

Transformative Entrepreneurship and Prosperity: Core Concepts

The module/MSc is a first attempt to decentre US-centricity in social enterprise teaching by emphasizing literature/theories/cases by scholars from the Global South (even if at Western institutions), women, feminist approaches, and designing for community/societal change over markets/products/services.

The module was created by Samer Abdelnour <samer.abdelnour@ed.ac.uk> and is currently taught as part of the MSc in Prosperity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship at UCL's Institute for Global Prosperity.

Module overview

We find ourselves at a formative moment wherein growth-based financial models and inequality are driving new forms of conflict, dislocation and ecological damage, challenging the veracity of our economic and political systems. These necessitate a bold re-thinking of the relationship between economic activity and global prosperity, as well as new forms of social, political and economic innovation to effect alternative pathways for a prosperous global future. They also require confronting the tension that market actors, seeking to address social and environmental problems through market 'solutions,' are often embedded in economic systems that create those problems.

Through interactive seminars, readings, speakers and cases, *Transformative Entrepreneurship and Prosperity: Core Concepts* is designed to introduce the core concepts, frameworks and theories of transformative entrepreneurship. As part of this module, you will: consider the core ideas of 'prosperity thinking' in relation to contemporary responses to socioeconomic and environmental crises; learn about the emergence and forms of social entrepreneurship; understand entrepreneurship as an institution, intervention, policy and practice; study concepts and theories relevant for analysing the transformative potential of entrepreneurship; explore the promise and limits of transformative entrepreneurship to provoke institutional and structural change in different settings including extreme and diverse global contexts; and how to evaluate the potential of transformative entrepreneurship to advance more equitable, inclusive societies and address global challenges.

Learning outcomes

Students will:

- Understand foundational ideas, emergent thinking and theories of transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity;
- Gain a critical understanding of transformative entrepreneurship as a policy, practice, institution and intervention;
- Learn how to analyse cases of transformative entrepreneurship, in their social, cultural, economic and political contexts;
- Draw on diverse knowledge and inclusive ideas to develop their own account of transformative entrepreneurship.

Module Structure

The module begins by questioning the role of transformative entrepreneurship in the context of global prosperity. The remainder of the course investigates the following topics: concepts and definitions of transformative (social) entrepreneurship; understanding entrepreneurship as practice, policy, intervention and institution; rethinking innovation and prosperity; social entrepreneurship metaphors, motivations and tensions; different theories through which to understand transformative entrepreneurship (agency and institutional change, community-based enterprise, and effectuation); transformative entrepreneurship in extreme contexts; and the limits of transformative enterprise.

Students will be challenged throughout to think critically about the possibilities and limitations of transformative entrepreneurship to engender social, political, economic and environmental change. They will write two short reflection pieces and submit a 2000- word literature review, both of which are intended to support other learning activities carried out during the MSc (see assessments section below).

Topics

The module is taught through ten learning topics comprising of a range of introductory materials (short films, readings, interactive tasks) followed by one 1-2-hour live class per week and a range of advanced or extension material. Topic format will vary from week to week but will generally comprise (1) Introduction and framing of the weekly theme; (2) More advanced concepts and reading; (3) an interactive task; (4) live class addressing core questions and sharing of learning (5) advanced extension tasks and readings. Students are expected to complete the pre-set learning tasks prior to the commencement of the live class and to come ready to discuss key topics and issues arising from the advanced readings/films.

The module comprises the following learning topics:

Topic 1: Transformative entrepreneurship, prosperity, global challenges

Topic 2: Introduction: concepts, definitions, emergence, forms

Topic 3: Entrepreneurship: practice, policy, intervention or institution?

