

Irina Haba

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University,
Associate Professor (Ukraine)

gabaira@ukr.net

[https:// orcid id: 0000-0003-4606-4504](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4606-4504)

Olha Palamarchuk

Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University,
Associate Professor (Ukraine)

olgapalamaruk42@gmail.com

[https:// orcid id: 0000-0002-6783-8380](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6783-8380)

SOCIAL WORK MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP WITHIN THE SYSTEM OF SOCIAL INNOVATION: A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Анотація. У статті розкрито взаємозв'язок менеджменту соціальної роботи та соціального підприємництва в системі соціальних інновацій у соціально-психологічному вимірі. Актуальність теми зумовлена ускладненням соціальних викликів, потребою в оновленні моделей організації соціальних послуг, посиленням ролі міжсекторальної взаємодії та пошуком стійких механізмів підтримки вразливих груп населення в умовах воєнного й післявоєнного розвитку України. Обґрунтовано, що сучасний менеджмент соціальної роботи охоплює не лише організацію та контроль надання послуг, а й планування, координацію, оцінювання потреб, ведення випадку, розвиток партнерства, ресурсне забезпечення та моніторинг результатів. Показано, що соціальне підприємництво постає як одна з організаційних форм реалізації соціальних інновацій, здатна поєднувати соціальну місію, підприємницький підхід, інституційну гнучкість і соціальний вплив. Визначено основні виміри взаємозв'язку менеджменту соціальної роботи та соціального підприємництва, зокрема ресурсний, організаційно-управлінський, соціально-інтеграційний, інституційний та інноваційний. Акцентовано, що в соціально-психологічному вимірі соціальне підприємництво сприяє не лише диверсифікації ресурсів і розвитку проектно-орієнтованого управління, а й розширенню можливостей соціальної інтеграції, посиленню суб'єктності особистості, активізації участі та формуванню більш інклюзивного соціального середовища. Перспективи подальших досліджень пов'язано з розробленням моделей інтеграції соціального підприємництва у систему соціальних послуг територіальних громад, визначенням критеріїв оцінювання його соціального впливу, аналізом управлінських компетентностей фахівців соціальної роботи та вивченням соціально-психологічних механізмів включення, участі й стійкості громад.

Ключові слова: social work management, social entrepreneurship, social innovation, social policy, social services, social management, community.

Abstract. The article examines the interrelation between social work management and social entrepreneurship within the system of social innovation from a socio-psychological perspective. The relevance of the topic is determined by the increasing complexity of social challenges, the need to renew models of social service organization, the growing role of cross-sectoral interaction, and the search for sustainable mechanisms for supporting vulnerable population groups in the context of Ukraine's wartime and post-war development. It is substantiated that contemporary social work management encompasses not only the organization and control of service delivery, but also planning, coordination, needs assessment, case management, partnership development, resource provision, and outcome monitoring. It is demonstrated that social entrepreneurship emerges as one of the organizational forms of implementing social innovation, capable of combining a social mission, an entrepreneurial approach, institutional flexibility, and social impact. The main dimensions of the interrelation between social work management and social entrepreneurship are identified as resource-related, organizational and managerial, social integration, institutional, and innovative. It is emphasized that, from a socio-psychological perspective, social entrepreneurship contributes not only to the diversification of resources and the development of project-oriented management, but also to the expansion of opportunities for social integration, the strengthening of individual agency, the activation of participation, and the formation of a more inclusive social environment. Prospects for further research are associated with the development of models for integrating social entrepreneurship into the system of social services at the level of territorial communities,

the identification of criteria for assessing its social impact, the analysis of managerial competencies required of social work professionals, and the study of socio-psychological mechanisms of inclusion, participation, and community resilience.

Keywords: social work management, social entrepreneurship, social innovation, socio-psychological dimension, social policy, social services, social management, community.

