Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement: Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Entrepreneurship

Literature Review

Joseph P. Spiller, O. Gracious Jones

Introduction

For individuals whose passion lies within the manner in which businesses operate and their effect on society, this pathway groups together Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Social Entrepreneurship (SE) under the unifying idea of utilizing corporate structures and engaging markets for social good. Though these two concepts are quite differentiated in their nature and practice, they both address the same issue of *ethical business practice*, hence being grouped together for this Pathway to Community Service.

A simple way to conceptualize the relationship of these two concepts is that Social Entrepreneurship is *proactive* whereas Corporate Social Responsibility is *reactive*. For social entrepreneurship, "emphasis on the processes underlying innovative and entrepreneurial activity for social purposes" (Luke & Chu, 2013) as in SE involves the creation of new businesses to be proactive about social issues and societal benefit. Throughout the literature definitions for Corporate Social Responsibility became a bit more muddied.

Historical Background In Brief

With the Industrial Revolution of the late 1700s and early 1800s, societal landscapes changed drastically from agrarian, artisan, and direct-trade to wage-based labor. Large scale production businesses, factories, and industrialized farming began to take hold which took labor

and the manner in which goods were produced from being a mere reality of self sustenance, but as a societal issue as laborers no longer had ownership of the goods they were producing and put power into the hands of those paying wages for label. Advances in technology created new opportunities for business owners and increased capabilities in production, often without regard to environmental impact or safety. The later part of the 1800s and early 20th century saw social scientists and theorists such as Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Friedrick among others start to look at labor and the social effects of labor exploitation during the rise of industrialization and the corporations, it wasn't until the 1950s until the current framework of CSR was born.

The term "corporate social responsibility" was coined in 1953 by American economist Howard Bowen in his book *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. By "corporate social responsibility" Bowen was referring to "the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action that are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society." (Bowen. 1953) Built upon the work of social scientists and economists before him, Bowen's exploration of what it means to balance business practices with the good of society has become the foundation of how we view CSR today. That view has been expanded since then with that addition of John Elkington's "triple bottom line" (Elkington. 1997)

25 years after Elkington took the opportunity to write a piece for Harvard Business Review to continue modernizing the triple bottom line framework and its definition by stating:

> "[The triple bottom line is about] encouraging businesses to track and manage economic (not just financial), social, and environmental value added — or destroyed. This idea infused platforms like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes (DJSI), influencing corporate accounting, stakeholder engagement and, increasingly, strategy. But the TBL wasn't designed to be just an accounting tool. It was supposed to provoke deeper thinking about capitalism and its future, but many early

adopters understood the concept as a balancing act, adopting a trade-off mentality.” (Elkington.2018)

You might also see the TBL referred to more simply as “The Three Ps” (Slaper & Hall. 2011) which are: People, Planet, and Profit. The Three Ps of TBL give a common language and considerations which we can then evaluate and measure CSR and SE in the modern world.

Foundational Knowledge

One way of conceptualizing CSR would be "a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources" and "the ethical and philanthropic obligations of the corporation towards society" (Chang et al.). Such commitments and obligations are being made by pre-existing corporations that may not have had social responsibility as part of their initial business models. Affecting such change to pre-existing corporate structure and business practice can come from external as well as internal entities. These external and internal pressures for CSR then result in either external–stakeholder, community, society facing initiatives—or internal initiatives–employee facing initiatives– by the corporation in question (Bolton. 2020) Throughout the literature review CSR definitions of these scenarios varied so much in terms of inclusion or exclusion of specific practices that one might conclude that CSR is on a spectrum and could be seen as any shift in a corporation’s *priorities* toward social good over profit, whether that shift negatively or positively affects the corporation's fiscal bottom line, would be within the realm of CSR. In ideal circumstances, CSR and SE both create business models that are beneficial to the business, investors, and society.

SE and CSR as a Pathway to Community Service can be broken down into several key concepts: value creation, market orientation, social orientation, and entrepreneurial orientation.

Value Creation

Authors within literature on SE or CSR tend to describe social impact in terms of social *value creation*. Calvert, Dees, Helmsing, Peredo & McLean, Weerawardena & Mort) in a 1998 article entitled “The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship” Gregory Dees employs the words of Jean-Baptiste Say to define value creation as “shift(ing) economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and yield” (Dees, 2001). Thus, *value creation* is a process by which existing resources are transformed into something more usable and thus more valuable. Within both CSR and SE, value creation takes on 4 major forms which are also the primary forms of responsibilities of business enterprise: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropy (Carroll, 1999). Any value created within any of these 4 areas then “create[s] value for both internal (organization or corporate) environment and external environment including society or country” (Gholami, 2011) and can include anything from socially and environmentally responsible methods of transforming tangible raw materials into finished goods, to creating avenues for access to tangible and intangible resources, such as literacy or the ability to trade goods globally.

In a for-profit framework, the concept of value creation centers on increasing the wealth of corporate owners or shareholders. In contrast, the concept of social value centers on increasing the quality of life of members of a community. This could be focused on general goals such as poverty reduction or better population-wide health outcomes, or it could be focused on a specific goal, such as increasing school enrollment and attendance rates for girls or providing employment opportunities for formerly incarcerated people. It’s important to note that social value is not a zero-sum concept. Traditional business theory is situated in a structure of

competition, in which profit is achieved through creating a competitive advantage, regardless of the externalized cost. Social value can only be measured if attention is paid to the cascading effects of corporate practices. “Mission-related impact becomes the central criterion (of value creation), not wealth creation” (Dees, 2001). The problem of defining social value then is one of measuring social impact. Social value is essentially synonymous with positive social impact.