Topic 4: Rethinking innovation and prosperity

Topic 5: Social entrepreneurs: metaphors, motivations, tensions

Reading week

Topic 6: Agency and institutional change

Topic 7: Community-based enterprise

Topic 8: Effectuation

Topic 9: Extreme contexts and the limits of transformative enterprise

Topic 10: Understanding value, measuring impact

Assessment

Summative Assessment 1: Reflection I (20% of the final mark)

Students will write a short reflection of 500 words and submit it on [platform] by [date]

The reflection should critically engage with the concept of transformative entrepreneurship, and seek to apply this to a problem, issue or global challenge of interest. This initial reflection is intended as an opportunity for students to explore the underlying (conceptual, theoretical) assumptions they have about transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity. Please contact the module convenor for advice.

Students will be expected to demonstrate:

1. Clarity of ideas and a structured reflection of the concept/definition of transformative entrepreneurship.
2. Thoughtful reflection and application to a problem, issue or global challenge.

Summative Assessment 2: Reflection II (20% of the final mark)

Students will write a short reflection of 500 words and submit it on [platform] by [date]

The reflection should critically engage with one of the theories or concepts covered in the module: agency/institutional theory, community-based enterprise, or effectuation. Students will be expected to reflect on what aspects of the theory are relevant for understanding or studying the potential of transformative entrepreneurship to address a problem, issue or global challenge of interest. This reflection is an opportunity to critically engage with and challenge the theory or concept of choice. Please contact the module convenor for advice.

Students will be expected to demonstrate:

1. Clarity of ideas and a structured reflection of the chosen theory.
2. Thoughtful reflection and application to a problem, issue or global challenge.

Summative Assessment 3: Literature review (60% of the final mark)

Students will be assessed through a literature review of 2,000 words submitted on [platform] by [date]

The literature review must:

1. Indicate a research focus/question that motivates the review, and a broader area of study the review contributes to.
2. Include a detailed and critical engagement with 10-12 academic articles (at least 60% from the Module reading list).
3. Identify a gap within the literature that future research might address.

Students will be expected to demonstrate:

4. An understanding of the chosen topic.
5. A basic/brief interpretation and analysis of relevant literature.
6. Clarity of ideas and structured argumentation.

Core Bibliography

- Abdelnour, S. (2011). *Forging Through Adversity: The Blacksmiths of North Darfur and Practical Action. Growing Inclusive Markets Initiative of the UNDP, New York: UNDP.*
- Abdelnour, S., Hasselbladh, H., & Kallinikos, J. (2017). Agency and Institutions in Organization Studies. *Organization Studies, 38*(12), 1775–1792.
- Akemu, O., Whiteman, G. & Kennedy, S. (2016). Social enterprise emergence from social movement activism: The Fairphone Case. *Journal of Management Studies 53*(1): 89-124.
- Alvi, F.H., Prasad, A. & Segarra, P. (2017). The political embeddedness of entrepreneurship in extreme contexts: The case of the West Bank. *Journal of Business Ethics.*
- Bagnoli, L. & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring performance in social enterprises. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*, 149-165.
- Blake, M. K., & Hanson, S. (2005). Rethinking Innovation: Context and Gender. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 37*(4), 681–701.
- Brandl, J., & Bullinger, B. (2009). Reflections on Societal Conditions for the Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Behavior in Western Societies. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 18*(2), 159-173.
- Branzei, O. & Abdelnour, S. (2010). Another day, another dollar: Enterprise resilience under terrorism in developing countries. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(5), 804–882.
- Calás, M.B., Smircich, L. & Bourne, K.A. (2009). Extending the Boundaries: Reframing “Entrepreneurship as Social Change” Through Feminist Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 34*, 552–569.
- Choi, N. & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing, 29* (3), 363-376.
- Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A, Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science 22*(5):1203-1213.
- Dorado S. (2006) ‘Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values So Different Process of Creation, No?’ *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship 11*(4): 319-43.
- Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J. & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 34*, 81-100.
- Ebrahim, A., & Rangan, K. (2013). What impact: A framework for measuring the scale and scope of social performance. *California Management Review, 56*(3), 118–141.
- Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), *Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, and Institutions: Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship Across Nations. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 37*: 479–504.
- Jiménez, A. (2019) Inclusive innovation from the lenses of situated agency: insights from innovation hubs in the UK and Zambia, *Innovation and Development, 9*:1, 41-64.
- Jiménez, A. & Roberts, T. (2019) Decolonising Neo-Liberal Innovation: Using the Andean Philosophy of ‘Buen Vivir’ to Reimagine Innovation Hubs. In: Nielsen P., Kimaro H. (Eds) *Information and Communication Technologies for Development. Strengthening Southern-Driven Cooperation as a Catalyst for ICT4D. ICT4D 2019. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, vol 552. Springer, Cham.*
- Khavul, S. and Bruton, G. D. (2013), *Harnessing Innovation for Change: Sustainability and Poverty in Developing Countries. Journal of Management Studies, 50*: 285–306.
- Khoury, T. A., & Prasad, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship amid concurrent institutional constraints in less developed countries. *Business and Society, 55*(7), 934–969.
- Lan, H., Zhu, Y., Ness, D., Xing, K. & Schneider, K. (2014) The role and characteristics of social entrepreneurs in contemporary rural cooperative development in China: case studies of rural social entrepreneurship., *Asia Pacific Business Review, 20*:3, 379-400.
- Mair J., Martí I., Ventresca M. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*, 819-850.
- Mulgan G. (2006) *The Process of Social Innovation, Innovations 1*(2): 145–62.

