

## Educating Social Entrepreneurs as Agents for Inclusive Innovation

Brigita Janiunaite and Edita Gelbudiene

*Kaunas University of Technology  
Donelaicio str. 73, LT-44244 Kaunas, Lithuania*

**crossref** <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ss.86.4.9256>

### Abstract

**During the last decade great attention is paid to a social organization, social entrepreneur by pointing out that they strive to work for the welfare of the society by solving social problems in unconventional, creative, innovative and effective ways. Seeking social goals and creation of social value are the main features of social entrepreneurship (Peredo and McLean, 2006). With reference to social entrepreneurs, who work or will work in the public sector, it is necessary to emphasize education and/or self-education of social entrepreneurs. The article addresses the following research question: what challenges emerge for entrepreneurship education of social entrepreneurs considering the features of social entrepreneurs? The main research methods are research literature analysis and individual in-depth interview. The first part of the article discloses the concepts of social entrepreneurship, social inclusions and inclusive innovation; the second part provides rationale for social entrepreneur's features, whereas the third part presents strategies for the education of social entrepreneurs.**

**Keywords:** social entrepreneurs, inclusive innovation, social inclusion, education for entrepreneurship.

### Introduction

Entrepreneurship has emerged over the last two decades as arguably the most potent economic force the world has ever experienced (Kuratko, 2005). During the last decade great attention is paid to a social organization and social entrepreneur by pointing out that they strive to work for society welfare by solving social problems in unconventional, creative, innovative, long-run and effective ways. Scientific discourse about the activity of a social entrepreneur is in more detail presented in the article 'The Profile of Social Entrepreneurs Working for Non-Governmental Organizations' published in this journal (Adomavičiute, Janiunaite and Stuopyte, 2012).

When speaking about social entrepreneurs who work or will work in the public sector it is necessary to emphasize education and/or self-education of social entrepreneurs. In this aspect it is very important 'to have' the structure of social entrepreneur's competence, which would allow modelling particular study programmes. The article focuses on social entrepreneurs who act in non-

governmental organizations and implement innovations related to the expansion of social inclusion. Considering the above-mentioned aspects, the article aims to answer the following research question: what challenges emerge for educating social entrepreneurs of social entrepreneurs with reference to the features of social entrepreneurs?

The main research methods are research literature analysis and individual in-depth interview.

The first part of the article discloses the concepts of social entrepreneurship, social inclusions and inclusive innovation; the second part provides rationale for the features of social entrepreneur's, whereas the third part presents strategies for education of social entrepreneurs.

### Social entrepreneurs as agents for inclusive development: conceptual approach

In pursuing for welfare society social innovations become particularly important beside technological innovations. Why?

In satisfying the needs of own security, welfare and comfort, every person tries to belong to a certain social group. In order to attain this, they learn to properly behave, develop necessary skills, form good relations with the people around, create positive reputation and by different ways seek to conform to the standards defined in the society (Baumeister et al., 2005). However, due to the constantly changing economic, social and political conditions, the society becomes very polarized. Certain groups of people feel unsafe; it is hard for them to adjust to constant changes and fast pace of life. Thus even the fast growth of economics does not determine upgrading economic and social conditions for the entire society. So despite economic growth social exclusion often increases (Johnson and Andersen, 2012). More and more different society groups become partly or completely socially excluded.

Social exclusion is a restriction of civil rights of groups of certain people that exists in the society, involuntary estrangement from public and economical values (Barsauskiene, 2004). Such people lose certain rights or social status, they often stop social relations and do not consider themselves as part of the society. Social exclusion is a restriction of social, economic, cultural and political participation (Saloojee, 2008). It involves several dimensions of the retreat: separation from the labour market (activities providing the income), consumption (the

income does not allow satisfying even basic needs), possibilities to influence the political life of the country. These people are socially excluded – their social relations are so weak that they digress from public and social values. The essential strategy for decreasing social exclusion is *social inclusion* (Badelt, 1999). Social inclusion is a process that unites many different areas of social activity and obligates to innovatively consider existing social problems as well as to search for effective strategies for their solution (Saloojee, 2003). Social inclusion is a rather complicated concept, which cannot be defined by one aspect. Saloojee (2003) distinguishes the following essential dimensions of inclusion:

- the recognition of different values – respect for people and their groups, their differences;
- social development of a person – creation of the possibilities to improve, develop abilities, learn and purposefully rest;
- participation and inclusion – the possibility to take part in the decision-making, which influence the person, his/her family or community, as well as to be included into the community life, is created ;
- proximity – reduction of social distance among people, sharing common physical and social space (libraries, parks, neighbourhood);
- material well-being – secure home and fixed income.

