RES MILITARIS
REVUE EUROPEENNE D ETUDES EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MILITARY STUDIES
Social Science Journal

Development and Validation of Social Entrepreneurship Competency Measurement in Public Sector Organizations

By

Edy Dwi Kurniati
Lecturer, University of Darul Ulum Islamic Center Sudirman GUPPI (Undaris) Semarang
Corresponding email: edydwikurniati705@gmail.com

Abstract

Capacity building for public administrators is only in the aspects of technical, managerial, socio-cultural competence, but also needs to involve the development of social entrepreneurship competencies. Social entrepreneurship competence has an important role for public administrators to raise awareness, responsiveness, innovation, and proactiveness in giving a contribution to managing various economic, social and environmental problems in entrepreneurial ways. This study aims to develop and validate social entrepreneurship capacity measurements in public sector organizations. The research was conducted with an explanatory approach. The social entrepreneurship capacity measurement model was developed from previous research and adapted to public sector organizations. The dimensions and indicators are summarized from previous research to be evaluated by experts (practitioners and academics) in the field of human resources and entrepreneurship. Furthermore, a limited trial was conducted through an online survey of 30 respondents and factor analysis (Confirmatory factors Analysis): The results of the study found four dimensions and 16 indicators of social entrepreneurship capacity in public sector organizations consisting of the dimensions: social values, innovative, proactive, and risk-taking. The results of the model feasibility test meet the goodness of fit. The results of this study provide implications for the dimensions and indicators of the capacity of social entrepreneurship to complement the capacity of public administrators amidst the complexity and dynamics of the environment.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship competency, measurement, public sector organizations1.

Introduction

Public service organizations face challenges amid increasingly complex and dynamic environmental changes. The paradigm of the role of public administrators has long experienced a shift from the service bureaucratic approach behind the desk (old public management), to a fast and efficient public service approach (new public management), towards an integrated public service approach to respond to increasingly complex and dynamic environmental changes (new public service) (Hondeghem & Vandenabeele, 2007).

Environmental changes are complex and dynamic requiring social entrepreneurship capacity. Public administrators must have the capacity for social entrepreneurship, namely solving economic, social, and environmental problems in entrepreneurial ways (Saebi et al., 2019). The spirit of social entrepreneurship does not only cover economic aspects, but also the capacity to provide more values that orient towards producing meaning and value for inner peace, social peace and ecological peace (Ims & Ove Jakobsen, 2017). Various problems of environmental imbalances such as poverty, unemployment, equal access to education and health services, disability issues, injustice in agricultural value chains, development of small-scale enterprises, access to water and energy resources, pollution/waste, and other economic, social and environmental problems become social entrepreneurship challenges. An

entrepreneurial spirit is an ability to capture and respond to environmental imbalances. In times of imbalance, entrepreneurs carry out innovative activities to restore environmental imbalances (economic, social, environmental) towards a new balance. During the conditions of equilibrium (static), entrepreneurs carry out innovation activities to create new growth opportunities.

Under conditions of dynamic environmental change, social entrepreneurship capacity is required. In general, social entrepreneurship aims to overcome economic, social and environmental problems. Social entrepreneurship solves social problems through entrepreneurial ways. Entrepreneurship is a spirit of solving various economic, social and environmental problems (Bozhikin et al., 2019). Borrowing from the concept of classical economists Schumpeter and Kirztner, entrepreneurs are people who create and grasp opportunities from conditions of equilibrium and disequilibrium (Bwisa, 2010). When the environment is static (in a state of balance), entrepreneurs create innovations to create new growth opportunities. When the environment is in a state of imbalance, entrepreneurs grasp opportunities from the imbalance. The entrepreneurial spirit is not only needed by economic actors, but also by social organizations such as in the bureaucracy (Irani & Elliman, 2008). It is because the concept of entrepreneurship is different from managers, employees, investors or other professions.

To date, there is no universal agreement on the definition of the concept of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship has different meanings among different parties. Aside from the problem of definition, there are no clear dimensions of the social entrepreneurship construct that are widely supported. It makes the concept of social entrepreneurship still difficult to capture the heterogeneity of the analysis unit. As result, there is no convention on the definition and dimension of the social entrepreneurship construct in explaining its operationalization (Dwivedi & Weerawardena, 2018; Kroeger & Weber, 2014). The ambiguity of the term makes it difficult to distinguish social entrepreneurship from other phenomena, such as charity and philanthropy, corporate social responsibility, (Saebi et al., 2019), social calling and social worker.

