



[www.igi-global.com](http://www.igi-global.com)

## INTRODUCTION

As the complexity and the prevalence of social problems increase, their consequences have started to affect more people than ever. The climate crisis, unequal distribution of wealth and natural resources accompanied by increasing poverty undermine the prevalent economic system, and traditional way of doing business. Additionally poverty, resource crises and ecological degradation have transformed the perceptions of development by giving equal importance to social and ecological values besides economic interests (Schaltegger et al., 2016; Stubbs and Cocklin, 2008). Further, the prevailing economic system in terms of equal income generation creates the question of inclusiveness of the poor in the system. Thereby, economic growth not as an impediment but as an accelerator for equity becomes the required view for the welfare of current and forthcoming generations (Ranieri and Ramos, 2013).

The quest for equal opportunities, social integration and social welfare are embraced by inclusive growth paradigm. Inclusive growth, though have defined by various angles, refers to a growth process that embraces all without discriminating the poor, minorities, the disabled etc. (Klasen, 2010). Inclusive growth also questions the value creation through businesses and transforms created value to shared value that offers value to disadvantaged groups through redesigning products/services and transforming value chain (Kramer and Porter, 2011; Porter and Kramer, 2019). Parallel to inclusive growth, the shared value perspective advocates the sustainability of business success and competitiveness only if the given business operations support the economic and social development of societies (Porter and Kramer, 2019). Moreover, inclusive growth through creating shared value can be regarded as a solution to distrust directed at corporate mentality that is believed to put all its' efforts and will on profit maximization (Porter and Kramer, 2019).

Inclusive growth through creating shared value also requires innovative products and processes in the value chain regarding disadvantaged groups. Since Schumpeter's arguments (1934) on entrepreneurs, entrepreneurs and their innovative initiatives are regarded as triggers of social and economic transformation (Hall et al. 2010). In line with Schumpeter's entrepreneurship definition, this study follows the 'social innovation' school of thought's approach to social entrepreneurship (Dees and Anderson, 2006a,b). Within this school, social entrepreneurs are evaluated as "change makers as they carry out 'new combinations' in at least one the following areas: new services, new quality of services, new methods of production, new production factors, new forms of organizations or new markets" (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010:44). To exemplify the social entrepreneur, Muhammed Yunus and his idea of Microfinance method with his socially innovative product, Grameen Bank can be given. In his case, the created value is enlarged to the poor women of Bangladesh through small loans so that Bangladeshi women can earn their living through minor activities as buying animals for breeding.

Based on not only to the social innovation school but also to other recent studies, this chapter aims to discuss the contributions of social enterprises on social inclusiveness through a Turkish initiative; Future is Brighter Youth Platform which offers solutions to the fight against the inequality and social exclusion experienced by Turkish youth related to skill development and employment. Additionally, to have a better insight on social enterprises, the chapter also analyzes the propositions below related to social business models:

- a. The *social entrepreneur* (mostly the founder of the social business), his/her dedication to finding solutions to meeting social problems and creating *social value* is critical and influential on finding *new ways in their search for new sources* (such as volunteering) and *forming partnerships* that blends actors/organizations from NGOs, private sector, governmental domain (Dees and Anderson, 2006)
- b. The *organizational designs* of social business (either planned or emergent after the establishment) are *flexible, decentralized and hybrid* that stands on *cooperation and constant learning* embracing actors and partnerships from diverse industries and disciplines (Mulgan et al., 2007; Defourny and Nyssens, 2013; Yunus et al. 2010).
- c. Within the scope of answering problems, social businesses adopt *inclusiveness perspective* and thereby more sensitive to the problems of disadvantaged groups' needs in terms of providing their services/products for creating substantial benefits (Hall et al., 2012). Equality in all aspects is an important motivator. In some cases, they can even help the formation of a new market by answering societal needs through innovative products and services.
- d. Because of their targets of answering social problems by being inclusive without a profit-maximization mindset, social enterprises are sources both for *creating and diffusing social innovation* as they can trigger a dynamic process through which each innovation can lead to the possibility of another innovation (Bornstein, 2004; Mughan et al. 2007; Westley and Antadze, 2010).