Formulation of the problem The social work system in Ukraine operates under conditions of multi-level societal challenges associated with the war, internal displacement of the population, growing demand for psychosocial support, the need to facilitate the adaptation of veterans, persons with disabilities, and families facing difficult life circumstances, as well as the necessity to strengthen the capacity of territorial communities. Under such conditions, social work management can no longer be limited to the administrative support of services alone. Its content increasingly encompasses the coordination of cross-sectoral interaction, the design of new solutions, resource mobilization, needs assessment, the organization of case management, and the development of sustainable support mechanisms. The updated Procedure for the Organization of Social Service Provision, approved by Resolution No. 64 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated January 14, 2026, explicitly establishes the mechanism for organizing the provision of social services, case management, and determining the number of social managers, which indicates the growing managerial component in the social sphere. Within this framework, social entrepreneurship acquires significance not as a peripheral phenomenon, but as one of the forms of social innovation capable of combining the resolution of socially significant problems with mechanisms of self-sustainability, flexible management, and the creation of social value. The issue lies not only in the possibility of attracting additional resources, but also in transforming the managerial paradigm of social work — from a predominantly compensatory model to a model of development, integration, partnership, and social impact. For this reason, scholarly reflection on the interrelation between social work management and social entrepreneurship within the system of social innovations acquires particular relevance.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In the contemporary Ukrainian academic field, the issue of social entrepreneurship is increasingly considered in connection with the development of social work. T. Tarasenko and Ye. Borodin [8] define social entrepreneurship as a factor in the development of social work, emphasizing its connection with social change, social innovation, interdisciplinarity, and interprofessional interaction. The scholars stress that social entrepreneurship expands the boundaries of professional social work practice and creates new opportunities for responding to social problems at the national, regional, and local levels. A. Komisarenko [5] analyzes social entrepreneurship as an instrument of social policy, emphasizing that its significance is determined not only by economic difficulties, but also by the need to generate positive social change and protect vulnerable population groups. Within this approach, social entrepreneurship appears as a form of redistribution of responsibility among the state, business, and civil society in addressing social problems. S. Boldyzhari and I. Khokhlova [1] consider social entrepreneurship as an innovative instrument for solving social problems in Ukraine. They associate its development with the global sustainable development goals, limited state resources, and the need to overcome poverty, social exclusion, environmental problems, and unemployment. At the same time, the scholars draw attention to the regulatory uncertainty surrounding social entrepreneurship in Ukraine and the insufficient development of state support mechanisms.

The issue of the managerial support of social entrepreneurship is examined by S. Ohinok, M. Kohut, and A. Kohut [6]. They argue that social management is a factor in the development of social entrepreneurship, since it is precisely the methods of social management that influence the effectiveness, stability, organizational viability, and social performance of such initiatives. H. Starchenko and A. Duka [7], analyzing project-oriented management of social entrepreneurship, focus on the need for systematic alignment of goals, resources, managerial instruments, and expected outcomes. In their approach, social entrepreneurship is viewed as a component of the implementation of social policy that requires effective management in order to ensure long-term sustainability. In 2025, A. Braunagel [2] outlined the strategic directions for the development of social entrepreneurship in Ukraine and identified a number of barriers, including the absence of a comprehensive regulatory and legal framework, limited access to financial resources, low public awareness, and the difficulty of integrating social enterprises into the market environment. At the same time, the author links the development of social entrepreneurship with economic recovery, public support, and the strengthening of regional resilience.

Despite the existence of these scholarly contributions [1; 2; 5; 6; 7; 8], the academic field still lacks a sufficiently comprehensive disclosure of the interrelation between social work management and social entrepreneurship as components of the system of social innovations. This determines the need for further theoretical generalization.

The purpose of the study is to provide a theoretical substantiation of the interrelation between social work management and social entrepreneurship within the system of social innovations, as well as to identify the main managerial, resource-related, and integration opportunities of this interrelation under the contemporary conditions of the development of Ukraine's social sphere.