When done effectively, value creation, in the socially responsible sense, is a process which will turn more stakeholders (ie, members of surrounding communities, society) into shareholders as the needs of society are given voice and weight within the decision making process and implementation of business practice as impact on society and environment become a consideration when measuring performance and goals. Though some stakeholders and shareholders shall remain separate, the interests of both can be met such as in the example of Heineken-operating company, Nigerian Breweries Ltd:

“In 2014 [Nigerian Breweries Ltd.] signed partnership agreements with small-scale farmers in Nigeria to produce more and better cassava. Cassava is a root vegetable with a high starch content and can be used in the brewing process. The partnership aligns with Heineken’s commitment to local sourcing and improving the cassava value chain. By this effort, Heineken eliminated the cost of importing raw materials, reduced cost of production, ensured raw materials are sustainably sourced while empowering local farmers and contributing to Nigeria’s economic development” (Heineken, 2018)

This approach firmly placed locally sourcing a supply needed for the business directly from the local area which the product was being manufactured and resulted in production savings and higher profits for Nigerian Breweries Ltd. Similar to this approach would be creating fair trade between suppliers and manufacturers. For example, using Fair Trade tea and coffee for coffee chains (Bansal and Roth 2000; Dentchev 2004) which then extends out beyond the

local communities of production and retail outlets and can theoretically have positive social impact as well as value creation for entire industries while giving economic benefits to a multitude of communities in which agriculture is prominent.

A familiar form of CSR value creation that many might be familiar with is *community-based development* (Maskrey 1989). This approach focuses on externally facing initiatives that create services and opportunities for local communities that are outside of the general scope of a corporation's business model as seen in the example of Early Learning Centers in the Flower Valley region of South Africa. These were coordinated with and funded by the Shell Foundation. These centers provide free education to children which yield new skills within the community as students of these centers age into adults(Bansal and Roth, 2000). If this same approach were to reside in SE settings, the same initiative of creating learning centers could take place but it would be the central business operation of the entrepreneur. That entrepreneur could then source funding from corporations and create partnerships that could place the entrepreneur in the non-profit-sector or be purely philanthropic.

Social Orientation

Perhaps the most central concept to CSR and SE is social orientation. Broadly, social orientation is “how one relates to and is tuned in to other people” (Tetlock, 1985). The application of the word “social” is reflective of the central goal or mission of the enterprise. Dees states "For social entrepreneurs, the social mission is explicit and central" (2001). This does not exclude for-profit enterprises, so long as profit is the secondary goal of the enterprise, and social good the primary mission. Mueller et al. echo this delineation between traditional and social entrepreneurship as one of intent: economic vs. social impact (2016). Much of the literature is vague in regard to defining positive social impact, likely due to the incredibly nuanced nature of

social good. What is good for one community may be harmful to another. The frameworks of UN Sustainable Development Goals, which are applicable to all nations, and Millenium Development Goals, which set benchmarks for developing nations (Thomsen et al.), are helpful in establishing a general understanding of social good, but much of the literature instead leans toward an empowerment-based definition. "The ‘social’ in social enterprise not only refers to the social mission of entrepreneurs but also resides in processes by which these initiatives are conceived and made viable” (Helmsing, 2015). The enterprise must be established in such a way that it empowers impacted communities to shape the organization and its programs.

One central mechanism by which impact is measured is *community self-efficacy*. SE and CSR tend to take on a spirit of empowerment, providing communities with access to competitive arenas and markets that have been subject to increasing inequity due to globalization and unequal access to rapidly advancing technologies. When social good, rather than wealth is the goal, the inclusion of the voices of people at all levels of an organization, corporation, or community is essential. “There is a limit to what can be accomplished vertically, from the top down. If companies are to take their social initiatives to the next level, they will need to rethink and reshape themselves, tapping into the creativity of every individual” (Austin et al., 2006). Not only is depriving a person or community of autonomy inherently harmful, but failing to engage a variety of perspectives will hobble a social enterprise by interrupting the feedback mechanism by which social value is measured. Thus, individuals may be called social entrepreneurs, but social entrepreneurship is never an individual activity.

As with government, it is possible for individuals to misuse language and institutional mechanisms of social enterprise. Cho & Gillespie (2006) are critical of the possibility of SE as a vehicle for individual advancement, rather than community self-efficacy, and warn that SE can create competition with government-run public programs that eventually lead to the extinction of public programs. Bornstein and Davis however, using the example of Bangladesh,

argue that SE is a vehicle for grassroots change, and that “competition” with government-led welfare or development projects acts as a check against rampant corruption. Bornstein and Davis also contrast SE to public programs and policymaking in its long-term and sustainability focused mindset. “Governments and social entrepreneurs need one another. Because nobody elects social entrepreneurs, their legitimacy is subject to question. The government remains the only actor that represents the whole of society” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). Yet governments must work within election cycles and, since government programs are written into immutable policies either indefinitely or for predetermined periods of time, these programs cannot have the environmental responsiveness and adaptability that social enterprises can achieve. If then SE is a check against and remedy to government corruption, markets themselves are the check against and remedy to corruption and inefficacy in social enterprises.

