

# 1

## Social Entrepreneurship, Social Intrapreneurship, Social Innovation, and Social Value Creation: An Overview and Implications for Social Work

*Monica Nandan, Tricia B. Bent-Goodley, Gokul  
Mandayam, and Archana Singh*

Discussions of social entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and innovation in social work have been gradually increasing in recent years (Bent-Goodley, 2001; Berzin, Pitt-Catsouphes, & Gaitan-Rossi, 2015, 2016; Germak & Singh, 2009; Gummer, 2001; Jaskyte & Dressler, 2005; Nandan, London, & Bent-Goodley, 2015; Nandan & Scott, 2013; Savaya, Packer, Stange, & Namir, 2008). Social workers employed in various fields of practice and at different systemic levels are realizing the importance of entrepreneurial thinking and of creating shared economic and social value (Singh, 2016). Ironically, the “social” in social entrepreneurship, social intrapreneurship, social innovation, and social value creation has seldom engaged the social work profession. Though social workers are the most visible professionals occupying a realm that has been challenged by contemporary changes in the political, economic, and social landscapes, the discipline has not had a strong presence in the social enterprise movement (Neal, 2015). Over the last three decades, since Bill Drayton coined the term “social entrepreneur” (Davis, 2002), social workers have been slow to embrace the concept. It is important to remember social work’s entrepreneurial endeavors throughout history, such as settlement houses and charity organization societies. Similarly, through policy advocacy, social workers spearheaded or promoted policy entrepreneurship (for example, during the War on Poverty and the New Deal era). In our opinion, social workers are important stewards of social entrepreneurship—as promoters, pioneers, and partners.

Social entrepreneurship and social work are compatible in terms of both skills and values and complement each other (Neal, 2015). Social entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship processes entail using skills, practices, and behaviors that often resonate with social work practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. For instance, problem assessment, working closely with

various stakeholders, tapping social networks, mobilizing community and individual resources, and creating social value as a result of the innovative intervention are illustrations of parallels between social work practice and social entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Social workers are some of the best-prepared professionals to act in response to the world's social problems (Germak & Singh, 2009). Social workers play a decisive role in economic and social development not only in developing countries but in developed countries as well (Singh, 2016). "Social work and SE [social entrepreneurship], combined together, could potentially emerge as an effective tool to solve the world's complex social problems innovatively" (Singh, 2016, p. 31). With rapidly increasing social service needs and an ever-changing context, there is all the more need for linking social work practice with innovative approaches that are efficient and effective solutions for contemporary social problems. Given the potential of social entrepreneurship to augment social work practice, empower clients, provide alternative funding sources, and offer insulation from disruption of essential services, it is evident that social entrepreneurship dovetails with social work values of service, social justice, and competence (Neal, 2015).

Businesses too have taken a keen interest in the field of social entrepreneurship. Health, education, and employment goals are perceived by business as encouraging national investments in human resources from both demand and supply perspectives (Hopkins, 2016). Through corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, businesses are focusing on shared value creation (Porter & Kramer, 2002; Rahdari, Sepasi, & Moradi, 2016). Corporations can conduct business in a way that produces not only economic value but also social value by addressing society's challenges and contributing to sustainable development (Rahdari et al., 2016). Baron (2005) made a case that social entrepreneurs can take strategic CSR activities beyond profit maximization to create social good. Actually, "socially responsible companies are those whose primary goal is profit; and, for most of them, their socially responsible behavior is motivated by the belief that it will improve the bottom line" (Dorado, 2006, p. 322). By embracing the principles of sustainable development and harnessing the benefits of shared value approaches focused on people, businesses have taken a significant leap with intersectoral collaboration by moving beyond the traditional confines of charity and philanthropy (Hopkins, 2016). More than 148 institutions of higher learning in the United States were offering courses related to social entrepreneurship, as reported by Kim and Leu (2011), though most of these courses appear to have been situated in business or public administration programs.

Although the social work profession has been slow to embrace social work entrepreneurial perspectives (Nandan & Scott, 2013), social workers

are educated as social change agents for creating “something with nothing.” These characteristics align with social work entrepreneurial thinking. “Social workers involved in community development initiatives with impoverished communities have been strong advocates of social enterprise . . . though, on the whole, it has been a marginal theme in professional social work” (Gray, Healy, & Crofts, 2003, pp. 141–142). Unfortunately, some practitioners and educators believe that social work entrepreneurship could conflict with the profession’s code of ethics (Germak & Singh, 2009; Gray & Crofts, 2008). The popular view that social work and business disciplines are incompatible on various grounds fails to recognize the contextual reality in which social workers are increasingly expected to navigate issues such as service administration, reimbursement, and alternative sources of funding (Mirabito, 2012; cf. Neal, 2015). Notwithstanding this perspective, social workers across the globe are initiating or promoting social enterprises, social businesses, nonprofit organizations, or socially intrapreneurial projects—as is evidenced in this book—for creating innovative individual, family, and community-level changes. They are combining social work skills with business models to create social entrepreneurial ventures, corporate sector service organizations, and private practices that create social value (Dale, 2012). Thus, social work entrepreneurial thinking has, in many ways, already been used within the profession without fully understanding or maximizing the knowledge and skill set related to social entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, one of the 10 imperatives for the next decade adopted by the Social Work Congress in 2010 was to infuse new models related to sustainable organizations and leadership into social work education and practice (Dale, 2012). In addition, the Grand Challenges for Social Work (Uehara et al., 2013) and the new United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations Development Programme, n.d.) are a clarion call to the profession to more actively engage with the concepts of social entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, innovation, social enterprise, and shared value creation. “The scale, complexity, and interrelatedness of social problems—from poverty and dramatic inequality to the sustainability of health and human service infrastructures across the globe—demand problem-solving skill and collaboration at levels perhaps unprecedented in our history” (Uehara et al., 2013, p. 165).

Social entrepreneurs create local opportunities for social, physical, and economic sustainable development (Seelos & Mair, 2005). Konda, Starc, and Rodica (2015) observed the positive impact of social entrepreneurs in addressing several UN sustainable goals—for example, in health care, education, social inclusion, employment—in Slovenia. They concluded that partnerships across sectors assisted social entrepreneurs in designing innovative solutions to address the aforementioned goals. Evidence was provided, and the

case was built, for social entrepreneurship strategies that can transform the economy toward achievement of sustainable development (İyigün, 2015; Roy & Tripathi, 2015). Spearheading or contributing to sustainable development and environmental justice are social work's ethical responsibilities. Thus, it behooves the social work field to be ethically responsible by actively partaking in the discourse on social entrepreneurship as a viable strategy for addressing social problems (Neal, 2015).