At present, the capacity building of public administrators in Indonesia is only in the aspects of technical, managerial and socio-cultural competence (Law Number 5 of 2014; Article 69, PP No 11 of 2017; LAN RI Regulation Number 10 of 2018) and has not yet involved the development of social entrepreneurship competency aspects. The development of social entrepreneurship capacity requires an understanding of the concepts and indicators of social entrepreneurship capacity. This is for codification in planning, control, and evaluation. Instruments for evaluating the capacity of social entrepreneurship have been developed in several studies, but they are limited to public sector organizations. The public sector is often considered to be associated with problems of inefficiency, lack of motivation to be innovative, lack of equitable access to fair public services, and lack of responsiveness to community needs (Irani & Elliman, 2008).

This article further aims to develop and validate social entrepreneurship capacity measurements in public sector organizations. The structure of this article consists of six sections. The first subject is the introduction related to the urgency of developing the model. The second subject is related to the development of conceptual models, dimensions and indicators of social entrepreneurship based on literature studies. The third subject discusses the ways in which research is conducted to validate the model. The fourth and fifth topics report the results of testing and discussion of research results. The sixth point contains the conclusions and implications of the research results.

Literature Review

Understanding the concept of social entrepreneurship begins with understanding the concept of environmental balance-imbalances, and the role of entrepreneurs within. The organizational environment is in a cycle of balance-imbalance. Changes in the balance-imbalance cycle are not only related to economic resources but also social (social-equilibrium) (Fararo, 1993), and environment (ecological-equilibrium) (DeAngelis & Waterhouse, 1987). The demand for resources, environmental degradation, pollution, income inequality, disability problems, psycho-social burdens, social conflicts, and poverty are conditions of imbalance and become opportunities for entrepreneurial activity.

Based on the concept of classical economists Schumpeter and Kirzner, an entrepreneur is a party that plays a role in the cycle of balances and imbalances of economic resources (Bwisa, 2010). In conditions of market imbalance, entrepreneurs grasp opportunities and take risks from the imbalances, and return them to a new balance (Hansen et al., 2022). Furthermore, the equilibrium condition, where the demand is almost the same as the product or service supply, creates a static market. In static market conditions, entrepreneurs create innovations for new economic growth (Carraher et al., 2016; Kannampuzha & Hockerts, 2019; Petrella & Richez-Battesti, 2014; Santos, 2012; Satar & Natasha, 2019).

This concept distinguishes entrepreneurs from owners of capital, entrepreneurs, managers, and employees although they can also have entrepreneurial roles and spirit. A manager oversees process efficiency, responsible for routine activities. Conversely, the function of entrepreneurs is to create opportunities and take advantage of opportunities with a number of returns and risks. Compared to owners of capital, entrepreneurs do not need their capital. Compared to professionals, they use their knowledge to facilitate economic transactions, whereas entrepreneurs provide economic opportunities with new ideas, products and ways of doing things.

To name of few, the concept of social entrepreneurship was developed by Bowen in the 1950s (Saebi et al., 2019), with a social mission to distinguish it from economic entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is an individual or group activity that has a mission to solve social problems through entrepreneurial methods, both profit-oriented and non-profit-oriented. The social mission is to play a role in balance-imbalance social problems, such as poverty, empowering women, catalyzing social transformation, encouraging inclusive growth, and bringing about institutional change. Social entrepreneurship has developed as a field separated from conventional entrepreneurship and has a distinct focus on creating social value, with or without a financial value (profit).

Based on this concept, social entrepreneurship exists both in profit-non-profit oriented organizations, government-private-community (informal), and individual-group-organizations. Social entrepreneurs need the ability to bridge relationships across stakeholders, which enables entrepreneurs to manage critical work resources effectively. Some examples of the social mission of social entrepreneurship at the organizational/company level (Saebi et al., 2019) include providing goods and services on the market or in the public sector whose availability is limited or not available, developing capabilities, creating work opportunities, opening access for people who are socially excluded, reducing poverty through empowerment for example with microcredit movement, health services. It can start from a small scale that provides support for people affected by mental disorders in a community to a wider scale such as tackling the HIV/AIDS pandemic, provide education and training, promotion of healthy

lifestyles, environmental preservation activities, waste management, development of renewable energy, development of rural areas, creating jobs for the unemployed or homeless, and also drug abuse projects and alcohol.