Market Orientation

Just as social enterprises can act as a check to the power of governments to impact social issues, markets themselves act as the check to social enterprises. Social enterprises, just as traditional enterprises, are swayed by the “invisible hand” of a free market. Social enterprises must be market oriented, meaning they must be able to respond to community needs the same way traditional businesses respond to consumer demand. Pinheiro et al. found a positive correlation in social enterprises between market orientation and financial performance (2020). Competition with other social enterprises can be a driving force of CSR within for-profit businesses. “Firms increasingly maintain brand loyalty through their behavior as corporate citizens— including how they treat their employees and suppliers, how they protect the environment, and how their products contribute to society’s well-being” (Bornstein & Davis,

2010), as they have to compete with a growing number social enterprises for customers, employees, and managerial talent.

While the literature universally agrees that social value creation is a central goal of SE and CSR, scholars disagree on whether or not economic performance should be of any concern beyond the sustainability of the enterprise. It seems the place of "profit" within the corporate ideology of a social enterprise is dependent upon the "institutional configuration" of the enterprise. "Different 'institutional configurations' of social enterprises are: i) social enterprises that operate in the market and that are the result of collective action (marketing or production co-operatives, mutual societies). These produce what some call "general interest" goods and services. These are institutionally quite distinct from ii) social enterprises operating outside the market. These are self help enterprises which operate through collective action (e.g., local food banks). Furthermore, there is a growing institutional category of iii) social business ventures in the market. These ventures produce private goods that have a merit character (e.g., safe drinking water). Last but not least there are iv) 'hybrids' that combine 'iii' with 'i' or 'ii'" (Helmsing, 2015). A social enterprise of type "i" will necessarily concern itself with profit, as the social good it seeks to achieve is enabling market access for otherwise disenfranchised individuals, thereby generating profits for its members. A type "ii" social enterprise must not be profit-seeking, as that would simply be exploitative of the served community. Whether or not type "iii" or hybrid organizations should be profit seeking is a matter of individual nuance.

Entrepreneurial Orientation

The definition of the word social in the literature can be applied to both corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship. It is the concept of entrepreneurship that delineates the two. The essence of entrepreneurship is its newness and innovative quality. The practice of

CSR will engage markets and business structures for the purpose of doing social good, but established practices are often perfectly well suited toward solving social problems and, in the immortal words of Bert Lance, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” An entrepreneurial perspective, by contrast, requires that existing systems and processes be constantly assessed for inefficiencies and unintended consequences. Sometimes existing systems and processes are entirely dismantled and replaced, and sometimes gaps are identified where no system currently exists to address a problem. “Social entrepreneurship is a process by which citizens build or transform institutions to advance solutions to social problems” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). The exact way in which or level to which an enterprise must be innovative in order to qualify as entrepreneurial is both ineffable and irrelevant. Entrepreneurial orientation is a theoretical framework, not an official designation of any sort.

Cultivating Skills for Student Success

Perhaps the most foundational understanding for students interested in this pathway is how the practices of SE and CSR relate to financial performance. In their study of student and faculty attitudes toward service learning in social entrepreneurship, Mueller et al. found that students oriented toward traditional entrepreneurship were significantly more likely to name a monetary outcome (such as personal wealth or job security) as their primary motivation, while students oriented toward social entrepreneurship were more likely to name social impact as their primary motivation (2015). This discrepancy indicates a possible assumption that SE is at odds with financial success. While the Mueller study did not include data regarding CSR,

The global survey data collected by Austin et al. showed toward the beginning of the 21st century a market trend favoring socially responsible companies in all regions surveyed (2006). Given the option of supporting socially responsible or socially irresponsible companies,

consumers, investors, and workers increasingly favor the companies they see as having a positive impact on communities and the environment. “Irresponsible firms run the risk of losing markets, capital, and talent” (Austin et al., 2006). Pinheiro et al. also showed a positive correlation between Social Entrepreneurial Orientation and performance, with market orientation as a mediating factor. "Entrepreneurial orientation and market orientation are complementary" (Pinheiro et al., 2020). Research has not shown consensus around the correlation between CSR and Corporate Financial Performance (CFP), but Wang et al. (2016) found that CSR and CFP are more strongly correlated in developed as opposed to developing economies.

Foundations of Business Management

Students interested in pursuing career paths in social entrepreneurship should equip themselves with the foundations of business management (Bornstein & Davis, Calvert). Basic skills in finance, project management, and marketing are all essential to developing a successful enterprise, whether the goal is profit or social good. The literature suggests that students should know what’s in the box in order to think outside the box. Peredo and McLean (2006) describe this as "borrowing from the outlook and methods of market-driven enterprise." Strong managerial skills will aid future entrepreneurs in adapting to the ever changing landscape of community need and available resources. Students should also become familiar with the processes and practices of local institutions within the community they wish to impact. This includes other social enterprises, but also for-profit businesses and government institutions. Familiarity with existing processes creates an opportunity for process innovation (Chang et al.), by enabling students to identify ways in which process inefficiencies can be remedied or new collaborations and connections can be built.

