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A B S T R A C T

The activities of social enterprises have been neglected despite the efforts of the government, individuals, and other supportive agencies. Much of this neglect could be attributed to the failure to adopt suitable business models/entrepreneurial marketing (EM) models that address the many challenges these enterprises face. This paper aims to evaluate extant literature and models on EM to propose a new and comprehensive model for social enterprises. In this pursuit, a background literature review on EM was conducted in several peer-reviewed journals. Eight core dimensions were adapted from existing models: social innovativeness, social proactiveness, socially calculated risk-taking, social resources leveraging, social customer intensity, social value creation, social market sensing, and social alliance. Based on these dimensions, a new and all-inclusive model of SEM is proposed. This paper concludes that applying these EM dimensions to social enterprises would significantly promote innovative and sustainable success.
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Introduction

Academic debate has been made possible by adopting entrepreneurial marketing strategies by for-profit and non-profit organisations. Globally, many businesses have failed due to those companies’ lack of entrepreneurial skill when implementing their business plans. According to Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2022a), they cannot survive the VUCA business environment. One of the most significant issues SMEs, particularly those in the social sector, deal with is marketing, crucial business growth and survival activity. According to Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2020a), the fundamental ideas and conventional marketing models that apply to large companies are not always appropriate for the context of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Because of this, it is not surprising that many SME owner-managers, especially those of social enterprises, have a cynical attitude towards traditional marketing concepts and give marketing activities a low priority compared to other business activities (Resnick, Cheng, Simpson & Lourenço, 2016). Despite this seeming low-key approach, studies show that marketing and entrepreneurial skill are essential to the growth of a business (Lusch & Vargo, 2014). Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2022b) also asserted that marketing and entrepreneurship scholars are becoming more and more interested in exploring marketing for entrepreneurs (such as new ventures marketing), marketing for entrepreneurial ventures (such as those aimed at stimulating growth and innovation), or entrepreneurship for marketing (such as innovative marketing).

Social enterprises aim to combine business logic with socially motivated plans to make a positive social impact (Sandén & ug, 2017). Social enterprises transcend sector boundaries. By addressing the most fundamental needs that most people have, such as poor health, inadequate education, and unemployment, social enterprise has primarily changed how many institutions and governments approach the socio-economic problem (Folmer, Nederveen, & Schutjens, 2018). Social enterprises are an emerging global force that promotes development through fresh, proactive business models. According to Mair, Huysentruyt, and Stephan (2016), a social enterprise has incorporated a market-oriented phenomenon and a socially based approach.
Organisations are increasingly being assessed based on their interactions with their team members, clients, and communities and their impact on society (Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends, 2018). According to Jenner (2016), incredible transformation depends on companies becoming more commercially based social enterprises that serve both profit- and non-profit-based purposes. There has been an increasing need for companies to act socially and responsibly by adopting EM tools that would help them survive and grow. When social enterprises are the first to enter an untapped market, they play a crucial role in gaining access to it (Jammulamadaka & Chakraborty, 2018). Their practice frequently entails resolving societal issues while maintaining a social front. Despite their market niche, they still face obstacles like high costs brought on by their lack of expertise in building a strong customer base. It's frequently risky because additional challenges like market imperfections, inefficient infrastructure, and institutional dysfunction affect their offer (Jenner, 2016). Identifying social issues and using EM strategies to address both immediate and long-term issues are vital components of the concept of social enterprises (Addou, Fahmy, Greenwood, & Nelson, 2021). A social entrepreneurial marketing model that includes the core dimensions is necessary for businesses to implement EM strategies.

However, no existing EM models are created to address the problems in the social enterprise sector, and neither are there any EM models that are generally accepted. The development and distribution of every EM model currently used have been targeted at SMEs and significant business operations. Nwankwo (2020) reviewed some of the EM models that have already been developed, including those by Bjerke and Hultman (2002), Hamali, Suryana, Effendi & Azis (2016), Kilenthong, Hills & Hultman (2015), Mort, Weerawardena, and Liesch (2012), Swenson, Rhoads, and Whitlark (2012), as well as Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2022a). This paper modified the model slightly and adapted it in light of the new integrative model's nuance, which recognises the importance of teamwork while emphasising the critical factors affecting the development and survival of social enterprises across the globe. As a result, this study aims to highlight the new EM model that would guide social enterprise operations and help them grow sustainably in this volatile economic environment.