In the following parts of the chapter, the given propositions are examined in detail through literary background and a Turkish case, Future is Brighter Platform.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

To the Social Business Initiative (2011:2), social businesses are “operators in the social economy whose main objective is to have a social impact rather than make a profit for their owners or shareholders.” Similarly, OECD (1999:105) explains the social enterprise as “any private activity conducted in the public interest, organized with an entrepreneurial strategy, but whose main purpose is not the maximization of profit but the attainment of certain economic and social goals and which has the capacity for bringing innovative solutions to the problems of social exclusion and unemployment”. The literary background also provides a variety of definitions. Among many, this study adopts the social business explanation of Boons and Lüdeke-Freund (2013:16) due to its emphasis on sustainable innovation and the business model: “Social business models are enterprises that create the opportunity for “social entrepreneurs to create social value and maximize social profit; of significance is the business model’s ability to act as market device that helps in creating and further developing market for innovations with a social purpose.”

The business model refers to a systematically designed value creation process for all stakeholders (Teece, 2010). In line with this, the previous studies indicate that there is an association between the way of organizing the value creation process, namely the business model, and social innovation (Boons and Lüdeke-Freund, 2013). Based on Osterwalder (2004) and Doganova and Eyquem-Renault (2009), Boons and Lüdeke-Freund (2013) argue that a generic business model stands on four pillars: a. the value offered to stakeholders, b. supply chain structure, c. customer relations and d. financial structure. Moreover, in case of social businesses, the business model with its four pillars can become a competitive advantage factor due to the differentiated value offered to stakeholders.

In terms of the value offered, the social businesses mainly aim at meeting a social need accompanied by a financial design for generating profit, which is a secondary objective. In other words, social businesses also get beyond the limits of the traditional profit-maximization oriented business model by indicating a

different motive, social wealth maximization. As an alternate business model, it is thereby glorified as a model that saves societies from “the egocentric value creation” mindset (Schaltegger et al., 2016; 5).

The entrepreneur is a critical element of the social business. In the traditional manner, an entrepreneur refers to someone who seizes opportunities in the market by taking risks and failures on himself/herself. This definition also applicable to social entrepreneurs but the difference between the two lies in social entrepreneur’s dedication to creating social value rather than generating profits (Dees, 1998). The social mission embraced by the social entrepreneur determines value to be generated thereby differentiating the business model from the traditional business models. The social entrepreneur approaches the traditional resources, networks, processes in a novel way (Schumpeter, 1934) in order to create innovative solutions to social/economic or ecological problems. Therefore based on Schumpeter, the social innovation school defines social entrepreneurs as “individuals who reform or revolutionize the patterns of producing social value, shifting resources into areas of higher yield for society” (Dess and Anderson, 2006b:44).

Within the perspective social innovation school, social entrepreneurs are regarded as social transformation agents (Partzsch and Ziegler, 2011) that struggles for achieving what they realize their ideas. Thorough their insistence of realizing their aims, social entrepreneurs go beyond the limits of organizational boundaries. Their insistence and dedication to their mission both facilitate the creation of new patterns and formation of new relationships between sectors by deforming the organizational boundaries (Dess and Anderson, 2006b). All attempts to share experiences, ideas together with forming partnerships between business, NGOs and academia are common activities of the social entrepreneurship ecosystem.

The social entrepreneur also has different motives. Not excluding monetary gains, social entrepreneur has motives of reaching self-actualization through achieving personal aim in serving society. Along with the social entrepreneur; the other actors and institutions in the supply chain are noteworthy as they have to be on the same socially responsible side of the social business. This is valid for customers, as well. The customers that seek for the social business’ products or services are among those who are more alert to ecological, economic and social problems. Within these premises, it would not be wrong to come to the conclusion that the developed country markets welcome and hosts most of the social businesses in the world (Bansal et al., 2019); whereas underdeveloped countries’ markets have some time to “unfold the sustainability potential” of social businesses (Schaltegger and Wagner, 2008; 2011,cited in Boons and Lüdeke-Freund, 2013:13). Moreover, private sector partnerships are vital for social initiatives both for encouraging social entrepreneurship system and the sustainability of social initiatives. Yet, it is difficult for social initiatives to have the attention of private sector as monetary gains can’t function as an outcome (Hall, 2004).