In building foundational business management skills, some common business practices

should be purposefully eschewed by social entrepreneurs. If the primary goal is increasing social value, then the survival of the enterprise is also secondary, meaning that other enterprises with similar goals should be treated as collaborators, not competition. “Social entrepreneurs should not build up entrance barriers to markets as business entrepreneurs do… Thus, information regarding successful social business models and access to relevant resources should be shared in order to increase the overall positive impact on society and/or environment” (Halberstadt et al.). Individual organizations or institutions must be allowed to die, if their extinction furthers the *mission.* “Just as trees fall and are absorbed into the ground, institutions go through cycles of growth and decay. Some find ways to renew themselves; some die off. In thinking about sustainability, it is key to focus on the forests” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). The forests, in this analogy, are of course the communities in which the social entrepreneur aims to increase social value. Another common business practice to avoid is the externalization of costs, which is frequently seen in for-profit businesses that dispose of waste into water systems or ship it to developing countries, or export labor to places with fewer protections for workers. This out-of-sight-out-of-mind mentality enables extreme environmental destruction and human rights violations, including child labor and slavery. For this reason, some literature suggests that a broader understanding of economic systems is essential to the fledgling social entrepreneur. An understanding of global economic systems will help social entrepreneurs achieve sustainability and have a greater positive impact on the communities they seek to serve (Luke & Chu, 2013), by illuminating the ways in which served communities interact with global economic systems, and how a community’s collective power can be leveraged to participate in larger economies.

Government funding/ state subsidies have been named as unreliable or even in decline, and the competition for such awards are fierce (Helmsing, Weerawardena & Mort). Similar issues apply to funding from private donors, and so the ability to engage in markets as a funding

stream for social enterprise is essential to the longevity of the project. Luke and Chu advocate for creative approaches to traditional business concepts such as credit and investment (2013), with particular emphasis on the ways collective enterprises increase their chances for success by turning competition into collaboration, and thus developing a more reliable production stream, and greater bargaining power with their trade partners. This gets at the heart of social entrepreneurship: engaging in markets with the aim of producing social good.

Cultural Competence Continuum & Community Based Solutions

As social issues are at the core of CSR and SE, one must be able to understand not only where those issues come from, but who they affect, and how those issues are affecting the population identified along with the cross-cultural attitudes within a population. Cross-cultural attitudes to CSR relate to the notion that the expectations and orientations of different stakeholders with regard to CSR are not universal but can differ across borders, that is, from one culture to the next. (Planken, 2013) These cultures are not just separated by country, but also by town, state, even region.To do so, someone within the pathway of CSR and SE must cultivate cultural competencies in order to understand not only the issues, but have perspective and scope of the actions in which they are taking to try to address those issues. All of which can be framed up as cultural competence.

Cultural competence is a developmental process that requires the learner to: 1. ensure ongoing education of self and others 2. research for additional knowledge and develop approaches based on cultural considerations 3. seek ongoing mentoring, supervision of cultural practice. (Health New Zealand, nd) This ongoing process is referred to as the cultural competence continuum and comes from the 1989 work overseen by Terry L. *Cross in Towards a Culturally Competent System of Care.* Cross et al assert that cultural competence is a complex framework, and there is a tendency for systems and organizations [and practitioners] to want a

textbook solution, a quick fix, a recipe, or a “how to”, step-by-step approach. However, cultural competence is complex and ever changing as societal conditions are constantly evolving. Thus, achieving cultural competence does not allow for easy or straightforward solutions and takes place over an extended period of time that is essentially never ending, hence the framework of being a continuum.(Cross et al, 1989)

The National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC) embraces a conceptual framework and model for achieving cultural competence based on the seminal work of Cross et al. that is potentially the most fitting for practitioners of CSR. The NCCC modified framing sets the areas of practitioners, organizations, and other entities working on the cultural competency continuum to cultivate the following:

> “(A) Have a defined set of values and principles, and demonstrate behaviors, attitudes, policies, and structures that enable them to work effective cross-culturally. (B) Have the capacity to (1) value diversity, (2) conduct self-assessment, (3) manage the dynamics of difference, (4) acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge, and (5) adapt to diversity and the cultural contexts of communities they serve. (C) Incorporate the above in all aspects of policy-making, administration, practice and service delivery, systematically involve consumers, families and communities.” (NCCC, 2004)

Cultivating cultural competence then allows for practitioners of CSR and SE to be in a position to more effectively interact with and collaborate with the affected communities to identify the issues caused by business practice and work with these stakeholders to find then implement solutions. (London & Morfopoulos,·2009) Aside from awareness of these conceptual framings, the cultivation of these skills is often through direct service and volunteering. An important aspect of this is characterized as “While it makes intuitive sense that an international or expatriate assignment has the potential to be a developmental experience, we can also

recognize that merely breathing the air of another country is not the feature that makes the experience developmental. The quality of a given cross-cultural experience matters in the development of cross-cultural competencies.” (Caligiuri et al, 2019) Ergo, it is not simply that someone is physically present or mechanically doing labor in a setting of direct service, but that the person is cognitively and empathetically engaged in the volunteering or service being done. One must be prepared and be self-motivated to learn from those they interact with and listen to their insights. Cultural competence and finding community based solutions relies on the practitioners ability to recognize their position within the community or that they may not actually be part of the community affected by business practice and to listen to those that are.