As Kirwan et al. (2013) state, social innovations are particularly related to social justice and social inclusion. Social innovations are new forms of civic empowerment, participation and democracy, which contribute to the empowerment of the disadvantaged groups as well as determine more active participation of citizens, which in its turn can meet their unsatisfied needs (Neumeier, 2012).

Thus both the process of social inclusion and its aims are oriented to innovations and it requires the innovative viewpoint to existing social problems and their solution. As social innovations are the life-force in implementing social changes as well as in solving social problems (Phills, Deiglmeier and Miller, 2008; Butkeviciene, 2009), and the essential dimensions of social innovations include the processes of social interaction, satisfaction of human needs, socio-political activity and social inclusion, by means of social innovations it is possible to solve problems of social inclusion by using them as the measure to increase the social inclusion.

In this sense it is relevant to talk about ‘inclusive innovation’. The notion of ‘inclusive innovation’ is increasingly used in connection to the development policy and strategy. Inclusive innovation is often regarded as an important ingredient of inclusive development. It is normally supposed to incorporate innovation *for* the poor as well as innovation *by* the poor. ‘The bottom of the pyramid’ needs good products at low costs, which may be brought about by innovations in ordinary firms in the normal sector. But grass root entrepreneurs may as well address the needs of the bottom of the pyramid through innovation (Learning, Innovation and Inclusive Development, GLOBELICS 2011/12).

*Inclusive* innovation is a ‘branch’ of social innovation which aims to enlarge social inclusion seeking to:

- react to the differentiation of the contemporary society into groups and to create possibilities to take part in the social life adequately (according to maximum personal powers and needs);
- empower the transformation of the future society by enlarging social inclusion through developing such features of a person that he/she would be able to create a different society.

Thus ‘inclusive innovation’, initiated at the local level, can determine the satisfaction of the essential human needs (material, employment, place of residence and so on). Under the influence of inclusive innovations social relations can change; in its turn this determines a closer social interaction of community members, the reduction of social exclusion, involvement and participation of the groups representing it.

Social entrepreneurs are persons who notice possibilities of social innovations, are not afraid to take possible risk, are able to concentrate necessary resources as well as to implement the innovation despite emerging obstacles. Social entrepreneurs not only understand and construct innovative models for solving social problems but also involve other members of the community by their ideas as well as empower them to act for the public interest (Drayton, 2011).

In order to encourage the activity of social entrepreneurs at different levels and to form the essential strategies for education/self-education of social entrepreneurs, it is important to disclose ‘the features’ of a social entrepreneur.

### The features of social entrepreneurs

Even today researchers around the world continue to search for a monolithic personality of the entrepreneur. Brockhaus and Horwitz (1986) reviewed the early literature on traits and concluded that there are four major personality traits of individuals: need for achievement, internal locus of control, high risk-taking propensity and tolerance for ambiguity. Miner (1996) proposed four psychological personality patterns of entrepreneurs: personal advisors, empathetic super salespeople, real managers and expert idea generators. Also, most recently, Shane posited the role of the entrepreneurial gene, taking the nature versus nurture discussion to new extremes (Mount, 2010). Any discussion of the numerous challenges in this line of research can range from problems with defining, differentiating and explaining the core of entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurs are distinguished by exceptional features related to the social field they have chosen. The literature also distinguishes different segments of social entrepreneur’s activity; however, another strategy is chosen in this article. The interview with the social entrepreneurs seeks to highlight the features of social entrepreneurs. The empirical research has allowed finding out how the features disclose in the real activity of social entrepreneurs – employees of NGOs providing social services.

**Research method.** A qualitative research based on the phenomenological research strategy was carried out. The

research method was an individual in-depth interview. Six open questions of the in-depth interview were formulated for the interview purposes:

1. Why did you decide to work for a NGO which provides social services?
2. What are the aims of your professional activity?
3. What a NGO should be like to inspire its employees to make social initiatives?
4. What personality features, abilities and knowledge are necessary for a person working for a NGO which provides social services?
5. What was the most successful project/initiative you have implemented?
6. What are your future plans?

The data for the analysis were obtained after having transcribed the in-depth interviews. Then *descriptive content analysis* was employed for the analysis of the obtained data.

Considering that the people – those to whom social entrepreneurship is everyday life – can provide the best information about the phenomenon being researched (Groenewald, 2004); the following criteria of informants' selection were distinguished:

- the founder of the NGO that renders social services and functions successfully;
- the author and implementer of the social project/initiative that was successfully implemented (compulsory an employee of a NGO).

Five informants who met the requirements of the criteria relevant for the research were chosen. As the interview was in-depth, no strict succession of the questions was kept; they were asked according to the situation and informant's experience and narrative. During the research all essential principles of the research ethics were kept.