Another differentiation related with social businesses is their organizational design. Most social businesses are labelled as “hybrid” organizations because of their dependence of networks that cover governmental agencies, private sector, universities and other NGOs (Defourny, and Nyssens, 2013; Tykkyläinen and Ritala, 2020). Participation of these actors and participation of users or customers are welcomed by social businesses; thus, a participative management perspective often is an important characteristic of social enterprises. Parallel to this participatory structure, most social businesses rely on voluntary work as an important factor of production (Defourny and Nyssens, 2013; Mulgan et al., 2007). Additionally, in the contexts that offer no legal, governmental and financial incentives for social businesses and even being subjected to same taxes designed for profit oriented businesses (e.g. Turkey), it becomes more difficult to balance the budget and to reach the financial resources. Thereby, in these cases, social businesses find the solution by establishing associations and foundations. This solution enables them to benefit from the incentives already offered to associations.

Yet the life cycle of the social business also differs as they show a pattern of slow growth. Mulgan (2019:32) puts this as in the following lines: “social organizations tend to have different patterns of growth: as a rule

they don't grow as fast as private ones, but they also tend to be more resilient." A recent British Council study on Turkish social enterprises confirms Mulgan for the Turkish case. The study findings show that Turkish social enterprises don't grow fast and operate on a micro scale.

Besides transgressing boundaries, social businesses are inclusive models covering groups that lack power, resources, representation and thereby access to basic social services. As their target is answering social needs, the disadvantaged groups are most of the time in the formula of the social business as beneficiaries in the forms of producers, suppliers or customers. This inclusiveness is one of the reasons why new methods of answering social needs are labelled as "social innovation". From this perspective, social innovation is closely related to working with and for the disadvantaged groups and it arouses interest and action towards "addressing human needs that were previously unmet" (Marques et al., 2018:500).

In the similar line, social innovation is defined as 'a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals' (Phills et al., 2008: 39). To Hall (2004), innovation would not create the effect it desires on societies if it is not diffused. Diffusion refers both to the process and to the degree of adoption of the given novelty. Likewise, Rogers (2003:35) define diffusion as "the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system. Diffusion is seen as a special type of communication concerned with the spread of messages that are perceived as new ideas".

Aligned with the target oriented social entrepreneurial tactics and manners, social businesses are closely associated with innovation and more to that they also help instilling innovative behavior into the lives of their stakeholders and value chain. Moreover the participatory, flexible structure together with cross-sectoral partnerships render social businesses advantageous in diffusing social innovation. Through these mechanisms, social businesses diffuse its' novelties to the society by sharing the mindset and practices together with offering opportunities for diffusion by creating a mutual social learning atmosphere (Baker and Mehmood, 2015). Also, as Yunus et al. (2010) explain in the case of Grameen Bank, strategic experimentation is critical and the constant experimentation for finding radical solutions to problems is one of the main practices of social businesses.

To the studies, the adaptation and replications of new ideas are very common in the entrepreneurship practices. For instance, British Council's (2019) recent study on Turkish social businesses prove evidence that 86% of the social businesses that participated in the study have developed a new service, product or model in the last 12 months. In the report, this percentage- compared with the innovation activities of traditional Turkish businesses measured between 2014 and 2016, which is 47%, - is evaluated as very high. Another interesting finding of the study (British Council, 2019:47) is that participants describe the basic qualities of their social enterprises as "being social/environmental impact-oriented (88%), innovative (60%) and they also report that they invest a certain percentage of profit back to their mission (49%)".

Spread and adoption of new ideas in the social entrepreneurship ecosystem is encouraged and commonly experienced. Institutions such as Ashoka Foundation function as facilitators of social innovation by offering funds, prizes, networks and platforms through which social entrepreneurship can develop in the society. Besides providing institutional efforts and resources for innovation diffusion, the individual attempts of social entrepreneur also help in diffusion. The social entrepreneur playing the roles of liaison and spokesperson of the social business also not only spreads his/her innovative ideas but also helps other social entrepreneurs by being a role model, as well. As in the Ashoka case, most Ashoka fellows are also act as influencers. They share their ideas by talking about their own social business experience and try to help to-be social entrepreneurs in establishing their social businesses and in diffusing their new ideas in the society. All these features render social businesses unique in their approach to target achievement, forming networks, designing new organizational structures and social innovation. In the following sections of the