- Muntean, C.S. & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016), Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3): 221-241.
- Peredo, A.M. & Chrisman, J.J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309–328.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2006). What makes entrepreneurs entrepreneurial?
<https://www.effectuation.org/sites/default/files/documents/what-makes-entrepreneurs-entrepreneurial-sarasvathy.pdf>
- Sarasvathy, S. (2011). What is effectuation?
<https://www.effectuation.org/sites/default/files/documents/effectuation-3-pager.pdf>
- Yusuf, J.-E. (Wie), & Sloan, M. F. (2015). Effectual Processes in Nonprofit Start-Ups and Social Entrepreneurship: An Illustrated Discussion of a Novel Decision-Making Approach. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(4), 417–435.
- Wheeler, D., McKague, K., Thomson, J., Davies, R., Medalye, J. & Prada, M. (2005) Creating Sustainable Local Enterprise Networks, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1): 33-40.

Additional Materials

- Abdelnour, S. et al. (2008). Examining Enterprise Capacity: A Participatory Social Assessment in Darfur and Southern Sudan. Toronto: Centre for Refugee Studies, York University.
- Abdelnour, S. & Pemberton-Pigott, C. 2018. For Cook and Climate: Certify Cookstoves in their Contexts of Use. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 44: 196-198.
- Albert L.S., Dean T.J. & Baron R.A. (2016) From Social Value to Social Cognition: How Social Ventures Obtain the Resources They Need for Social Transformation, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 7(3): 289–311.
- Ansari S. & Krop P. (2012) Incumbent Performance in the Face of a Radical Innovation: Towards a Framework for Incumbent Challenger Dynamics, *Research Policy* 41(8): 1357–74.
- Arend, R.J. (2013). A heart-mind-opportunity nexus: Distinguishing social entrepreneurship for entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 313-315.
- Atari, D.O., Abdelnour, S., McKague, K. & Wager, R. (2010) Technical, Vocational, and Entrepreneurial Capacities in Southern Sudan: Assessment and Opportunities. Toronto: Centre for Refugee Studies, York University & Plan International.
- Berends, H., Jelinek, M., Reymen, I. & Stultiëns, R. (2014), Product Innovation Processes in Small Firms. *J Prod Innov Manag*, 31: 616-635.
- Bergmann, H., Hundt, C. & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 53–76.
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I. & Riaz, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship in Non-munificent Institutional Environments and Implications for Institutional Work: Insights from China. *J Bus Ethics* 154, 605–630.
- Briant Carant, J. (2017) Unheard voices: a critical discourse analysis of the Millennium Development Goals' evolution into the Sustainable Development Goals. *Third World Quarterly*, 38(1), pp.16-41.
- Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D. and Wright, M. (2015), New Financial Alternatives in Seeding Entrepreneurship: Microfinance, Crowdfunding, and Peer-to-Peer Innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39: 9–26.
- Clemens, M.A. and Demombynes, G., 2011. When does rigorous impact evaluation make a difference? The case of the Millennium Villages. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 3(3): 305-339.
- Daniel, E.M., Domenico, M.D., & Sharma, S. (2015). Effectuation and home-based online business entrepreneurs. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(8), 799–823.

