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Foreword

I am grateful to Mark Rice, Dean of the School of Business of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Phil Cyr, Vice Chair of the Program Committee of the WPI Venture Forum, and Stephen Marini, Co-Moderator of the WPI Venture Forum Panel for inviting me to speak on Social Entrepreneurship at the December 2010 meeting of the WPI Venture Forum. The outline of the address was suggested to me, and below I briefly discuss each of these topics in the order provided in the given outline. Note that the “social” in social entrepreneurship raises contested and competing political as well as economic claims, so it should not be surprising to find mention of political and ideological preferences and tensions in the treatment below. I welcome comments on the paper.

1. What is Social Entrepreneurship?

Social entrepreneurship is a process by which citizens build or transform institutions to advance solutions to social problems, such as poverty, illness, illiteracy, environmental destruction, human rights abuses and corruption, in order to make life better for many.


No single definition

To begin, despite the quotation opening this paper, there is no single standard definition of social entrepreneurship. In a collection of 49 different definitions of “social entrepreneurship” compiled in two, peer-reviewed papers published within the last two years (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009), 27 definitions (55%) focused on creating social value, as distinct from economic value; 6 (12%) focused on solving social problems; and 16 (33%) centered on creating social
Most definitions, therefore, emphasize value (including double and triple bottom line accounting) over problem solving or change, and thus appear to favor market solutions to solve social problems. This is not surprising, as social entrepreneurship as an academic discipline grew directly out of the field of entrepreneurship, which is traditionally and conventionally taught in business schools.

J. Gregory Dees is often credited with starting the first course in Social Entrepreneurship, though as he recounts it the demand came from his students, who wanted to develop business plans for nonprofit and for-profit ventures that addressed social and environmental problems (Dees, 2008). That was at Yale. The funny part comes when he moved to the Harvard Business School. There he proposed a new course on Social Entrepreneurship, which was initially rejected outright as “not appropriate for a business school,” and later accepted as long as he did not put the term “social” at the beginning of the course name, so he called the course Entrepreneurship in the Social Sector (Dees, 2008). Dees himself provides us with a fairly long definition of social entrepreneurship (see below), but he also espouses using a one-liner, such as “innovative approaches to social change” (Dees, 2008). Note the reference to social change rather than, say, increasing social value.

**Key definitions**

As leading examples of a social value definition, Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern of the Harvard Business School write, “We define social entrepreneurship as innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors” (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006, p. 2).
Bornstein and Davis open this paper with a definition that integrates both change and problem solving: “Social entrepreneurship is a process by which citizens build or transform institutions to advance solutions to social problems, such as poverty, illness, illiteracy, environmental destruction, human rights abuses and corruption, in order to make life better for many” (Bornstein & Davis, 2010, p. 1).

Dees’ relatively lengthy definition, used widely, is as follows (Dees, 2001/1998):

*Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and
- Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.*

Although Dees refers to social change as one of several dimensions addressed by a social entrepreneur, the predicate in his definition is social change. Thus we may understand a distinction in meanings of social entrepreneurship in terms of an emphasis on social change entrepreneurship versus social value entrepreneurship.

**Social value entrepreneurship and CSR**

Definitions of social entrepreneurship that are predicated on creating *social value* are somewhat tenuous in that any company arguably creates social value of some kind or another. This has led some to argue that in degree, the social value generated must be at
least equal to or greater than economic value generated, as if economic value itself were not a social value. But even such a balance can come under pressure when, in the final analysis economic profit takes precedence to achieving a social mission. Indeed, the challenge of combining a for-profit purpose and nonprofit mission recently received attention in the press.¹

2. Tension between Social Mission and Profit Imperative

It is important to understand the reason why there is a distinct tension between the endeavor to achieve a social mission and the imperative to generate a profit. No matter how well-intentioned are those who claim to be social entrepreneurs and also make a profit, the tension is still there and generally comes to the fore in economically challenging times. This tension has both an economic and a political reality that is baked in the cake of our political economy of democratic capitalism. Let’s begin with a look at what capitalism—the world’s greatest engine of creativity and wealth creation—is in its purest, unregulated form:

![Figure 1: The unregulated capitalist engine](image)

If you cycle through this logic a few times, it becomes clear that those with capital get more of it over time, and eventually you have a condition of great wealth disparity. This is, in fact, how the titans of capitalism grew rich in the Industrial Revolution, when there were virtually no regulatory constraints. While charismatic CEOs and the competitive environment can mediate the process in ways that are socially and environmentally responsible, the only means at our disposal to ensure the general welfare in a civilized society is through regulation, which would include both income redistribution and environmental regulatory policies. We are, at considerable cost, relearning this reality today.