**Literature Review**

**Evolution of Entrepreneurial Marketing**

There is a growing body of literature concentrating on the causes of EM. However, a theoretical issue still needs to be addressed regarding how EM manifests, how it relates to performance, and how complex it is. The EM phenomenon is underdeveloped and lacks a unifying theory to direct cogent research, according to academics like Kilenthong et al. (2015). Consequently, there is a need for theory-based EM research to shed light on entrepreneurial processes and actions that link entrepreneurship with marketing strategy and execution. Given this cavity, examining the intricate nature of the EM phenomenon is crucial.

There is no objectively correct or incorrect conceptualisation of the phenomenon, according to Toghraee, Rezvani, Mobaraki, and Yadollahi Farsi (2017:289) (Nwankwo, 2020). This is true despite scholarly efforts over the past decades to provide an answer to the question of what constitutes EM. Therefore, there is no agreement on the fundamental characteristics of the construct, its dimensions, the nomological network in which EM exists, or the proper definition of the construct. It is crucial to comprehend the complexity of this phenomenon in light of this uncertainty (Toghraee et al., 2017:289). These SME marketing initiatives are essential for a company's survival and expansion. This claim, however, does not imply that EM, regardless of a firm's size, age, or legality, prioritises marketing activities and disregards the entrepreneurial mindset. The EM concept is viewed as complicated and nebulous by many academics. A closer examination of the various EM definitions reveals that they can be categorised using three different methods. First, the integrated approach welcomes accounts of EM that attempt to combine entrepreneurial and marketing mindsets. The second component of the process approach is the definition of EM as a personal or organisational process. Thirdly, the imbalance approach addresses EM goals related to an organisation's entrepreneurial behaviour or marketing mindset (Kurgun, Bagiran, Ozeren & Maral, 2011). To accurately reflect the complexity of the EM phenomenon, each category is discussed in the following section.

According to Morris et al. (2002:5), EM is the "proactive identification and exploitation of opportunities for acquiring and retaining profitable customers through innovative approaches to risk management, resource leveraging, and value creation". With marketing as a tool to create customer value (customer focus, guerrilla marketing, resource leveraging, and value creation), this definition combines and pronounces the fundamentals of entrepreneurship (innovativeness, opportunity, proactiveness, and risk-taking). A dynamic, dispersed, and hostile business context requires a particular behaviour. Whalen et al. (2016:7) define EM as "a combination of innovative, proactive, and risk-taking activities that create, communicate, and deliver value to and by customers, entrepreneurs, marketers, their partners, and society at large" (EM). This integration-focused definition is also clear from their discussion of how EM is integrated into other business practices. Determining the dominant aspect is difficult when using the integrated approach to define EM. Since there isn't a single definition that everyone accepts, the current study agrees with the definitions given above to state that EM is "an unconventional attitude of business practitioners that embraces innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking to identify, anticipate, but also satisfy profitably, the needs of customers and organisations." As one of the many outcomes of EM, competitive advantage in the marketplace is acknowledged in this definition.