Engaging Markets & Stakeholders

The ability to build collaborative networks is also essential to SE and CSR. "Social entrepreneurs have to engage a range of stakeholders to identify and navigate the barriers to entry and in that process formulate their social value proposition” (Helmsing, 2015). Engaging stakeholders requires strong communication skills, and “the ability to convince other stakeholders... to support (the social entrepreneur’s) efforts" (Mueller et al., 2015). Bornstein and Davis (2010) recommend intertwining storytelling with data in order to present both a rational and emotional argument. Luke and Chu (2013) discuss engaging existing social networks to find creative and cost effective ways to disseminate information into communities. Stakeholders must be invested in the mission of the social enterprise, must see the mutual benefit of engaging with the enterprise, and cannot be limited to particular segments of society. “Social entrepreneurs must have civic engagement with the state, civil society, and the market in order to formulate and operationalize their social enterprises" (Helmsing, 2015). This cross-segment networking creates opportunities for connection between people of diverse

needs, skills, capacity levels, and backgrounds, which cultivates an environment of personal empowerment for stakeholders, as well as providing projects with the greatest opportunity for success. (Luke & Chu, 2013). Mandrysz's framework of Bonding and Bridging Capital emphasizes the necessity of building social capital both within and between communities. The effective social entrepreneur will be able to engage members of the served community in strengthening the bonds that enable the community to act in collaboration and collective power (Bonding Capital), preventing a destructive pattern of "migration" from communities, in which individuals seek only to escape the conditions of the community, rather than work to change those conditions. The entrepreneur must also engage members of other communities (Bridging Capital), more or differently privileged from served communities, allowing the served community to learn from others and attract external investment, preventing "poverty and stagnation resulting from internalized and ineffective ways of coping" (Mandrysz). The entrepreneur who builds each of these types of social capital, is not necessarily the same person. The very essence of networking is the ability to form dynamic partnerships that allow individuals to play to their strengths. These partnerships can often act as a safeguard and help companies and organizations rebound after inevitable mistakes and failures.

Engaging markets and attempting innovative solutions to age-old problems are inherently risky activities. The effective social entrepreneur will take measured risks, and exhibit resiliency in the face of failure. Thomsen et al. found that "student failure drove innovation and may be a required part of the (social) entrepreneurial process" (Thomsen et al.) Avoiding risk will lead to stagnation and a refusal to move away from ineffectual or partially effectual practices. It is far more important for a social entrepreneur to prepare for the failures that are part of that measured risk taking. Thomsen et al. also describe the emotional resiliency needed to cope with failures as "putting the backpack down" (Thomsen et al.), as an acknowledgement of the possibility of emotional burnout and the ability to set burdensome responsibility down

when needed.

Measuring Social Impact

The ability to measure impact is essential to social entrepreneurship. Without measurement, entrepreneurs would not be able to evaluate the impact of their enterprises, and would fail to adapt to community needs, becoming at best an ineffectual monument to the status quo, or at worst a counterproductive reinforcement of oppressive institutions. As Bornstein & Davis state, “Translating a social change into a meaningful number is an artful task.” Whether the entrepreneur is attempting to measure economic or ideological impact, the scales to be used are rarely straightforward, and are unique to each individual enterprise. An advocacy organization may attempt to measure changes in public opinion, but there are innumerable variables in a society’s shifting perspectives, so establishing a direct causal relationship is impossible. A microfinance lender will need to assess reduction in the poverty of its borrowers and their communities, but will first need to define poverty in the area; poverty looks different in different countries, and rural poverty bears little resemblance to urban poverty.

Finding appropriate measures of impact goes hand in hand with the analysis of and responsiveness to community needs. Holding the foundational knowledge of business management is a position of privilege within a community, as the gatekeeper of the managerial toolbox. In order to serve a community’s needs, one must empower that community to make decisions for their own future and development. Managerial toolbox is a skill set to be lent out for the furtherance of collective goals, rather than used as a mechanism for control. Dolacis et al. describe this as "encouraging those facing difficulties to find solutions to their own social problems” (2021), and Mandrysz defines the social responsibility of a business manager or entrepreneur as to “treat citizens not only as customers, clients but also as co-producers”

(2020). Throughout the literature the theme is apparent that assessing a community's needs necessitates engaging with that community's *wants.*

Adaptability

Finally, the literature names adaptability as an essential skill for social entrepreneurs. In addition to being able to pivot to new strategies after a failure, social entrepreneurs must be able to respond to changes in market conditions, served communities, cultural values, environmental stressors, and available resources. Entrepreneurial adaptability must be both reactive and proactive, employing forecasting techniques, financial modeling, and strategic planning (Weerawardena & Mort). Innovation is not a haphazard practice throwing things up on the wall to see what sticks, but engaging with a shifting environment through constant data collection and analysis for the purpose of strategic decision making.