- Dean T.J. & McMullen J.S. (2007) Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action, *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(1): 50-76.
- Desai, S. (2011) A Tale of Entrepreneurship in Two Iraqi Cities, *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 24(2): 283-292.
- Eisenhardt K.M., Graebner M.E. and Sonenshein S. (2016) Grand challenges and inductive methods: Rigor without rigor mortis, *Academy of Management Journal* 59: 1113-1123.
- Esquivel, V. (2016) Power and the sustainable development goals: A feminist analysis. *Gender & Development*. 2016 Jan 2;24(1):9-23.
- Escobar A. (2012) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar A. (2017) *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ferraro, F., Etzion, D. & Gehman, J. (2015) Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies*, p.0170840614563742.
- Germak, A.J. & Robinson, J. (2014). Exploring the motivation of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(1), 5-21.
- Grieco, C., Michelini, L., & Iasevoli, G. (2015). Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(6), 1173–1193.
- Gümüşay, A.A. (2015). Entrepreneurship from an Islamic Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130: 199–208.
- Gümüşay, A.A. & Bohné, T.M. (2018). Individual and organizational inhibitors to the development of entrepreneurial competencies in universities. *Research Policy*, 47(2): 363–378.
- Hällgren, M., Rouleau, L. & de Rond, M. (2018). A Matter of Life or Death: How Extreme Context Research Matters for Management and Organization Studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12: 111–153.
- Hickel J. (2018) Is it possible to achieve a good life for all within planetary boundaries?, *Third World Quarterly* 40(1): 18-35.
- Hickel J. (2019) Degrowth: A Theory of Radical Abundance, *Real-World Economics Review* 87: 54-68.
- Hota, P., Mitra, S., & Qureshi, I. (2019). Adopting Bricolage to Overcome Resource Constraints: The Case of Social Enterprises in Rural India. *Management and Organization Review*, 15(2), 371-402.
- Hwang, H. & Powell, W.W. (2005). Institutions and entrepreneurship. In Alvarez, S.A. , Agarwal, R. & Sorenson, O. (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship research: Disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 201–232). New York: Springer. <https://web.stanford.edu/group/song/papers/HwangPowell.pdf>
- Johannisson, B. (2018) Disclosing everyday practices constituting social entrepreneuring – a case of necessity effectuation, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30:3-4, 390-406.
- Joseph, J., Katsos, J.E. & Daher, M. (2020) Local Business, Local Peace? Intergroup and Economic Dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Lehner, O.M.; Nicholls, A. (2014). Social Finance and Crowdfunding for Social Enterprises: A Public-private Case Study Providing Legitimacy and Leverage. *Venture Capital*, 16, 271–286.
- Mayer C.P. (2013) *Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation Is Failing Us and How to Restore Trust In It*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- McLoughlin, J., Kaminski, J., Sodagar, B., Khan, S., Harris, R., Arnaudo, G. & Mc Brearty, S. (2009) A strategic approach to social impact measurement of social enterprises: The SIMPLE methodology. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 5(2): 154-178.
- Millar, R. & Hall, K. (2013) Social Return on Investment (SROI) and Performance Measurement, *Public Management Review*, 15(6): 923-941.
- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.
- Mulgan, G. 2010. Measuring social value. *Stanford social innovation review*, 8(3): 38–43.

