

The Concept of Social Entrepreneurship as a Form of Social Motives and Career Paths according to a Psychosocial Perspective

Yulianah

Perbanas Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Corresponding Author:

Yulianah,
Perbanas Institute, Jakarta,
Indonesia.
Email:
yulianah.fachrudin@yahoo.com

The notion of social entrepreneurship can offer answers to social problems prevalent in today's society, particularly in entrepreneurship and social innovation. The idea of social entrepreneurship is a brand-new and interesting research area that piques the interest of the vast majority of scholars currently working in the field. In the context of social entrepreneurship, this review aims to isolate pertinent research issues in social psychology. This investigation takes a qualitative approach and makes use of descriptive research tools. Due to the many investigative research, individual qualities, societal motivations, and a specific vocational identity were some of the possible psychosocial elements discovered necessary for this sort of entrepreneurship. In addition, various perspectives on society, organizational goals, and psychosocial aspects of organizational behaviour were incorporated.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, social motives, career identity

1. INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship (SE) is a complex phenomena due to its distinctive work and social orientation, which focuses on the establishment of employment and social projects that cannot be solely described as traditional entrepreneurship. That is, it goes beyond the potential or necessity to make a firm lucrative (Perrini, 2006). Social entrepreneurship entails the conception, execution, and support of projects aimed at resolving social issues and achieving mutual advantages for human groups through business or socio-community endeavors. As with other forms of entrepreneurship, innovation and risk are important to the development of inventive solutions to a need or problem. However, a distinction between commercial and social entrepreneurship already exists (Waddock & Post, 1991).

Social entrepreneurship has been defined in a variety of disciplines, including the non-profit, for-profit, public, and a combination of these sectors. According to Bill Drayton (2006), the founder of social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship is comprised of two essential elements. First, there is a social innovation that can alter the current social system. Second, the existence of visionary, imaginative, enterprising, and morally-responsible persons behind these revolutionary ideas. Hulgard (2010) provides a more inclusive definition of social entrepreneurship as the creation of social value through collaboration with other individuals or community organizations engaged in a social innovation that typically involves economic activity.

Entrepreneurship is the origin of the term social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is a mix of the terms social, which means community, and entrepreneurship, which means enterprise. A social entrepreneur is a person who understands social problems and uses entrepreneurial skills to create social change, particularly in the fields of welfare, education, and health care (Cukier et al., 2011).

As a relatively new developing field, there will be several different opinions about social entrepreneurship and what constitutes social entrepreneurship. Statements or existing formulations describe a special type of social entrepreneur and the characteristics of its roles and activities. Based on the findings of the existence of various types of business entrepreneurs, it is also possible that there are several types of social entrepreneurs. In this phase, organizations and experts in this field will explore and define several social entrepreneurship formulations. As a result, the theme attracts the attention of various social fields as an

alternative path to social and economic progress (Smith & Woodworth, 2012). However, their knowledge and consensus still need to be improved to achieve greater depth and integration.

According to Gregory J. Dees (1998), a professor at Stanford University and expert in the field of social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship combines a strong passion for social mission with business-like discipline, invention, and determination. Social entrepreneurship activities may be: a) not for profit; b) for social purposes; or c) a combination of the two, i.e., not for profit and for profit but social causes. Social entrepreneurs build and direct companies, whether for-profit or non-profit, that are meant to be system-level catalysts for social change via new ideas, products, services, processes, and changing attitudes. Social entrepreneurs establish hybrid companies that employ business processes, but the end goal is the creation of social benefit.

In this regard, it is essential to move toward a psychosocial characterization of social entrepreneurs that allows us to identify the factors that predict intention and its execution, as well as the elements of the entrepreneurs' and their contexts' social entrepreneurship experiences that help them sustain their ventures (custodians of social entrepreneurial activity). This integrated, multifaceted, and multilayered perspective will provide a significant contribution to the effective development of SE, as it will provide useful scientific information that can be utilized in educating, advising, and supporting social entrepreneurs. Thus, our society's current public policies are urgently required to construct a socially viable economic model for those afflicted by natural disasters and economic and political crises.

2. LITERATUR REVIEW

a. Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship refers to the practice of using business principles and strategies to create positive social or environmental outcomes. Social entrepreneurs identify social problems or needs, and develop innovative and sustainable solutions to address them. Unlike traditional entrepreneurs, who are primarily focused on maximizing profits for themselves and their shareholders, social entrepreneurs prioritize creating positive social impact as their primary goal. They may still generate revenue, but this is usually reinvested back into the social enterprise rather than distributed as profits (Brooks, 2008).