The capitalist model of economic organization is not the only model that thrives in our political economy. Two others, identified but not much discussed here are *worker cooperatives*, in which the workers, not outside investors, own their own firm, and *nonprofit organizations*, in which the public and not private entities owns the assets.

![Diagram: The cooperative model](image)

**Figure 2: The cooperative model**
Thus the capitalist engine, efficiently designed to create private wealth through profits, has an inherent tendency to produce inequality, which is antithetical to the political commitment of equality enshrined in our Constitution. This political dimension of tension goes back to the arguments between our founding fathers, some of whom wanted a strong central government and others who argued that such a government would act as the very monarchy that justified the Revolution. One aspect of this tension that continues to be played out, and always will be present, is the regulatory versus anti-regulatory rhetoric that defines the ideologies of political opponents.

So we can take it as a given that there will always be a tension between a social mission and a profit imperative in our political economy, and the challenge then is how to find a balance and also to compensate for the social costs involved in cases of market failure or government failure to meet social needs. That represents the opportunity space for modern social entrepreneurship.
3. The History and Evolution of Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship has a long and evolving history. Here is a brief note on selected, key antecedents to modern social entrepreneurship that invoke concerns for social responsibility.

The beginning

It is perhaps anyone’s guess when the first distinctive act of social entrepreneurship took place. The oldest story known to us, Gilgamesh, which took place some 4,500 years ago, told of an egotistical king who mistreated his people and who then, by the intervention of the gods, undertook a long journey of self-discovery following which he forsook his own immortality to tend to the immediate and present needs of his people, ironically achieving a sort of immortality after all. Could the very act of recording this story as a morality tale to shape the norms of responsible political behavior be seen as an early act of social entrepreneurship?

Two thousand five hundred years later, it was required by religious admonishment in ancient Judea for farmers to leave a portion of their harvest for the poor to gather for themselves (Loewenberg, 2001, p. 34). Prior to the emergence of a mercantile class, most people lived at the subsistence level in agricultural lands, and thus they were all equal poor and families and communities, shaped by common belief systems, looked after those in need. Can we conceive in the origins of religious doctrines of whatever faith, entrepreneurially inspired innovations to serve the common good?

The dark side

Social entrepreneurship, like any entrepreneurship, can of course have a dark side, even an evil nature that serves private interests at the expense of the general welfare. One
of my favorite historical accounts of the dark side masquerading as social entrepreneurship involved the practice gone awry of selling indulgences in the Middle Ages. This practice was entirely predicated on the widespread belief in Purgatory, and some wayward clerics took it on themselves to sell reductions in the time spent in Purgatory ostensibly in order to raise funds to care for the sick and poor. As it happened, many almshouses were indeed built, but much of the money so raised also supported a lavish and debauched lifestyle for certain clerics. As Barbara Tuchman wrote in *The March of Folly*, “The Church had become a machine for making money, declared John Colet in 1513, with the fee considered as the effective factor rather than repentance and good works” (Tuchman, 1984, p. 113). This of course upset Martin Luther, who was more Catholic than the Pope, and the rest is history—a history of unintended consequences.

But the story is worth reflection because of how the moneymaking scheme was grounded entirely on belief. I ask my students, what widespread and largely unchallenged beliefs do we have today that are similarly causing us to willingly risk, and lose, our modest gains? One answer that explains a massive transfer of wealth from the many to the few is our popular belief in the future value of a stock. Another, in some cultures, is the belief that private property should have higher value and greater protection than human rights.