Against this brief background, this chapter provides an overview of the changing social environment and describes social innovation, social work entrepreneurship, social intrapreneurship, social enterprise, and SV creation both within and outside the social work profession. This chapter also provides historical and contemporary approaches to social work entrepreneurship and concludes with an ethical rationale for the profession's engagement with these concepts and incorporation of these strategies within the curriculum.

### **Changing Social Environments Call for Innovative Thinking**

Changing dynamics, increasing complexity of social issues, and the evolving nature of the funding environment have created a space where social work entrepreneurship is needed to advance practice and create social impact (Nandan & Scott, 2013). Complex and dynamic social issues also require new assessment lenses and newer intervention approaches, because traditional approaches may be inappropriate or not helpful in addressing the issues. The relatively limited and recent interest in social work entrepreneurship within the profession is partially related to several social, political, and economic factors, such as the devolution of public services, economic recession, reliance on diverse revenue streams in nonprofit organizations, and questionable effectiveness of the social welfare system (Nandan & Scott, 2013; Singh, 2016). Interestingly, "in response to the changing political and economic context, human service agencies are being forced or encouraged to adapt their governance and management to emphasize performance, innovation and flexibility" (Smith, 2015, p. 407). It is therefore not surprising that traditional funding sources are drying up, leaving many nonprofit agencies with fewer avenues for generating revenues to address ceaseless increases in service demand. Internationally, nongovernmental organizations and developmental organizations are having low levels of sustainable social impact (Rahdari et al., 2016). Social workers have been innovative and creative in building and sustaining institutions and programs that are "moving the needle." Perhaps unconsciously, they have been socially innovative, entrepreneurial, and intrapreneurial while creating

social value as illuminated by Nandan and Scott (2013), who stated that social entrepreneurs “address social issues in new ways by thinking beyond conventional solutions and designing truly innovative, proactive, sustainable solutions for some of society’s most vexing problems” (p. 262).

Historically, social work administrators and community planners have often utilized entrepreneurial thinking to advance their agencies and programs and ensure their sustainability, while creating the desired social impact. Today, one may propose that to sustain oneself within a social work organization, social work intrapreneurial and innovative thinking is almost a necessity.

Neal (2015) highlighted that the social work profession needs to willingly accept entrepreneurial strategies in two specific ways: (1) social work agencies should engage more with social enterprise organizations and associations, and (2) social work programs should include within their curriculum at least one course on social entrepreneurship with interdisciplinary content to get a better grasp of cross-sector collaborative approaches for creating entrepreneurial solutions to solve social problems. In addition, Zhu, Rooney, and Phillips (2016) proposed a curriculum matrix that enables students to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills for balancing the tension between addressing social welfare through social entrepreneurship while ensuring financial viability of the innovative idea.

Against this context and curriculum proposal, the next section defines the key concepts and explains the principles of social innovation, social entrepreneurship, social intrapreneurship, and social value creation.

### **Defining Social Innovation, Social Entrepreneurship, Social Intrapreneurship, Social Enterprise, and Social Value Creation**

Before going into detail about each of the concepts, we would like to clarify that social innovation and social value creation are important components of social work entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship processes; social entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs are persons who possess specific qualities, perspectives, and predispositions that enable them to succeed in these roles (Singh, 2016). These individuals initiate the innovative change process while taking calculated risks (Bacq & Janssen, 2011), or they could be following the principle of affordable loss as explained by Sarasvathy (2001). Social enterprises are organizational vehicles or conduits—in the commercial, public, nonprofit, or civil society sectors—that are created by social entrepreneurs, or that employ intrapreneurs, for implementing socially innovative initiatives (Konda et al., 2015).

### *Social Innovation (SI)*

Within the current dynamic political, social, and economic global context, SI is almost a necessity for professional and organizational survival and for creating sustainable solutions with lasting social impact (Salamon, Geller, & Mengel, 2010). The future of global society appears to lie in SI (Konda et al., 2015, p. 219). SI is broader than social entrepreneurship and has been used in multiple contexts. SI can take various forms in the context of sustainable business models (Hockerts & Wustenhagen, 2010; cited in Boon & Ludeke-Freund, 2013). These include (1) product and process innovations with a social purpose; and (2) innovation related to the scope of entrepreneurial, intra-preneurial, or managerial activities, such as initiating and developing social enterprises and organization-based internal activities. In a qualitative study of human service leaders' understanding and perceptions of the meaning of SI, Berzin et al. (2015) discovered that SI reflected four themes: innovative solutions, business and social enterprise, partnerships, and technology. SI goes through a development cycle of generating ideas from the bottom, developing and testing of the idea, accumulating empirically supported ideas, enabling the ideas through building synergies between unrelated systems, testing these synergies, building capacity, and finally supporting changes in structural frameworks (cf. Konda et al., 2015, p. 219).

Thus, social entrepreneurship is clearly one form or manifestation of SI. According to Dees (1998), SI is central to social entrepreneurship and arguably even to social intrapreneurship. SI entails implementing novel solutions that enhance individual and community welfare as compared with the status quo (H. P. Young, 2011). Some authors assert that social entrepreneurship is an "innovative, social value creating activity" (J. E. Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006, p. 1) and that social entrepreneurs are social innovators who drive social change (Mair & Marti, 2006). "Innovation in the social sphere means accomplishing more with less, working together, leveraging resources, sharing data and creating models for change that are sustainable" (Nandan, London, & Bent-Goodley, 2015, p. 42). SI encompasses implementation of new and improved ideas, processes, products, and services (Baregheh, Rowley, & Sambrook, 2009) that ultimately improve quality of life (Pol & Ville, 2009). Successful corporations, too, have figured out that for sustainable long-term growth and development, investment in SI is key (Konda et al., 2015).

