The Psychological Well-Being of Social Entrepreneurs: A Conceptual Analysis of Career Choice

Savi Bahuguna [1], Dr. Garima [2], Dr. Ravikesh Srivastava [3]

[1] Research Scholar, School of Management, IMS Unison University, Dehradun.
savinandab@gmail.com

[2] Assistant Professor (Senior Scale), School of Management, IMS Unison University, Dehradun
garima@fmsbhu.ac.in

[3] Pro-Vice Chancellor, IMS Unison University, Dehradun
ravik_63@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research paper explores the intersection of social entrepreneurship as a career choice and its impact on psychological well-being. The study presents a comprehensive conceptualization of social entrepreneurs' well-being and theories encompassing the individual, environment, organization, and process dimensions, which interconnect various aspects of entrepreneurial traits, organizational development, venture stages, environmental influences, and market success. Moreover, it emphasizes the importance of understanding the relationship between social entrepreneurship, career choice and well-being. The paper recognizes the significance of well-being in preventing burnout and sustaining motivation among social entrepreneurs. Psychological well-being, encompassing various dimensions such as positive affect, life satisfaction, self-esteem, and resilience, and these concepts are discussed in context of social entrepreneurs. Understanding the factors that influence their career decisions and helps in creating more holistic psychological well-being is vital for supporting their continued engagement in social entrepreneurship. By delving into these areas, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of social entrepreneurship as a career choice and its implications for psychological well-being.

INTRODUCTION

Career and individual well-being are closely interconnected, as the satisfaction and fulfillment derived from one's work significantly impact various dimensions of well-being. When individuals decide on a career path, they consider a range of factors that are important to their overall well-being. These factors can include personal interests, values, skills, and long-term goals. While some individuals may prioritize extrinsic motivations such as financial stability or societal recognition, for social entrepreneurs, the primary drive is not from monetary or achievement objectives. Instead, their motivation is often rooted in a deep sense of purpose, a desire to create positive social impact, and a commitment to addressing social or environmental issues. Social entrepreneurs find fulfillment in contributing to a cause, greater than themselves, to make a better world, by improving the lives of others. By aligning their career with their values and the needs of society, social entrepreneurs derive a unique sense of satisfaction and purpose from their work, ultimately contributing to their overall well-being (Dees, 1998; Martin & Osberg, 2007).

The available literature provides significant insights into the factors that drive individuals to embark on social entrepreneurship careers, focusing on motivations. Notwithstanding, our grasp of social entrepreneurship careers remains constrained, necessitating further research and investigation (Au et al., 2021). Understanding the way social entrepreneurs analyze their careers from a well-being perspective is paramount to enhancing our current understanding of the factors driving their resilience in pursuing social entrepreneurial ventures, even amidst adversity and challenges for their endeavors (Renko, 2013). This inquiry is particularly relevant, considering that social entrepreneurs often incur significant personal costs in their pursuit of social impact (Dempsey & Sanders, 2010). Embarking on a journey of social entrepreneurship offers distinctive opportunities for both career fulfillment and personal well-being. However, the psychological well-being of social entrepreneurs is significantly

influenced by their operating context, which often entails resource scarcity, challenging conditions, and potential exposure to trauma. Social entrepreneurs face unique psychological challenges that impact their overall mental health and well-being. The complexities of addressing social issues can lead to significant challenges, including elevated levels of stress, burnout, and emotional exhaustion. Furthermore, the constant pressure to balance financial sustainability with social impact can create tension and affect psychological well-being.

Recognizing the importance of psychological well-being for social entrepreneurs is essential. It has been observed that social entrepreneurs often gauge their success based on the positive impact they create for the communities they serve (Dees, 1998), which contributes to their psychological well-being. While recognizing the apparently altruistic motives of social entrepreneurs, certain scholars contend that these individuals may also be propelled by a personal desire for self-fulfillment (Mair & Noboa, 2006), which aids psychological well-being. For instance, studies have shown that social enterprises strive to strike a delicate balance between social and economic objectives (Townsend & Hart, 2008). However, it is the social entrepreneurs who place a greater emphasis on the social aspect, prioritizing the creation of value for the communities they serve (Austin et al., 2006; Prabhu, 1999).

