683. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/224969063?accountid=14484>
- Hofer, C.W. and Schendel, D.E 1978. *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts* West, St. Paul, MN
- Robbins, S.P. and Coulter, M. 2003. *Management* (11<sup>th</sup> edition), Prentice Hall, NJ USA.
- Roth, P. L., Arnold, J. D., Walker, H. J., Zhang, L., & Van Iddekinge, C. H. (2022). Organizational political affiliation and job seekers: If I don't identify with your party, am I still attracted? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(5), 724–745. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000932>
- Ryan, A. M., & Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2003). Personality's role in person-organization fit: Unresolved issues. M. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work*, (pp. 262-288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rammstedt, Beatrice, and Oliver P. John. 2007 "Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German." *Journal of research in Personality* 41, no. 1, 203-212.
- Roberts, D. and Woods, C. 2005, "Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship", *University of Auckland Business Review*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 45-51.
- Senor, D. and Singer, S. 2011. *Start-up Nation: The Story of Israel's Economic Miracle*. Boston and New York: Grand Central Publishing.
- Shamuganathan, G. and Nga, J.K.H. 2010. "The Influence of Personality Traits and Demographic Factors on Social Entrepreneurship Start Up Intentions". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.
- Shaw, E., and Carter, S. 2007, "Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes". *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 14(3), 418-434.
- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. 2000, "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research", *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shapiro, A. 1975, "The displaced, uncomfortable entrepreneur", *Psychology Today*, 9 (6), 83-88.
- Spence, J. T., and Buckner, C. E. 2000, "Instrumental and Expressive Traits Stereotypes, and Sexist Attitudes. What Do They Signify?" *Psychology of women quarterly*, 24(1), 44-62.
- Stephan, U. and Drencheva, A. 2017. The person in social entrepreneurship: A systematic review of research on the social entrepreneurial personality, in *The Wiley Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, edited by Ahmetoglu, G., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Klinger, B. and Karcisky, T., Wiley, Chichester, pp. 205-229.
- Stewart, W.H., Jr. and Roth, P.L. 2001, "Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 145-153.
- Sullivan Mort, G., and Weerawardena, J. 2006. "Networking capability and international entrepreneurship: How networks function in Australian born global firms". *International Marketing Review*, 23(5), 549-572.
- Sullivan Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., Carnegie, K., Sullivan Mort, G. and Weerawardena, J. 2003, "Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation", *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8 (1), 76-88.
- Tett, R.P., and Burnett, D.D. 2003, "A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 500-517.

- Van Ryzin, G.G., Grossman, S., DiPadova-Stocks, L. and Bergrud, E. 2009," Portrait of the social entrepreneur: Statistical evidence from a US panel", *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 20(2), 129-140.
- Von Wittich, D. and Antonakis, J. 2011," The KAI cognitive style inventory: Was it personality all along?" *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(7), 1044-1049.
- Wales, W.J. 2016." Entrepreneurial orientation: A review and synthesis of promising research directions", *International Small Business Journal*, 34 (1), 3-15.
- Watson, D. and Clark, L.A. 1992," On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model", *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 441-476.
- Weiman-Cocton, A. 2006. *Social Entrepreneurs from the Former Soviet Union: The Social Project and the Meaning of Entrepreneurial Activity*. Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.
- Wilson, L.J. 2000, Building employee and community relationships through volunteerism: A case study, in *Public Relations as Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to the Study and Practice of Public Relations* Edited by Ki, E.-J., Kim, J.-N, and Ledingham, J. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), pp. 137-144.
- Yaffe-Yanai, O., Yanay, D. and Milo, T. 2007, Entrepreneurs, and managers: a family portrait – family dynamics, language, and modes of effective dialogue, in *Career Choice in Management and Entrepreneurship. A Research Companion*, Edited by Özbilgin, M.F. and Malach-Pines, A. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 51-74.
- Yunus, M. 2007," Credit for the poor: Poverty as distant history", *Harvard International Review*, 29 (3), 20-24.
- Wood, W., and Eagly, A. H. 2002." A cross-cultural analysis of the behaviour of women and men: implications for the origins of sex differences". *Psychological bulletin*, 128(5), 699-727.
- Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. and Shulman, J.M. 2009," A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.
- Zhang, L, F. 2006." Thinking styles and the big five personality traits revisited". *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 1177-1187.
- Zaleznik, A. 1991. Leading and managing: Understanding the difference, in *Organizations on the Couch: Clinical Perspectives on Organizational behaviour and Change (Jossey Bass Business and Management Series)*, Edited by Kets de Vries, M.F.R. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, US, pp. 97-119.
- Zhao, H. and Seibert, S.E. 2006," The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2),
- Zhao, H, Seibert, E, and Lumpkin, G.T. 2010" The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and performance: a meta-analytic review". *J. Manag.*, 36 (2) (2010), 381-404  
259-271.
- Zhao, L. and Jung, H. 2018," The winning personality", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial behaviour and & Research*, 24(2), 553-573.