Through innovation, social workers can build and strengthen capacity, improve processes, create new avenues for organizational and social change, develop new streams of revenue and staffing, and build coalitions that create sustainability and have potential for continued growth. Thus, SI can be used

anywhere in the process of social value creation. Berzin and Pitt-Catsouphes (2015) indicated that SI could include a shift in resource development strategies within a human service organization, new organizational structures, organizational policy innovations, or changes in service delivery processes (Pitt-Catsouphes & Berzin, 2015). In our opinion, incorporating social work perspectives into designing socially innovative solutions could greatly enable professionals to emphasize social justice for addressing social problems. In a study by Pitt-Catsouphes and Berzin (2015), respondents indicated that social workers needed to be involved in SI leadership as SI enables the adoption of new approaches to address problems of disenfranchised populations and ensure social justice. Given the increasing importance that innovation plays in the conceptualization and funding environment for solutions to address unfulfilled social needs, the concept of SI is being thoroughly examined by social work academicians, practitioners, and funders (Berzin et al., 2015).

### *Social Entrepreneurship (SE)*

Providing social services is not the same as creating and implementing a social entrepreneurial venture or initiating a social intrapreneurial program. Existing social services may appease social issues while social entrepreneurs attempt to alleviate social issues and transform society and communities in the process. Social entrepreneurial thinking necessitates bringing together a wide range of stakeholders and organizational representatives to tackle the core of complex social and community issues (Fawcett & South, 2005). "As traditional approaches to addressing society's ills have failed, social entrepreneurship is seen as a way to leverage resources, enhance effectiveness through innovative partnerships, raise levels of performance and accountability, and ultimately achieve sustainable impact" (Wei-Skillern, 2010, p. 1).

A myriad of definitions and conceptualizations of SE and social entrepreneurs exist in the literature (see, for example, Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Dees, 1998; Short, Moss, & Lumpkin, 2009). After extensively reviewing the literature, Choi and Majumdar (2013) proposed that SE is actually a cluster of subconcepts—social value creation, social entrepreneur, SE organization, market orientation, and SI. Except for social value creation, which is a necessary condition for SE, the other four subconcepts exist at varying levels in an SE endeavor. Improving livelihood of individuals could be the end result or an integral condition of social value creation through an SE process (Seelos & Mair, 2005). Thus, finding a universally accepted definition of SE is hardly possible. Nandan and Scott (2013) identified five definitions of social entrepreneurs that resonate with social work practice and values, two of which are noted as follows:

- Light (2006) defined a social entrepreneur as “an individual, group, network, organization, or alliance of organizations that seeks sustainable, large-scale change through pattern-breaking ideas in what governments, nonprofits, and businesses do to address significant social problems” (p. 50).
- The Skoll Foundation (cf. Dacin et al., 2010) views social entrepreneurs as transformational change agents who “pioneer innovative and systemic approaches for meeting the needs of the marginalized—the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised—populations that lack the financial means or political clout to achieve lasting benefits on their own” (p. 41).

Social entrepreneurs are influenced both by activities that help society and have a nonmonetary focus and by their own closeness to the social problem they are attempting to address (Radhari et al., 2016). SE too has been conceptualized and defined in many different ways, two of which follow:

- J. E. Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern (2006) defined SE as “innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, business or government sectors” (p. 371).
- Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, and Shulman (2009) (cf. Shepherd & Patzelt, 2011) defined SE as “activities and processes undertaken to discover, define and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner” (p. 143).

SE can be best understood as a multidimensional and dynamic construct moving across various intersection points between the public, private, and social sectors; therefore, social entrepreneurs can design for-profit, not-for-profit, and hybrid organizations to implement their innovative strategies (Nicholls, 2006).

Social work entrepreneurship has been defined as “the creation of institutions through entrepreneurial thinking that are guided by social work ethics and based on the integration of social service, business and public relation skills” (Bent-Goodley, 2002, p. 291). In other words, social work ethics guide entrepreneurship and innovation and shape responses of practitioners and organizations for addressing social issues (Nandan, Nandan, & London, 2015). SI is an important component for social work agencies using the entrepreneurship framework for retooling their practices through establishment of strategic relationships with for-profit business organizations and public-sector agencies (Berzin et al., 2015). Social work entrepreneurs create new ventures, solutions, and interventions to advance social change. Thus, SE is not an alternative to existing social work practice but is a much-needed perspective and set of behaviors for effectively carrying out the profession’s mission.

### ***Social Intrapreneurship (SIn)***

The term “social intrapreneurship” is more common in the business literature than in the social science context. SIn is a process used to create innovative, sustainable change within existing organizations. A social intrapreneur is “[a] person who focuses on innovation and creativity and who transforms a dream or an idea into a profitable venture, by operating within the organizational environment” (Carland & Carland, 2007, p. 84). Social intrapreneurs are change agents within organizations who recognize opportunities in seemingly unimportant events (Brunaker & Kurvinen, 2006). More specifically, social work intrapreneurship focuses on the ability to proactively create change within organizations by recognizing new opportunities and taking calculated risks for sustaining innovative ideas and organizations (Nandan, London, & Bent-Goodley, 2015; Nandan, Mandayam, Collard, & Tchouta, 2016).

Corporations, too, through CSR initiatives, are internally promoting social intrapreneurs. “Corporate social entrepreneurship” (CSE) is a process aimed at enabling business to develop advanced and powerful forms of CSR (J. E. Austin & Reficco, 2009). J. E. Austin, Leonard, Reficco, and Wei-Skillern (2006) defined CSE as “the process of extending the firm’s domain of competence and corresponding opportunity set through innovative leveraging of resources, both within and outside its direct control, aimed at the simultaneous creation of economic and social value” (p. 170). Forward-thinking corporations are recognizing and supporting their social intrapreneurs, which ultimately help them retain talent and also fulfill society’s expectations related to their social responsibility (Santos & Williams, 2013).

### ***Social Value (SV) and SV Creation***

SV can be created through various professional social work approaches, CSR, and welfare programs designed and implemented by government and civil society. SV is intrinsically linked to the concept of SE, and SV creation is the main distinctive feature of SE (Narangajavana, Gonzalez-Cruz, Garrigos-Simon, & Cruz-Ros, 2016). The core mission of SE and social enterprises is to benefit society and create SV (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). The latent drive for SE is the creation of SV as opposed to shareholder wealth, which is achieved through innovative ways and not through replication of existing enterprises or practice (J. E. Austin, Leonard, et al., 2006). Despite disagreement on the universal definition of SE, there seems to be consensus on the notion of “social value” as being central to SE (Choi & Majumdar, 2013).