The primary objective of this research paper is to understand the impact of social entrepreneurship as a career choice on the psychological well-being of social entrepreneurs. Additionally, the study aims to explore the challenges they encounter in achieving well-being and the implications of these challenges. By delving into the relationship between psychological well-being and career decision-making in the context of social entrepreneurship, this research seeks to gain deeper insights that can inform the development of interventions and support systems. The goal is to enhance the well-being and career outcomes of social entrepreneurs, enabling them to navigate their entrepreneurial journey with greater resilience and fulfillment.

To achieve this aim, the study conducted a comprehensive review and synthesis of existing literature, theoretical frameworks, and conceptual models. This process helped build a solid theoretical foundation and propose new insights and perspectives on the topic. The research paper provided conceptual frameworks that could guide future empirical studies in the relationship between psychological well-being and career decisions among social entrepreneurs. By examining the interplay between psychological well-being and career choices, this research contributes to our understanding of the unique challenges and rewards faced by social entrepreneurs. The findings have implications for the design of interventions and support systems that can foster well-being and enhance career outcomes in social entrepreneurship. Overall, this study offers valuable insights into the relationship between psychological well-being and career decisions among social entrepreneurs, providing a basis for further exploration and practical applications in this field.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS: WHO ARE THEY?

Social entrepreneurs are defined as "change agents who establish enterprises primarily to meet social objectives rather than generate profit" (Renko, 2013). Social entrepreneurs go beyond the pursuit of financial gains, prioritizing the catalysis of transformative social change and addressing urgent societal needs (Groot and Dankbaar, 2014; Zahra et al., 2009). This sets them apart from conventional profit-oriented entrepreneurs, as their motivations, competencies, and approaches to enterprise development differ (Germak and Robinson, 2014). Prosocial motivation and altruistic intentions to fulfill a profound social mission that serve as the driving force that propel social entrepreneurs forward (Austin et al., 2006;). Importantly, as dynamic agents of societal innovation, social entrepreneurs actively generate and sustain significant social value through their sharp business acumen, adept management of enterprises, and inspirational leadership (Jensen and Luthans, 2006; Austin et al., 2006; Mair and Marti, 2006).

Alvord et al, (2004) argue "social entrepreneurship utilizes entrepreneurial competencies to tackle social problems, such as poverty alleviation and sustainable societal transformations". The diversity within social entrepreneurship, gives way to the definitional and theoretical deliberation, which is still open-ended (Saebi et al., 2019). Prior studies have illuminated the competencies and motivational factors that play a role in driving individuals to choose social entrepreneurship as their path (Ghalwash et al., 2017; Lewis, 2016), the trajectory of this transformation has remained largely obscure.. Choi and Majumdar (2014) describe social entrepreneurship as an "essentially contested concept." Nonetheless, there is an agreement that social entrepreneurship exhibits

contextual variations but the basic theme of creating social value, remains the same (Saebi et al., 2019; Seelos and Mair, 2005; Zahra et al., 2009).

"The lack of comprehensive studies exploring the distinct process of becoming a social entrepreneur has limited our understanding of the processual aspects of social entrepreneurship (Santos, 2012). Despite the extensive focus on static characteristics, such as personalities and competencies, in existing studies on social entrepreneurs (Germak and Robinson, 2014), there has been a notable gap in understanding the dynamic process by which individuals become social entrepreneurs and sustain their careers over time in the pursuit of living a fulfilling life or a life of full potential (Peredo and McLean, 2006). Understanding this will contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the intricacies and transformative nature of social entrepreneurship and their psychological well-being

WHAT IS CAREER AND WHAT IS CAREER CHOICE?

The dominant career literature emphasizes careers as planned behaviors with predictable paths of advancement (Cadenas et al. 2018). A career can be described as a "dynamic and purposeful voyage, symbolizing an individual's pursuit of professional and personal fulfillment and growth". It transcends the mere notion of employment, encompassing a holistic journey of learning, development, and achievement within a chosen field or industry. It entails a deliberate progression through various roles, experiences, and opportunities, marked by the cultivation of skills, expertise, and a sense of purpose. A career is a manifestation of one's dedication to continuous improvement, as well as the pursuit of personal and professional aspirations. In this context, the term "career" denotes the personally perceived progression and interplay of ambition, perseverance, and strategic decision-making, guiding individuals towards a fulfilling and meaningful professional trajectory and engagements over an individual's lifetime (Baruch, 2004).