Outline of the main material. Social work management in its contemporary understanding encompasses not only the organization and supervision of social service delivery, but also planning, coordination, interagency cooperation, needs assessment, case management, the development of partnership models, resource mobilization, and outcome monitoring. This approach reflects the broader tendency toward increasing complexity in the content of social work as a professional activity, since contemporary social challenges require not only responses to existing problems, but also the creation of mechanisms for their prevention, mitigation, and long-term resolution. It involves the timely identification of social risks, the anticipation of potential complications, the design of individualized support pathways, and the assurance of continuity of assistance in a changing social environment. Under such conditions, social work management acquires the characteristics of a multilevel activity that integrates administrative, organizational, communicative, analytical, and strategic components. Each of these performs a distinct function; however, the actual effectiveness of social work is ensured precisely through their interaction: the administrative component regulates procedures and responsibilities, the organizational component ensures the orderly functioning of processes, the communicative component forms the basis for interagency and interpersonal interaction, the analytical component enables the assessment of needs, resources, and outcomes, while the strategic component directs activities toward the achievement of long-term social impact.

Under contemporary conditions, the managerial dimension of the social sphere can no longer be interpreted as auxiliary or secondary, since the quality of support organization, the coordination of actions among different actors, the timeliness of responses to clients' needs, and the effectiveness of resource use directly depend on it. Moreover, it is the quality of managerial decisions that largely determines whether social assistance remains fragmented and situational or acquires a systemic, consistent, and effective character. Management in social work is increasingly associated not only with the implementation of formal procedures, but also with the ability to integrate community resources, coordinate the interaction of institutions and professionals, sustain partnerships among the state, civil society, and non-governmental sectors, and ensure the adaptability of social services to emerging societal challenges.

This becomes especially significant in the context of a growing number of crisis situations, the spread of difficult life circumstances, the increasing demand for psychosocial support, social adaptation, the integration of vulnerable groups, and the development of services at the level of territorial communities. In this regard, social work management is increasingly moving beyond the boundaries of internal administrative regulation and is emerging as a mechanism of purposeful influence on the social support system as a whole. Its task is no longer limited to ensuring the functioning of the existing support infrastructure, but also includes initiating its further development, improving service delivery models, introducing innovative approaches, and creating conditions for enhancing the accessibility, targeting, and quality of social work. The regulatory changes introduced in 2026 [3], which further formalized the category of social managers within the mechanisms for organizing service delivery, have reinforced the significance of this dimension and demonstrated that managerial processes are increasingly becoming one of the foundations of the social sphere. This indicates a gradual institutional recognition that contemporary social work requires not only professional sensitivity and a humanistic orientation, but also a high level of managerial competence. For this reason, social work management should today be regarded as one of the key conditions for the effective functioning of the social service system, for increasing its resilience and flexibility, and for strengthening its capacity to respond to the complex challenges of contemporary society. Within this context, social entrepreneurship should be viewed as one of the organizational forms through which social innovation is implemented. Its essence lies in combining a social mission with an entrepreneurial approach to the use of resources, the organization of labor, the production of goods or services, and the achievement of socially significant outcomes. This combination is fundamentally important for contemporary social work management, as it opens the possibility of moving beyond a model of assistance that relies primarily on the redistribution of budgetary resources and contributes to the formation of a development-oriented model focused on self-sustainability, the mobilization of a community's internal potential, the strengthening of individual agency, and the creation of conditions for more active participation in social life. Thus, social entrepreneurship appears not as a phenomenon external to social work, but as a mode of organizing social activity that makes it possible to combine assistance, development, integration, and innovation within a single managerial process. This is precisely where its

particular value for the system of social innovation becomes evident: it does not merely offer isolated local solutions, but contributes to transforming the very logic of social support – from maintenance to development, from passive provision to active inclusion, and from fragmentation to systemic coherence [1; 8].

The first important dimension of this interrelation is the resource dimension. Its significance lies in the fact that social entrepreneurship makes it possible to rethink the issue of resource provision in social work. In the traditional model, the resources of the social sphere are primarily viewed as externally given and limited, which results in the dependence of many social programs on budgetary funding, grant support, or short-term projects. Social entrepreneurship, by contrast, introduces a different logic – the logic of creating, attracting, multiplying, and reinvesting resources in socially significant goals. In this sense, the resource dimension includes not only material and financial assets, but also human, organizational, partnership, and reputational capital. Such an approach is particularly important in a situation where social needs are growing faster than the capacity of the state to respond. For social work management, this means broadening the boundaries of professional vision: a manager in the social sphere must think not only in terms of distributing existing goods, but also in terms of initiating new opportunities, building cross-sectoral connections, activating local communities, and creating more sustainable models of support. Therefore, the resource potential of social entrepreneurship lies not merely in generating additional funding, but in transforming the very understanding of resources as dynamic, multicomponent, and capable of being purposefully constructed within the process of social management [1;5].