*Modern philanthropy*

The modern philanthropic foundation did not emerge until the great fortunes of the Industrial Revolution created titans of wealth who were first entrepreneurial and only after amassing great private fortunes became magnanimous social engineers. Dwight
Macdonald notes that the “first foundation of the modern type” was the Peabody Education Fund (Macdonald, 1989/1955, p. 45), established in 1867. This was followed by foundations established respectively by Andrew Carnegie (1902), Mrs. Russell Sage (1907), John D. Rockefeller (1913), and so on. Eventually, these philanthropic foundations were instrumental in creating and supporting a burgeoning ecosystem of nonprofit organizations to do their social work, called by some the Nonprofit Industrial Complex (INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, 2007). Since the Second World War, the number of nonprofits that carry out both philanthropic and government-funded work has exploded, and today we have some 1.4 million 501-c-3 organizations in the United States.²

**Contemporary social entrepreneurship**

The modern era of social entrepreneurship arguably began in 1978, when Bill Drayton began searching the world for a particular species he called the *Social Entrepreneur*. By 1981 the first Ashoka Fellow was named, and today there are 2,700 Fellows in 60 countries. Drayton has since shifted his focus on what some deem an elitist view of social entrepreneurship and he now promulgates the mantra than anyone can be a change-maker. In addition to the tension between elite and populist visions of social entrepreneurship, there are several other evolutionary forces that are shaping the field.

**Evolutionary forces**

Three key evolutionary forces that are influencing the theory and practice of social entrepreneurship include: market failure; decline in government welfare state and the rise in nonprofits; growth of the MBA degree and a business orientation toward

opportunity seeking. Market failure is the manifest inability of the market to meet social needs that are not monetized, and for which there is thus no market. The decline in the government welfare state is evidenced by the deregulatory and small government movement, which has displaced the agency for meeting social needs from the government to private associations, including the church but more recently the rapidly growing nonprofit sector. Finally, the rapid growth of MBA students has equipped legions of opinion leaders and professionals with a mindset and orientation toward meeting social needs by applying traditional business models and tools.

None of these three necessarily indicates a good thing. Indeed, we should critically reflect on that fact that the prevalence of social entrepreneurship, regardless of the economic strength of a country, is an index of market failure, government failure, and the response being to emulate market-based frameworks predisposed to efficiency instead of traditionally more democratic ones striving for social justice. Where are these trends likely to head?

4. Current Status and Analytical Tools

The current status of social entrepreneurship presents a field that continues to diverge, rather than converge, and my prediction is that the field will eventually split into separate sub-disciplines rather than unify. One sub-discipline will emphasize creating social value through market mechanisms, and the boundary between this and corporate social responsibility will continue to blur and eventually integrate as the triple bottom line becomes a mainstream standard business practice more responsive to a likely secular resurgence in regulation.
Another sub-discipline will emphasize creating social change, and this will be how social entrepreneurship is treated in other professions outside of business, such as in schools of social work, public health, education, and law.

To impart a core conceptual framework for understanding contemporary social entrepreneurship, I will provide four, key concepts: A Social Change Model, Motivation, Needshare, and Opportunity identification.

**A Social Change Model**

The Model of Social Change outlined below allows us to differentiate the definitions of social entrepreneurship according to the degree of change they effect. Those definitions that emphasize creating social value are transactional in nature, while those that emphasize social change, including systemic change, endeavor to achieve transformative change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATIVE Systemic</th>
<th>TRANSACTIONAL Incremental</th>
<th>SOCIAL CULTURAL</th>
<th>DISCOURSE ARENA</th>
<th>POLITICAL ECONOMY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Targeted (Charity)</td>
<td><strong>3. Normative (Education)</strong> Large-scale change in informal, behavioral rules (e.g., social values, norms)</td>
<td><strong>1. Targeted (Charity)</strong> Incremental change to the status quo for a few for a short time</td>
<td>Discursive Arena</td>
<td>POLITICAL ECONOMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchange (Market)</td>
<td><strong>4. Codified (Policy)</strong> Large-scale change mandated by formal, written rules (e.g., laws, regulations)</td>
<td><strong>2. Exchange (Market)</strong> Incremental change for a few within market stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Model of Social Change*
This Model of Social Change, inspired by the work of Douglass North (North, 2005/1990) and Max Weber (Weber, 1978/1968a, 1978/1968b), is a conceptual framework to understand the dynamic of social change in a formal social system, whether an organization (such as a company) or a political unit (such as a community or nation-state). The social system, seen here, consists of the interconnections between the social, cultural, political, and economic rules that define the social system. Regardless of the unit of analysis, the Type of Change refers to the prevailing social system, in which social change can be transactional and incremental, that is, partially improving the system without fundamentally changing the system, or transformative and systemic, meaning that the social system itself is changed, either in terms of its structure or the relationship between its elements. As described by North, systemic change requires changes in informal rules (such as social values or norms) or formal rules (such as laws or regulations). The Discursive Arena of change refers to the domain of expertise where change is typically considered most appropriately discussed within the prevailing power structure. It is unusual and can be seen as threatening when experts from the Social Cultural domain meddle in matters of Political Economy, and vice versa, though such engagement can forebode social change.