Various career choice theories anchored in sociology and psychology, explain the career development process and highlight the driving factors behind career choices. Theories embedded in psychology, such as 'trait theory, developmental theory, and social cognitive career theory (SCCT)', suggest that career decision-making is primarily influenced by individualistic factors (Wang et al., 2022). These theories emphasize that an individual's traits, developmental experiences, and cognitive processes shape their career choices. In theories arising from sociology, social experiences and external factors, such as the opportunity structure within society, play a significant role in career decision-making. According to sociological perspectives, individuals' career choices are influenced by the available opportunities and constraints within their social context. By considering both individual and social factors, these theories provide a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of career choices (Lent et al., 2000).

Trait theory asserts that career decision-making involves matching individual personality traits, skills, and interests with job requirements. In contrast, the developmental theory of Ginzberg et al. (1951) highlights the lifelong nature of career planning and the influence of evolving self-concept and social context on career choices. Another influential theory in career choice is Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), which is grounded in Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory. SCCT emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between individuals and their environment and underscores the significance of learning experiences, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations in the career development process (Hodkinson & Sparkes, 1997). Baumgardner (1982) and Miller & Fiddleman, (1983) argue against planned decision-making models, emphasizing the significance of "happenstance" and fortuitous opportunities (Hodkinson & Sparkes, 1997). Hodkinson & Sparkes (1997) suggested that individual career decisions are shaped by "opportunity structures" in the youth labor market, influenced by industrial organization, employment dynamics, government regulations, and social class. Boreham & Arthur (1993) focus on identifying the information needs of young individuals. Career choice theories encompass various essential factors that influence career decisions, such as "self-concept, personal goals, social experiences, external constraints, learning experiences, outcome expectations, self-efficacy, opportunity structures, government policies, social class, and vocational interests" (Leung, 2008). These factors collectively contribute to the complex process of career decision-making in general.

But in practicality, the decision-making process of career choice is influenced by different dimensions of well-being (Uthayakumar et al., 2010, Mohammed and Padakannaya, 2021). Well-being plays a significant role in

shaping one's career choices and promoting a fulfilling and balanced professional life (Sheldon et al., 2004). Individuals often prioritize the type of well-being they value the most and then align their careers accordingly. For instance, economic well-being focuses on financial stability and prosperity. Individuals who prioritize economic well-being may prioritize job opportunities that offer high earning potential, financial security, and opportunities for wealth accumulation, and those who value psychological well-being may opt for careers that provide a sense of purpose and fulfillment (Weimann et al., 2015). By understanding their personal needs and priorities in terms of well-being, individuals can make informed career choices that are better suited to their overall happiness, fulfillment, and life satisfaction. It's important for individuals to reflect on their own values, goals, and aspirations when considering career choices. By understanding the type of well-being they prioritize, individuals can make career decisions that support their overall well-being and contribute to a more fulfilling and balanced life.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A CAREER CHOICE

The success of social entrepreneurs' hinges on their ability to attract resources and employ innovative strategies to create social value. In the context of career choice, social entrepreneurs are innovative, pro-active, and risk-taking (Weerawardena and Mort, 2006). A significant aspect to consider is the conceptual framework that encompasses four dimensions: the individual (entrepreneur), the environment, the organization, and the process (Sharir and Lerner, 2006). This framework connects the unique traits and leadership skills of entrepreneurs with various organizational aspects, venture stages, environmental influences, and the ability to succeed in the market. To further explore social entrepreneurship as a career choice, it is crucial to understand the interplay between the driving forces of social entrepreneurship and the well-being of individuals as it is important in preventing burnout and sustaining motivation in the pursuit of social goals.

While research on careers extends to various fields beyond entrepreneurship (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Gubler et al, 2014; Mainiero and Sullivan, 2005) and commercial entrepreneurship (e.g., Tlaiss, 2019; Zikic and Ezzedeen, 2015), it fails to adequately capture the unique career experiences of social entrepreneurs due to the contextual and socially anchored nature of their careers. Furthermore, as social entrepreneurs operate in the realm of hybrid organizations, combining both social and commercial elements (Mair et al, 2012). The incorporation of risk and uncertainty in this combination (e.g., Renko, 2013) further distinguishes social entrepreneurship from other career paths and there is a need to study the linkage of psychological well-being with the competencies (Parasuraman et al., 1996, Nielsen et al., 2009). Social entrepreneurs find fulfillment in contributing to a cause greater than themselves, making a difference in the world, and improving the lives of others (Sheldon et al., 2004) and this fulfillment leads to their own well-being.

WELL-BEING AND WHAT ELSE?