**Social Enterprises**

Social enterprises are a relatively new idea in both academic and real-world contexts. Many academics and professionals, particularly in developing nations, have shown little or no interest in this type of enterprise over time. It's important to remember that social
enterprises follow the same organisational principles as conventional businesses. They might have the same appearance, tone, and behaviour as other traditional businesses (Schaltegger, Hansen, & Lüdeke-Freund, 2016). Other names that frequently refer to the nature of social enterprises include "hybrid organisations," “social businesses hybrid,” and other names that are similar to these terms (Santos, Pache, & Birkholz, 2015:36). This divergent point of view or disagreement in social enterprise results from a hazy understanding of the concept. According to Schaltegger et al. (2016), social enterprises are a relatively new phenomenon that has only recently come to the forefront of discussions and research. The definition of a social enterprise is subject to debate. Instead, the discussion is focused on developing a clear definition of a social enterprise that has not yet been disclosed. Even though many words have specific meanings in particular contexts, they are frequently used interchangeably. The complexity of this phenomenon necessitates close observation (Engelke, Mauksch, Darkow & von der Gracht, 2014). There are differences in social enterprises’ conceptualisation and use of the term (Schaltegger et al., 2016). There is some agreement regarding the characteristics of a social enterprise, but it is at a high level of abstraction, according to Young and Lecy (2013:1309).

Battilana, Sengul, Pache, and Model (2015:1658) provided the most popular definition of social enterprises, defining them as organisations that pursue "social missions while also engaging in commercial activities to sustain their operations through sales of products and services.” It is described as a business that "highlights social missions and combines social value creation with commercial means” by Lundström and Zhou (2014:5). As a result of their varied applications in various contexts and the importance of socio-economic factors in their definitions, the above broad definitions only serve to further increase misunderstanding. The role, function, and design of social enterprises depend on the national context in which they are implemented, according to Engelke et al. (2014:58). However, explanations of the types of regional variations and how the socio-economic context affects social enterprise variations are largely absent from the social enterprise literature. According to the same study, “social enterprises are more probable in developed countries than in developing countries” (Engelke et al., 2014:72). Having read and absorbed some of these definitions, this paper defines social enterprises as any business venture created to address social issues and create social value while adhering to the social mission, financial regulations, innovation, and resolve of a private sector endeavour.

Evolution of Social Enterprises

Numerous schools of thought assert to have long been aware of social enterprises' existence. But only recently have they gained recognition under the specific label of “social entrepreneur” (Poon, 2011). (Poon, 2011). This initiative was primarily pioneered and actively backed by Ashoka, a non-profit organisation that identifies and supports top businesspeople worldwide to support social change. However, a number of social entrepreneurs throughout history were in charge of many of the countless social innovations that are now commonplace long before Ashoka was founded in 1981 and popularised the term. By establishing the modern nursing profession, Florence Nightingale revolutionised caregiving and served as the model for such historical social entrepreneurs (Poon, 2011). However, the majority of these social enterprises are isolated, singular instances.

However, there are two fundamental types of social enterprises: hybrid-based social enterprises and market-based social enterprises. This growth and emergence of social enterprise sectors have taken different paths in various geographical areas of the world. North America and Africa are where market-based states first emerged, whereas Europe and Latin America saw the emergence of hybrid states. Future studies will, therefore, thoroughly investigate the various types of social enterprises. To better understand the evolution of social enterprise, figure 1 below summarises the global forces that gave rise to social enterprises.

Figure 1: The evolution of the social enterprise; Source: Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends (2018)
A social enterprise is a company that acknowledges its responsibility to uphold civic virtues both inside and outside of its walls, setting an example for its peers and promoting intense teamwork at all organisational levels. Many businesses are now transitioning from a functional model—which is siloed—to an operational model known as a “network of teams” to promote better internal collaboration and agility (Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends, 2018). The rising shift from an internal enterprise focus to an external ecosystem focus is depicted in Figure 1. A social enterprise is a business that is perceptive and adaptable enough to meet the needs and expectations of stakeholders. Many factors have influenced the development of social enterprises. Nevertheless, according to Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends (2018), three reliable macro forces—people (individuals), businesses, and technological advancement—are accelerating this transformation.

One must pay close attention to both the internal and external environments if they are to behave in a social enterprise-like manner. Being a social enterprise also means investing in the broader social ecosystem, starting with the company’s team members. It entails treating each employee equally, openly, and objectively on and off the balance sheet. To actively manage their position within the social ecosystem, social enterprises strategically identify and pursue the kinds of relationships they wish to develop with each stakeholder. Silos cannot be used to approach this (Engelke et al., 2014). Every area of focus requires strong leadership collaboration inside and outside the organisation.