The second dimension is the organizational and managerial dimension. It is this dimension that most directly links social work management with social entrepreneurship. If social entrepreneurship is viewed only as socially beneficial economic activity, then its role in the social sphere remains partly external. However, when approached as a specific organizational model, it becomes evident that its effectiveness is determined by the quality of managerial decisions. This includes strategic planning, the clear formulation of a social mission, the establishment of communication with stakeholders, the application of social impact indicators, personnel management, the maintenance of financial viability, the development of social responsibility, and the ability to adapt under changing conditions. All this brings social entrepreneurship closer to the contemporary understanding of social work management, within which effectiveness is determined not only by the number of services delivered, but also by the quality of process organization, the ability to ensure the sustainability of assistance, its appropriate targeting, and its social impact. Thus, the organizational and managerial dimension demonstrates that social entrepreneurship is not a spontaneous initiative, but requires professional management grounded in project thinking, systemic coordination, evaluation of outcomes, and a strategic vision of development. It is in this sphere that social work management receives a new impetus for renewal, as it comes to include not only support and administrative functions, but also the function of constructing new social models [6; 7].

The third dimension is the social integration dimension. Social entrepreneurship within the system of social work is significant not merely because of its economic viability or organizational utility, but, above all, because of its capacity to create meaningful conditions for the inclusion of vulnerable groups in productive social life. In this respect, it differs fundamentally from purely charitable or compensatory forms of support. Whereas traditional assistance is often confined to the provision of protection, relief, or maintenance, social entrepreneurship opens up opportunities for active participation, professional development, skills acquisition, the restoration of social roles, and the strengthening of personal agency and self-worth. Its value therefore lies not only in meeting immediate needs, but also in enabling individuals to regain a sense of social relevance, competence, and belonging.

This dimension is especially important for those population groups that experience not only material deprivation, but also social exclusion, weakened interpersonal ties, reduced access to employment and community life, and a gradual erosion of confidence in their own capacities. For such individuals, the provision of aid alone is rarely sufficient to ensure long-term integration. What is required instead is a model that combines support with empowerment and creates pathways toward renewed participation in social and economic processes. Social entrepreneurship offers precisely such a model, as it allows vulnerable individuals to be engaged not as passive beneficiaries, but as participants, contributors, and, in certain cases, co-creators of socially significant activity.

Within the framework of social work management, this approach implies a substantial shift in the very philosophy of support. The individual is no longer viewed exclusively as a recipient of services whose needs are to be addressed from outside, but rather as an active subject capable of inclusion, participation, responsibility, and development. This change in perspective is of particular importance for contemporary social work, as it reflects a movement away from paternalistic forms of assistance and toward more

empowering, participatory, and development-oriented models of intervention. In this sense, social entrepreneurship supports not only the alleviation of vulnerability, but also the activation of human potential.

Moreover, the integrative function of social entrepreneurship extends beyond the level of the individual. By creating opportunities for participation in socially meaningful and economically relevant activity, it also contributes to the strengthening of communities, the expansion of inclusive practices, and the development of new forms of solidarity. It helps to bridge the gap between support and participation, between assistance and agency, and between social protection and social inclusion. For this reason, the social integration dimension of social entrepreneurship should be regarded as an important component of social innovation. Its significance lies not only in addressing a particular social problem, but also in fostering a more inclusive social environment in which vulnerable groups are given real opportunities for participation, recognition, and sustainable development [1; 5].