Well-being encompasses a state of optimal health and satisfaction, encompassing physical, mental, and social aspects of an individual's life. It involves a holistic sense of wellness, positive emotions, fulfilling relationships, a sense of purpose, and overall life contentment. Well-being is influenced by various factors and can be cultivated through personal choices and supportive environments. Psychological well-being, which encompasses aspects such as emotional stability, positive emotions, resilience, and self-esteem, is an integral component of a comprehensive understanding of holistic well-being or well-being in general. It is one facet among others, including social, spiritual, and physical well-being, that contribute to a person's overall state of welfare and flourishing. 'Psychological well-being' as the term used in this research, should not be confused with the PWB (named-psychological well-being), a well-being approach based on eudaimonia, developed by C.D Ryff (Ryff, 1989), which will be discussed in next paragraph. We will be using psychological well-being interchangeably with well-being.

Psychological Well-being: The Broader Term

In the field of academia, different conceptualizations of this kind of well-being have emerged, including Subjective Well-being (SWB), based on life satisfaction and experiences as proposed by Diener et al. (1985), Eudaimonic Well-being (EWB), to assess life as one's best potential as proposed by Waterman (2008), and Psychological Well-Being (PWB), an eudaimonic approach based on positive psychological functioning, as

proposed by Ryff (2008), including Ryan and Deci's 2006 tripartite model of subjective well-being, which included hedonic and eudaimonic approached under subjective well-being and the 'Self Deterministic Theory' (SDT), which is widely applied. These conceptualizations have led to varying theories and understandings of well-being forming correlated yet different perspectives. However, to simplify the understanding, it can be argued that all three dimensions of well-being should fall under the overarching concept of psychological well-being as they have common and correlated constructs such as autonomy, personal growth and self-esteem (Kashdan et al, 2008). The concepts have been expanded below.

Subjective Well-being (SWB)

Subjective Well-being (SWB) pertains to an individual's self-assessment and subjective evaluation of their life and emotional experiences. It encompasses their overall life satisfaction, the presence of positive emotions, and the absence of negative emotions. Measurement of SWB often involves self-report scales that assess factors such as life satisfaction and subjective feelings of happiness or positive affect. SWB places emphasis on an individual's personal and subjective perception of their own well-being. Satisfaction with life scale (SWLS) is one of the most commonly used scale to assess SWB. The notable works include 'Ryan and Deci's' conceptualization and Dieners' SWLS scale (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Eudaimonic Well-being (EWB)

Eudaimonic well-being centers around the quest for meaning, self-realization, and personal growth. It draws its foundation from the philosophy of eudaimonia, which posits that well-being is achieved by leading a virtuous life and fulfilling one's potential. Eudaimonic well-being places emphasis on elements such as 'self-actualization, personal values, personal growth, and the pursuit of meaningful goals'. It underscores the significance of engaging in activities that foster personal development and provide a sense of purpose in life. Assessments of eudaimonic well-being often encompass constructs such as 'purpose in life, personal growth, and self-transcendence' (Waterman et al., 2010).

Psychological Well-being (PWB)

Psychological well-being places emphasis on the psychological functioning and internal experiences that contribute to an individual's overall well-being, as formulated by Ryff who developed the six dimensions of Psychological Well-Being (PWB). It encompasses various dimensions of well-being, including positive relationships, personal growth, purpose in life, autonomy, self-acceptance, and environmental mastery. PWB is based on the well-being theory proposed by psychologist Carol Ryff, which underscores the significance of psychological functioning and personal development for overall well-being. Assessing PWB is commonly done using scales such as Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff et al., 2012). We will be referring to this as PWB and this should not be confused with the generalized broader term '*Psychological Well-being*', which is a generalized broader term encompassing all of these and is often referred to as 'well-being' in academia.

It is important to note that these concepts of well-being overlap and are interconnected. For example, constructs like altruism and helping, which are arguably eudaimonic in their virtuous nature, are also strongly related to the experience of positive affect, which falls under the realm of Subjective Well-being (SWB) (Waterman 2008). Studies have shown that factors such as autonomy and a balance between autonomy, growth, and relatedness, which are proxies for eudaimonia, are associated with increased SWB (Sheldon and Niemiec, 2006; Kashdan et al., 2008). In summary, SWB focuses on an individual's evaluation of their life and emotions, psychological well-being emphasizes 'positive functioning and personal growth, and eudaimonic well-being emphasizes meaning and self-realization' which often overlap, and this stirs debate with scholars regarding the concept and what is more holistic in approach (Waterman, 2008). For a more precise and clear understanding, it is important to assess an individual's subjective well-being and their EWB or PWB as to assess their state of mind as to understand how it affects the decision making process and enhances the sustainability of a social entrepreneur.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING!