- Miller, T.L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. & Vogus, T.J. (2012). Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 616-640.
- Nicholls, A. (2006) *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicholls, J. (2007). *Why Measuring and Communicating Social Value can help Social Enterprise become More Competitive*, London: Cabinet Office.
- Pacheco, D.F., Dean, T.J. & Payne, D.S. (2010), Escaping the green prison: entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5): 464-480.
- Peredo, A.M., Haugh, H.M. & McLean, M. (2017). Common property: Uncommon forms of prosocial organizing. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(5): 565-582.
- Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.
- Raz, K.G. (2012). Toward an improved legal form for social enterprise, *N.Y.U. Review of Law and Social Change*, 36, 283-310.
- Rotheroe, N. and Richards, A. (2007), Social return on investment and social enterprise: transparent accountability for sustainable development. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 3(1): 31-48.
- Ryan, P.R. & Lyne, I. (2008) Social enterprise and the measurement of social value: methodological issues with the calculation and application of the social return on investment, *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, 2:3: 223-237.
- Sachs J. (2015) *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sakarya, S., Bodur, M., Yildirim-Öktem, Ö. & Selekler-Göksen, N. Social alliances: Business and social enterprise collaboration for social transformation, *Journal of Business Research*, 65(12): 1710-1720.
- Salafsky, N., Cauley, H., Balachander, G., Cordes, B., Parks, J., Margoluis, C., Bhatt, S., Encarnacion, C., Russell, D. & Margoluis, R. (2001), A Systematic Test of an Enterprise Strategy for Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 15: 1585-1595.
- Sharp, Z. (2020). Manipulating Structure in Institutional Complexity Scenarios: The Case of Strategic Planning in Nonprofits. *Business & Society*.
- Sharpe B., Hodgson A., Leicester G., Lyon A. and Fazey I. (2016) Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation, *Ecology and Society*, 21: 47.
- Smith, W.K., Gonin, A. & Besharov, M.L. (2013). Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23, 407-442.
- Somerville, P. & McElwee, G. (2011) Situating community enterprise: A theoretical exploration, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23:5-6, 317-330.
- Todd Z. (2016) An Indigenous Feminist's Take on the Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' Is Just Another Word for Colonialism, *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29(1): 4-22, <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124>
- Verreynne, M., Miles, M.P. & Harris, C. (2013). A short note on entrepreneurship as method: a social enterprise perspective. *International Entrepreneurship & Management Journal*, 9: 113-128.
- Villalba U. (2013) Buen Vivir vs Development: a paradigm shift in the Andes?, *Third World Quarterly* 34(8): 1427-1442, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.831594>
- Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. & Shulman, J.M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.

Detailed syllabus and reading lists

Topic 1: Transformative entrepreneurship, prosperity, global challenges

Focus: This class introduces the module by placing the topic of transformative entrepreneurship in the context of global prosperity. It explores what prosperity means, and how we can imagine and build prosperous futures. It provides an overview of 'prosperity thinking', examining how present conceptualisations of prosperity go beyond the economic paradigm to embrace well-being, quality of life, capabilities and environmental sustainability. In this way, the class seeks to provoke students to not take for granted the end goals and outcomes that are typically associated with entrepreneurship (e.g. innovation, market creation, increased employment, etc.) and instead challenges students to consider how transformative entrepreneurship may be harnessed to address complex social, economic and ecological challenges. Rather than promote a singular view of global prosperity, the class introduces the critical idea of embracing multiple, inclusive and contextually appropriate notions of prosperity. Students will be asked to both draw on and interrogate their own diverse experiences and understandings of global challenges and to consider the kinds of prosperous futures *they* aspire to.

Essential reading:

Khavul, S. and Bruton, G. D. (2013), Harnessing Innovation for Change: Sustainability and Poverty in Developing Countries. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50: 285–306.

Pacheco, D.F., Dean, T.J. & Payne, D.S. (2010), Escaping the green prison: entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5): 464-480.

Wheeler, D., McKague, K., Thomson, J., Davies, R., Medalye, J. & Prada, M. (2005) Creating Sustainable Local Enterprise Networks, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1): 33-40.