Thus, it is crucial to emphasise the differences between social marketing (SM) and entrepreneurial marketing (EM) to comprehend the role and activities of social enterprises.

**Entrepreneurial Marketing (EM) and Social Marketing (SM) Variations**

The differences in context, approach to the market, focal point, risk perspective, and marketer’s role, among other attributes, between entrepreneurial marketing (EM) and social marketing (SM), can aid in expanding one's understanding of SM. In terms of practice, SM can be distinguished from EM in terms of the actual process involved in marketing. This is based on the justification that business owners employ marketing differently than social marketers.

According to Kotler and Lee (2008), social marketing is a process that “applies marketing principles and techniques to create, communicate, and deliver value to influence target audience behaviour that benefits society (public health, safety, the environment, and communities) as well as the target audience.” Toghraee et al. (2017) argued that EM is non-traditional or social marketing, which frequently deals with issues like a lack of economies of scale, severe resource constraints, a limited geographic market presence, a limited market image, a limited level of brand loyalty or marketing share, a lack of specialised management expertise, and decision-making with incomplete information. According to Toghraee et al. (2017), EM is proactive and shifts focus as it introduces change instead of reacting to it. Others emphasise that EM encompasses not only the marketing initiatives of resource-constrained businesses but also individualised, crude, and unorthodox forms of marketing. To improve conceptual understanding of the EM phenomenon in social enterprises, a thorough comparison of EM and SM is essential. Table 1 lists thirteen dimensions that highlight the differences between EM and SM.
According to Toghraee et al. (2017), SE, or marketing for good, is customer-centric, while EM is characterised by innovation and an entrepreneurial mindset. In this situation, SM typically calls for assessing the market's needs before developing a product. EM frequently starts with an idea and then looks for a market for it (Toghraee et al., 2017), which is happening simultaneously. The prevalence of the top-down strategy in SM, where activities like segmenting occur in a clearly defined arrangement, is also noteworthy. In contrast, EM uses a bottom-up, reversed process as an entrepreneur tests an opportunity through trial and error.

At the tactical level, EM uses an interactive marketing strategy because it prefers having one-on-one interactions with customers. Entrepreneurs understand the value of carefully examining the marketing environment. However, they use unofficial techniques like close observation or networked information gathering. Entrepreneurs frequently claim that they do not use marketing, primarily because they view marketing as equivalent to advertising, which they avoid because it is expensive. Entrepreneurs often disregard long-term issues in favour of operational problems and current trends. The crucial distinction is that business owners employ a distinct form of marketing because they are adaptable but always focused on offering long-term solutions (Kilenthong et al., 2015:4; Whalen & Akaka, 2016). Given the comparison above, it is instructive to consider how EM is contextualised in social enterprise.

**Generalisation of the Main Statements and Discussion**

Considering the theoretical stance, methodological diversity, and critical findings is crucial when situating EM in social enterprises. First, there is no solid theoretical foundation or academically approved grounding for EM research in social enterprise. Researchers like Ghods (2019) created the framework for EM and social enterprises but did not validate any construct.

The main goal of marketing and entrepreneurship is to create value for the customer (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2022b). Therefore, it is crucial for SMEs, especially social enterprises, to integrate marketing and entrepreneurial traits. Social enterprises are a subset of small and medium-sized entrepreneurial ventures which operate on a limited budget (Gwadabe & Amirah, 2017). Most marketing tasks are performed by the owners and managers (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2022a). This suggests that an entrepreneurial firm's operation closely mirrors the personality of the owner-managers or entrepreneurs (Suardhika & Suryani, 2016). Unlike many well-