To create transformative societal change through entrepreneurial endeavors, one needs to have entrepreneurial competencies (EC). EC can be defined as a specific set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are essential for

effectively performing a job or role. This definition emphasizes the importance of competencies and it when it transcends in a social entrepreneur, it aids and eases their journey (Saxena, 2018). By exploring the multifaceted realm of social entrepreneurs' lives, one can understand what competences they have, as to understand the true nature of their well-being, that shape their career trajectories. Such knowledge enables a deeper understanding of the competencies and well-being dimensions that contribute to their success and fulfillment in their entrepreneurial pursuits examined social entrepreneurs in the USA and identified two categories of competencies: transformational and transactional. Transformational competencies include transformational leadership, rainmaking, teambuilding, and change management. Transactional competencies encompass establishing a high-performance team, sustaining effort over the long term, supervising staff, and retaining volunteers.

In the context of social entrepreneurship, there are specific characteristic attributes that distinguish it, including: 'Empathy and a Sense of Moral Judgment,' and 'Desire and Ability to Bring about Significant Social Change and Impact'. These attributes are highlighted in the literature on social entrepreneurship (Dees, 1998; Mair & Marti, 2006). These competencies collectively contribute to the success and effectiveness of social entrepreneurs in managing their social ventures (Saxena, 2018). Now, in the case of social entrepreneurs, even the competences include empathy and desire for change, which are deep rooted in sensitivity, kindness and selflessness which are connected with one's psychological well-being. This connect erases the boundaries between personal and professional lives, as the individual is exposed to many emotions, pleas, problems and sad situations every day, where they empathize with others and work for their better future. This leads to not only tiredness but also emotional exhaustion, leading to burnouts, impacting one's state of well-being.

THE CHALLENGE OF ATTAINMENT

Consequently, a lack of understanding persists regarding social entrepreneurs' motivations, lived experiences, and competencies that encompass their comprehensive entrepreneurial processes, spanning their past, present, and future endeavors (Shaw and Carter, 2007; Jeong et al., 2020). The assimilation of values and the process of making meaning in relation to their careers remain unclear for social entrepreneurs. In addition to these gaps, our comprehension of how to nurture and cultivate social entrepreneurs is still at a nascent stage and has yet to capture the distinctive nature of the social entrepreneur's journey as a career choice. (Hynes, 2009; Cohen et al., 2019).

As per a study by Jeong et al 2019, a model based on the life-career process of social entrepreneurs was proposed, where three time-sequential themes were identified. It explained how becoming leads to being and then sustaining. Being represents the present, where life-career activities lead to deep commitment and feeling lonely and overwhelmed as one takes on multiple responsibilities. Unlike some other careers that offer more structured schedules or greater work-life balance, social entrepreneurs often find themselves working long hours, navigating uncertainty, and taking on multiple roles within their organizations. The emotional investment required to address social issues and the potential setbacks and obstacles they encounter along the way can take a toll on their well-being. Careers in fields like education, technology and creative arts have shown comparatively lower burnout rates, as they may offer more predictable schedules, institutional support, and opportunities for self-care. Understanding these differences can shed light on the specific challenges faced by social entrepreneurs and highlight the importance of promoting psychological well-being and resilience within this unique career path (Alam, 2022).

It is crucial for social entrepreneurs to prioritize their psychological well-being in order to sustain their efforts and make a lasting impact. The following reasons aid to the challenge of attainment.

Purpose and Passion

Social entrepreneurs are motivated by a profound sense of purpose and unwavering passion to tackle social and environmental challenges. However, this intense drive can lead to an excessive workload and a constant feeling of responsibility, as they often take on multiple roles within their ventures. The relentless pursuit of their mission, coupled with limited resources and a sense of urgency, can increase the risk of burnout.

Resource Constraints

Social entrepreneurs frequently work with limited financial resources, staffing, and infrastructure. They often face the challenge of achieving social impact while dealing with financial instability, fundraising pressures, and the constant need to juggle competing priorities. The continuous strain of managing limited resources can contribute to chronic stress and burnout.