**Presentation of informants.** Three informants who took part in the research have been already presented in the article by Adomaviciute, Janiunaite and Stuopyte (2012). This article presents two social entrepreneurs who took part in this research and have not been presented yet:

- 75 year-old woman, who has established the independent non-profit organization that helps women and their family members, who find themselves in crisis situations, protect their rights and influence public attitudes to violence.

The informant has education in electrical engineering and for 30 years she worked by speciality. Having retired, she got interested in the activity of older women, learnt self-defence for women and became an instructor. This occupation stimulated the wish to develop further activity: when presenting self-defence programme and communicating with different women, she recognized essential problems: women lack legal knowledge, psychological help and countenance. This encouraged her to establish a crisis centre. Later the informant initiated establishing more centres in Kaunas County as well as the Men Crisis Centre. The main aim is to help women who get into difficult and crisis situations, to represent them at different institutions. According to the woman, *'she is led by someone from the heaven'*. This is how she names her

motives. The informant together with her colleagues much contributed to the initiation of the law about the prevention of violence in close environment: *'it was necessary somehow to draw out this entire stiff apparatus that they would pay attention'*. When telling about the organization that encourages social initiatives of employees, the informant particularly points out teamwork and joint decision-making process. With reference to essential features, abilities, knowledge of NGO employees, she names innovativeness, persistence, obstinacy, ideological work, endless desire and disposition to help others, to live with other people's problems. *'Really, not for money I am involved in this activity. It is important to feel that during the day you have done something good'*, *'To the centre the people who find themselves here come to work – but not for honour or money'*, *'You just become contaminated by the work in the social field'*. The informant finds ideas in the experience of foreign countries, tries to adapt the good experience in Lithuania. She points out the importance of social networks. When creating projects, she searches for new and original ideas, consults with her colleagues. She does not look for sponsors; she gets financing from different projects and benefit from their large quantity and success. The informant calls social changes a miracle, the creation of which it is good to contribute. Her essential attitude is: *'if you really want to help, so you will'*.

- The 48 year old woman living in Kaunas. She is one of the founders and the manager of the association that provides social assistance and consultations for women, organizes competitions, educational seminars, conferences for the society, carries out lobbying activities at state and municipal levels seeking for laws and resolutions beneficial for women, organizes groups of teenage girls from problematic families, where they do not have conditions adequate for strengthening their communication skills and abilities. The main aim is to improve women's life quality both in public and private space, as well as to provide assistance for women of different age, to organize prevention, to initiate changes in laws so that the assistance would be performed not only by organizations but also at the state level. Great attention is paid to maintenance, inducement, promotion of equal possibilities for women and men.

The informant follows the phrase *'find the job you like and you will not have to work a day'*. According to her, the activity of NGO employees mostly depends on the people. It is hard to encourage some employees so that they would initiate innovations. The ideal case is when the organization is established by like-minded persons and they work for it. The research participant names the following most important features of employees: activity, persistence, initiative, communicability. She also points out the following abilities: entrepreneurship, abilities to speak in public, to resolve conflicts. Knowledge of English is necessary, particularly for the manager of an organization. She also emphasizes equal possibilities and secularity as her approaches. She also stresses the importance of continuous learning. Certain knowledge is

necessary when specializing in certain fields, e.g., of equal possibilities or violence reduction.

The informant finds ideas in foreign experience; however, most often ideas emerge in the activity or just at night time. The informant is not afraid to take risk and calls herself as a very brave person who is not afraid to speak in public. Especially the research participant likes to work with sponsors. In case she had more time, she could collect much more finance necessary for the activity. Training in network marketing influenced the emergence of this skill. The fear to hear 'no' disappears; thus the bravery to address most potential sponsors emerges.

**The research results and discussion.** Having performed the analysis of scientific literature, it has become evident that social entrepreneurship is the phenomenon to which the following essential elements are characteristic: aim, context, vision, identification of a possibility, search for resources, risk management, proactive relations, social networks, learning and final result of the process – created social value (Phills, Deiglmeier and Miller, 2008; Bornstein and Davis, 2010; Bessant and Tidd, 2011; Marshall, 2011). These elements of social entrepreneurship process have also unclosed in the activities carried out by the research participants:

**Aim:** the research data showed that the informants directly relate their personal and organization's (which they manage) aims to the identified social problems and their solution.

**Environment (context):** the research disclosed that environment influenced the choice of the informants' activity direction and problems being solved. In other words, in the environment, in which a social entrepreneur got, he/she noticed social problems and began to search for innovative possibilities for their solution.

**Vision:** the research participants point out inexplicit visions of better and happier life for all people.

**Targeted activity:** the research disclosed that the informants pursue for their stated aims insistently and purposefully.