---

**Table 1: Social Marketing and Entrepreneurial Marketing Variations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Social marketing</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer needs</td>
<td>Perception, articulation, assumption, and expression of customers through market research.</td>
<td>Unarticulated, discovered, and identified by customers through lead users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer's role</td>
<td>The consumer is central to and actively participates in the social marketing process.</td>
<td>Participate actively in the firm's marketing decision process, defining product, price, place, and promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Marketing mix coordination and achievement of social change and social benefits.</td>
<td>New value-creation for customers through alliances, relationships, resource management, and mixed marketing approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market approach</td>
<td>An adaptive and reactive approach to current market position with incremental innovation (marketing striving to solve problems).</td>
<td>Proactive approach, leading the customer with dynamic innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Intelligence</td>
<td>In-depth dependence on market research; formalised research and intelligence systems.</td>
<td>Sceptical use of conventional market research; adoption of alternative procedures; informal networking and data gathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketer's role</td>
<td>Harmonisation of the marketing mix and acting as an agent of social change.</td>
<td>Acts as the agent of internal and external change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing overview</td>
<td>Marketing facilitates in-kind services, volunteerism, and donations of other resources that may add to the available resources.</td>
<td>As a cross-disciplinary and inter-functional pursuit, marketing facilitates adaptability, speed, change, and agility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing concept</td>
<td>Community-oriented: product development through evoking consciousness, changing behaviour, and helping the environment people live in.</td>
<td>Innovation-oriented: encourages idea-generation and intuitive assessment of market needs (external environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>The marketing mix (utilisation of four/seven marketing Ps to pursue social outcomes).</td>
<td>Interactive marketing methods (word-of-mouth, network marketing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New product/service</td>
<td>Through research and development, marketing supports the development of new products/services (offering behavioural change).</td>
<td>Marketing is the shelter of a firm's entrepreneurial process and the shelter of innovation (the customer is a co-active producer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk perspective</td>
<td>Reduction of risk in marketing programmes.</td>
<td>Marketing as a vehicle for calculated risk-taking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Authors' concept
known organisations, EM in the SME is crucial because marketing activities are primarily informal (Al-Lawati, 2017). According to Ghods (2019), the relationship between marketing and entrepreneurial orientation in social enterprises directly results from environmental uncertainty. According to Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2020), owners or managers may be prevented from being proactive, inventive, and risk-taking if they are overly focused on catering to and understanding an established market. However, marketing practice is inherently entrepreneurial, particularly if it involves taking calculated risks, dealing with the unknown, being proactive, and offering innovations (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2020).

In developing countries, how businesses conduct their marketing activities is crucial due to the intensely competitive environment in which they operate (Otika, Nwaizugbo & Olise, 2019). According to Nwaizugbo & Anukam (2014), the current situation for SMEs reveals a sector that has remained more production- than market-oriented. Important marketing issues persist as a result of the emphasis. According to studies, numerous SMEs cannot be classified as entrepreneurial (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2020). This confirms the findings of Otika, Nwaizugbo, and Olise (2019), who assert that businesses waste time and resources on operations that aren't necessary to gain a competitive advantage. Owners and managers of social enterprises ignore fundamental EM practices like innovation, opportunity seeking, and value creation, which could significantly increase their competitive advantage. Companies' disregard for entrepreneurial actions has led to the failure of numerous businesses (Gwadabe & Amirah, 2017).

It is well documented in the literature (Engelke et al., 2014) how social enterprise contributes to the economic growth and development of both developed and developing countries. According to Ghods (2019), business ventures can only improve and maintain their positions if appropriate strategies, like creating and implementing appropriate EM practices, are used to achieve successful performance. In other words, the dynamic business environment's uniqueness has increased the competitive level for businesses (Olannye & Eromafuru, 2016).

It is crucial to know that limited studies on EM and social enterprises exist. Additionally, no EM model has been created or proven effective in addressing the social problems associated with operating social ventures worldwide. However, the survival of SMEs has been significantly aided by earlier studies focusing on existing EM models in other SME sectors (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2022a). Therefore, many business owners, staff members, and academics are interested in developing a new EM model that applies to social enterprises and understanding EM dimensions. This study fills this knowledge gap by adapting the integrative entrepreneurial marketing model Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2020) proposed and validated by Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2022a). This EM model's initial eight dimensions include inventiveness, proactivity, calculated risk, resource leveraging, customer intensity, value creation, market sensing, and teamwork. However, due to their contextual stances, some EM dimensions would be modified in the context of social enterprises. For instance, social market orientation (MO), social market-driving orientation (SMDO), and social entrepreneurial orientation (SEO).