Emotional Toll

Social entrepreneurs are frequently exposed to emotionally challenging situations as they work directly with individuals and communities facing social issues. The empathetic connection and emotional investment in their work can result in emotional exhaustion, compassion fatigue, and heightened vulnerability to burnout.

Complexity and Uncertainty

Social entrepreneurship involves navigating complex social, economic, and political landscapes. Social entrepreneurs often encounter systemic barriers, resistance to change, and the uncertainty of achieving their desired outcomes. The constant need to adapt, innovate, and overcome obstacles adds to the stress and pressure they experience.

IMPLICATION

The Practical Ways to Enhance the Experience of Psychological Well-Being

This study reveals an important implication that social entrepreneurs prioritize social capital as a fundamental business resource and actively seek to broaden their personal networks. Consequently, social skills emerge as a vital competency for successfully navigating the social entrepreneurial journey. Unlike traditional entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs do not allow limited resources to hinder the pursuit of their vision. Instead, they proactively attract resources from various sources and engage in collaboration with stakeholders to achieve their goals. This finding aligns with existing definitions of social entrepreneurship, highlighting the resourceful and collaborative nature of social entrepreneurs in overcoming limitations and driving social change.

Social entrepreneurs are often deeply invested in their work, blurring the boundaries between personal and professional life. This can make it challenging to establish a healthy work-life balance, resulting in a constant state of being "on" and difficulty in disconnecting from work. The inability to recharge and recover can contribute to burnout. While burnout can occur in any profession, these factors unique to social entrepreneurship contribute to an increased risk. It highlights the importance of addressing well-being and implementing strategies to mitigate burnout among social entrepreneurs. Creating supportive networks, promoting self-care practices, and fostering work-life integration are essential steps in supporting the well-being of social entrepreneurs and reducing the likelihood of burnout. Following steps can be taken to promote social entrepreneurs' well-being.

1. Establish Supportive Incubators and mentorship: Create incubators and accelerators that not only provide business support but also prioritize the mental well-being of social entrepreneurs. Collaborate with mental health professionals or organizations to offer counseling, coaching, and workshops focused on well-being. Access to experienced mentors and coaches is invaluable for social entrepreneurs. Tailored mentorship programs catering specifically to the needs of social entrepreneurs can be established to ensure ongoing support.

2. Create Peer Support Networks: Facilitate the formation of peer support networks among social entrepreneurs by organizing regular meetups, workshops, or online forums. These platforms allow entrepreneurs to connect, share experiences, and support each other, fostering a sense of belonging and understanding. Meaningful interactions with like-minded individuals who share their vision inspire and invigorate social entrepreneurs. Establishing platforms or events where entrepreneurs can share their stories and accomplishments creates a positive feedback loop, reinforcing their sense of purpose and well-being.

3. Offer Skill Development Programs: Provide skill development programs that specifically address non-business aspects of social entrepreneurship, such as stress management, resilience, and emotional

intelligence. Equip social entrepreneurs with tools and strategies to effectively manage their psychological well-being while pursuing their ventures.

4. Provide Access to Mental Health Resources: Collaborate with mental health organizations to offer accessible and affordable mental health resources, including counseling services, workshops, and educational materials.

5. Foster Collaboration with Universities and Research Centers: Collaborate with universities and research centers to conduct research on the psychological well-being of social entrepreneurs. This partnership can help identify challenges, develop evidence-based interventions, and contribute to the overall understanding of enhancing well-being.

6. Promoting Self-Care Practices: It is vital to encourage self-care practices encompassing regular exercise, meditation, sufficient sleep, and engaging in leisure activities. By emphasizing self-care as an indispensable aspect of their entrepreneurial journey, the maintenance of a healthy work-life balance and the prevention of burnout can be achieved.

7. Advocating Work-Life Integration: Instead of rigidly segregating work and personal life, promoting the concept of work-life integration contributes to the well-being of social entrepreneurs. Encouraging flexible work arrangements, fostering a healthy work culture, and offering resources for effective time management enable them to maintain a harmonious balance between their personal and professional spheres.

8. Advocate for Policy Support: Advocate for policies that support the well-being of social entrepreneurs. Collaborate with policymakers to address systemic issues affecting psychological well-being, such as access to healthcare, work-life balance, and social safety nets. By advocating for supportive policies, institutions create an enabling environment for social entrepreneurs to thrive.