In this case, social entrepreneurship competence is an individual entrepreneurial ability that is continuously developed to reach optimal abilities (Guritno et al., 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020). Competence is a behavioural dimension behind competency performance (McClelland, 1973). Some of the competency characteristics consist of (Spencer & Spencer, 1993) character, motivation, self-concept, knowledge and skills or expertise. The components of character and self-concept motivation are difficult to develop, while knowledge, skills and motivation can be developed. Entrepreneurial competence is related to conceptual abilities that are reflected in entrepreneurial behaviour for example skills in decision-making, absorbing and understanding complex information, taking risks and innovation (Minimol, 2021).

Based on the concepts of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship competence can be measured from indicators of social values, innovation, proactivity, and risk-taking (Satar & Natasha, 2019). The element that distinguishes social entrepreneurship from economic entrepreneurship is the existence of social values (Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020). Elements of innovation and risk-taking (spending resources to take advantage of opportunities) are characteristics of entrepreneurship that distinguish it from similar concepts, such as pro-social behaviour (Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez -Parra et al., 2020).

Innovation is the spirit of entrepreneurship that the activities are to create added value on the output and or minimize the input (Jong & Hartog, 2019). It is executed through the development of new markets, new products, and new methods (Anderson et al., 2014). Innovation is the driving force for meeting the needs and problems of environmental imbalance in a growing world. Innovation enables social entrepreneurs to use resources more efficiently for the wider community, with little or no residue, by integrating local wisdom. Innovation is an activity that is often carried out by humans to achieve goals and solve various problems in many sectors of life.

Various individual and organizational social problems can be solved using a proactive and reactive approach (Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019). A reactive approach is more responsive when something happens. On the other hand, proactive behaviour controls the situation and makes initial changes, rather than adjusting to the situation or waiting for something to happen. Proactive behaviour is activity or action towards a future situation.

Social entrepreneurs carry out activities to take care of social problems, and social benefits for the environment (Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020). Social spirit includes a strong commitment to consider social and environmental issues. The demand for resources, environmental degradation, pollution, income inequality, disability problems, psycho-social burdens, social conflicts, and poverty are conditions of imbalance and become opportunities for social entrepreneurial activities. The issue of environmental problems presents production and service challenges that are not only used up in one production cycle, but they are a continuous cycle or known as the circular economy concept and management of resources that will not run out with zero waste production. Social entrepreneurs need the community both as initiators and participants.

Table 1. *Social Entrepreneurship Dimension*

Dimension		Reference
Social value	Social values are related to attitudes and a strong commitment to concern for social and environmental issues which make meaning and one of the goals in life.	(Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020)
Innovation	Innovation is the provision of added value to a product, service or process (Jong & Hartog, 2019). Innovation can be defined as "new ideas, new devices or methods", as well as implementing better solutions to meet new standards and needs, or meeting needs (Anderson et al., 2014).	(Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020)
Proactive	Proactive behaviour is an activity or action towards a future situation. Proactive behaviour controls the situation and makes initial changes, rather than adjusting to the situation or waiting for something to happen (reactive).	(Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019)
Risk Taking	Risk-taking is an action to take advantage of available resources to obtain uncertain results	(Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019)

Source: *mapping from previous research*

Risk-taking is an act of utilizing available resources to obtain uncertain results (Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019). Social entrepreneurs provide time, energy, and other resources with uncertain results. Social entrepreneurs often devote their minds, heart and/or resources to social benefits. However, support and results (benefits) are not always as expected.