However, SE-based academic research does not usually offer a definition of SV, especially the way it is conceptualized and described through broad

generic statements (Narangajavana et al., 2016). Moreover, the concept of value itself is not clear in the literature (Singh, 2016), probably owing to the multidisciplinary perspectives on the concept (Lepak, Smith, & Taylor, 2007). In addition, *value creation* refers to both the content—that is, what is value, who values what, and where value resides—and the process of new value creation—that is, how value is generated (Lepak et al., 2007).

As a result, the term “value” takes on different meanings across disciplines. For example, philosophers and ethicists study the values held by an individual or groups of individuals, such as a society (Haksever, Chaganti, & Cook, 2004). They deal with the principles or values that should guide human behavior and try to separate the rights from wrongs. Social work is also not value-free. Values constitute “a basis of identification and responsibility for all social workers—wherever they practice, whatever purposes they may serve, whatever functions they perform, whatever methods they employ, and whatever clientele they work with” (Levy, 1973, p. 35). Values are central guiding principles for the social work profession and are reflected in the moral conundrums of practice (Bisman, 2004), conceived along three basic dimensions (Levy, 1973). These are preferred conceptions of people, preferred outcomes for people, and preferred instrumentalities for dealing with people. Unlike ethicists and social workers, economists and engineers are interested in the value of things (Haksever et al., 2004). Taking this point further, from a strategic point of the view, Haksever et al. (2004) defined value “as the capacity of a good, service, or activity to satisfy a need or provide a benefit to a person or legal entity” (p. 292). This definition of value is clearly broader than the traditional definition used by some economists. It includes any type of good, service, or act that satisfies a need or provides a benefit, which may be tangible or intangible, including those that positively contribute to quality of life, knowledge, prestige, safety, physical and financial security, as well as providing nutrition, shelter, transportation, and income. It is obvious that when the “content” of value varies across disciplines, the “process of value creation” will also differ. Thus, value creation should be studied for a particular functional area or from a particular perspective.

In addition, value creation and value capture should be viewed as distinct processes, but most often the process of value creation is confused or confounded with the process of value capture or value retention (Lepak et al., 2007). The individual, organization, or society—that is, the source of value creation—is not the one that always captures or retains the value the most, because there are various stakeholders for whom value can be created. For example, in the context of charitable organizations, Polonsky and Grau (2008) defined “social value” as the total social impact a charitable organization has on all its stakeholders (donors, employees, volunteers, other charities and

nonprofits, clients, and society in general). It also depends on the intended target of value creation (Lepak et al., 2007).

In the context of SE, social enterprises create value for all the stakeholders (beneficiaries, funders, investors, employees, suppliers, and so on), which can be negotiated among the stakeholders (R. Young, 2006). The main purpose of a social enterprise is to create SV irrespective of whether the value is generated within an organization or outside of it (J. E. Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). However, beneficiaries are always the intended targets of value creation in SE. The primary mission of SE is to create SV for clients—those who receive the value created (Lepoutre, Justo, Terjesen, & Bosma, 2013). Thus, Singh (2016) restricted the concept of SV to the total impact that a social entrepreneur has on the beneficiaries (individual, community, or society as a whole) and provided two perspectives on SV. From the perspective of social entrepreneurs,

social value creation is about bringing the desired social change or creating social impact/social outcomes, through a resolution of social problems/issues. These “social changes” or “social impacts/outcomes” include a range of impacts such as increasing awareness, empowering the beneficiaries, creating and providing socio-economic benefits to them, impacting their lives, bringing a change in their perception, attitudes, behaviour and finally, changes in norms. These changes occur at the institutional, individual, community, state, and international levels. (Singh, 2016, pp. 109–110)

The beneficiaries perceived “value” in getting various kinds of benefits created for them by social entrepreneurs and in the various positive changes and impacts in their lives brought about because of these benefits. These positive changes or impacts in their lives were both direct and indirect. Direct changes or impacts refer to getting direct benefits, opportunities, and improved capability in various forms, such as increased confidence, self-respect, income, and knowledge; and indirect impacts or changes refer to the changes or impacts beneficiaries felt in their lives as a result of the direct changes, such as their improved ability to fulfill the needs of their family members and the improved standard of living of their family. They secured opportunities in various fields, and their capability increased in various dimensions, such as their ability to earn a livelihood and fulfill the needs of family members (Singh, 2016, p. 114). R. Young (2006), too, mentioned that social entrepreneurs create SV that benefits people whose urgent needs and reasonable needs are not being met by other means.

The *values of social work* also focus on the mission of creating *social value*, which drives the process of *social value creation* in social work. Bisman (2004)

rightly said, “Values and mission are central to the profession; without them there is no social work” (p. 120). The actions of social workers must promote “social change, problem-solving in human relationships and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being” (British Association of Social Workers, 2002). Employing evidence-based methods of social work practice, social work professionals aim to create social values and bring about intended social change. It is clear that, similar to the field of SE, the concepts of SV and SV creation are equally important in the field of social work. Thus, Singh’s (2016) conceptualization of *social value* and *social value creation* can be used to understand these concepts within the social work context.

In addition, it is difficult to find a single indicator to measure the contributions made by SE because SV is complex, multidimensional, and contextual in nature (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006). Measurement of SV deals with understanding what value is created and for whom (Clark & Brennan, 2016; Neck, Brush, & Allen, 2009). Thus, social enterprises must identify their own metrics (financial and nonfinancial) of success based on mission, industry, area, and intended social impact (Clark & Brennan, 2016; Neck et al., 2009).

### *Skills*

Social work values and skills are coveted credentials for being in the social enterprise space (Neal, 2015). The core skills for SI, SE, SIn, and SV creation include but are not limited to administrative and management skills; social, strategic, and community planning; financial management and development; organizing and coalition building; emotional intelligence; community development; policy advocacy; policy analysis and formation; and the ability to engage different public and social media platforms (London & Morfopoulos, 2010; Nandan, London, & Blum, 2014). As one delves deeper into these concepts, an argument can be made that social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, innovation, and SV creation warrant their own focus within social work academic programs (Bent-Goodley, 2002; Nandan et al., 2014; Singh, 2016; Tropman & Morningstar, 1989).