Using this model we can place any venture defined by its strategies for social change relative to the four ideal types, one in each of the quadrants. We can also position mobilizing strategies—strategies employed to achieve social preferences—in reference to the four ideal types. For example, a social movement, such as the Civil Rights Movement, can be mobilized to achieve a desired policy change, in this case, the Civil
Rights Act of 1964; grassroots and advocacy strategies can be employed to influence social change; and philanthropic funding strategies can be similarly designed to effect social change.

The social value branch of social entrepreneurship is likely to be concentrated in the Exchange quadrant (2) at the lower right. The case study for discussion at this Venture Forum—Waste to Watts, LLC—falls primarily within the Market quadrant: it focuses on producing and marketing a backup energy apparatus constructed from discarded components. This innovation will affordably serve an acute need in developing countries through a transactional arrangement. Thus by using recycled materials and meeting a critical need in economically poor areas the venture provides dimensions of both social and environmental value and can be seen as exemplifying social value entrepreneurship. Even if the venture were to reorganize as a nonprofit, charitable organization and donate its devices to the poor, it would remain a transaction oriented venture in the Charity quadrant (1). In any case, Waste to Watts does not in its current business plan propose to create the systemic change necessary to eliminate the need for backup power in the countries it plans to serve.

By contrast, ventures that strive to innovate transformative and systemic change, including through the application of mobilizing strategies, would be defined as social change entrepreneurship ventures. If Waste to Watts were to transform itself into a venture that created massive and sustainable behavioral change in OECD countries resulting in significant energy conservation (see the Normative quadrant 3), or if it undertook through mobilization strategies to pass a law in Congress to transfer subsidies
to the oil and gas industry to support the creation of green technologies (see the Codified quadrant 4), it would then be redefined as an example of social change entrepreneurship.

**Motivation**

The social entrepreneur looks out at the status quo, is dissatisfied, and is thus motivated to change the status quo. The social entrepreneur recognizes dissonance because his or her internalized social values are at odds with those conveyed in the status quo, and he or she is then moved to change the world in a way that conveys his or her preferred social values.

![Figure 5: Model of Entrepreneurial Motivation](image)

In the case of Waste to Watts, we learn of the experience of its founders, James, Patrick, and Adam, working as hospital technicians in Tanzania, where they witnessed what they describe as the “harrowing” consequences of energy blackouts. Clearly their internalized social values, were sufficiently jarred to create a moment of decision such that their social values preferences—say for equality and/or health—sufficiently motivated them to take action and form a venture to change the status quo. The social values that are eventually conveyed through the outcomes of their venture should correspond to those that inspired them to act at the outset, so we would expect to see their venture as raising equality and of course improvements in health care delivery and healthier outcomes.
This attention to social values is largely absent in the literature, which typically begins an analysis of social change with the resources at hand and then proceeds, usually in the form of a logic model (Kellogg Foundation, 2004), to address how such resources are allocated to achieve the desired change. But this approach largely ignores the role that social values preferences plays in rationalizing those resource allocation decisions, and the little research and analysis done in this area (Whitman, 2008, 2009) could be expanded.