3. Research Methodology

This study uses an explanatory approach (Creswell, 2014) in which explanatory design is for the development of social entrepreneurship competency measurement models. This study uses research objects in public service sector organizations in Semarang Regency, Indonesia. The research consists of two stages of research, starting from the exploration of the theoretical model followed by the evaluation of the development model. Initially, the questionnaire was prepared based on a literature review (Hsu and Sandford, 2007). Validation of the theoretical model against the operational model is carried out through a discussion of expert judgment and limited trials. The initial list of social entrepreneurship capacity questions was used as a template to develop data collection from four experts consisting of academics and entrepreneurship practitioners in Semarang district. The initial questionnaire was administered independently to four experts for evaluation of content, layout, arrangement of grammar, completeness, adequacy of content, logical order of questions and ease of understanding.

The next stage is a limited trial of 30 respondents through quantitative analysis aimed at evaluating the development model. The limited test was conducted on 30 respondents including experts and practitioners, who were taken randomly. Furthermore, the limited test is carried out by correlating the scores obtained on each question item with the total score. Questionnaire items are declared valid if the significance value of the item correlates with the total variable score (p-value) <0.05. Conversely, if the item correlation significance value with

the total variable score (p-value) is > 0.05, the item is declared invalid and cannot be used (Ghozali, 2017). Model trials are also to see how far the model can achieve goals and objectives, test the model on the acceptance of academics and practitioners, and evaluate measurements through Confirmatory Factors Analysis (CFA).

4. Result

The evaluation of social entrepreneurship capacity measurement is through validity and reliability analysis. Based on the result of the limited test (Table 2), a correlation value was obtained between items with a total for all items (p-value) <0.05. In this sense, the instrument was declared valid because it was greater than the required minimum limit. Therefore, it could be used for construct measurement.

Table 2. *Result of Validity Test of Instrument Item*

Indicator	r	p
Social Value/Passion		
A strong commitment to consider other people's problems	0.937	0.000
Enthusiastic and committed to creating social value	0.892	0.000
Passion to provide benefits to the environment	0.874	0.000
Have a goal to improve the quality of the environment	0.920	0.000
Innovativeness		
Rediscover useful values in organizations, communities and the environment	0.830	0.000
Be innovative by creating new products, services or combinations thereof to provide environmental benefits	0.865	0.000
Always looking for solutions to solve social problems	0.867	0.000
Always seek solutions to limitations by resources	0.881	0.000
Always try new ways	0.769	0.000
Pro-activeness		
Seeing opportunities for social problems	0.883	0.000
Anticipate future needs or changes in social problems	0.868	0.000
Be ready to take action rather than waiting for another person or group to do it	0.900	0.000
Project future problems and solutions	0.896	0.000
Risk-taking		
Dare to take risks to solve social problems	0.991	0.000
Willing to invest a lot of time and/or other resources in solving social problems, with uncertain returns	0.991	0.000
Dare to engage in risky activities for greater opportunities for benefits	0.968	0.000

Source: *analysis from trial test results of 30 respondents*

The reliability test is used to measure the stability level of the measuring instrument. Questionnaires can be declared reliable if the answers to questions given by respondents are consistent/stable from time to time. The reliable measurement of a variable can be seen from the value of Cronbach Alpha (α) value. Variables or constructs that are measured through questionnaires can be declared reliable if their value is greater than 0.70. Based on the results of the instrument reliability test as shown in Table 3, the Cronbach Alpha numbers produced by all variables are greater than 0.7 as the minimum standard of the required reliability test, so the instrument has high reliability.

Table 3. *Result of Reliability Test of Instrument Item*

Social Entrepreneurship Dimension	Reliability	Description

Social value	0.990	Reliable
Innovative	0.966	Reliable
Proactive	0.973	Reliable
Risk-taking	0.988	Reliable

Source: *analysis of trial test results from 30 respondents*

In this study, factor analysis through Confirmatory Factors Analysis (CFA) analysis is used to test the measurement of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship competence consists of four dimensions; social value, innovative, proactive, and risk-taking. The social value dimension consists of four indicators, and the innovative dimension consists of five indicators. Meanwhile, the proactive dimension consists of four indicators, and the risk-taking dimension consists of three indicators. So that, there are a total of 16 indicators.

Validity analysis used discriminant validity criteria. Discriminant validity can be seen from the outer loading value. An indicator possesses good validity on reflective latency if it has a loading factor value greater than 0.70 (Hair et al., 1998). Based on Table 4, it can be seen that all indicators have a high correlation with the constructs. Therefore, it can be concluded that the research model has good discriminant validity.