The social work profession has the ability to make a unique contribution to the teaching and practice of social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and innovation (Pitt-Catsoupes & Berzin, 2015; Singh, 2016). The nuanced thinking of the social work entrepreneur certainly fits under macro practice; however, it is often taught neither in the classroom nor through field education. It could also be argued that such content should not be limited to macro practitioners but is also relevant to clinical practitioners who open private practices and work within communities to advance change. Social workers are change agents at all systemic levels and are key players in creating SV for

individuals, families, and communities. Given social workers' strong adherence and commitment to values and ethics, as social innovators, entrepreneurs, and intrapreneurs, they can advocate, more strongly, for creating empowering opportunities for marginalized populations—SV creation aligned with the mission of the profession (Neal, 2015).

In essence, social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, innovation, and SV creation are important perspectives and strategies for all fields of social work practice and at all systems of intervention. As state and federal governments continue to scale back public financing, and as private philanthropists ask for accountable social investments, social entrepreneurial and social intrapreneurial thinking is essential for social change agents like social workers to remain relevant, viable, and sustainable (Nandan & Scott, 2013).

### **Social Work Entrepreneurship in Action**

Although we are witnessing some growth in the literature on social work entrepreneurship within social work, social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and SV creation and innovation have had a long history in the profession. The profession, in many ways, began with an entrepreneurial spirit that created large SV and has been sustained as a result. However, the idea of social work entrepreneurship has been met with some resistance (Bent-Goodley, 2002). For some, the idea of being entrepreneurial appears to be contradictory to helping professionals, advocates, and change agents (Germak & Singh, 2009). Some view social work entrepreneurship as only a for-profit business venture (Gray & Crofts, 2008). The scarcity of social work perspectives in SI literature overtly condones the rich history of innovations in social service organizations (Berzin et al., 2015). Long before William Drayton used the term “social entrepreneurship” some 30 years ago (Davis, 2002), early social work pioneers were implementing social work entrepreneurship and innovation to address larger, broader societal and local issues and adding to SV. Settlement houses were largely built on the premise of entrepreneurial thinking. For example, Jane Addams, a social work pioneer, created Hull House in 1889 as a way to provide supports and services to newly arrived European immigrants in Chicago (Lundblad, 1995). By its second year of services, Hull House was serving over 2,000 people per week. It eventually had over 13 locations. Although it started with a focus on addressing primarily individual and familial concerns, Hull House was later recognized for addressing environmental concerns, poverty, health, employment, and other social issues—SV creation activities.

During the same period, Ida B. Wells-Barnett established the Negro Fellowship League. The league was established to provide reentry services, such as opportunities to find jobs and housing, promotion of literacy, and

reintegration back into the community for African American men returning home from jail or prison (Bent-Goodley, 2001). The NFL later also worked with the community to build sustainable efforts to help the men engage in voter participation and take a more active role in addressing social and civic issues within the community—SV creation activities.

Social work administrators used entrepreneurial thinking to fuel their organizations toward sustainable and impactful change, even before the profession recognized it as being entrepreneurial (Hoefer, 1993; Menefee, 1997; Tropman & Morningstar, 1989). As an example, the National Center for Children and Families (NCCF) was founded in 1915 to provide services to children who were homeless in Washington, DC (NCCF, 2016). NCCF now serves over 4,000 children and families in the Washington, DC, area. Born as a small nonprofit organization, as an orphanage providing social services for children who desperately needed them, NCCF eventually evolved into an important institution for planning and delivering much-needed social services to vulnerable children, youths, and families from diverse backgrounds. Black Family Development, Incorporated (BFDI), is another organization that has acquired sustainability through an intrapreneurial focus (BFDI, 2016). BFDI was founded in 1978 to help abused and neglected children in Detroit, Michigan. BFDI was born out of a community development project focusing on child abuse and neglect. Over time it has expanded its capacity and infrastructure to meet the increasing demand for family counseling and child welfare advocacy services in the community. Both NCCF and BFDI had to shift their foci and design innovative solutions to remain relevant and sustain themselves through political and social changes, fluctuations in public and private funding, and evolving social challenges within the communities that they serve while staying true to their mission.

During the last quarter of the 19th century, with the birth and growth of charity organization societies (COS), influential business leaders tried to bring more efficiency and effectiveness into the operations of these organizations. Training programs were established around the country to train charity investigators, who were later identified as “social workers.” Mary Richmond, a recognized advocate for administration of charity societies, was invited to serve as a “staff of the newly created Russell Sage Foundation” and lead the Charity Organization Department within the foundation (D. M. Austin, 2000, p. 32). She helped streamline practices within COS and scale the new innovative practice of relief distribution, operating as a social intrapreneur.

More recently, Rebecca Kousky, a social worker and founder of Nest, has established a nonprofit organization that helps women artisans in developing countries by providing them with microloans and also markets in the United States. The Nest collaborative connects U.S. designers with more than 2,000

artisans from across the globe who have skills but need employment or a sustainable living wage (Dale, 2012). This is just one of several examples from around the world.

Social work entrepreneurship and innovation are not limited to the United States. For example, an Ashoka fellow—who is also a community practice social worker—cofounded the Bharatiya Muslim Mahila Andolan, a nonprofit organization in Mumbai, India, that organizes Muslim women in the country to collectively overcome sociocultural limitations in exercising their citizenship. Social workers have been called to bring their intersectional knowledge of business and social work practice coupled with the profession's code of ethics to the global stage (Casimir & Samuel, 2015). Not only can social workers grow these social enterprises across the globe; they are called to also document and uplift existing entrepreneurial practices around the world (Foy, 2013). These illustrations illuminate social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, innovation, and SV creation. With a focused intent on growing the number of social workers in each of these areas, the profession can advance and sustain itself while addressing the social, political, and economic issues in which it is deeply invested.