Social entrepreneurship can take many forms, including nonprofit organizations, cooperatives, and for-profit businesses. The key characteristic that distinguishes social entrepreneurship from traditional entrepreneurship is its emphasis on using business principles and practices to address social and environmental issues. Social entrepreneurship has become increasingly popular in recent years as individuals and organizations seek to create sustainable solutions to some of the world's most pressing social and environmental challenges, such as poverty, inequality, and climate change (Spear, 2006).

b. Psychosocial Perspective

The psychosocial perspective is a theoretical approach to understanding human behavior that considers both psychological and social factors. This perspective emphasizes the interaction between an individual's internal psychological processes (thoughts, emotions, behaviors) and the external social and cultural environment in which they live. At the core of the psychosocial perspective is the belief that an individual's behavior cannot be fully understood by looking only at their individual psychological processes or their social context alone. Rather, it is the interaction between these factors that shapes an individual's behavior and development over time (Lent, 2004). The psychosocial perspective is often used in fields such as psychology, sociology, and social work to understand how people develop and change over time. It is particularly useful for understanding how social factors such as culture, family, and community influence an individual's psychological development and well-being.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This investigation takes a qualitative approach and makes use of descriptive research tools. Qualitative research methods, founded on postpositivism and philosophy, are integrated with data-gathering procedures (Triangulasi). These approaches study natural objects, form theory and research, and analyze historical developments (Sugiyono, 2011). The data being used in this study are secondary data gathered from online media archives. As a result, the archiving approach is utilized in this investigation to compile the accumulated material and offer it in a more readily digestible format. This research uses content analysis as a point of reference while gathering data or identifying sources based on the covered themes.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

a. Social Entrepreneurship

In most ES, it is characterized as a business or enterprise in the broadest sense, with specific goals defined very broadly as social goals. When we talk about value creation, we refer to the generation of actions that positively impact a group or society. That is, social value is obtained for the public interest. In this sense, it is important to highlight the difference between economic and social value creation. The former refers to

the acquisition of material wealth through the production of items that respond to environmental opportunities and for which consumers are ready to pay more than the cost of production. In contrast, the second objective seeks to bring about good improvements in people's lives and communities, thereby enhancing their quality of life (Mursidi et al., 2020).

There are at least four strategies to provide social benefit via social entrepreneurship, including: (Peredo & Mclean, 2006):

- 1) Break down barriers that lead to exclusion for certain groups, such as lack of education, opportunities to access credit and working capital, difficulties of geographic access, and lack of employment options for women and immigrants, among many others.
- 2) Support groups that are weak or vulnerable in several aspects run special programs to strengthen local communities.
- 3) Giving voice to social agents to play an active role in defending their interests and rights, such as children, youth or other groups that are weak in the eyes of others, such as drug users, people with disabilities or sick, etc.
- 4) Solve undesired side effects of goods or services produced in the existing economic system (pollution, addiction, etc.).

Another common element in the reviewed definitions and analyses of SE refers to the heterogeneity of the organizations in which this social value creation is possible. Diverse ways for achieving SE economic sustainability and, consequently, guaranteeing that social value creation is sufficiently stable to have the desired effect on modifying social structures and groups, allow this variability. In other words, one of the most commonly questioned concerns regarding the definition of SE is whether economic and social goals are related (Firdaus, 2014).

Two models may be distinguished for classifying and differentiating SE. Cohen et al. (2008) identified three value creation objectives in their initial model: social, environmental, and economic. In addition, a synergistic relationship between these three sorts of objectives is offered, as well as the possibility of developing different forms of business if they combine one, two, or all three types of objectives. Thus, from this model, there are four possible SE classes related to different entrepreneurial motivations:

- 1) Social goals are motivated by a commitment to the community.
- 2) Social and environmental goals are motivated by responsible management of environmental resources.
- 3) Social and economic goals are motivated by social efficiency.
- 4) Social, environmental and economic goals, motivated by ecological sustainability and liveability.

The second model is that proposed by GEM (Bosman & Livie, 2010), where four types of social enterprises are classified from two elements: the proportion of social goals and the presence of a strategy to earn income. At the junction of these elements, various types of SE are denoted. However, as a form of entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship shares three fundamental characteristics with commercial entrepreneurship: innovation, risk, and initiative. According to Peredo & Mclean (2006), innovation in ES can be assumed to take five forms: introduction of new goods or improvement of existing quality, introduction of new production methods, opening of new markets, access to new sources of raw materials, or creation of new types of industrial organizations. Alvord et al. (2004) points out three types of innovation associated with SE: generating local capacity, deploying innovation to meet the specific needs of very large groups, and building alliances that oppose monopoly or abuse of power. This difference is explained by the second author's intention of innovation as social transformation and not simply social value creation. But they never challenged perspectives but instead reckoned with the need to deepen the innovation component of SE.