Table 4. *Measuring Instrument Validity*

	Outer Loading			
	Social value	**Innovative**	**Proactive**	**Risk-taking**
SV1	0.824			
SV2	0.848			
SV3	0.897			
SV4	0.864			
INOV1		0.750		
INOV2		0.448		
INOV3		0.876		
INOV4		0.853		
INOV5		0.844		
PRO1			0.787	
PRO2			0.859	
PRO3			0.856	
PRO4			0.841	
RISK1				0.865
RISK 2				0.871
RISK 3				0.839

Source: *Analysis of Primary Data*

The reliability of indicators in measuring constructs (variables) can be seen from the values of average variance extracted (AVE), Cronbach's Alpha, and Composite Reliability. The construct used is declared valid if the average variance extracted (AVE) value is > 0.5, the composite reliability value is > 0.7, and the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.7 (Hair et al., 2017). Test results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. *Measuring Instrument Reliability*

	AVE	**Composite Reliability**	**Cronbach's Alpha**

Social value	0.716	0.926	0.900
Innovative	0.594	0.875	0.818
Proactive	0.692	0.918	0.889
Risk-taking	0.729	0.931	0.908

Source: *Analysis of Primary Data*

Based on Table 5, it can be seen that the results of convergent validity are based on the average variance extracted. These results indicate that all latent variables have an AVE value greater than 0.5, so all constructs are declared valid. Based on Table 5, it can also be seen that all latent constructs have Cronbach's Alpha values and composite reliability of more than 0.7. It indicates that all latent constructs have good reliability.

5. Discussion

An entrepreneurial spirit is needed for both the public and private sectors to capture the problems of environmental imbalances, as well as provide new environmental (economic, social, ecological) balance values. However, the characteristics of the work environment for civil servants in the public sector have different characteristics from private employees. Work for employees in the private sector is more economically oriented, while employment relationships are more transactional. Work for civil servants is more devoted to solving economic, social and environmental problems. The entrepreneurial spirit for the public sector is more socially entrepreneurial. However, empirical studies of the dimensions of social entrepreneurship have not found conclusive conclusions, especially regarding the different regulatory, social, cultural, economic, technological environments.

The results of this study found that social entrepreneurship consists of dimensions of social orientation, innovation behaviour, risk-taking and pro-activity (Table 2). The social orientation dimension is important in social entrepreneurship which distinguishes it from conventional entrepreneurship. The dimension of social orientation is needed for sensitivity and concern for social and environmental issues. It makes planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to be effective. Innovative, risk-taking and pro-active dimensions are dimensions of entrepreneurship in general that distinguish social entrepreneurship from other pro-social behaviours. The results of the model evaluation (Table 5) found that the average variance extracted (AVE) value was > 0.5, Cronbach's Alpha value and composite reliability were > 0.7, so it can be concluded that the model meets the assumption of goodness of fit.

Social entrepreneurship in public sector organizations within local government is useful for harnessing the power of social innovation to create public goodness through appropriate policies, regulatory tools, and programs (Irani & Elliman, 2008). The innovation element has an AVE value = 0.594 (> 0.5), Cronbach's Alpha value = 0.875 (> 0.7) and composite reliability = 0.818 (> 0.7) (table 5). It shows that the element of innovation is an important dimension that constructs social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is needed to create a better policy environment, public programs and investments that enable social innovators to thrive and profit and become active agents of change in society. Social entrepreneurship can create change in a number of ways, including shaping public policy, increasing citizen engagement, directing resources towards social innovation, and increasing social investment.

Innovation and social entrepreneurship in public sector organizations are useful for harnessing the power of sensitivity to social problems rather than just implementing programs

(Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Satar & Natasha, 2019; Vázquez-Parra et al., 2020), so it is important to encourage the program effectiveness both in planning and implementation. The social value element has an AVE = 0.716 (> 0.5), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.926 (> 0.7) and composite reliability = 0.900 (> 0.7) (table 5). It shows that the element of social value is an important dimension that constructs social entrepreneurship. Employees who work in public sector organizations are essentially socially oriented to devote themselves to serving the country and the people of Indonesia and are accountable for their actions and performance to the public (article 4 of Law Number 5 of 2014). Public organizations in government departments generally have work regulations that are standardized and clearly formalized related to activity programs, structures, work procedures and infrastructure. However, standardization and formalization have weaknesses such as many aspects of work that cannot be regulated by formal standards, standardization creating overly rigid work systems and goal bias which intensively pursues fulfilling work standards compared to substantive goals. In this case, the spirit of social entrepreneurship has the potential to direct staff towards aspects of program effectiveness rather than compliance with formal standards and procedures.