### **Social Entrepreneurship, Intrapreneurship, Innovation, Value Creation, and the Code of Ethics**

Neal (2015) builds a case for social workers' involvement in social enterprises as a means of addressing social problems. Social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, SV creation, and SI are not only in compliance with the social work code of ethics but are also encouraged in many ways by this code. Social workers are bound by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) *Code of Ethics*, which emphasizes six core principles of service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, human relationships, integrity, and competence (NASW, 2017). Within the code, social workers are also called to engage in very specific acts that support these core areas. Section 3.07 of the code, entitled "Administration," calls on social workers to build organizations that advocate for resource allocation that is rooted in fairness and equity and to create environments that social workers can optimally engage in practice. Section 6.01 of the code, entitled "Social Welfare," calls on social workers to engage in practice that benefits the general welfare of society. It calls on social workers to act as tools of change and to ensure that they are working to benefit the common good and to advance the needs of those who are vulnerable and oppressed in particular—another form of SV creation. Section 6.04 of the *Code*, entitled "Social and Political Action," promotes the notion that social workers work toward ensuring equal access to resources and opportunities, promote

social justice, and safeguard protections for the vulnerable. Each of these components of the code is propelling contemporary social workers to think and behave differently to create sustainable social change, that is, to use SI, SE, and SIn perspectives for creating social change. Social entrepreneurs work for social well-being by helping marginalized and disadvantaged people to enhance their capabilities, access basic human needs, and become contributing members of society (Singh, 2016). By employing these perspectives and strategies, social workers can continue advancing the goals of the profession within the guidelines of the *Code of Ethics*.

Zhu et al. (2016) presented a teaching model—a curriculum matrix—to assist fledgling social entrepreneurs in balancing the tension between social and commercial outcomes or logic. The curriculum matrix aims to incorporate values, ethics, and problem solving into practice. Zhu et al. (2016) proposed that students need to

empirically define the situation they face, state and compare the merits of differing values, state the principle that each value honors (social or commercial), consider and compare other ethical values, decide to whom they are being loyal, evaluate the presence of others deserving loyalty, select a course of action embracing the most important values, principles, loyalties, and evaluate the impact of the decision. (pp. 617–618)

Through their teaching model, they proposed integrating, in a coherent fashion, disparate commercial and social logics through behavioral, sociological, and cognitive frameworks.

## Conclusion

The roots of social work are in innovative and entrepreneurial thinking. The pioneers of the profession had to creatively address complex social and economic challenges while being financially sustainable. In recent decades, social workers have been called on to think creatively, seek diverse funding, mobilize social capital, and collaboratively deliver innovative and sustainable solutions to recalcitrant social issues. Social workers are poised to contribute to make significant advancements in social entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, innovation, and SV creation. By intently harnessing these strategies and perspectives, the profession can grow its impact in local communities around the world. Not only is the profession capable of incorporating these strategies, it has been doing so since the turn of the 20th century.

The historic Wingspread meeting of the leading organizations within the social work profession and the 2010 Social Work Congress developed imperatives that speak to the thesis of this chapter:

infusing models of sustainable business and management practice in social work education and practice . . . clarifying and articulating the unique skills, scope of practice and value added of social work to prospective social work students . . . empirically demonstrating to prospective recruits the value of social work profession in both social and economic terms. (Williams, 2015, p. 68)

In addition, social work entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, and innovation are important processes for mobilizing the profession as it embarks on addressing the 12 Grand Challenges for Social Work over the next two decades: healthy development of youths, closing the health gap, stopping family violence, advancing productive lives of individuals, eradicating social isolation, ending homelessness, creating social responses to the changing environment, promoting just decarceration, building financial capacity of community members, reducing extreme economic inequality, tapping technology for promoting social good, and achieving economic and political justice (American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, 2018). Finally, in addition to the existing practices, the social work profession may need other tool kits to systemically attend to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations Development Programme, n.d.). Social work entrepreneurship creates an opportunity for the profession.

## References

- American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare. (2018). *12 challenges*. Retrieved from <http://aaswsw.org/grand-challenges-initiative/12-challenges/>
- Austin, D. M. (2000). Social work and social welfare administration: A historical perspective. In R. J. Patti (Ed.), *The handbook of social welfare management* (pp. 27–54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Austin, J. E., Leonard, H. B., Reficco, E., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: It is for corporations, too. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable change* (pp. 169–180). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. E., & Reficco, E. (2009, March 3). *Corporate social entrepreneurship* (Working Paper No. 09-101). Retrieved from <http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/09-101.pdf>

- Austin, J. E., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1–22. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x
- Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23, 373–403. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.577242
- Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., & Sambrook, S. (2009). Towards a multidisciplinary definition of innovation. *Management Decision*, 47, 1323–1339. doi:10.1108/00251740910984578
- Baron, D. P. (2005). *Corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship* (Working paper). Retrieved from <https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/faculty-research/working-papers/corporate-social-responsibility-social-entrepreneurship>
- Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2001). Ida B. Wells-Barnett: An uncompromising style. In I. B. Carlton-LaNey (Ed.), *African American leadership: An empowerment tradition in social work history* (pp. 87–98). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2002). Defining and conceptualizing social work entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38, 291–302. doi:10.1080/10437797.2002.10779098
- Berzin, S. C., & Pitt-Catsoupes, M. (2015). Social innovation from the inside: Considering the intrapreneurship path. *Social Work*, 60, 360–362. doi:10.1093/sw/swv026
- Berzin, S. C., Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & Gaitan-Rossi, P. (2015). Defining our own future: Human service leaders on innovation. *Human Services Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 39, 412–425. doi:10.1080/23303131.2015.1060914
- Berzin, S. C., Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & Gaitan-Rossi, P. (2016). Innovation and sustainability: An exploratory study of intrapreneurship among human service organizations. *Human Service Organization: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 40(5), 1–13. doi:10.1080/23303131.2016.1184207
- Bisman, C. (2004). Social work values: The moral core of the profession. *British Journal of Social Work*, 34, 109–123. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bch008
- Black Family Development, Inc. (2016). *About* [Web page]. Retrieved from <http://blackfamilydevelopment.org/index.php/home/about>
- Boon, F., & Ludeke-Freund, F. (2013). Business models for sustainable innovation: State of the art steps towards a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 45, 9–19. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.007
- British Association of Social Workers. (2002). *The code of ethics for social work*. Brighton, UK: Author.