**Identification of possibilities:** though the informants state that they themselves generate ideas, the tendency that more often they recognize innovative solutions of problems in good practice of foreign countries and adapt them in their activity is observed.

**Search for funds** is the strongest ability of the informants. All participants of the research are able to raise funds for their social initiatives being performed, but they do it by different methods: searching for sponsors by usual ways and presenting them possible benefit of sponsors, applying knowledge of network marketing, 'infecting' potential sponsors with own enthusiasm or raising necessary funds by means of project activity.

**Proactive relations and social networks:** all informants who took part in the research point out the importance of collaboration as well as the necessity to create social networks both with individuals and organizations. They are necessary both for searching potential sponsors or volunteers and carrying out large projects. Targeted communication is also aimed towards politicians.

**Learning:** continuous learning is inevitable in carrying out social initiatives; however, the informants consider learning as the most important in practical activity.

**Risk and its management:** the informants are subject to take the risk related to the activities being implemented; however, this ability is not strongly expressed. The informants have revealed their approach that in social sphere risk is greater as it considers not only financial resources but also it can have much more social outcomes.

**Created social value and/or successfully functioning established organization:** as the research has aimed to disclose manifestation of social entrepreneurship features of employees at non-governmental organizations, it is possible to state that all five informants possess competence of social entrepreneurship, which can be confirmed by the social value they have created and which, according to Auerswald (2009), is defined as new solution of a social problem, which is more effective and more sustainable than already existing solutions and is directed more towards society needs than needs of a private person. This is social initiatives performed by the informants, established organizations, initiated laws and their amendments. All participants of the research have initiated the establishment of NGO providing social services and carry out social activities well-known for society.

Though creation of social value is the activity oriented to social profit by trying to resound society needs and problems (Auerswald, 2009), the research has revealed that despite all five informants create social value for society by discovering new and effective ways to solve social problems as well as initiating the changes initiating the changes in laws of the country, they care for creation of social wellbeing for private persons.

One of the aspects uniting the experience of all informants is their education, which seems not to have anything in common to their social activity being performed: no informant studied social sciences before he / she got involved in social sphere. It is also important to notice that present experience of the informants was very different – two of them worked in business field, one – at an educational institution, one – at a production company, one began his work activity in studying history and performing odd jobs. Four informants are unifies their age – 42-48 year old, only one informant is 75 year old; however, she began her social activity being 55 year old. Strong inspiration in the activity being performed, their abundance and variety are characteristic for all participants of the research. All informants pointed out that they had future plans related to new social initiatives, even to the creation of the organizations providing new social services.

During the research the informants disclosed the following **features** of a social entrepreneur, NGO employee: creativeness, proactivity, spontaneity, persistence, self-confidence, tolerance, self-restraint, commitment for the aim, moral strength, empathy, and sincerity. The research participants also disclosed the features, which had not been distinguished when analyzing scientific literature: positivity and sociability. The following features of the informants are most strongly

expressed: creativity, proactivity, empathy, self-restraint and tolerance. Commitment for the aim and moral strength are less expressed.

The informants have revealed the following **approaches** of social entrepreneurs – NGO employees: greater importance of social problem solution than of personal wellbeing, secondary attention towards possessed resources, short joy in an achieved result and pursuit to carry out further changes, concentration towards long-term aims, as well as the approach that an entrepreneur does not face any problems, but only possibilities. The following approach is the closest for the informants: short joy in an achieved result – glance to future – what else has to be changed?

During the research the informants have disclosed the following **values** of a social entrepreneur working for a NGO that provides social services: self-sacrifice, society wellbeing, respect and self-esteem, work and the vision of better world. Society wellbeing is the value important absolutely for all informants. Volunteering is a value that was not distinguished when analyzing research literature, but it became evident during the research. It is important for three out of five research participants personally.

The informants indicated the following **motives**: long-term and effective social changes, self-realization, altruism, and creation of social value, society progress, the change of people's behaviour models and understanding, inspiration by an idea. The wish to create social value motivates all participants of the research most strongly. The following factors are also emphasized as well: self-realization and society progress. The informants indicated the following aspects as very important ones motivating to get involved into social activities, though they were not mentioned in the analysis of scientific literature: vocation, strong inner need, which determined the wish to help in changing the life for others, as well as the influence of close environment – family, acquaintances, and colleagues.

The following **knowledge** is important for a social entrepreneur: understanding and knowledge of social problems, how to solve them, as well as project activities and particularly knowledge of policy and laws. All informants emphasized the importance of continuous learning.