Social entrepreneurship in public sector organizations also has the potential to increase willingness and ability to take risks (Capella-Peris et al., 2020; Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019). The element of risk-taking has an AVE = 0.729 (> 0.5), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.931 (> 0.7) and composite reliability = 0.908 (> 0.7) (table 5). It shows that the element of risk-taking is an important dimension that constructs social entrepreneurship. In public sector organizations, the return on risk (risk-reward profile) is not always direct but often indirect. The effectiveness of training programs, community empowerment, and social investment often cannot be seen in the short term. Employee reward-contribution systems in public sector organizations are also more hierarchical than performance-based. It often makes programs, and procedures more for meeting formal standards than effectiveness. The spirit of social entrepreneurship has the potential to direct staff such as more towards program effectiveness rather than just implementing program activities, and budget effectiveness rather than budget usage.

Social entrepreneurship in public sector organizations also has the potential to increase proactive capabilities in responding to environmental changes rather than simply being reactive to change (Guritno et al., 2019; Satar & Natasha, 2019). The proactive element has an AVE = 0.692 (> 0.5), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.918 (> 0.7) and composite reliability = 0.889 (> 0.7) (table 5). It shows that the proactive element is an important dimension that constructs social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is needed amid increasingly complex and dynamic environmental changes. Increasingly complex environments require an organization's internal and external collaboration capacities. Increasingly dynamic environmental changes require adaptive capacity and innovation. Complex environmental changes mean that changes require integrated problem-solving between sectors. For example, agriculture is not only related to food production but also involves other fields such as health (food security), food security (politics), food access (sociology, and urban farming (city planning)). The recent global pandemic is not only a problem in the health sector but also involves almost all fields, such as economics, social, politics, education during a pandemic, work environment during a pandemic, and logistics provision during a pandemic. The problem of poverty is not only related to the social sector but also requires integrated problem-solving between sectors such as access to nutrition, health, education for the poor, development of human resources, job creation for the poor, economic empowerment of the poor,

Organizational environment in the future will be more complex and dynamic. This requires higher social entrepreneurship competencies to manage increasingly dynamic

environmental changes. Dynamic means that environmental changes are no longer like flowing water which is easy to predict, but they are fast, often on a large scale (turbulence). These changes are driven by the degradation of resources, developments in innovation and technology, as well as information. In the traditional era, resources were abundant compared to the population. Increasing population, quality requirements, and resource degradation ultimately require innovation and technology. Lately, the development of technology is getting faster and easier to spread. New technology will easily be replaced by newer technology. It will also affect dynamically changing ways of life, ways of working and services based on technology. Information technology also influences people's lifestyles and tastes. It is easier for people to give their aspirations in expressing opinions and participating in development. Change is also often on a large scale. Changes in digital technology, for example, are affecting the transformation of routine work of service and production displaced by automation-based service and production. Digital technology also influences flexible work services and designs that are not limited by space and time.

6. Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship in public organizations in government departments is useful in creating social value through the effectiveness of policies, regulatory tools, and appropriate programs both in planning and implementation. The results of this study found that the social entrepreneurship development model includes four elements and 16 indicators. The four elements are the dimensions of social value, innovative, proactive and risk-taking which construct social entrepreneurship. Social value is an element of social entrepreneurship that distinguishes it from conventional entrepreneurship. Innovative, proactive and risk-taking are important elements of entrepreneurship that differentiate from other prosocial. The results of the model feasibility test fulfilled the goodness of fit with average variance extracted (AVE) values > 0.5, Cronbach's alpha values and composite reliability > 0.7.