**Needshare**

The difference between a need and a market is that there is money to pay for needs in a market. But many needs go unmet because they cannot be funded. Thus, strictly speaking, there is no market for them, and this distinction between a market and needs gives rise to the concept of *needshare*, on which I elaborate elsewhere (Whitman, In preparation-b). The social entrepreneur seeks to understand needs. The total number of people who share a particular need provides the denominator in our needshare equation. The total number of people actually served in a social venture provides the numerator.

\[
\text{Needshare} = \frac{\text{Number of people served}}{\text{Total number of people in need}}
\]

Carrying out the division calculates the needshare, which can be converted to a percent. This provides a standard metric for comparing the relative reach of different social ventures, as well as serving as a strategic target for year over year performance in a single venture.
Needshare also provides a basis on which to make a first order estimation of how much money may be required to meet 100% of a particular need. In this approach we take the annual budget of a social venture and simply scale it up to 100% for our first order approximation. Economies may actually bend the curve, but even when applied on a straight-line basis, needshare provides some analytical utility. Here is an analysis of needshare for Teach for America, which serves a portion of the 15.5 million students living in poverty in the United States:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children served by TFA</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in poverty</td>
<td>15,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needshare</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TFA Revenues (2009)      | $278,667,879     |
| Needshare                | 0.03             |
| Scaled up 100%           | $8,638,704,249   |

| Education budget (2007)  | $581,648,000,000 |
| Annual increment to reach 100% | 1.49%           |
| Teachers for 500,000 students | 8,200          |
| Students per teacher      | 61              |
| Teachers needed for 100%  | 254,200         |
| Factor increase           | 31              |

While it appears that the total education budget would have to increase by about only 1.5%, the question remains where to come up with the $9 billion, not to mention the additional number of Teach for America quality teachers needed to serve all students in poverty.

Needshare applies directly to the Waste to Watts business plan, for the principals clearly recognize that the need for backup power supplies in poor countries is not being met by existing suppliers because their equipment is unaffordable. In other words, the
market is not sufficiently responsive to the underlying need. By analyzing unmet needs, the W2W founders saw the opportunity to create lower cost power supplies and thus expand the market to meet such needs accordingly.

Needs are growing, not disappearing; are more global; and are more intractable than ever in history. Seen through the needshare lens, the opportunity for social entrepreneurs is vast.

*Opportunity identification*

Once we see that needs, not markets, define the scope of opportunity for social entrepreneurship, the space for innovation is huge. Perhaps the most compelling source that identifies opportunities worldwide is the Millennium Development Goals, which consist of eight goals, 21 quantifiable targets, and 60 indicators to reduce world poverty by the year 2015. The United Nations Development Programs is perhaps the best site for monitoring needs and tracking both global and country-by-country progress in the MDGs. But as we know, even vast needs go unmet unless monetized for a market.

*5. Size of the Market*

The term *market*, as noted above, requires that the needs to be met are somehow monetized. The entire United States economy represents about a $14 trillion market in aggregate. Of this, the nonprofit segment, which by definition is meant to address what the Internal Revenue Code designates as worthy of tax-exemption, included 583,514 organizations with more than $25,000 in revenues in 2007, which, in turn, reported more than $1.9 trillion in combined revenue and $4.3 trillion in assets (Urban Institute, 2010). Private charitable giving amounted to $303.75 billion in 2009, of which individual giving

---

was $227.41 billion (Giving USA Foundation, 2010) and grant making by philanthropic foundations in 2008 was $47 billion,\(^4\) some one percent of the $4 trillion Federal budget for that year. In this context, the actual amount of money specifically available for social entrepreneurship is quite small and is predominantly focused on the grant making and fellowship sponsorship budgets of a small number of private foundations, including Echoing Green, the Skoll Foundation, Schwab Foundation, and the Kauffman Foundation.

Yet the market for social entrepreneurship, however small, should not constrain entrepreneurs motivated to create social change through non-market venues including those that involve mobilizing social and political resources. Some of the most transformative examples of social change have been achieved through just such social entrepreneurship.