The following **abilities** of social entrepreneurs have been disclosed during the research: the ability to envisage possibilities, which are not observed by others, to initiate social changes, to attract necessary resources, to act innovatively, to take risk, to inspire others, to collaborate, to start relations, to listen, to represent, to work in a team, to take responsibility, to defend own beliefs, to draw public attention, to mobilize political power, to refuse personal wellbeing. The ability to attract necessary resources, to act innovatively, to collaborate is the most strongly expressed abilities, which are characteristic for all participants of the research. Time management, entrepreneurship, development of an organization are the abilities additionally distinguished by the informants.

Thus, having performed the qualitative research and having analyzed the expression of the social entrepreneurship features of the chosen informants working for NGO that provide social services, the

uniqueness of social entrepreneurs' activities has become evident. Though the informants work for different organizations and perform more or less different activities, in initiating social changes and creating social value they need the same abilities and knowledge, common features, approaches and values are characteristic for them, similar motives inspire them to act. The insights obtained during the research allow modelling certain scenarios for developing a social entrepreneur as active agent of innovations.

## Educating for social entrepreneurship

The magnitude and complexity of social challenges requires a more robust, diverse and talented cadre of social entrepreneurs and changemakers, prepared and positioned to solve these problems (Ashoka and Brock, 2011).

As the above-mentioned source states, the education for social entrepreneurship took place in several 'waves'.

First Wave of development was characterized by activity and courses primarily at graduate schools of business, with early leadership from Harvard University, University of Geneva in Switzerland, Stanford University, and later schools of Government and Public Policy including New York University and Harvard University joined in along with pioneering centres at Oxford University, Duke University, and others.

In the past several years we have observed that social entrepreneurship education is entering a Second Wave of development with a Third Wave emerging quickly on the horizon.

The Second Wave:

- 1) Shift from Business Schools to 'Everyone a Changemaker'. We see a shift from business schools as the primary or sole driver of social entrepreneurship toward cross-campus, interdisciplinary, 'embedded' programs that serve undergraduates, graduates, and executive education seekers. Several leading institutions have set a goal that every student will be exposed to the concepts of social entrepreneurship in the classroom before graduation.
- 2) Focus on Comprehensive, Rigorous Social Entrepreneurship Course of Study that Combines Classroom and Practice Colleges and universities are paying increased attention to combining and to connecting social entrepreneurship theory with practice, and connecting the classroom to campus life and to a career. *Colleges and universities are replacing applied learning experiences of internships and community consulting models with innovative models that offer more value to students, community partners and to the practitioners in the field. Finally, institutions are creating a comprehensive social entrepreneurship experience, integrating social entrepreneurship teaching, thinking, and practice into diverse campus elements, including residential life, student affairs and alumni relations.*
- 3) Diversity of Institutions. Diverse institutional types are embracing social entrepreneurship, including 2- and 4-year institutions, online universities, continuing

and executive education programs and undergraduate and graduate schools across diverse disciplines, including engineering, design, law, social work, and education. In addition, social entrepreneurship education is moving outward from its popularity at elite colleges and universities to institutionalization at universities and colleges worldwide.

Unlike the previous two waves, this third wave focuses on social and environmental objectives ahead of narrow economic or parochial national concerns. Globalization 3.0 has created a set of new institutional contexts that are very amenable to socially entrepreneurial models in terms of fresh policy agendas, *disruptive business models, new markets, and a reformed civil society*. As social entrepreneurship becomes more established as an academic field, the opportunity exists for a third wave of innovation. Institutions of higher education have the opportunity to *build on existing social entrepreneurship programs to act as both engines and agents of systemic change*. As engines of change, colleges and universities can effectively develop human capital to implement pattern changing ideas to address the world's most pressing challenges. *The development of student competencies will depend on the creation of effective pedagogies and methodologies to ensure results.*

When developing a social entrepreneurship course, the faculty are provided an array of teaching methods to choose from. These options include traditional lectures, class discussions, the case method, and hands-on projects that range from interviewing/shadowing social entrepreneurs to writing a business plan for a fictitious social venture to providing expertise and volunteer time to existing organizations interested in social change.

Referring to Neck and Green (2011), in this article it is at large suggested to treat the education of a social entrepreneur through the prism of entrepreneurship as a method. Why? Entrepreneurship is often thought of as a process – a process of identifying an opportunity, understanding resource requirements, acquiring resources, planning, and implementing. However, the world 'process' assumes known inputs and known outputs as in manufacturing process. A process is quite predictable. Entrepreneurship is not predictable. On the other hand, a method represents a body of skills or techniques; therefore, teaching entrepreneurship as a method simply implies that we are helping students understand, develop, and practice the skills and techniques need for productive entrepreneurship. Referring to the above-mentioned authors, underlying assumptions of the method include the following:

- each student understands how he or she views the entrepreneurial world and his or her place in it;
- the method is inclusive in the sense that the definition of entrepreneurship is expanded to include any organization at multiple levels of analysis;
- the method requires continuous practice. The focus here is on doing rather than learning;
- the method is for an unpredictable environment.