By implementing these institutional network-based implications, a supportive ecosystem can be established, recognizing and addressing the psychological well-being needs of social entrepreneurs. To create a scientific linkage between the dimensions that define social entrepreneur and its well-being, constructs have to be derived based on the existing research and informed through extensive primary research which includes interviewing social entrepreneurs, psychologists (experts of well-being), and the beneficiaries (with whom the social entrepreneur is involved).

FUTURE DIRECTION

Fostering the growth of social entrepreneurs is a crucial endeavor to effectively address social challenges and promote sustainable economic development. Researchers can conduct longitudinal studies to examine the dynamic relationship between social entrepreneurship and well-being over time. They can also do comparative studies, where the well-being of social entrepreneurs is compared with individuals in traditional entrepreneurship or other professions to understand the unique challenges and benefits specific to social entrepreneurship. Intersectionality and Diversity factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic backgrounds should be taken into consideration for further investigation. 'Development of Well-being Interventions' should be considered by the policymakers, to enhance the well-being of social entrepreneurs. Evaluate the effectiveness of various interventions, such as mindfulness training, resilience-building programs, and well-being coaching, in improving psychological well-being, reducing burnout, and promoting overall well-being. This can be done in context of global perspective, scaling impact, or in tackling ethical dilemmas.

By pursuing these future research directions, scholars can deepen our understanding of the complex relationship between social entrepreneurship and well-being, leading to the development of evidence-based strategies and interventions that can support the well-being of social entrepreneurs.

Declaration of conflict

No conflict is reported between the authors.

References

1. Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *40*(3), 260-282.

2. Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). A career lexicon for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *10*(4), 28-39.

3. Alam, A. (2022). Investigating sustainable education and positive psychology interventions in schools towards achievement of sustainable happiness and wellbeing for 21st century pedagogy and curriculum. *ECS Transactions*, *107*(1), 19481.

4. Au, W. C., Drencheva, A., & Yew, J. L. (2021). Narrating career in social entrepreneurship: Experiences of social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-27.

5. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei–Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.

6. Baron, R. A., & Markman, G. D. (2000). Beyond social capital: How social skills can enhance entrepreneurs' success. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *14*(1), 106-116.

7. Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming careers: From linear to multidirectional career paths: organizational and individual perspectives. *Career Development International*, *9*(1), 58-73.

8. Boreham, N. C., & Arthur, T. A. A. (1993). Information requirements in occupational decision making. *Employment Department*.

9. Baumgardner, S. R. (1982). Coping with disillusionment, abstract images, and uncertainty in career decision making. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*.

10. Cadenas, G. A., Lynn, N., Li, K. M., Liu, L., Cantú, E. A., Ruth, A., ... & Spence, T. (2020). Racial/ethnic minority community college students' critical consciousness and social cognitive career outcomes. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *68*(4), 302-317.

11. Cohen, H., Kaspi-Baruch, O., & Katz, H. (2019). The social entrepreneur puzzle: The background, personality and motivation of Israeli social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *10*(2), 211-231.

12. Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits: What do you do when traditional sources of funding fall short. *Harvard business review*, 76(1), 55-67.

13. Dempsey, S. E., & Sanders, M. L. (2010). Meaningful work? Nonprofit marketization and work/life imbalance in popular autobiographies of social entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 17(4), 437-459.

14. Drayton, B. (2006). Everyone a changemaker-innovations.

15. Germak, A. J., & Robinson, J. A. (2014). Exploring the motivation of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *5*(1), 5-21.

16. Ghalwash, S., Tolba, A., & Ismail, A. (2017). What motivates social entrepreneurs to start social ventures? An exploratory study in the context of a developing economy. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *13*(3), 268-298.

17. Gottfredson, G. D. (2005). Career development in organizations. *Handbook of Vocational Psychology*, *3*, 297-318.

18. Gottfredson, L. S. (2002). Gottfredson's theory of circumscription, compromise, and self-creation. *Career Choice and Development*, *4*, 85-148.

19. Groot, A., & Dankbaar, B. (2014). Does social innovation require social entrepreneurship?. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 4(12).

20. Gubler, M., Arnold, J., & Coombs, C. (2014). Reassessing the protean career concept: Empirical findings, conceptual components, and measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(S1), S23-S40.

21. Hodkinson, P., & Sparkes, A. C. (1997). Careership: A sociological theory of career decision making. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *18*(1), 29-44.

22. Hynes, B. (2009). Growing the social enterprise–issues and challenges. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *5*(2), 114-125.

23. Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 254-273.

