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Proposal for Discussion Idea: a short, informal presentation of a research idea or teaching challenge, intended to solicit constructive feedback.

Grounding: The current proposal emerged from a book chapter in a forthcoming volume entitled Creating Good Work: The World’s Leading Social Entrepreneurships Show How to Build a Healthy Economy. While scheduled for publication, the ideas outlined in this chapter have neither been presented at a professional academic conference nor vetted with academic colleagues.
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This discussion idea is based on a deconstruction, and ultimate reconstruction, of the term social entrepreneurship. The first step in this exploration has to do with drawing a distinction between inductive and deductive reasoning as these apply to the literature of social entrepreneurship. The inductive approach seeks to identify—largely using powers of intuition—solid examples of social entrepreneurship, and then categorize those characteristics that such exemplars hold in common. Little time will be spent with the inductive approach (though its value is both recognized and appreciated), in favor of examining the literature of social entrepreneurship through the lens of deductive reasoning. Here attention turns to the variety of ways in which the range of explorations into social entrepreneurship might best be ‘organized’...including but not limited to the following:

- identifying (dis)similarities between social entrepreneurship and traditional entrepreneurship
- categorizing social entrepreneurship along a continuum of for-profit to not-for-profit enterprise
- differentiating individual behavior from institutional behavior, and outlining the characteristics of successful social entrepreneurs
- exploring entrepreneurship from a hierarchical perspective, examining whether social entrepreneurship is (merely) one specific ‘type’ of entrepreneurship
- examining whether the emergence of social entrepreneurship can be fully explained as a response to market failure
- assessing the multiplicity of ways in which one might evaluate the effectiveness of social ventures

The question at this point in the discussion is: do any of these structural schemes, either individually or taken collectively, allow for a full explication of the term social entrepreneurship?

Next comes an inquiry (in light of Kant’s categorical imperative that we not treat individuals as mere means to some other end) into the term social entrepreneurship itself. Several ‘jarring juxtapositions’ are explored: these are conjoined terms that share in common the supposed uniting of a sacred term with an economic term. These include but are not limited to:

- human resource management
- human assets
- human capital
- exchanging gifts

The invitation at this point is to engage session attendees in offering their own ‘jarring juxtaposition.’ More central to the discussion idea theme, it is hoped some consensus can be achieved around the question of whether or not the term social entrepreneurship itself falls into this category of ‘jarring juxtaposition’—and thereby is a term that diminishes the human experience, violating the dignity that a universalist ethical perspective demands.

It is not enough to provide criticism without offering an alternative conceptualization. If it is agreed that the term social entrepreneurship is replete with ethical challenges, as is expected
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(hmm...if it is not a flawed construction...this might be a shorter discussion session than I have anticipated!), what might a better ‘frame’ for the construct be labelled? Put another way, what are the essential attributes that make for social entrepreneurship? The following three will be offered for consideration:

- deliberate
- disruptive
- design

This is to say that social entrepreneurship is deliberate, not accidental. The achievement of social good is not a mere unintended byproduct of traditional entrepreneurship activity that intends only an economic end; rather, it is the result of purposeful human activity that intends as its end the enhancement of positive social ends—and profit, perhaps. Intentionality is essential to what has come to be known as social entrepreneurship.

This is also to say that social entrepreneurship is disruptive, not incremental. Minor shifts in traditional entrepreneurship—say, utilizing the free market as a means to accumulate wealth that is then donated to social causes—does not constitute social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is a tectonic shift, not a mere tremor. Social entrepreneurship is the next (logical) evolutionary step of free market capitalism, motivated as it is by a spreading moral enlightenment regarding not only the limitations, but the destructive force, of unconstrained economic activity within a laissez-faire system of scarce resource allocation. Disruption is essential to what has come to be known as social entrepreneurship.

This is also to say that social entrepreneurship is design, not disorder. Design engages innovative systems thinking serving to unite inspiration, ideation and implementation. Inspiration comes from the practice of being embedded in the lives of the people one is designing for, and certainly has no relation to paternalism. It often involves positive deviance, or at a minimum divergent thinking. Design is essential to what has come to be known as social entrepreneurship.

What is being explored here is a notion that is fundamentally subversive. Deliberate disruptive design is meant to address persistent problems—problems that have often been viewed as necessary concomitants to the ‘human condition.’ Such problems often have to do with social inequities, which are amplified within market systems. This system needs to be overturned (not abandoned), to change completely—in short, to be subverted. Deliberate disruptive design bears the potential to harness that which is effective within market systems—thereby engaging the head—as a legitimate means to attaining greater social justice—thereby attending to the heart.

Do you agree? Do you disagree? In either case, do you perceive there to be value in an intellectual, heartfelt conversation that will take you—and your IABS colleagues—in an unusual direction...one that is clearly grounded in the conference theme?
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