The main dimensions of the method are starting business as a part of coursework (in the case of social

entrepreneurship it may be social enterprise or something like that); serious games and simulations, design-based learning and reflective practice. Further in the article it will be presented how design-based learning and reflective practice can be realized.

Simon (1996) argued that applied disciplines are better served by design-based curricula. Design is a process of divergence and convergence requiring skills in observation, synthesis, searching and generating alternatives, critical thinking, feedback, visual representation, creativity, problem-solving and value creation. Teaching entrepreneurship through a design lens can help students identify and act on unique venture opportunities using a toolkit of observation, fieldwork, and understanding value creation across multiple stakeholder groups.

Reflection is particularly important for perplexing experiences, working under conditions of high uncertainty and problem-solving. As a result, it should not be surprise that reflection is an integral component of entrepreneurship education and also a way of practicing entrepreneurship.

In summary, it is necessary to point out that when teaching social entrepreneurship everyone have to recognize the defining characteristics of social entrepreneurship and that they cover the seven essential topics in the courses – addressing social needs/problems, innovation, scaling a social venture, resource acquisition, opportunity recognition, sustainable business model and measuring outcomes – in order to prepare future leaders in the field. The ultimate question is what course content and designs are most appropriate to persuade students to develop a social mindset and become service-oriented leaders of tomorrow. How many will choose a career path working for a socially entrepreneurial enterprise or starting their own social venture within one year, five years, ten years, and twenty years after graduation? In the short-term, mid-term and long-term, to what extent will they positively impact the triple bottom line?

## Conclusions

- Social innovation is particularly related to social justice and social inclusion. Social innovation is new forms of civic empowerment, participation and democracy, which contribute to the empowerment of the disadvantaged groups as well as determine more active participation of citizens, which in its turn can meet their unsatisfied needs.
- For social innovation to be successful, the role of a social entrepreneur is important. Social entrepreneurs are the persons, who notice possibilities of social innovations, are not afraid to take possible risk, are able to concentrate necessary resources as well as to implement the innovation despite emerging obstacles.
- Inclusive innovation is a 'branch' of social innovation, which aims to enlarge the social inclusion in the following: to react to the differentiation of the contemporary society into groups and to create possibilities to take part in the society life adequately (according to maximum personal powers and needs);

to empower the transformation of the future society by enlarging social inclusion through developing such features of a person that he/she would be able to create different society.

- Having surveyed the expression of social entrepreneurship features, the uniqueness of social entrepreneurs' activities has become evident. Though the informants work for different organizations and perform more or less different activities, in initiating social changes and creating social value they need the same abilities and knowledge, common features, approaches and values are characteristic for them, similar motives inspire them to act.
- New frontiers of educating for entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship are entrepreneurship as a method. The method is people-dependent but it does not depend on a type of person.