Video clips:

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie: The Danger of a Single Story (TED Talk 2009),
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Ihs241zeg>

Extended reading:

Briant Carant, J. (2017) Unheard voices: a critical discourse analysis of the Millennium Development Goals' evolution into the Sustainable Development Goals. *Third World Quarterly*, 38(1), pp.16-41.

Eisenhardt K.M., Graebner M.E. and Sonenshein S. (2016) Grand challenges and inductive methods: Rigor without rigor mortis, *Academy of Management Journal* 59: 1113-1123.

Esquivel, V. (2016) Power and the sustainable development goals: A feminist analysis. *Gender & Development*. 2016 Jan 2;24(1):9-23.

Ferraro, F., Etzion, D. & Gehman, J. (2015) Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies*, p.0170840614563742.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A. & Tihanyi, L. (2016) Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research, *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 1880-1895.

Hickel J. (2018) Is it possible to achieve a good life for all within planetary boundaries?, *Third World Quarterly* 40(1): 18-35.

Hickel J. (2019) Degrowth: A Theory of Radical Abundance, *Real-World Economics Review* 87: 54-68.

Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A. & Fazey, I. (2016) Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation, *Ecology and Society*, 21: 47.

Topic 2: Introduction: concepts, definitions, emergence, forms

Key focus: This class provides an overview of different streams of thought linking together entrepreneurship with positive social and environmental change (e.g. cooperatives, sustainable, social, transformative, etc.). It also explores different forms socially and environmentally-oriented forms of entrepreneurship may take, both legal and organisational. Students will gain an appreciation for how rooted these different understandings of entrepreneurship are to capitalist notions such as markets and progress, and what it means if proposed 'solutions' are rooted in the same systems that produce the very grand challenges we seek to ameliorate. A key objective of this class is to challenge students to cultivate their own definition(s) of transformative entrepreneurship.

Essential reading:

Choi, N. & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29 (3), 363-376.

Calás, M.B., Smircich, L. & Bourne, K.A. (2009). Extending the Boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" Through Feminist Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 552–569.

Extended reading:

Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A. & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science* 22(5):1203-1213.

Dean T.J. & McMullen J.S. (2007) Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action, *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(1): 50-76.

Lehner, O.M.; Nicholls, A. (2014). Social Finance and Crowdfunding for Social Enterprises: A Public-private Case Study Providing Legitimacy and Leverage. *Venture Capital*, 16, 271–286.

Muntean, C.S., & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016). Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3): 221-241.

Nicholls A. (2006) *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peredo, A.M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1): 56-65.

Raz, K.G. (2012). Toward an improved legal form for social enterprise, *N.Y.U. Review of Law and Social Change*, 36, 283-310.

Wheeler, D., McKague, K., Thomson, J., Davies, R., Medalye, J. & Prada, M. (2005) Creating Sustainable Local Enterprise Networks, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1): 33-40.

Topic 3: Entrepreneurship: practice, policy, intervention or institution?

Focus: This class challenges students to think beyond the dominant understanding of entrepreneurship as *practice*, and examines it in relation to four dimensions: practice, policy, intervention and institution. Only by taking such a broad view of entrepreneurship is it possible to understand just how deeply ‘entrepreneurship thinking’ has penetrated across different sectors and fields (e.g. economic development, education, healthcare, social policy, humanitarianism, etc.). Such a view will enable students to critically reflect on and relate the transformative potential of entrepreneurship in the various contexts of interest to them.

Essential reading:

Brandl, J., & Bullinger, B. (2009). Reflections on Societal Conditions for the Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Behavior in Western Societies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18(2), 159-173.

Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, and Institutions: Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship Across Nations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37: 479–504.

Extended reading:

Albert L.S., Dean T.J. & Baron R.A. (2016) From Social Value to Social Cognition: How Social Ventures Obtain the Resources They Need for Social Transformation, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 7(3): 289–311.

Bergmann, H., Hundt, C. & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 53–76.

Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I. & Riaz, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship in Non-munificent Institutional Environments and Implications for Institutional Work: Insights from China. *J Bus Ethics* 154, 605–630.