The fourth dimension is the institutional dimension. Its significance stems from the fact that the development of social entrepreneurship is impossible without an appropriate legal, organizational, and political foundation. Imperfections in the legal framework constrain not only the scaling of successful initiatives, but also the very possibility of their systemic interaction with institutions of the social sphere. At the same time, the shifts that took place in 2025–2026 [4; 10] and were associated with support for the legal recognition of social entrepreneurship entities indicate the gradual transition of this phenomenon from the sphere of local practice to that of public policy. For social work management, this is of fundamental importance, as it opens the prospect of including social enterprises in local support programs, mechanisms of social partnership, community development strategies, and broader systems of social service provision. The institutional dimension also demonstrates that social entrepreneurship cannot develop merely as a collection of separate initiatives. Its sustainability depends on the extent to which society and the state are prepared to recognize its significance, develop support criteria, establish mechanisms of interaction, and create conditions for long-term functioning. Thus, institutional formalization is not an external addition to social entrepreneurship, but a necessary condition for its integration into the system of social innovation.

The fifth dimension is the innovative dimension. It synthesizes the preceding dimensions and makes it possible to view social entrepreneurship as part of a broader system of social innovation. Its innovativeness does not necessarily consist in technical novelty as such, but rather in its capacity to generate new ways of addressing social needs that are more flexible, targeted, sustainable, and socially beneficial. In this sense, social entrepreneurship should be understood not merely as an alternative organizational format, but as a dynamic mechanism through which new social practices, new forms of interaction, and new approaches to support can emerge and develop. Its innovative character is rooted in the combination of local initiative, social responsibility, managerial flexibility, and a clear orientation toward the achievement of concrete social outcomes. This feature is of particular importance for contemporary social work, since it provides grounds for considering social entrepreneurship one of the mechanisms through which the field may be renewed. The issue is not limited to the introduction of new forms of activity or the diversification of existing services. Rather, it involves the formation of a new culture of social management in which initiative, partnership, impact assessment, the search for non-standard solutions, and an orientation toward long-term effects acquire central importance. Within such a framework, innovation is understood not as a one-time intervention or isolated experiment, but as a continuous process of adapting social support systems to changing needs, contexts, and vulnerabilities. The innovative dimension also highlights the fact that social entrepreneurship is capable of responding to gaps and limitations within traditional models of social assistance. Conventional systems are often constrained by institutional inertia, rigid administrative procedures, and dependence on predefined mechanisms of support. Social entrepreneurship, by contrast, creates space for experimentation, adaptation, and the development of more responsive forms of intervention. It allows local actors to design context-sensitive solutions, to mobilize available resources in new ways, and to combine social goals with organizational sustainability. In this respect, its value lies not only in proposing new initiatives, but in transforming the very principles according to which social support is conceived and delivered.

Moreover, the innovative dimension of social entrepreneurship is closely linked to its ability to bridge different sectors and levels of action. It encourages cooperation among public institutions, civil society organizations, local communities, and socially oriented economic actors. Such interaction creates conditions for the emergence of hybrid models that are better suited to addressing complex and multidimensional social problems. For social work management, this means expanding the range of available instruments and moving toward more open, adaptive, and partnership-based forms of governance.

Innovation thus becomes not only a characteristic of individual projects, but also a defining principle of the wider system within which social work is organized.

For this reason, the innovative dimension makes it possible to understand that social entrepreneurship is not simply an addition to the existing system of social assistance, but one of the mechanisms of its qualitative transformation. Through social entrepreneurship, social work management gains the opportunity to move beyond the reproduction of established practices and toward the formation of new models of social action. These models are more responsive to local needs, more capable of combining support with development, and more oriented toward sustainable social impact. In this sense, the innovative dimension of social entrepreneurship should be regarded as one of its most significant contributions to the contemporary development of social work.