## References

1. Ashoka, U., & Brock, D. D. (2011). *Social Entrepreneurship Education Resource Handbook*. The University Division of Ashoka: Innovators for the Public.
2. Auerswald, P. (2009). Creating Social Value. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, Spring*, 50-55.
3. Badelt, C. (1997). Entrepreneurship theories of the non-profit sector. *Voluntas*, 8, (2), 162-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02354193>
4. Badelt, C. (1999). The Role of NPOs in Policies to Combat Social Exclusion. *Social Protection Discussion Paper Series*, 9912, 4-28.
5. Baršauskienė, V. (2004). *Bendruomenės socioedukacinio vystymo teoriniai pagrindai* (Habilitacijos procedūrai teikiamų mokslo darbų apžvalga, Kauno technologijos universitetas, 2004).
6. Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2005). Social Exclusion Impairs Self-Regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, (4), 589-604. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.589>
7. Bessant, J., & Tidd, J. (2011). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. Chichester: Wiley.
8. Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to Change the World. Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford University Press.
9. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: what everyone needs to know*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Brockhaus, R., & Horwitz, P. (1986). The Psychology of the Entrepreneur. *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*. D. Sexton, R. Smilor (eds.). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
11. Butkevičienė, E. (2009). Social Innovations in Rural Communities: Methodological Framework and Empirical Evidence. *Social Sciences*, 1, (63), 80-88.
12. Bygrave, W., & Zacharakis, A. (2011). *Entrepreneurship*. NJ, Hoboken: JohnWiley.
13. Drayton, B. (2011). Collaborative Entrepreneurship. How Social Entrepreneurs Have Learned to Tip the World by Working in global Teams. *Innovations*, Spring, 1-9.
14. Gilmore, A., Gallagher, D., & O'Dwyer, M. (2011). Is Social Entrepreneurship an Untapped Marketing Resource? A Commentary on its Potential for Small Sports Clubs. *Journal of Small business and Entrepreneurship*, 24, (1), 11-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2011.10593522>
15. Groenewald, T. (2004). A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3, (1).
16. Hemingway, C. A. (2005). Personal Values as A Catalyst for Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60, 233-249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-0132-5>
17. Johnson, B., & Andersen, A. D. (2012). *Learning, Innovation and Inclusive Development. New perspectives on economic development and development aid*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
18. Jucevičienė, P. (2007). *Besimokantis miestas*. Kaunas: Technologija.
19. Jucevičius, R., ir Urbonė, R. (2008). *Intelektuali antreprenerystė: fenomenas, kontekstas, perspektyvos*. Kaunas: Technologija.
20. Kirwan, J., Ilbery, B., Maye, D., & Carey, J. (2013). *Grassroots social innovations and food localisation: An investigation of the Local Food programme in England*. Global Environmental Change. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.12.004>
21. Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education: Development, Trends, and Challenges. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, September, 577-597. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00099.x>
22. Light, P. C. (2009). Social Entrepreneurship Revisited. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer, 21-23.
23. Lipinskiene, D., ir Stanikūnienė, B. (2010). Vadovai ir darbuotojai organizacijose, siekiančiose žinių ir inovacijų. *Socialiniai mokslai*, 2, (68), 7-15
24. Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 36-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
25. Miner, J. B. (1996). *The 4 Routes to Entrepreneurial Success*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
26. Mount, I. (2010). Nature vs. Nurture: Are Great Entrepreneurs Born... or Made? *Fortune Small Business*, December 09/January 10, 25-26.
27. Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship Education: Known Worlds and New Frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49, (1), 55-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00314.x>
28. Neumeier, S. (2012). Why do Social Innovations in Rural Development Matter and should they be Considered More Seriously in Rural Development Research? – Proposal for a Stronger Focus on Social Innovations in Rural Development Research. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52, (1), 48-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00553.x>
29. Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. H., & Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An Exploration of Social Entrepreneurship in the Entrepreneurship Era. *Asian Social Science*, 6, (6), 3-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v6n6p3>
30. Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 56-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007>
31. Petuškiene, E., & Glinskiene, R. (2011). Entrepreneurship as the Basic Element for the Successful Employment of Benchmarking and Business Innovations. *Inžinerinė ekonomika – Engineering Economics*, 22, (1), 69-77.
32. Phillips, J. A. Jr., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Fall, 34-43.
33. Saloojee, A. (2003). *Social Inclusion, Anti-Racism and Democratic Citizenship*. Canada: The Laidlaw Foundation.
34. Saloojee, A. (2008). *Social Inclusion, Citizenship and Diversity*. Retrieved January 15, 2013, from <http://www.ccsd.ca/subsites/inclusion/bp/as.htm>
35. Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship. Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 3, (14), 418-434. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529>
36. Simon, H. A. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
37. Spencer, L., & Spencer, S. (1993). *Competence at work: models for superior performance*. London: John & Sons.
38. Stripeikis, O. (2008). Antrepreneriško formavimas Lietuvos smulkaus ir vidutinio verslo įmonėse. *Vadybos mokslas ir studijos – kaimo verslų ir jų infrastruktūros plėtrai*, 15, (4), 1-11.
39. Thompson, J. L. (2002). The world of social entrepreneur. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 5, (15), 412-431. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513550210435746>
40. Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 21-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.001>
41. Williams, D. A., & K'nlfe, K. A. K. (2011). The dark side of social entrepreneurship. *Proceedings of the Academy of Entrepreneurship*, 17, (1), 67-72.



E. Gelbūdienė, B. Janiūnaitė

### Socialinių antreprenierių kaip aprėpties inovacijų agentų ugdymas (-sis)

#### Santrauka

Pastaruoju dešimtmečiu ypatingai daug dėmesio skiriama socialines paslaugas teikiančių organizacijų vystymui ir socialinei antreprenerystei. Socialinis antreprenieris – asmuo, dirbantis visuomenės labai ir sprendžiantis socialines problemas netradiciniais, kūrybiškais, inovatyviais, ilgalaikiais bei efektyviais būdais. Esminis socialinės antreprenerystės išskirtinumas nuo antreprenerystės apskritai yra socialinių tikslų siekimas.