Dean T.J. & McMullen J.S. (2007) Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action, *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(1): 50-76.

Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, and Institutions: Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship Across Nations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37: 479–504.

Mayer C.P. (2013) *Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation Is Failing Us and How to Restore Trust In It*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Muntean, C.S., & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016). Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3): 221-241.

Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.

Raz, K.G. (2012). Toward an improved legal form for social enterprise, *N.Y.U. Review of Law and Social Change*, 36, 283-310.

Topic 4: Rethinking innovation and prosperity

Focus: This class begins with the question: what is innovation? The topic will address this question by examining dominant understandings of innovation, which are overly tied to modern/Western notions of progress, technical expertise, and niche specialities. Students will have the opportunity to consider alternative approaches required for global prosperity. Different ideas about innovation to be considered seek to decentre dominant notions. Decolonial, community-based and contextually-embedded approaches to innovation will be explored. The topic and discussions will foreground some of the thinking and activities that will take place in Transformative Entrepreneurship and Prosperity: Design.

Essential reading:

- Blake, M.K. & Hanson, S. (2005). Rethinking Innovation: Context and Gender. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 37(4), 681–701.
- Jimenez, A. & Roberts T. (2019) Decolonising Neo-Liberal Innovation: Using the Andean Philosophy of ‘*Buen Vivir*’ to Reimagine Innovation Hubs. In: Nielsen P., Kimaro H. (eds) Information and Communication Technologies for Development. Strengthening Southern-Driven Cooperation as a Catalyst for ICT4D. ICT4D 2019. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, vol 552. Springer, Cham

Extended reading:

- Ansari S. & Krop P. (2012) Incumbent Performance in the Face of a Radical Innovation: Towards a Framework for Incumbent Challenger Dynamics, *Research Policy* 41(8): 1357–74.
- Bergmann, H., Hundt, C. & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 53–76.
- Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D. and Wright, M. (2015), New Financial Alternatives in Seeding Entrepreneurship: Microfinance, Crowdfunding, and Peer-to-Peer Innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39: 9–26.
- Escobar A. (2017) *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gümüşay, A.A. & Bohné, T.M. (2018). Individual and organizational inhibitors to the development of entrepreneurial competencies in universities. *Research Policy*, 47(2): 363–378.
- Jiménez, A. (2019) Inclusive innovation from the lenses of situated agency: insights from innovation hubs in the UK and Zambia. *Innovation and Development*, 9:1: 41-64.
- Khavul, S. and Bruton, G. D. (2013), Harnessing Innovation for Change: Sustainability and Poverty in Developing Countries. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50: 285–306.
- Lehner, O.M.; Nicholls, A. (2014). Social Finance and Crowdfunding for Social Enterprises: A Public-private Case Study Providing Legitimacy and Leverage. *Venture Capital*, 16, 271–286.
- Mayer C.P. (2013) *Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation Is Failing Us and How to Restore Trust In It*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.
- Mulgan G. (2006) The Process of Social Innovation, *Innovations* 1(2): 145–62.
- Nicholls A. (2006) *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.
- Raz, K.G. (2012). Toward an improved legal form for social enterprise, *N.Y.U. Review of Law and Social Change*, 36, 283-310.
- Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A. & Fazey, I. (2016) Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation, *Ecology and Society*, 21: 47.

Topic 5: Social entrepreneurs: metaphors, motivations, tensions

Focus: Who is a social entrepreneur? Why do people, communities and organisations choose social entrepreneurship? This topic offers students a closer look at social entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship, with a focus to exploring metaphors, understanding motivations and unpacking tensions inherent to the people who practice social enterprise. The topic introduces students to some of the individual and organizational level concerns typically found in the literature, such as hybridity and mission drift. In turn, students will be challenged to think about what these mean for the practice of transformative entrepreneurship, and the capacity of transformative entrepreneurs to provoke positive systemic change in the service of global prosperity.

Essential reading:

Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J. & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81-100.

Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O. & Shulman, J.M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.

