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 argu-ably 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 imple-mentation 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