Opportunities For Student Engagement

The primary way that universities engage students in the concept and practice of SE and CSR are through coursework. Universities can build foundational skills in junior courses, and project based senior courses (Calvert, 2011). Unfortunately, universities often only offer elective courses in social entrepreneurship rather than integrating concepts of sustainability, social and environmental impact, equitable business practices, etc. into the core curriculum (Bornstein & Davis,2010), and a 2009 study of entrepreneurship syllabi in US universities showed that SE was excluded from upper level courses in the majority of cases (Thomsen et al. 2021). "Business education has been widely criticized for generating graduates with shallow moral values who employ a 'tool-box' mentality for resolving problems" (Calvert, 2011). Some

institutions such as Ashoka U are attempting to rectify this disparity in social-oriented business training by creating comprehensive curricula in social entrepreneurship. “Over the past three decades, Ashoka has supported more than two thousand Fellows from seventy countries, many of whom have achieved social impact at national and international levels” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010).

Kursheed et al. are critical of entrepreneurial education programs for being more favorable toward men than women, by failing to prepare women for the unique barriers they will face as a result of gender bias. Among other start-up barriers, “the female gender is more exposed to finance and credit hurdles in initiating business setups rather than men” (Kursheed et al., 2021). This logic can extend to any demographic that is systematically oppressed in a particular culture, and so educational programs should take special care to include in their curricula ameliorating resources available to marginalized students.

Service learning, which involves for-credit student engagement with social organizations, is a popular way for schools (from primary school to universities) to foster civic responsibility in their students while accomplishing specific learning outcomes. Programs such as “Minding Our Business" at Rider University, which partners local middle school students with university students who mentor them in starting their own business, significantly “[enable] graduates to develop social responsibility and entrepreneurship skill” (Calvert, 2011). Students in non-business disciplines can also develop entrepreneurial skills in cross-departmental programs. In one such program in Taiwan, computer engineering students developed entrepreneurial skills partnering with the Frontier Foundation. "Students as trainee engineers participated in identifying the issues with the (computer recycling program), generating workable solutions to implement changes, and making constant reflections in the continuous spiral process of inquiry, analysis, and actions in the light of action research” (Chang et al., 2013). Students were encouraged to develop innovative solutions to problems in the business structure

of the foundation as they applied their technical skills to the primary work of the organization. For services learning programs to be meaningful to students and increase motivation toward civic engagement, certain conditions must be maintained. One study discussed how student buy-in to partner organizations' mission is essential to the service learning experience, noting that "students were being driven by a desire to 'make a difference' rather than merely to 'get a good grade'" (Thomsen et al. 2021). This type of buy-in is fed when students are allowed some degree of autonomy, ideally self-selecting their service learning experiences (Mueller et al. 2015). Students who are allowed this type of autonomy are able to develop skills relevant to their interests and goals, and can also use service learning opportunities to begin networking with professionals in the arena they wish to enter. "Problems arise when the faculty member appears to have a vested interest in promoting a particular community partner for service learning, brining issues of conflict of interest and student coercion" (Vasbinder and Kohler, 2015). Additionally, "Strong communication amongst project members is key, involving articulating and coordinating tasks and deliverables especially when participants have inherently different backgrounds, skills, and experiences" (Thomsen et al. 2021). The importance of the role of faculty in communicating learning outcomes with participating organizations can't be overstated. It is the faculty's responsibility to ensure that community partners are able to employ students in meaningful work that furthers their educational goals.

Vasbinder and Koehler (2015) dig into ways service learning can serve as a "professionally useful experience," in comparison to private sector internships. "The research consensus is that students place the highest value on project-based learning that most closely resembles the private-sector placements the students expect to assume upon graduation" (Vasbinder and Koehler, 2015), and so their study assessed the experiential learning of students partnered with for-profit firms that strongly engaged in CSR. They found "that combining two elements that have be found to appeal to students – a profit orientation and a triple-bottom-line

strategic approach – (results) in high levels of student engagement" (Vasbinder and Koehler, 2015). Students were able to put into practice business concepts they had developed in classroom learning, and develop the moral convictions associated with buy-in to a socially-oriented mission.

Cultivating Student's Attributes & Character Qualities for CSR and SE

Risk Tolerance

A strong theme that comes through in much of the existing literature is risk tolerance as a necessary character trait for social entrepreneurs (Bornstein & Davis, Halberstadt et al., Peredo & McLean, Weerawardena & Mort). While all entrepreneurship, in its very essence as innovative and thus untested, is risky, "social entrepreneurship may also require greater risk-taking due to limited resources… Risks connected to social entrepreneurship seem at least equal to or higher than in business entrepreneurs… However taking social entrepreneurial risks, in case of success, does not only lead to social performance, but also goes along with increasing chances of economic return" (Halberstadt et al., 2019). Halberstadt et al. go on to discuss the ways in which social ventures are pushed to grow rapidly by eager funders or simply the enormity of the needs they attempt to meet. This rapid growth is associated with increasing risk as each adjustment in scope or scale is an opportunity for error. It is therefore essential that social entrepreneurs be willing to take *measured* risks, knowing that at least some of the innovations they implement are bound to fail. This willingness to fail is part of a growth mindset, which is characterized by a belief that individuals (especially oneself) are not defined by predetermined and immutable characteristics, but are capable of continuous learning. Bornstein and Davis state that those "with growth mindsets are more willing to admit mistakes and exhibit

more determination in the face of adversity. These qualities are essential for social entrepreneurs” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). Simply the willingness to take risks without the ability to adjust one’s practices based on the outcomes is just foolishness and won’t help any entrepreneur. Adaptability and responsiveness to one’s environment are just as important, allowing for the identification of *realistic* opportunities (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006).