In the proposed new EM model for social enterprises, social innovativeness, social proactiveness, socially calculated risk-taking, and social resource leveraging are incorporated in SEO; social customer intensity and social value creation are part of SMO; and social alliance and social market sensing are embraced in SMDO. The suggested EM model for social enterprises is shown in Figure 1 below.
Social Entrepreneurial Orientation (SEO): Reviewing the body of existing research on SEO reveals that the majority of earlier studies adopted Miller's definition of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) as a combination of initiative, innovation, and calculated risk-taking (Nwekpa, Onwe, & Ezezue, 2018). Studies examining the distinct dimensions of deliberate risk-taking, inventiveness, proactiveness, and resource leveraging have discovered that these dimensions can be connected in various ways to form configurations. As a result, in the context of social enterprises, SEO facilitates opportunity recognition among people who are perceptive to changes in the business environment (Abaho, 2017). Proactiveness, innovation, and thoughtful risk-taking are the three most frequently used EO dimensions. According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), the competing aggressiveness and autonomy dimensions are two additional salient dimensions of EO.

Some EO studies only look at three dimensions, suggesting that the Covin and Slevin scale is the most widely used SEO literature (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2022a). All five of these dimensions have allegedly been used in at least one study, according to Abaho (2017). Innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness are the three dimensions many researchers have used. Therefore, these four crucial dimensions were used in this study: social resources, leveraging the already used dimensions of social innovativeness, social proactiveness, and socially calculated risk-taking because of their effects on social enterprise survival.

Social proactiveness: Proactiveness has been characterised in a variety of ways. The definition of "proactive", as given by Merriam-Webster, is "managing a situation by forcing things to happen or by getting ready for potential future issues" (Merriam-Webster, 2015). Entrepreneurial marketers consequently adopt a pro-active attitude towards their customers and the market by nature (Holmes & Jorløv, 2015). Aggressive behaviour is "acting in advance of future circumstances, rather than just reacting," according to Thal (2016:5). Instead of adjusting to the circumstance or waiting for something to happen naturally, this calls for taking the initiative and making things happen. In most contemporary businesses, employees must do more than simply respond to and adapt to their environments. However, proactiveness is "an entrepreneurial willingness to dominate competitions through a combination of proactive and aggressive moves, thus introducing new products or services ahead of the competition and acting in anticipation of future demands to create change and shape the environment," according to Olannye and Eromafuru (2016:139). The ability of the social entrepreneur to recognise and address innate, unfelt, or unnoticed needs that customers have not anticipated is known as proactiveness in the context of social enterprise.

Social innovativeness: The "word innovation is derived from the Latin word innovare, which means new" (Stenberg, 2017:2). Innovation can be summed up in one simple definition: trying something new (Farniha, Ferreira & Gouveia, 2016). According to Baskara and Mehta (2016), innovation can also be a strategy and technology for developing new markets, processes for producing goods, and target markets. This means that social businesses of all sizes must innovate and quickly adapt to shifting consumer demands and market dynamics to seize an opening in the market (Linton, 2019). Notably, a company's social innovation has a broad scope and encompasses products, services, processes, operations, and people. This model defines innovation as "the ability of a firm to engage in creative processes, experimentation of novel ideas, which may result in the creation of new production techniques and the introduction of new products or services to existing or new markets." This definition suggests that social innovativeness enables social enterprise managers to concentrate on fresh concepts guiding the company towards investigating new markets, goods, and procedures.
Social calculated risk-taking: Academic literature has long used the idea of taking risks. Sociologist Niklas Luhmann believes that the word risk is a neologism that has evolved from traditional to modern ideology. According to Allah and Nakhaie (2011:76), the word “residuum” was used to define and characterise all forms of maritime trade and the legal issues resulting from damage and loss. The terms “loss and damage” were referred to as riezgo and rischio in the 16th century (Aven 2014:21). The older idea of loss, damage, and bad luck started to change, though, as the term risk became more commonly used (Bijloos, 2017:25). Risk-taking is described as “the tendency to take bold decisions, such as venturing into unknown new markets, committing a significant amount of resources to endeavours with uncertain outcomes, and borrowing heavily with a chance of failing” by Kapepa and Van Vuuren (2019:7). The uncertainty of entrepreneurial behaviour is frequently attributed to risk-taking (Olaniran, Namusonge, & Muturi, 2016). According to the proposed social enterprise model, socially calculated risk-taking is the firm’s capacity to use consciousness when making decisions with a high potential for success or failure. More importantly, risk-taking as a component of EM includes the firm’s ability to use calculated approaches to lessen the risk associated with the opportunity and the willingness to take a chance on the opportunity.