With respect to the second component, risk, it can be noted that at the outset of the use of the phrase entrepreneurship, although there is not just one type of social entrepreneur, there appears to be a range of characteristics that can be associated with this risk component, such as persistence, pragmatism, independence, and a sense of adaptability. with a conventional pattern. However, to the extent that SE is also related to social value creation or even social transformation, it is reasonable to think that the risks that social entrepreneurs have to bear are not only related to the sustainability or possible economic failure of a business. In addition, they will face risks and difficulties in approaching the needs of the group differently with the aim of improving the perceived condition and, consequently, they will have to rely on different mechanisms to sustain their efforts (Ormiston & Seymour, 2011).

The final component, proactivity, involves mobilizing one's resources to implement a SE plan or project. This proactivity is the inclination to undertake and maintain environmental-impacting acts based on initiative and foresight. These factors pertain to the capacity to recognize and act upon opportunities, which, in the case of SE, is a social need for which the social entrepreneur is personally liable.

SE emerges as a phenomenon that encompasses diverse perspectives on society, corporate objectives, and psychosocial aspects of organizational behavior. According to this last argument, social

motives are necessary for the development of social companies. In other words, there is a component of motivation that incorporates the well-being of others or simple altruism because it is intended to produce social value. Consequently, a psychosocial approach must explicate the types of social motivations present in SE.

b. Social Motives and Social Entrepreneurship as A Career Path

Motives are hypothetical constructs that explain behaviour's direction, amplitude, and persistence. For its part, social motives are motives whose ultimate goal is to increase the welfare of others (Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). In other words, they will be motivated by self-interest to avoid unpleasant feelings (i.e. guilt) or social sanctions. Given this, Hoffman (2015) states that the motivation for the welfare of others and oneself in helping behaviour comes into competition, not opposition.

From another angle, Batson et al. (2002) identified four social motives that explain helping behaviour: egoism, principles, collectivism, and altruism. The end goal of each is a distinctive element. In selfishness, it would be an avoidance of personal expense; in principles, respecting certain ethical principles; in collectivism, the increase in the welfare of a group and altruism, the increase in the interest of a particular individual. The latter would be a social motive oriented towards the welfare of others and, therefore, a "selfless" motive.

Regarding social motives, helping behaviour is associated with the emergence of emotion, namely, empathy in dealing with the situation. It has been determined that altruism and collectivism will place a premium on the universalist and virtue ideals, respectively. As for the form of empathy, it appears that empathy is experienced as compassion that stimulates both social motivations (Batson et al., 2002). For Hoffman (2015), there is a clear difference between sympathetic pressure, empathic anger, guilt, empathic feelings of injustice, and empathic concern or compassion. Both will be elements that will support the need to create social value from SE.

By integrating views of social motives and an orientation toward social entrepreneurship, we can show that these are anchored by social motives, which are connected to the presence of certain value patterns and the experience of empathy. These social reasons can catalyze social entrepreneurship, which activates or makes it emerge in a given context. In particular, In addition to empathy, the presence of values of self-transcendence (universalism and virtue) and openness to change (self-direction and stimulation) focuses on others and not one's own discomfort, hence activating motivation for social entrepreneurship. As SE is articulated with a continual work trajectory, it will become a more complicated assisting behavior. In this regard, it must be evaluated from a broader temporal vantage point in order to uncover the aspects that sustain it over time.

A person's employment trajectory encompasses all positions, responsibilities, and activities related to their work. Therefore, this includes paid, volunteer, freelancing, training, and domestic job experience. Thus, this work trajectory leads to the development of stable career patterns that compromise many decisions and actions during a work career: career identity or work self-concept. This career identity includes occupational interests and aspirations and builds on previous experiences of success and failure and developed self-confidence. At the same time, these experiences depend on the educational and social opportunities open to us, which in turn,

Since Edgar Schein's "career anchor" approach (1990), nine distinct career self-concepts have provided each person with a stable sense of career identity. They serve as a guide in decision-making and represent an almost indispensable field of action. As such, they make it possible to explain the development and stability of one's professional career. These nine career anchors are organizational stability/security, geographical stability, autonomy/independence, technical/functional competence, managerial competence, service/dedication to goals, entrepreneurial creativity, style life, and pure challenge. It should be noted that Schein (1990) asserts that these career anchors can be found in all types of professions. Although some occupations tend to identify with some anchors, people develop different self-concepts within every kind of profession. Schein called this "race within race".