Expansion of World View

Engaging in SE or CSR oriented service learning can have a great personal impact on students as well, fostering "communication skills, personal growth, self-esteem, personal efficacy, development of personal responsibility, and adaptability behavior" (Calvert, 2011). Thomsen et al. describe how "students responded to the 'weight of responsibility,' showing an immediate increase in maturity in their demeanor and sudden serious approach to the projects” (2021). Witnessing their own impact on a community or an organization can be personally transformative for students who begin to see their work and actions as part of a human ecosystem. “Service-learning experiences helped students build a stronger connection to their community and showed them that they have the power to make a change at work and in life” (Chang et al., 2014).

Collaboration into Development of Self

While students built a sense of self-efficacy during service learning activities, they also developed collaborative skills, necessary to the success of any social enterprise. "Social entrepreneurs must have civic engagement with the state, civil society, and the market in order

to formulate and operationalize their social enterprises" (Helmsing, 2015). No man, and no enterprise is an island. Dolacis et al. describe how social entrepreneurs can work closely with social workers, contributing administrative structure and business savvy to the direct service work of social workers (2022). This type of partnership is illustrative of how individuals oriented toward different Pathways of Public Service can be more effective as a team. When working in collaboration, a strong sense of self remains essential. The ability "to balance the interests of multiple stakeholders and to maintain (one's) sense of mission in the face of moral intricacy" (Peredo & McLean, 2006) is an attribute that will allow a social entrepreneur to identify and respond to opportunities, without losing track of the end goal.

Putting Theory into Practice

Perhaps the most essential outcome of service learning is "the ability to connect theory and practice" (Mueller et al., 2016). Service learning gives students the opportunity to take classroom lessons into the real world, experience how their decisions and actions play out in unique environments. This teaches resourcefulness in a way classroom experience cannot, by demanding innovation in response to realistically limited resources and opportunities. (Peredo & McLean, 2006). The combination of all these learning outcomes is a professional demeanor that appeals to potential employers, community partners, and funders.

Critiques

A social entrepreneur's greatest asset is an imagination, and a recognition that business practices and corporate structures are simply a tool to be used creatively in the pursuit of a mission. A successful social entrepreneur is willing to make mistakes, and more importantly,

willing to admit and learn from those mistakes. Social entrepreneurs shamelessly reject convention in favor of innovation, and some of the world's most successful social entrepreneurs have met with derision when first presenting their ideas (Bornstein & Davis, 2010).

Not everyone can shrug off external pressures and expectations or think creatively enough to establish a truly innovative enterprise, but that doesn't exclude them from social entrepreneurship or engaging in corporate social responsibility. Even the smallest socially conscious innovations to existing patterns of providing (or often failure to provide) goods and services can be qualified as social entrepreneurship, and corporate social responsibility does not need to be entrepreneurial at all. Even the most profit-focused businesses can make changes that address income inequality or environmental impact, and can market those changes to an increasingly conscientious customer base.

At the core of social entrepreneurship or corporate social responsibility is the mission to create social value. "When you peel back the layers of an idea, what remains at the core must be bedrock: an insight or belief that grips you with its power—something you know to be 100 percent true" (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). Anyone engaging in this Pathway of Public Service must wholeheartedly reject Milton Friedman's famous hypothesis that profit is the only responsibility of a corporation. A corporation is simply a formalization of collective economic power that can (and should) be used for the benefit of all impacted communities.

While conducting this literature review, it was challenging to find literature that ever connects CSR or SE to any form of cultural competence or community based solutions. Often the methods for this work are spoken of as being prescriptive which overly asserts a point of privilege and can lead to classism. The other primary challenge was how frequently CSR is spoken of as a calculation which frames being socially responsible and profits as an either or scenario. Much of this can logically be attributed to how corporations have positioned changes in business practices as always being a detriment to their business

models, however, companies such as Heineken have shown how creativity and drive to be more socially responsible can lead towards increased profits while having substantial positive impact on local communities. If we are looking forward to the future of business practice and culture, highlighting how CSR and SE is not only societally beneficial but is also central to longevity of a business while being a means for increasing profits.

References

Austin, J. E., Leonard, H. B., Reficco, E., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: It is for Corporations, Too. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship : New models of sustainable social change*. (pp. 169 - 180). Oxford University Press, Inc.

David Bornstein & Susan Davis. (2010). *Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press.

Calvert, Victoria. (2011). Service Learning to Social Entrepreneurship: a Continuum of Action Learning. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice,* 11(2), 118-129.