Social resource leveraging: This is a crucial component of EM models because social enterprises typically have scarce resources to meet the many and varied needs of their internal constituencies (such as employees) and external constituencies (such as customers and regulators). Because they use several strategies to leverage resources, EM adopters are not constrained by the resources at their disposal. These consist of “stretching resources much further than competitors do, exploiting resources that others are unable to realise, using other people’s resources to achieve their own goal, combining the resources of two firms to increase value as well, and using specific resources to obtain additional resources and recycling” (Nwaizugbo & Anukam, 2014:93).

Resource leveraging is frequently seen as distinct from and distinct from the EM orientation. Leveraging resources is an essential component of EM activities in this study. Resource leveraging is the innovative and efficient use of a company's resources to accomplish complex goals. More importantly, if they do not adopt an entrepreneurial approach to carrying out their activities, social entrepreneurs cannot leverage tangible and intangible resources. Therefore, having EO skills means that a person must not only be proactive, creative, risk-averse, independent, and aggressive but also creative in managing and using the limited resources at their disposal. According to the conceptual model of SEM for this study, resource leveraging is the capacity to identify resources that aren't being used to their full potential and comprehend how those resources might be used in unconventional ways.

Social Market Orientation (SMO): For the past 20 years, this has been a crucial metric for assessing marketing operations (Sombultawee & Boon-it, 2018). It is regarded as one of the essential components for a business to survive. The importance of MO in social enterprises cannot be understated due to its strong correlation with business performance, regardless of culture or market type (Na, Kang, & Jeong, 2019). Numerous of these researchers looked at SMO from a cultural or behavioural perspective. First and foremost, SMO relies on an organisational culture that successfully fosters the behaviours required for facilitating superior value for customers and, as a result, the ongoing outstanding performance of the company (Narver & Slater, 1990:21). Second, SMO, as a behavioural strategy, emphasises the creation of market intelligence about present and future customer needs across the entire organisation. Additionally, it presupposes that said intelligence would be shared across departments and that an organisation-wide reaction will be made to it (Jaworski & Kohli, 2017). Social customer intensity and social value creation are used in this study to create the SMO dimensions.

Social customer intensity: Customers are given top priority by successful businesses in their organisational goals. In marketing literature, there has been much discussion about customer intensity or centricity. Deshpandé, Farley, and Webster (1993:27), for example, define it as “the set of philosophies that places the customer's interests first without ignoring those of all other stakeholders (including owners, managers, and employees) to develop a long-term profitable enterprise thus.” In this study, social customer intensity describes how a company operates in a social setting. Before and after the sale, these business activities should offer a satisfying customer experience, encouraging repeat business, customer loyalty, and financial success. It is a strategy that contends that the goals of a social organisation should be driven by the principle of putting the needs of the customer first.

Social value creation: A company's entrepreneurial and marketing orientation revolves around creating value (Rezvani & Khazaei, 2014). A company’s ability to create value is crucial to survival (Kotler & Keller, 2016). The value of (augmented) goods and services and relationships are two opposing schools of thought regarding value creation that have emerged in the recent marketing literature (Lindgreen, Hingley, Grant & Morgan, 2012). From the perspective of goods and services, value is viewed as the cost of the good (i.e., the total amount paid) and a subjective marginal value based on the value system of the buyer (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2022b). Value and price are individualistic, according to Aminu (2016). For customers to be motivated to purchase, the value must always outweigh the cost. Discovering untapped customer value sources and coming up with inventive resource combinations is how value is created in social enterprises to produce innovative value in the social context.