- Brunaker, S., & Kurvinen, J. (2006). Intrapreneurship, local initiatives in organizational change processes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27, 118–132. doi:10.1108/01437730610646624
- Carland, J. C., & Carland, J. W. (2007). Intrapreneurship: A requisite for success. *Entrepreneurial Executive*, 12, 83–94. doi:10.1080/23303131.2014.955236
- Casimir, A., & Samuel, E. (2015). Social work and the challenge of entrepreneurship in Africa. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 5, 155–165. doi:10.4236/ojps.2015.52017
- Choi, N., & Majumdar, S. (2013). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29, 363–376. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.05.001
- Clark, C., & Brennan, L. (2016). Social entrepreneurship: A global model for evaluating long-term impact. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 20(1), 1–15. Retrieved from <http://www.alliedacademies.org/articles/ijevol20no12016.pdf#page=5>
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37–57. doi:10.5465/AMP.2010.52842950
- Dale, M. (2012, January). Social work takes on business. *NASW News*, 57(1). Retrieved from <http://www.socialworkblog.org/nasw-news-article/2012/01/social-work-takes-on-business/>
- Davis, S. (2002). *Social entrepreneurship: Towards an entrepreneurial culture for social and economic development*. Arlington, VA: Ashoka.
- Dees, J. G. (1998, October 31). *The meaning of "social entrepreneurship."* Retrieved from <https://entrepreneurship.duke.edu/news-item/the-meaning-of-social-entrepreneurship/>
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32–53. doi:10.1080/19420670903442053
- Dorado, S. (2006). Social entrepreneurial ventures: Different values so different processes of creation, no? *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 11, 319–343. doi:10.1142/S1084946706000453
- Fawcett, B., & South, J. (2005). Community involvement and primary care trusts: The case for social entrepreneurship. *Critical Public Health*, 15(2), 191–204. doi:10.1080/09581590500144660
- Foy, R. D. (2013). Utilizing the social learning theory as a new paradigm to evaluate the International Labour Organization (ILO) assessment of support for growth-oriented women entrepreneurs in Uganda. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 5, 27–32. doi:10.5897/JASD11.023

- Germak, A. J., & Singh, K. K. (2009). Social entrepreneurship: Changing the way social workers do business. *Administration in Social Work, 34*(1), 79–95. doi:10.1080/03643100903432974
- Gray, M., & Crofts, P. (2008). Social development and its relevance to Australian social work. *Australian Social Work, 61*(1), 88–103. doi:10.1080/03124070701818757
- Gray, M., Healy, K., & Crofts, P. (2003). Social enterprise: Is it the business of social work? *Australian Social Work, 56*(2), 141–164. doi:10.1046/j.0312-407X.2003.00060.x
- Gummer, B. (2001). Innovate or die: The necessity for change in contemporary organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 25*(3), 65–84. doi:10.1300/J147v25n03\_05
- Haksever, C., Chaganti, R., & Cook, R. G. (2004). A model of value creation: Strategic view. *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*, 291–305. doi:10.1023/B:BUSI.0000017968.21563.05
- Hockerts, K., & Wustenhagen, R. (2010). Greening Goliaths versus emerging Davids—Theorizing about the role of incumbents and new entrants in sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, 25*, 481–492. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.07.005
- Hofer, R. (1993). A matter of degree: Job skills for human service administrators. *Administration in Social Work, 27*, 1–20. doi:10.1300/J147v17n03\_01
- Hopkins, M. (2016). *Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the United Nations sustainable development goals (SDG): The role of the private sector*. Retrieved from <https://www.csrfi.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/CSR-and-the-United-Nations-SDGs.pdf>
- İyigün, N. Ö. (2015). What could entrepreneurship do for sustainable development? A corporate social responsibility-based approach. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences, 195* (World Conference on Technology, Innovation and Entrepreneurship), 1226–1231. Retrieved from [https://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042815037325/1-s2.0-S1877042815037325-main.pdf?\\_tid=27b670bf-93e8-42eb-ab6a-b57a1a2ce4de&acdnt=1539375494\\_dd6deab202b6ad32b799c48ccee29742](https://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042815037325/1-s2.0-S1877042815037325-main.pdf?_tid=27b670bf-93e8-42eb-ab6a-b57a1a2ce4de&acdnt=1539375494_dd6deab202b6ad32b799c48ccee29742)
- Jaskyte, K., & Dressler, W. W. (2005). Organizational culture and innovation in nonprofit human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 29*(2), 23–41. doi:10.1300/J147v29n02\_03
- Kim, M., & Leu, J. (2011). The field of social entrepreneurship education: From the second wave of growth to a third wave of innovation. In U. Ashoka & D. Brock (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship education resource handbook* (pp. 8–9). Washington, DC: Ashoka U.
- Konda, I., Starc, J., & Rodica, B. (2015). Social challenges are opportunities for sustainable development: Tracing impacts of social entrepreneurship

- through innovations and value creation. *Economic Themes*, 53, 215–233. doi:10.1515/ethemes-2015-0012
- Lepak, D. P., Smith, K. G., & Taylor, M. S. (2007). Value creation and value capture: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 180–194. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.23464011
- Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S., & Bosma, N. (2013). Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: The global entrepreneurship monitor social entrepreneurship study. *Small Business Economics*, 40, 693–714. doi:10.1007/s11187-011-9398-4
- Levy, C. S. (1973). The value base of social work. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 9(1), 34–42. doi:10.1080/00220612.1973.10671941
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 4(3), 47–51. Retrieved from [http://www.nyu.edu/social-entrepreneurship/news\\_events\\_resources/pdf/paul\\_light.pdf](http://www.nyu.edu/social-entrepreneurship/news_events_resources/pdf/paul_light.pdf)
- London, M., & Morfopoulos, R. G. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: How to start successful corporate social responsibility and community-based initiatives for advocacy and change*. New York: Routledge.
- Lundblad, K. S. (1995). Jane Addams and social reform: A role model for the 1990s. *Social Work*, 40, 661–669. Retrieved from <http://www.vonsteuben.org/ourpages/auto/2015/3/20/54841189/Addams.pdf>
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002
- Menefee, D. (1997). Strategic administration of nonprofit human service organizations: A model for executive success in turbulent times. *Administration in Social Work*, 21, 1–19. doi:10.1300/J147v21n02\_01
- Mirabito, D. M. (2012). Educating a new generation of social workers: Challenges and skills needed for contemporary agency-based practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 40, 245–254. doi:10.1007/s10615-011-0378-6
- Nandan, M., London, M., & Bent-Goodley, T. (2015). Social workers as social change agents: Social innovation, social intrapreneurship and social entrepreneurship. *Human Service Organizations, Management, Leadership and Governance*, 39, 38–56. doi:10.1080/23303131.2014.955236
- Nandan, M., London, M., & Blum, T. (2014). Community practice social entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary approach to graduate education. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3, 51–70. doi:10.1504/IJSEI.2014.064106
- Nandan, M., Mandayam, G., Collard, C., & Tchouta, R. (2016). An examination of community practice social workers as social intrapreneurs or social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 4, 114–133. doi:10.1504/IJSEI.2016.076686