Chang, Y.-J., Chen, Y.-R., Wang, F. T.-Y., Chen, S.-F., & Liao, R.-H. (2013). Enriching Service Learning by its Diversity: Combining University Service Learning and Corporate Social Responsibility to Help the NGOs Adapt Technology to Their Needs. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *27*(2), 185–193. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-013-9278-8

Cho, S., & Gillespie, D. F. (2016). A Conceptual Model Exploring the Dynamics of Government–Nonprofit Service Delivery. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*,

35(3), 493–509. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764006289327

Dees, J. Gregory. (2001). *The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship."*

https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Dees_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf

Dolacis, V., Gūtmane, S., & Rode, D. D. (2022). Social Entrepreneurship as a Form of Social Work for the Social Cohesion of Society. *Tiltai*, 80–97. https://doi.org/10.15181/tbb.v87i2.2319

Halberstadt, J., Niemand, T., Kraus, S., Rexhepi, G., Jones, P., & Kailer, N. (2021). Social entrepreneurship orientation: Drivers of success for start-ups and established industrial firms. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *94*, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.06.012

Helmsing, A. H. J. (Bert). (2015). Conditions for Social Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Social Quality*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.3167/IJSQ.2015.050104 Khursheed, A., Fatima, M., Mustafa, Dr. F., Lodhi, Dr. R. N., & Akhtar, A. (2021). An Empirical Analysis of the Factors Influencing Social Entrepreneurship: A Gendered Approach. *Cuadernos de Gestión*, 49–62. https://doi.org/10.5295/cdg.201320ak Luke, B., & Chu, V. (2013). Social enterprise versus social entrepreneurship: An examination of the 'why' and 'how' in pursuing social change. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, *31*(7), 764–784. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242612462598

Mueller, S., Brahm, T., & Neck, H. (2016). Service Learning in Social Entrepreneurship Education: Why Students Want to Become Social Entrepreneurs and How to Address Their Motives. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, *23*(03), 357–380.

https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495815500120

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007

Pinheiro, P., Daniel, A., & Moreira, A. (2020). Social Enterprise Performance: The Role of Market and Social Entrepreneurship Orientations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *32*(1), 45–60.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00266-x

Thomsen, B., Muurlink, O., & Best, T. (2019). Backpack Bootstrapping: Social Entrepreneurship Education Through Experiential Learning. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *12*(2), 238–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2019.1689155

Vasbinder, William & Koehler, William. (2015). *Socially Conscious Ventures and Experiential Learning Perceptions of Student Engagement*.

Wang, Q., Dou, J., & Jia, S. (2016). A Meta-Analytic Review of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Financial Performance: The Moderating Effect of Contextual Factors. *Business & Society*, *55*(8), 1083–1121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315584317

Agudelo, M. A. L., Jóhannsdóttir, L., & Davídsdóttir, B. (2019). A Literature Review of the History and Evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, *4*(1), 1–23. Springeropen. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-018-0039-y

Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York, Harper.

Caligiuri, P., Mencin, A., Jayne, B., & Traylor, A. (2019). Developing cross-cultural competencies through international corporate volunteerism. *Journal of World Business*, *54*(1), 14–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2018.09.002

Carroll, A. B. (2008). A History of Corporate Social Responsibility. In A. Crane, D. Matten, A. McWilliams, J. Moon, & D. S. Siegel (Eds.), *Oxford Handbooks Online*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199211593.003.0002

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks : the triple bottom line of 21st century business*. New Society Publishers.

Elkington, J. (2018, June 25). *25 years ago I coined the phrase "triple bottom line." here's why it's time to rethink it.* Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2018/06/25-years-ago-i-coined-the-phrase-triple-bottom-line-heres-why-im-giving-up-on-it

Health New Zealand. (n.d.). *Cultural Competence Continuum* | *eCALD*. Www.ecald.com. https://www.ecald.com/resources/cultural-competence-assessment-tools/cultural-competence-continuum/

Heineken. (2022). *Sustainability and Responsibility*. The HEINEKEN Company. https://www.theheinekencompany.com/sustainability-and-responsibility

Heineken Co. (2020). The HEINEKEN Company. https://www.theheinekencompany.com/our-sustainability-story/our-strategy-and-achievements/sourcing-sustainably

KUMAR, A., KUMAR, A., & KUMAR BEHURA, A. (2022). The Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for Sustainable Corporate (Business). *WISDOM*, *23*(3), 214–226. https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v23i3.855

Lenfant, F., & van Cranenburgh, K. C. (2017). Business Responsibilities in Times of War and Peace: The Case of Heineken in Central Africa. *Business, Peace and Sustainable*

Development, *2017*(10), 35–60. https://doi.org/10.9774/tandf.8757.2017.de.00004

London, M., & Morfopoulos, R. G. (2009). *Social Entrepreneurship*. Routledge.

National Center for Cultural Competence. (2019). *NCCC | home*. Georgetown.edu. https://nccc.georgetown.edu/

Phillips, R., Schrempf-Stirling, J., & Stutz, C. (2019). The Past, History, and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *166*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04319-0

Planken, B. (2013). Cross-Cultural Attitudes to CSR. *Encyclopedia of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 643–647. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28036-8_595

Probyn, J. (2017, September 4). *Heineken on the ins and outs of local sourcing in Africa*. How We Made It in Africa. https://www.howwemadeitinafrica.com/heineken-ins-outs-local-sourcing-africa/59646/

Slaper, T., & Hall, T. (2011). *The Triple Bottom Line: What Is It and How Does It Work?* Www.ibrc.indiana.edu. https://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2011/spring/article2.html#:~:text=The%20TBL%20dimensions%20are%20also

Yzaguirre, R. (1999). The power of cultural competence. *Leader to Leader*, *1999*(13), 10–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/ltl.40619991303

Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.001