The development model has several limitations. First, this research was conducted in the developing country of Indonesia where social entrepreneurship competencies have not yet become part of the development of human resource competencies in civil servants in the public sector. Research can produce different results under different regulatory, social, cultural, economic, technological environmental conditions. Second, the research subjects are civil servants in general, and have not differentiated the characteristics of the work. Social entrepreneurship competency requirements can differ based on the characteristics of different tasks or jobs. Non-routine jobs, managerial level, planning fields, public relations will probably require more social entrepreneurship than routine jobs such as administration. Further research is needed to develop a model based on the type of work, position and field of assignment. Third, this research was conducted with a cross-sectional design. Research with a cross-sectional approach has weaknesses in the time, the influence of technology, changes in the economic environment, social and organizational regulations. Research results may change over time, so future research needs to consider these factors.

References

Bozhikin, I., Macke, J., & da Costa, L. F. (2019). The role of government and key non-state actors in social entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 226, 730–747. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.076

Bwisa, H. M. (2010). Economics And Entrepreneurship May Be Twins But They Are Not Identical Twins. http://www.professorbwisa.com/

Capella-Peris, C., Gil-Gómez, J., Martí-Puig, M., & Ruíz-Bernardo, P. (2020). Development and Validation of a Scale to Assess Social Entrepreneurship Competency in Higher Education. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 11(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1545686

Carraher, S. M., Welsh, D. H. B., & Svilokos, A. (2016). Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship. European Journal of International Management, 10(4), 386–402. https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2016.077421

DeAngelis, D. L., & Waterhouse, J. C. (1987). Equilibrium and Nonequilibrium Concepts in Ecological Models. Ecological Monographs, 57(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/1942636

Dwivedi, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2018). Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct. Journal of Business Research, 86(January), 32–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.01.053

Fararo, T. J. (1993). General Social Equilibrium: Toward Theoretical Synthesis. Sociological Theory, 11(3), 291. https://doi.org/10.2307/201972

Guritno, P. D., Suyono, H., & Pandowo, M. H. C. (2019). Competency Model of Social Entrepreneurs: Learning from Successful Indonesian Social Entrepreneurs. International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science, 8(3), 94–110. https://search.proquest.com/docview/2241220275?accountid=31562

Hair, Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. C., & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate Data Analysis. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Hair, Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hansen, A. V., Fuglsang, L., Gallouj, F., & Scupola, A. (2022). Social entrepreneurs as change makers: expanding public service networks for social innovation. Public Management Review, 24(10), 1632–1651. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1916065

Hondeghem, A., & Vandenabeele, W. (2007). New Public Service. In Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, Second Edition (Print Version). https://doi.org/10.1201/noe1420052756.ch268

Ims, K. J., & Ove Jakobsen. (2017). Quality of Life. Integral Ecology and Sustainable Business, 55–66. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1572-832320170000026004

Irani, Z., & Elliman, T. (2008). Creating social entrepreneurship in local government. European Journal of Information Systems, 17(4), 336–342. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2008.35

Jong, J. De, & Hartog, D. Den. (2019). Innovative Work Behaviour: Measurement and Validation. Journal of Innovation Management, 10(1), 41–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x

Kannampuzha, M., & Hockerts, K. (2019). Organizational social entrepreneurship: scale development and validation. Social Enterprise Journal, 15(3), 290–319. https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-06-2018-0047

Kroeger, A., & Weber, C. (2014). Developing a conceptual framework for comparing social value creation. Academy of Management Review, 39(4), 513–540. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0344

McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for "intelligence". The American Psychologist, 28(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034092

Minimol. (2021). Measurement and Validation of Entrepreneurial Competency Scale. Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government, 27(2), 2021. https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.02.389

Petrella, F., & Richez-Battesti, N. (2014). Social entrepreneur, social entrepreneurship and social enterprise: semantics and controversies. Journal of Innovation Economics &

Management, n°14(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.3917/jie.014.0143

Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises. Journal of Management, 45(1), 70–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318793196

Santos, F. M. (2012). A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Ethics, 111(3), 335–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1413-4

Satar, M. S., & Natasha, S. (2019). Individual social entrepreneurship orientation: towards development of a measurement scale. Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 13(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.1108/apjie-09-2018-0052

Spencer, L. M. J., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). Competence at Work: Model for Superior Performance. John Wiley & Sons.

Vázquez-Parra, J. C., García-González, A., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2020). Social entrepreneurship competency: an approach by discipline and gender. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 13(5), 1357–1373. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-09-2020-0317