- Nandan, M., Nandan, S., & London, M. (2015). Catalysts and agents of social change: Imperatives for social innovations. In J. Wallace (Ed.), *Social change perspectives, challenges and implications for the future* (pp. 19–40). New York: Nova Publishers.
- Nandan, M., & Scott, P. (2013). Social entrepreneurship and social work: The need for a transdisciplinary education model. *Administration in Social Work, 37*, 257–271. doi:10.1080/03643107.2012.684428
- Narangajavana, Y., Gonzalez-Cruz, T., Garrigos-Simon, F. J., & Cruz-Ros, S. (2016). Measuring social entrepreneurship and social value with leakage: Definition, analysis and policies for the hospitality industry. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 12*, 911–934. doi:10.1007/s11365-016-0396-5
- National Association of Social Workers. (2017). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Children and Families. (2016). *National Center for Children and Families: About us* [Web page]. Retrieved from <http://www.nccf-cares.org/our-history/>
- Neal, A. A. (2015). The intersection of social work and social enterprise. *Journal of Social Work Values & Ethics, 12*(2), 1–9. Retrieved from <http://jswve.org/download/2015-2/Fall%202015-Full%20issue-JSWVE-12-2.pdf>
- Neck, H., Brush, C., & Allen, E. (2009). The landscape of social entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons, 52*, 13–19. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2008.09.002
- Nicholls, A. (2006). Introduction. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable change* (pp. 1–35). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pitt-Catsoughes, M., & Berzin, S. C. (2015). Teaching note—Incorporating social innovation content into macro social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 51*, 407–416. doi:10.1080/10437797.2015.1012947
- Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *Journal of Socio-Economics, 38*, 878–885. doi:10.1016/j.socec.2009.02.011
- Polonsky, M. J., & Grau, S. L. (2008). Evaluating the social value of charitable organizations: A conceptual foundation. *Journal of Macromarketing, 28*, 130–140. doi:10.1177/0276146708314585
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review, 80*, 56–68. Retrieved from [https://sharedvalue.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/Competitive\\_Advantage.pdf](https://sharedvalue.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/Competitive_Advantage.pdf)
- Rahdari, A., Sepasi, S., & Moradi, M. (2016). Achieving sustainability through Schumpeterian social entrepreneurship: The role of social enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 137*, 347–360. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.159

- Roy, R., & Tripathi, V. (2015). Social entrepreneurship for sustainable economic development: A need to increase workforce participation. *Global Journal of Enterprise Information System*, 7(2), 106. doi:10.18311/gjeis/2015/2972
- Salamon, L. M., Geller, S. L., & Mengel, K. L. (2010). Nonprofits, innovation, and performance measurement: Separating fact from fiction. *Listening Post Project*, 17, 1–25. Retrieved from [http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/09/LP\\_Communique\\_17\\_2010.pdf](http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/09/LP_Communique_17_2010.pdf)
- Santos, F., & Williams, J. (2013, November 7). The rise of the social intrapreneur. *INSEAD Knowledge*. Retrieved from <https://knowledge.insead.edu/responsibility/the-rise-of-the-social-intrapreneur-2961#t4GdebtDvLLcy0X3.99>
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 243–263. doi:10.2307/259121
- Savaya, R., Packer, P., Stange, D., & Namir, O. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Capacity building among workers in public human service agencies. *Administration in Social Work*, 32(4), 65–86. doi:10.1080/03643100802293840
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). *Sustainable development: How social entrepreneurs make it happen* (IESE Business School Working Paper No. 611). Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=876404>
- Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2011). The new field of sustainable entrepreneurship: Studying entrepreneurial action linking “what is to be sustained” with “what is to be developed.” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 137–163. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00426.x
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3, 161–194. doi:10.1002/sej.69
- Singh, A. (2016). *The process of social value creation: A multiple-case study on social entrepreneurs in India*. New Delhi, India: Springer.
- Smith, S. R. (2015). Managing human service organizations in the 21st century. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership, & Governance*, 39, 401–411. doi:10.1080/23303131.2015.1087783
- Tropman, J. E., & Morningstar, G. (1989). *Entrepreneurial systems for the 1990s: Their creation, structure, and management*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Uehara, E., Flynn, M., Fong, R., Brekke, J., Barth, R. P., Coulton, C., et al. (2013). Grand challenges for social work. *Journal of the Society for Social Work & Research*, 4, 165–170. doi:10.5243/jsswr.2013.11
- United Nations Development Programme. (n.d.). *United Nations Sustainable Development Goals*. Retrieved from [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/brochure/SDGs\\_Booklet\\_Web\\_En.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/brochure/SDGs_Booklet_Web_En.pdf)

- Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business, 41*, 21–35. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.001
- Wei-Skillern, J. (2010). Networks as a type of social entrepreneurship to advance population health. *Preventing Chronic Disease, 7*(6), A120. Retrieved from [http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2010/nov/10\\_0082.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2010/nov/10_0082.htm)
- Williams, J. H. (2015). Unification, crafting imperatives, and defining a profession. *Social Work Research, 39*, 67–69. doi:10.1093/swr/svv008.
- Young, H. P. (2011). The dynamics of social innovation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 108*, 2185–2291. doi:10.1073/pnas.1100973108
- Young, R. (2006). For what it is worth: Social value and the future of social entrepreneurship. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change* (1st ed., pp. 56–73). New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.5465/amle.2013.0263
- 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*, 519–532. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007
- Zhu, Y., Rooney, D., & Phillips, N. (2016). Practice-based wisdom theory for integrating institutional logics: A new model for social entrepreneurship learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 15*, 607–625. doi:10.5465/amle.2013.0263