When analyzing social entrepreneurship from a workforce trajectory, one can surmise that the career anchor explaining it is a combination of entrepreneurship and service anchors. In line with this, I identified elements of similarity between the two anchors in previous research. In particular, the company's characteristic values and goals are shared with the service anchor. Good morals, independent decision-making, and professional aspirations based on factors such as pay, advancement opportunities, and personal growth are all crucial components. Bargsted (2008).

Furthermore, in subsequent analysis, it is possible to see, via multidimensional scaling, that these two anchors present a degree of immediacy in their constituent elements that differentiate them from other career anchors. From this finding, a hypothesis emerged related to certain types of labour self-concept. It will differ from entrepreneurship and ministry and include elements of both career anchors. Individual psychosocial antecedents of developing social entrepreneurship can be accounted for by these shared features, which include values, goals, cognitive and affective styles.

5. CONCLUSION

An open theoretical review prompted me to construct SE as a career self-concept that leads to the development of risky, innovative, and proactive job activities with specific social value generating components. In addition, the labor and economic activities conducted may or may not yield earnings that are long-term sustainable. Alternatively, the presence of social motivations comparable to collectivism or altruism may be a factor. These social reasons are related to the presence of values like altruism and self-direction, as well as empathic emotions like empathic wrath or feelings of empathic injustice, which facilitate the mobilization of personal resources. Based on this conceptualization, anchored in the reviewed literature, it is interesting to analyze how many initiatives to stimulate social entrepreneurship are closer to or further from this definition. In each country, several NGO and government initiatives have more diverse visions. In some, a well-being perspective is observed, understanding that corporate social value is given because it is oriented towards vulnerable populations but not to the generation of social values. There is a tendency to replicate initiatives such as microcredit creation without properly monitoring this strategy. And elsewhere, there is an important quest to generate sustainability and add social value. This research will help to understand social entrepreneurship and the elements that motivate people to do it, adding significant social value. From there, it will be feasible to propose a comprehensive model that serves as the basis for developing policies and practices for SE promotion. In this way, it will be possible to advance in knowledge and develop ways of doing business and organizations that harmoniously consider the advantages of generating business with social needs that are impossible to respond to with an exclusive market model.

REFERENCES

- Alvord, S.H., Brown, I.D., & Letts, C.W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282.
- Bargsted, M., Picon, M., Salazar, A., & Rojas, Y. (2013). Psychosocial characterization of social entrepreneurs: A comparative study. *Journal of social entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 331-346.
- Batson, C. D., Van Lange, P. A., Ahmad, N., Lishner, D. A., Hogg, M. A., & Cooper, J. (2007). Altruism and helping behaviour. In *The Sage handbook of social psychology* (pp. 241-258). London, UK: Sage.
- Bosman, N., & Livie, J. (2010). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2009 Executive Report.
- Cohen, B., Smith, B., & Mitchell, R. (2008). Toward a sustainable conceptualization of dependent variables in entrepreneurship research. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 17(2), 107-119.
- Cukier, W., Trenholm, S., Carl, D., & Gekas, G. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A content analysis. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 7(1), 99-119.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits: What do you do when traditional sources of funding fall short? *Harvard business review*, 76(1), 55-67.
- Drayton, B. (2006). Everyone a changemaker: Social entrepreneurship's ultimate goal. *Innovations*, 1(1), 80-96.
- Firdaus, N. (2014). Pengentasan kemiskinan melalui pendekatan kewirausahaan sosial. *Jurnal ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 22(1), 55-67.
- Hoffman, B. (2015). *Motivation for learning and performance*. Academic Press.
- Hulgård, L. (2010). Discourses of social entrepreneurship—Variations of the same theme. *EMES European Research Network*, 10(1), 2-21.
- Kleinginna Jr, P. R., & Kleinginna, A. M. (1981). A categorized list of motivation definitions, with a suggestion for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5(3), 263-291.
- Mursidi, A., Marhayani, D. A., Zulfahita, S., Susanto, H., Setyowati, R., & Wahyuni, R. (2020). *Kewirausahaan Sosial*. Penerbit Lakeisha.
- Ormiston, J., & Seymour, R. (2011). Understanding value creation in social entrepreneurship: The importance of aligning mission, strategy and impact measurement. *Journal of social entrepreneurship*, 2(2), 125-150.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of world business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Perrini, F. (Ed.). (2006). *The new social entrepreneurship: what awaits social entrepreneurial ventures?* Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Career anchors and job/role planning: The links between career pathing and career development.

-
- Smith, I. H., & Woodworth, W. P. (2012). Developing social entrepreneurs and social innovators: A social identity and self-efficacy approach. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 390-407.
- Waddock, S. A., & Post, J. E. (1991). Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change. *Public administration review*, 393-401.