Social Market-Driving Orientation (SMDO): The SMDO “outperforms market-driven orientation in terms of gaining sustainable advantage through changing the composition or structure of the market and the behaviours of its players” (Agarwala, Chakrabortib, Brema & Bocken 2017:3). Market-driving organisations, as noted by Kumar in Buckley and Ghauri (2015), are those that excel through technological and marketing innovation. Beyond meeting customers' expressed needs, SMDO goes above and beyond. This implies that organisations must actively identify and meet customers' latent and unspoken needs to follow the market-driving
paradigm. The market-driving orientation supports this view and is built on two fundamental components: vision and creativity. For businesses to draw in and keep customers, innovation is essential. According to the forward-sensing strategy (Van Vuuren & Wörgötter, 2013), this aligns with the market-sensing dimension, which enables social ventures to be responsive and develop novel concepts and ideas to alter the market. The social market sensing and social alliance dimensions have been adopted in this study as appropriate and pertinent for the survival of social ventures.

**Social market sense:** This is an integral and crucial component of the SMDO. According to Mu (2015), market sensing refers to a company’s capacity to predict market evolution and identify emerging opportunities using data gathered from its corporate ecosystem. Osakwe, Chovancova, and Ogbonna (2015:34) emphasize the significance of comprehending unmet market needs. Social market sensing, as used in the current study, refers to the capacity of social entrepreneurs to scan their surroundings and spot business opportunities. This skill enables the business to innovate, foresee, and track customer needs and trends before its rivals (Nwankwo & Kanyangale, 2020). From a personal or corporate standpoint, social market sensing emphasizes the significance of opportunity identification and refinement as a foundation for starting new businesses. Further consideration should be given to the entrepreneurial approach to determining specific market demands.

**Social alliance:** Finding a new market niche depends on this dimension. According to Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2019), the social alliance’s traits include voluntary business agreements, sharing or co-developing goods, technologies, or services, and exchange. Strategically speaking, an alliance is “an agreement between two companies working on the same horizontal level in the market to share resources for carrying out a desired project in which the two parties have a shared interest” (Zamir, Sahar & Zafar, 2014:25). Companies are forming alliances for a variety of reasons, such as sharing innovations and organisational learning, gaining access to new markets, distributing, and avoiding risks and expenses associated with increasing public visibility and recognition. According to Zamir et al. (2014), social alliances impact organisational performance by fostering a firm’s expansion, fostering innovation, preventing business mortality, accelerating organisational learning, and managing reputations. An alliance is the contractual pooling of resources and resource exchange agreements between two or more businesses in a social enterprise.

In light of these social entrepreneurial marketing dimensions (SEM) examples, the paper has suggested a SEM model that researchers can use when conducting empirical research. This paper adds to the variety of insightful ways to investigate this elusive phenomenon as more study of SEM is anticipated.

**Conclusion**

Despite the absence of widely accepted, empirically validated, and robust models, continuous exploratory efforts to create relevant and economic EM models have continued to gain prominence. To address this gap, the paper recognizes the significance of the eight fundamental EM dimensions of the integrative EM model developed by Nwankwo and Kanyangale (2022a). However, the model was not adopted in totality because of the nature and context of social enterprise activities. This study aims to propose a new EM model that would reduce the continued failure of social ventures around the globe. The multi-dimensional nature of the proposed EM construct has been operationalized through substantial and pertinent SEO, SMO, and SMDO elements taken from the literature, suggesting a novel SEM model. Applying the characteristics in the suggested EM to social enterprises is said to have an enormous potential to spread their success in a novel and long-lasting manner. Given its potential to spark the growth of EM practices in social enterprises, this proposed model requires further testing.
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