chapter, these features are to be examined through a Turkish social enterprise founded by a social entrepreneur. The social entrepreneur in question is one of the first Ashoka fellows in Turkey, Serra Titiz. Titiz is among the entrepreneurs that pioneers the development of social entrepreneurship ecosystem and leads two of the social enterprises in Turkey. Her entrepreneurial spirit, mission-oriented mindset, her efforts in helping other social entrepreneurs result in diffusing her new approach to others. Through her initiative, Future is Brighter Platform, Titiz offers an innovative method for youth recruitment and her method has been adopted by other initiatives. Her social enterprise is noteworthy for analysis because of their deep attachment to sustainability, equality and social inclusiveness.

Social inclusiveness is one of the main pillars for sustainable development and targets at creating equity for all in terms of reaching natural resources and accessing social services. Offering equal opportunities for education and skill development is one of the critical goals of sustainability and have attracted the attention of both policy makers and social entrepreneurs (Vavik & Keitsch, 2010). The need for equal opportunities for education is essential for developing countries with neo-liberal tendencies. In that cases, young people graduate with no significant qualifications beside the traditional curriculum, while some face exclusion because they don't have a degree from mainstream universities (Ainscow & Sandil, 2010). Thereby, as a developing country, Turkish society is in the need for social cohesion and equality in accessing skill development trainings and followingly generating employment opportunities. Through Future is Brighter Platform, Titiz achieves to offer mentoring service for Turkish youth for skill and career development. The following sections concentrates on analyzing Future is Brighter Platform in detail.

## **METHODOLOGY**

In a developing country context, social business models are more required and relevant for social welfare development. Within this perspective, the current study aims to test the propositions discussed in the theoretical background by analyzing Future is Brighter Platform. In order to analyze social business in the Turkish context, the case study method is adopted. The literature indicates that many studies on social businesses also use the case study analysis as the methodology (e.g. Comini et al., 2012; Mumford, 2002; Nielsen and Samia 2008; Yunus et al., 2010). Especially as this is a recently developed research domain, social business studies are more apt to analyze the phenomenon in detail and examine various cases for a better understanding.

The history of Future is Brighter Platform (FBYP) starts with another social enterprise founded by Titiz, namely Mikado Sustainable Development Consulting (from now on referred as Mikado). Established in 2007, Mikado is a social business registered as a limited company, committed to serve sustainable development and to yield social impact through crafting innovative models and solutions. Mikado's main business strategy is to support the creation of a sustainable corporate and social environment in Turkey through creating partnerships among private sector, civil society, academic, public and international organizations. Moreover, creating an awareness for sustainability in Turkish society and participating in a lot of projects that promote social, ecological and economic sustainability are the distinguishing features of Mikado. Another significant feature is that it earns the privilege to be Turkey's first certified B Corporation. This certification assures that Mikado's business model is designed for the good of the society. Furthermore, it is a key player in shaping the social entrepreneurship ecosystem in Turkey by developing platforms, by designing social innovation centers and by developing researches. Besides providing consultancy, it also develops capacity building programs, provides trainings and issues publications.

By incubating FBYP, Mikado transfers its' social sustainability DNA to FBYP. FBYP was established in 2009 and through creating a social network between these two organizations, Titiz achieves to get beyond the organizational boundaries to collaborate with more organizations, more people for her dream of a sustainable world. More to that, Titiz, through the resources and networks of Mikado, was able to realize what had been in her mind for several years—a global initiative providing youth with guidance, inspiration,

and empowerment to lead self-determined lives. FBYP, which began as a pillar of Mikado, gradually became a more independent national initiative.

During its first 5 years, FBYP is registered as an NGO and is a vocational orientation platform for youth aged 15-29. The platform works with volunteers (+2100 by March 2020) who are matched with youngsters according to their interest areas for better life, education and career decisions. Online mentoring, online trainings, videos and offline workshops are all designed to increase employability and decrease skills mismatch.