Straipsnyje pagrindinis dėmesys skiriamas socialiniams antreprenieriams, dirbantiems nevyriausybinėse organizacijose ir inicijuojantiems inovacijas, susijusias su socialinės įtraukties didinimu. Socialinė įtrauktis - tai procesas, vienijantis daugelį skirtingų socialinės veiklos sričių ir įpareigojantis inovatyviai žvelgti į egzistuojančias socialines problemas bei ieškoti efektyvių jų sprendimo strategijų. Taigi tiek socialinės įtraukties procesas, tiek jo tikslai yra nukreipti į inovacijas ir reikalauja inovatyvaus požiūrio į egzistuojančias socialines problemas bei jų sprendimą. Vertinant tai, kad socialinės inovacijos yra ypač susiję su socialiniu teisingumu ir socialine įtrauktimi, jas galima įvardinti kaip naujas pilietinio įgalinimo, dalyvavimo ir demokratijos formas, kurios prisideda prie esančių atskirtyje grupių įgalinimo bei lemia aktyvesnį piliečių dalyvavimą visuomenės gyvenime bei jų esminių poreikių patenkinimą. Taigi remiantis inovatyvumo svarba socialinės aprėpties procese bei jo tiesioginėmis sąsajomis su socialinėmis inovacijomis ir jų tikslais, straipsnyje suformuluota socialinės aprėpties inovacijų samprata: socialinės aprėpties inovacijos – tai socialinės inovacijos, kurios yra skirtos socialinei įtraukčiai didinti, siekiant: reaguoti į dabartinės visuomenės diferenciaciją į grupes ir sudaryti galimybes lygiavertiškai (atsižvelgiant į maksimalias asmenines galias ir poreikius) dalyvauti visuomenės gyvenime; įgalinti ateities visuomenės transformaciją, didinant socialinę įtrauktį – ugdant tokias asmens savybes, kad jis gebėtų kurti kitokią visuomenę.

Žinoma tam, kad socialinės inovacijos būtų sėkmingos, ypatingai svarbus socialinio antreprenierio vaidmuo. Kalbant apie socialinius antreprenierius, kurie dirba ar dirbs viešajame sektoriuje, svarbu akcentuoti socialinės antreprenerystės ugdymą/ugdymąsi. Šiuo aspektu būtina išanalizuoti socialinio antreprenierio kompetencijos struktūrą, kas leistų modeliuoti tam tikras studijų programas. Todėl straipsnyje siekiama atsakyti į klausimus: kokie komponentai sudaro socialinio antreprenierio kompetencijos struktūrą? Kokie iššūkiai kyla ugdant studentus - socialinius antreprenierius, atsižvelgiant į socialinio antreprenierio kompetencijos struktūrą?

Tyrimo metodai: mokslinės literatūros analizė, individualus giluminis interviu. Straipsnį sudaro trys dalys. Pirmojoje dalyje atskleidžiamos socialinės antreprenerystės, socialinės įtraukties ir įtraukties inovacijų sampratos. Antrojoje dalyje pagrindžiamos socialinio antreprenierio charakteristikos. Trečioje dalyje pateikiamos socialinių antreprenierių ugdymo (-si) strategijos.

Ištyrus socialinės antreprenerystės bruožų raišką, išryškėjo socialinių antreprenierių veiklų unikalumas. Nors informantai dirba skirtingose organizacijose ir vykdo daugiau ar mažiau skirtingas veiklas, tačiau inicijuojant socialinius pokyčius bei kuriant socialinę vertę, jiems reikalingi tokie patys gebėjimai bei žinios, būdingi bendri bruožai, požiūriai ir vertybės, juos veikti skatina panašūs motyvai.

Analizuojant socialinių antreprenierių ugdymo (-si) strategijas, straipsnyje atskleistos trys esminės „srovės“, iš kurių vyraujanti šiuo metu yra trečioji, akcentuojanti antreprenerystės bei socialinės antreprenerystės ugdymą kaip metodą. Metodo esmė – padėti ugdytiniams suprasti, vystyti ir taikyti produktyviai antreprenerystei reikalingus įgūdžius bei technikas. Metodas akcentuoja, kad studentas turi suvokti savo vietą antreprenieriškame pasaulyje; metodas turi aprėpties dimensiją – apimami visi subjektai ir analizės lygmenys; taikant metodą reikalinga nuolatinė praktika, akcentas – ne tik mokymuisi, bet ir veiklai; metodo prieiga tinkama nuolat besikeičiančiai aplinkai. Pagrindinės metodo dimensijos: socialinės įmonės kaip semestro projekto kūrimas; žaidimų ir simuliacijų taikymas; dizainu paremta ugdymo/si programa, reflektvyvioji praktika.

*Reikšminiai žodžiai:* socialiniai antreprenieriai, įtraukties inovacijos, socialinė įtrauktis, antreprenerystės ugdymas (-sis).

First received: September, 2014  
Accepted for publication: December, 2014