Such a model acquires particular significance under the conditions of war and the post-war recovery of Ukraine. During this period, the social sphere faces not only a growing number of requests for assistance, but also the need to create long-term support mechanisms for the population, strengthen community resilience, develop local economic activity, and restore social ties. In such a situation, social entrepreneurship can serve as an effective form of combining social support and development, since it contributes both to meeting specific needs and to creating new opportunities for communities and vulnerable groups. For social work management, this means broadening the professional perspective: from responding to crisis toward constructing conditions for recovery, stabilization, and long-term social development. Therefore, under contemporary conditions, social entrepreneurship should be regarded not merely as an alternative instrument, but as a promising form of organizing socioeconomic interaction that is capable of strengthening communities, expanding opportunities for vulnerable groups, and modernizing the ways in which social policy is implemented.

Thus, social work management and social entrepreneurship within the system of social innovation form a substantively interconnected complex in which managerial, resource-related, integrative, institutional, and innovative aspects mutually reinforce one another. It is precisely through this interaction that contemporary social work gains the opportunity not only to respond more effectively to existing challenges, but also to shape new models of social development that are more resilient to crises, more sensitive to human needs, and more open to the potential of communities.

Conclusions. Social work management and social entrepreneurship within the system of social innovation constitute a substantively interconnected direction in the development of the contemporary social sphere, one that should also be considered from a socio-psychological perspective. Social entrepreneurship emerges not only as a factor in the development of social work, an instrument of social policy, a mechanism of social integration, and a form of implementing social innovation, but also as a resource for strengthening individual agency, expanding participation, and fostering an inclusive social environment.

Its managerial value is manifested in the diversification of resources, the development of project-oriented management, the expansion of partnership-based models, the creation of opportunities for the social integration of vulnerable groups, and the formation of more sustainable local solutions. From a socio-psychological perspective, the significance of social entrepreneurship is associated with overcoming social exclusion, restoring social roles, strengthening a sense of self-worth, and activating human potential. Regulatory changes in the field of social services, together with legislative initiatives aimed at the legal formalization of social entrepreneurship, indicate a growing level of institutional readiness for such integration.

Prospects for further research are associated with the development of models for integrating social entrepreneurship into the system of social services at the level of territorial communities, the identification of criteria for assessing its social impact, the analysis of managerial competencies required of social work professionals, and the study of socio-psychological mechanisms of inclusion, participation, and community resilience under the conditions of Ukraine's post-war recovery.

References

1. Boldyzhar, S. M., & Khokhlova, I. V. (2024). Social entrepreneurship: An innovative tool for solving social problems in Ukraine. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 5, 356–360. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.05.55>
2. Braunahel, A. V. (2025). Strategic directions of the development of social entrepreneurship in Ukraine. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics and Technology*, 10(1), 170–175. <https://doi.org/10.36887/2415-8453-2025-1-28>

3. Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. (2026). *Some issues of the organization of social service provision* (Resolution No. 64, January 14, 2026).
4. Committee on Social Policy and Protection of Veterans' Rights of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2026, March 27). *Family and social entrepreneurship: New legislative opportunities for citizens*
5. Komisarenko, A. O. (2022). Social entrepreneurship as an instrument of social policy. *Law and Public Administration, 1*, 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.32840/pdu.2022.1.22>
6. Ohinok, S. V., Kohut, M. V., & Kohut, A. V. (2024). Social management as a factor in the development of social entrepreneurship. *Scientific Bulletin of Poltava University of Economics and Trade, 1(111)*, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.37734/2409-6873-2024-1-7>
7. Starchenko, H. V., & Duka, A. P. (2023). Project-oriented management of social entrepreneurship. *Problems of Modern Transformations: Series Economics and Management, 10*. <https://doi.org/10.54929/2786-5738-2023-10-03-06>
8. Tarasenko, T., & Borodin, Ye. (2022). Social entrepreneurship as a factor in the development of social work: An interdisciplinary and interprofessional perspective. *Public Administration Aspects, 10(5)*, 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.15421/152230>
9. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2019). *On social services* (Law of Ukraine No. 2671-VIII, January 17, 2019).
10. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2025). *Draft Law on amendments to the Law of Ukraine “On the development and state support of small and medium-sized entrepreneurship in Ukraine” regarding the development of social entrepreneurship* (No. 14156, October 27, 2025).

The article has been submitted to the editorial board 20.01.2026

The article has been recommended for publication 18.03.2026