## **FUTURE IS BRIGHTER YOUTH PLATFORM**

Before analyzing FBYP, the philosophy and business model of the incubator-Mikado- are discussed as an introduction both to FBYP and Turkish social initiatives. Moreover, as the founder is the same person, both initiatives share the cooperative management style governed by same values. Though very relevant and critical for the rising sustainability agenda in the world, standing as a “not-for-profit” company was a new concept in Turkey and not fully understood by potential stakeholders. The initial stage of Mikado took three years and only after three years, it achieved to sign long-term contracts and to convince companies to adopt responsible management practices. Good practices, good relationships, perseverance and a devoted team lead by a mission-oriented entrepreneur enabled Mikado to become a pioneer of innovation and an opinion leader. It can even be stated that Mikado created a “market” on sustainability strategy building and social impact measurement. It provided open trainings to empower consultants on sustainability and impact management and served other companies to start providing complementary services. As becoming a pioneer in providing consultancy services in the sustainability field in Turkey, Mikado also engages in the social innovation center or platform establishment projects. Thereby, Mikado provides capacity building and mentoring support to new entrepreneurs in the ecosystem for developing their social initiatives. Through these platforms, Mikado not only spreads already on the market social innovations and ideas but also supports the development of new ones.

Before establishing Mikado, the social entrepreneur- Titiz- worked for and with youth in the civil society and had the opportunity to witness and share their needs. In Turkey, where half of the population is under the age 30, 17% of the population is aged between 14 and 25 years and youth unemployment is 24%. Titiz noticed that young people cannot reach sufficient knowledge and guidance when they make decisions about their life. Consequently, they do not know what to expect from themselves truly and are not knowledgeable enough about occupations and career paths. Thereby, they face with difficulties in deciding on a suitable occupation or career path for themselves. While planning her own future, Titiz, herself, had difficulties and she is aware that many youths lose their direction in their career search. The idea of creating an “online, free and equal access to everyone” type of a platform came to her while she was establishing Mikado. She prioritized Mikado and then started devising the model and infrastructure of FBYP. The idea became a project under Mikado, then became a brand itself and was separated from Mikado to act under an NGO.

With this innovative and inclusive idea, Titiz founded FBYP as a first online platform on youth employment in September 2008. FBYP aims to increase employability of young people in Turkey through online and offline services empowering young people. Services vary from online mentoring, coaching, trainings, surveys, workshops, youth camps, etc. Titiz believed in the power of internet at the time when people were questioning its outreach and designed FBYP’s model on online sharing. She was able to secure in-kind technology providers’ to set the virtual rooms and online trainings. Her experience in the social sector, her reputation as a sustainable development expert and her network helped her introduce FBYP as a solution for the career counseling need of youngsters in Turkey.

While most Turkish youth are taught to refrain from asking questions and passively follow the choices adults make for them, FBYP envisions young people as self-determined, proactive, and well-informed

citizens. The initiative inspires youth with role models, raises awareness of existing social and personal opportunities, encourages them to make choices, and empowers them through a combination of guidance, mentoring, coaching, and skill development services/opportunities.

FBYP empowers and encourages youth self-determination with the ability to make informed education, career choices and life choices. This results in lower high school, university and job dropout rates, fulfilled personal lives and a more productive economy and society. Moreover, FBYP encourages youth to be proactive members of society, gears them up with 21<sup>st</sup> century life-skills and empowers them to make more informed life, education and career choices. Moreover, the initiative combines on-and offline mentoring-, coaching- and skill development approaches involving hundreds of professionals as volunteers, a majority of which engages with youth or volunteers for the first time. This results in more fulfilled lives, lower high school, university & job dropout rates, increased employability, more successful careers, a stronger economy and a more proactive and productive society overall. FBYP leverages the experience, knowledge, skills and networks of hundreds of volunteer role models, professionals, organizations, and companies all over Turkey by providing youth with mentors and training. The exchange is multifold and mutually beneficial. Volunteer mentors and coaches connect to a younger generation and engage in a meaningful social activity, youth receive access to inspiration, experience, knowledge, and guidance from professionals in Turkey's private sector and civil organizations (COs).