### 6. Success Stories

Ashoka, where Bill Drayton started a global search for leading social entrepreneurs, has at least 2,700 stories of successful social entrepreneurship. Perhaps the most newsworthy story is that of Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank. Other stories can be found in David Bornstein’s classic, *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* (Bornstein, 2004), in Wilford Welch’s *The Tactics of Hope: How Social Entrepreneurs are Changing Our World* (Welch, 2008), and in entrepreneurship textbooks, including my own chapter on social entrepreneurship (Whitman, 2011) in the text titled, *Entrepreneurship* (Bygrave & Zacharakis, 2011). As a

short list of selections of notable social entrepreneurship success stories in various categories, I would choose the following:

**Charity/philanthropic** social entrepreneurship: William Simon and the John M. Olin Foundation. This is an example of how Simon and a small number of conservative foundations transformed the political landscape in the United States beginning in the 1980s. They started a movement to dismantle the FDR welfare state, and this movement is still at work despite the closing of the John M. Olin Foundation in 2005 after spending down the foundation’s assets. I would note, however, that the social values of freedom and free markets (e.g., deregulation) that this group espouse appear to serve private interests very well, but have not done much to promote the general welfare of the country, so some (e.g., liberals) may see this as an example of the “dark side” of social entrepreneurship.

**Market-based** social entrepreneurship: Father Arizmendi and Mondragón. In founding what is today one of the world’s largest worker-owned cooperatives, Arizmendi’s social entrepreneurship demonstrated how an organization, in this case a cooperative, can create both social and economic value through its very structural nature (Whitman, In preparation-a).

**Grassroots organizing** social entrepreneurship: Saul Alinsky and the Industrial Areas Foundation. Alinsky was a genius at devising effective ways for community-based groups to organize and create power to represent their own interests. Hilary Clinton wrote her senior thesis on Alinsky, and President Obama followed in his footsteps as a community organizer in Chicago.
Social movement social entrepreneurship: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Civil Rights Movement. There is perhaps no greater example of social movement social entrepreneurship in the United States that how King mobilized the civil rights movement.

Advocacy social entrepreneurship: James Grant and UNICEF. Grant was appointed as head of a weak and inconsequential specialized agency of the United Nations and in less than a decade turned it into a powerful global advocate for the health rights of children.

Normative change social entrepreneurship: T. Colin Campbell and The China Study. Campbell is drawing on his lifetime of scientific work studying the diets of large populations, particularly China, to provide an evidence-based strategy for improving the health of a nation and drastically cutting its health care costs through a simple and voluntary change in eating habits based on a plant based, whole foods diet.

Policy change social entrepreneurship: Alan Khazei and the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act. Starting with City Year, moving to Be The Change, and ultimately getting the Serve America Act passed, Khazei exemplifies how the social entrepreneur can move from charity to normative to policy change and impact an entire nation.

Capacity building social entrepreneurship: Jessica Flannery and Kiva. Flannery saw the opportunity to combine Muhammad Yunus’ financial insight of micro-lending and the power of the Internet to create an unprecedented capacity for individuals to finance economically poor entrepreneurs anywhere throughout the globe.

These and many other stories can be found in the literature, including in the sources recommended at the end of this paper.
To recap, social entrepreneurship is directed toward meeting social needs that are not otherwise being sufficiently met through other institutions. The approaches to social entrepreneurship may be oriented more toward creating social value or creating social change. Most market-oriented social entrepreneurship addresses social needs without creating systemic or transformative social change. Social change entrepreneurship can transform the very institutions that cause the underlying disparities and social needs that create the opportunity for social entrepreneurship. Both orientations are worthy and likely to flourish as long as property rights trump human rights.

7. Recommended Sources

Although the references listed here are few, many of them provide, in turn, many more references.

Ashoka web site: www.ashoka.org

David Bornstein: Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know (Bornstein & Davis, 2010) and How to Change the World (Bornstein, 2004).

Debbi Brock, teaching resources (Brock & Ashoka Global Academy for Social Entrepreneurship, 2008)

Janelle Kerlin, Social Enterprise: A Global Comparison (Kerlin, 2009)

Mary Mazzio, Lemonade Stories and Ten9Eight, entertaining and instructive films on entrepreneurship.

Nonprofit organizations: www.guidestar.org

Philanthropic foundations: www.foundationcenter.org
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