24. Jeong, S., Bailey, J. M., Lee, J., & McLean, G. N. (2020). "It's not about me, it's about us": A narrative inquiry on living life as a social entrepreneur. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *16*(3), 263-280.

25. Kashdan, T. B., Biswas-Diener, R., & King, L. A. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: The costs of distinguishing between hedonics and eudaimonia. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *3*(4), 219-233.

26. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (2000). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47*(1), 36.

27. Leung, S. A. (2008). The big five career theories. In *International handbook of career guidance*, 115-132. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

28. Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the "opt-out "revolution. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *19*(1), 106-123.

29. Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. *In Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121-135). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK

30. Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Cardenas, J. (2012). Organizing for society: A typology of social entrepreneuring models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *111*, 353-373.

31. Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition.

32. Miller, R. D., & Fiddleman, P. B. (1983). Emergency involuntary commitment: A look at the decision-making process. *Psychiatric Services*, *34*(3), 249-254.

33. Mohammed, Z., Kumar, S., & Padakannaya, P. (2021). Well-being and career decision-making difficulties among master's students: A simultaneous multi-Equation modeling. *Cogent Psychology*, *8*(1), 1996700.

34. Nagy, N., Froidevaux, A., & Hirschi, A. (2019). Lifespan perspectives on careers and career development. *In Work Across the Lifespan*, (235-259). Academic Press.

35. Nielsen, K., Yarker, J., Randall, R., & Munir, F. (2009). The mediating effects of team and self-efficacy on the relationship between transformational leadership, and job satisfaction and psychological well-being in healthcare professionals: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *46*(9), 1236-1244.

36. Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., Godshalk, V. M., & Beutell, N. J. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *48*(3), 275-300.

37. Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 56-65.

38. Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career Development International*, 4(3), 140-145

39. Renko, M. (2013). Early challenges of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *37*(5), 1045-1069.

40. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 54-67.

41. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will?. *Journal of Personality*, *74*(6), 1557-1586.

42. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069.

43. Ryff, C. D., Friedman, E. M., Morozink, J. A., & Tsenkova, V. (2012). Psychological resilience in adulthood and later life: Implications for health. *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, *32*(1), 73-92.

44. Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, *45*(1), 70-95.

45. Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of business ethics*, *111*(3), 335-351.

46. Saxena, Garima. (2018). Multidimensional competency construct for social entrepreneurs: A logistic regression approach. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*. 10.1016/j.kjss.2017.12.013.

47. Sharir, M., & Lerner, M. (2006). Gauging the success of social ventures initiated by individual social entrepreneurs. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 6-20.

48. Shaw, E., & 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.

49. Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., & Kasser, T. (2004). The independent effects of goal contents and motives on well-being: It's both what you pursue and why you pursue it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(4), 475-486.

50. Sheldon, K. M., & Niemiec, C. P. (2006). It's not just the amount that counts: Balanced need satisfaction also affects well-being. *Journal of Personality andSsocial Psychology*, *91*(2), 331.

51. Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship–a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, *38*(5), 328-338.

52. Tlaiss, H. A., & Kauser, S. (2019). Entrepreneurial leadership, patriarchy, gender, and identity in the Arab world: Lebanon in focus. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *57*(2), 517-537.

53. Uthayakumar, R., Schimmack, U., Hartung, P. J., & Rogers, J. R. (2010). Career decidedness as a predictor of subjective well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *77*(2), 196-204.

54. Townsend, D. M., & Hart, T. A. (2008). Perceived institutional ambiguity and the choice of organizational form in social entrepreneurial ventures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(4), 685-700.

55. Waterman, A. S. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: A eudaimonist's perspective. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *3*(4), 234-252.

56. Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Ravert, R. D., Williams, M. K., Bede Agocha, V., ... & Brent Donnellan, M. (2010). The Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being: Psychometric properties, demographic comparisons, and evidence of validity. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *5*(1), 41-61.

57. Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 21-35.

58. Weimann, J., Knabe, A., & Schob, R. (2015). *Measuring happiness: The Economics of Well-being*. MIT press.

59. Wang, D., Liu, X., & Deng, H. (2022). The perspectives of social cognitive career theory approach in current times. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1023994.

60. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *24*(5), 519-532.

61. Zikic, J., & Ezzedeen, S. (2015). Towards a more integrated view of entrepreneurial careers: Qualitative investigation of the three forms of career capital and their relationships among high tech entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *21*(6), 756-777.