Concordantly, the main social value created through FBYP is to increase the employment opportunities for all young Turkish job seekers. Social inclusiveness in terms of skill development for employability is one of the most significant social impacts of FBYP. The opportunities FBYP provide include all young people who have an internet access. FBYP adds value to existing services/opportunities by placing them under one initiative and creates the opportunity of easily accessing to opportunities through a free of charge web platform. The youth may access the platform at anytime and anywhere, regardless of economic or social status. In addition to its web platform and online modules, FBYP facilitates offline forums and workshops countrywide, and is introducing mentoring manuals, handbooks, and training modules to allow high schools and universities to replicate and localize the initiatives.

Another social impact of FBYP is to offer employment and skill development opportunities for young people coming from not- privileged universities or wealthy families. A critical social problem related with employment in Turkey is the employers' intention to favor those who are graduated from top universities. The young job seekers coming from other universities sometimes face with a discrimination based on the reputation of the university. To minimize discrimination and for a better inclusion of all young job seekers in the labor market, FBYP functions as a bridge between possibly excluded job seekers and employers by developing an online platform. The platform targets at covering all young Turkish people regardless of their universities and offers them opportunities for interacting with mentors.

The innovative idea of offering on-and offline mentoring-, coaching- and skill development of FBYP has reproduced another program, Embark. Through Embark, FBYP extended its services to Syrian youth in Turkey through its reversing mentoring program. In the Embark program, where talented Syrian university students and graduates living in Turkey are matched with business leaders from companies like Unilever and Mastercard. The program components include mentoring sessions, a soft skills bootcamp and a goal setting program called Goals for Good.

Consequently, social innovation, social impact and sustainability are main pillars of both FBYP and Mikado Consulting. Additionally, Both FBYP and Mikado act as social innovation enablers reproducing social innovation through incubating platforms, projects and products in Turkey. Both Mikado's and FBYP's business ethics understanding lie in common values such as building partnerships, impact-orientation, good of the society and lifelong learning. Both at Mikado's and FBYP's teams work together and are people who believe in the cause and who strive to better the services and engage bigger parts of the society. Although

most of the social innovation based business models have problems in continuing their operations (Oeij et al., 2019), both Mikado and FBYP celebrated their 12<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> year respectively and FBYP recently achieved to take private sector investment. Through this investment, the platform is at the verge of developing its future version with the investment of its present sponsors and will be reestablished to serve a bigger cause: skills mismatch.

The achievements of Mikado and FBYP are closely associated with the experience, dedication and social network of its' founder, Serra Titiz. Titiz's drive to establish a social business lied in self-actualization through serving the society, and her personal search for a more meaningful life. In her words, she states that she created a world for herself that she could live in. Her experience in the civil society that spans from working in the field with disadvantaged communities to developing capacity building programs, from fundraising to corporate partnerships enabled her to see what's missing and led her to initiate her own organization. Moreover, both her dedication and her experience in the social sector qualified Mikado as a social business, a leader in the sustainable development ecosystem.

## **CONCLUSION**

The business model centered on social innovation offers the opportunity for extending the traditional business model assessed primarily by the financial (sales, profit etc.) and customer (satisfaction, loyalty etc.) related outcomes. The motive for creating social transformation puts its' stamp on the values, strategies, interactions, designs and management of social business models. Realizing social problems or needs, developing creative products, services, designs, dispersing these novelties into other organizations through network of enabling actors/institutions and creating social impact as an organizational outcome are major features of social business models. In line, the current chapter examines a Turkish social initiative to have a deeper understanding of the social enterprises' contribution to social inclusion.

The case of FBYP is the realization of providing skill development and employment opportunities to all youth in Turkey, leaving no one behind. Besides working for a better corporate environment, the social entrepreneur, Titiz also has a mission for empowering the Turkish youth. Especially her experience and her insight related with Turkish youth make her realize that Turkish youth is in the need for mentoring both for personal and professional development. Thereby, her ideal of an inclusive recruitment process result in the establishment of FBP. Through the platform, the youth can reach skill development educations or can match with a mentor just by an Internet connection regardless of their location and improve their personal skills. In case of Turkey, this platform, this platform plays a critical role since Turkey is amongst the countries that have a high rate of youth population and the related social problem of unemployment. The platform offers a solution to that problem by empowering the youth. Providing opportunities for skill development and including every young person in the labor market has been a concern for Turkey. Besides governmental efforts, civil society and social initiatives focusing on equal opportunities for skill development or career mentoring for all young people are noteworthy for the social and economic development.

In terms of the study propositions given at the introductory section of the study, it can be stated that the social entrepreneur of the case is a highly mission-oriented person and she realizes her missions through establishing a social business on sustainability and a platform on youth empowerment. Through her social business, she offers sustainability centered services, develops social impact projects and all efforts are directed at generating responsible corporate practices. Besides, she cooperates with universities and governmental agencies for the development of social entrepreneurship practices in Turkey. Starting from its' establishment, her social business stands on a cooperative structure accompanied by a constant learning atmosphere as diverse actors are included within each project. Furthermore, as a social business, Mikado incubated the basis of the examined social initiative, FBYP. The values of Mikado as social impact and innovation are also shared by FBPD and hence the social structure, network, organizational design are also



transferred to FBYP. All in all, although FBYP's focus is on youth employment, Mikado's way of doing business centered on social welfare development is diffused into FBYP.

Both Mikado and FBYP depend on constant experimentation and learning. As a result, Mikado incubated FBYP, FBYP incubates programs such as Embark. Embark answers the needs of Syrian youth which is increasing in Turkey by a collaborative solution. As meeting the needs of the refugees become a global debate, the Embark program is to be adopted by other initiatives and can turn into a global model. Through Embark, first-hand work experience, personal skill development opportunities are offered to young Syrians in Turkey. Through mentoring process, Turkish businesspeople also find the opportunity to understand how they can integrate young Syrians into the economic system for a shared social welfare. Both FBYP and Embark clearly underlines how an innovative solution can lead other innovative solutions covering sectors and cultures.

To conclude, some indications can be offered to researchers and authorities. The social problem related with the employment and skill development of Turkish youth has a significant ratio in the population. To answer these needs, all actors should act together for equal opportunities. Social initiatives that operates for finding solutions covering all have to be encouraged by both economic and social terms. In Turkey, the interest in social entrepreneurship is on the rise but legal infrastructure needed for supporting the interest isn't developed yet. Thereby, social entrepreneurs in Turkey are looking for ways to achieve their social value creation ideals within the limited support. The legal infrastructure and governmental framework have to be designed in a manner to empower social businesses as the power of social businesses will increase the power of societal development. Additionally, funding opportunities that can answer the needs of social innovation businesses have to be developed for a strong social business circle.

The main limitation of the study is its' methodology which makes it difficult to make generalizations for Turkish social businesses. However, the study aims to offer some insight about the phenomenon by offering a detailed data through case analyses. For the forthcoming studies, it can be advised to study more cases especially the cross-cultural cases for understanding the cultural differences of the phenomenon.

\*This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## REFERENCES

- Ainscow M. & Sandill A. (2010) Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14:4, 401-416, DOI: 10.1080/13603110802504903
- Baker S. & Mehmood A. (2015). Social innovation and the governance of sustainable places. *Local Environment*, 20:3, 321-334, DOI: 10.1080/13549839.2013.842964
- Bansal, S., Garg, I., & Sharma, G. D. (2019). Social entrepreneurship as a path for social change and driver of sustainable development: A systematic review and research agenda. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1091.
- British Council, Türkiye, 2019. 'Türkiye'de Sosyal Girişimlerin Durumu'. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from <https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/programmes/education/social-enterprise-research>.
- Boons, F., & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2013). Business models for sustainable innovation: state-of-the-art and steps towards a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 45, 9-19.

Bornstein, D. 2004. *How to change the world: social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Comini, G., Barki, E., & de Aguiar, L. T. (2012). A three-pronged approach to social business: A Brazilian multi-case analysis. *Revista de Administração*, 47(3), 385-397.

Dees (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Retrieved February 01, 2020, from [http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees\\_SE.pdf](http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf).

Dees, J. G. and Anderson, B. B. (2006a). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: building on two schools of practice and thought. *Research on social entrepreneurship, ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series*, 1(3): 39-66.

Dees, J. G. and Anderson, B. B. (2006b). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. In Gregory, J. (Ed). *Research on social entrepreneurship: Understanding and contributing to an emerging field*, 39-66.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32-53.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2013). Social innovation, social economy and social enterprise: what can the European debate tell us?. *The International Handbook on Social Innovation*, 40-53.

Doganova, L., & Eyquem-Renault, M. (2009). What do business models do?: Innovation devices in technology entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 38(10), 1559-1570.

Hall, B. H. (2004). Innovation and diffusion (No. w10212). *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 1-18.

Hall, J. K., Daneke, G. A., & Lenox, M. J. (2010). Sustainable development and entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 439-448.

Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L., & Silvestre, B. (2012). Entrepreneurship and innovation at the base of the pyramid: a recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion?. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 785-812.

Klasen, S. (2010). Measuring and monitoring inclusive growth: Multiple definitions, open questions, and some constructive proposals. *ADB Sustainable Development Working Paper Series*, No.12.

Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77.

Marques, P., Morgan, K., & Richardson, R. (2018). Social innovation in question: The theoretical and practical implications of a contested concept. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 36(3), 496-512.

Mulgan, G. (2019). *Social Innovation: How societies find the power to change*. Bristol University Press.

Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). *Social innovation: what it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. The Young Foundation, London.

Mumford M.D. (2002) Social innovation: Ten cases from Benjamin Franklin, *Creativity Research Journal*, 14:2, 253-266, DOI: 10.1207/S15326934CRJ1402\_11

Nielsen, C., & Samia, P. M. (2008). Understanding key factors in social enterprise development of the BOP: a systems approach applied to case studies in the Philippines. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(7), 446-454.

OECD (1999). *Social Enterprises*, OECD Publishing:Paris. Retrieved January 08, 2020 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264182332-en>.

Oeij, P. R., van der Torre, W., Vaas, F., & Dhondt, S. (2019). Understanding social innovation as an innovation process: Applying the innovation journey model. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 243-254.

Osterwalder, A. (2004). The business model ontology a proposition in a design science approach. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Université de Lausanne, Faculté des hautes études commerciales.

Partzsch, L.; Ziegler, R. (2011). Social entrepreneurs as change agents: A case study on power and authority in the water sector. *Int. Environ. Agreem. Polit. Law Econ.*, 11, 63–83.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2019). Creating shared value. In *Managing sustainable business* (pp. 323-346). Springer, Dordrecht.

Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34-43.

Ranieri, R., & Almeida Ramos, R. (2013). *Inclusive growth: building up a concept* (No. 104). Working Paper, International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth.

Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Fifth edition. Free Press: New York.

Schaltegger, S., Hansen, E. G., & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2016). Business models for sustainability: Origins, present research, and future avenues. *Organization & Environment*, 29(1) 3–10.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Third edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Social Business Initiative (2011). *Communication from the Commission: Social Business Initiative: Creating a favourable climate for social enterprises, key stakeholders in the social economy and innovation*. Retrieved January 17, 2020 from <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0682:FIN:EN:PDF>

Stubbs, W., Cocklin, C. (2008). Conceptualizing a “sustainability business model.” *Organization & Environment*, 21, 103-127.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2), 172–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.003>.

Tykkyläinen, S., & Ritala, P. (2020/In Press). Business model innovation in social enterprises: An activity system perspective. *Journal of Business Research*.

Vavik, T. & Keitsch, M. 2010. Exploring relationships between universal design and social sustainable development: some methodological aspects to the debate on the sciences of sustainability. *Sustainable Development* 18(5):295–305.

Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building social business models: Lessons from the Grameen experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 308-325.

Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2010). Making a difference: Strategies for scaling social innovation for greater impact. *Innovation Journal*, 15(2).

## **KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

**Social Business Model:** The business model that focuses on creating social welfare by developing solutions to social problems

**Social Entrepreneurship:** The social entrepreneur is someone who develops innovative solutions to social problems with a motive for generating social impact

**Social Innovation:** The social innovation is the developing new perspectives, new approaches, new solutions to social problems

**Social Impact:** Social impact is the consequences of activities, projects, programs or policies that can create a change in the knowledge and behaviors of individuals, groups or organizations

**Inclusive Growth:** Growth that adopts the principle of equity and that covers the development of conditions of the disadvantaged. Growth without the neglected groups' development would be unhealthy and unsustainable.