Extended reading:

Akemu, O., Whiteman, G. & Kennedy, S. (2016). Social enterprise emergence from social movement activism: The Fairphone Case. *Journal of Management Studies* 53(1): 89-124.

Albert L.S., Dean T.J. & Baron R.A. (2016) From Social Value to Social Cognition: How Social Ventures Obtain the Resources They Need for Social Transformation, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 7(3): 289–311.

Arend, R.J. (2013). A heart-mind-opportunity nexus: Distinguishing social entrepreneurship for entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 313-315.

Bergmann, H., Hundt, C. & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 53–76.

Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I. & Riaz, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship in Non-munificent Institutional Environments and Implications for Institutional Work: Insights from China. *J Bus Ethics* 154, 605–630.

Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D. and Wright, M. (2015), New Financial Alternatives in Seeding Entrepreneurship: Microfinance, Crowdfunding, and Peer-to-Peer Innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39: 9–26.

Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A, Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5):1203-1213.

Dorado S. (2006) 'Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values So Different Process of Creation, No?' *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 11(4): 319-43.

Miller, T.L., Grimes, M.G., McMullen, J.S. & Vogus, T.J. (2012). Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 616-640.

Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.

Muntean, C.S. & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016), Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3): 221-241.

Nicholls A. (2006) *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, W.K., Gonin, A. & Besharov, M.L. (2013). Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23, 407-442.

Topic 6: Agency and institutional change

Focus: This is the first of three topics focused on theories (or lenses) useful for understanding transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity. The topic of agency and institutional change underpins a wide variety of theories, including those commonly used in (social) entrepreneurship research. This topic begins with an introduction of key concepts and an overview of different ways to define institutions. Once the basics are covered, students will be introduced to a fundamental conceptual question of agency (also known as the structure/agency problem), namely: How are actors able to provoke change if embedded within the very institutions they seek to change? The topic proceeds by offering students a nuanced view of the topic involving different levels of analysis and conceptions of change for addressing grand challenges. These difficult and complex questions will be brought together in a case study that explores the social construction of collective enterprise.

Essential reading:

Abdelnour, S., Hasselbladh, H., & Kallinikos, J. (2017). Agency and Institutions in Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, 38(12), 1775–1792.

Mair, J., Martí, I., Ventresca, M. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 819-850.

Case study:

Abdelnour, S. 2011. Forging Through Adversity: The Blacksmiths of North Darfur and Practical Action. GIM Case Study No. B057. New York: UNDP.

Extended reading:

Brandl, J., & Bullinger, B. (2009). Reflections on Societal Conditions for the Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Behavior in Western Societies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18(2), 159-173.

Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J. & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81-100.

Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T. and Stephan, U. (2013), Entrepreneurship, Social Capital, and Institutions: Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship Across Nations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37: 479–504.

Gümüşay, A.A. (2015). Entrepreneurship from an Islamic Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130: 199–208.

Hwang, H. & Powell, W.W. (2005). Institutions and entrepreneurship. In Alvarez, S.A. , Agarwal, R. , & Sorenson, O. (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship research: Disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 201–232). New York: Springer. <https://web.stanford.edu/group/song/papers/HwangPowell.pdf>

Jiménez, A. (2019) Inclusive innovation from the lenses of situated agency: insights from innovation hubs in the UK and Zambia. *Innovation and Development*, 9:1: 41-64.

Khoury, T. A., & Prasad, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship amid concurrent institutional constraints in less developed countries. *Business and Society*, 55(7), 934–969.

Pacheco, D.F., Dean, T.J. & Payne, D.S. (2010), Escaping the green prison: entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5): 464-480.

Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.

Raz, K.G. (2012). Toward an improved legal form for social enterprise, *N.Y.U. Review of Law and Social Change*, 36, 283-310.

Sharpe B., Hodgson A., Leicester G., Lyon A. and Fazey I. (2016) Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation, *Ecology and Society*, 21: 47.

Webb, J. W., Khoury, T. A., & Hitt, M. A. (2020). The Influence of Formal and Informal Institutional Voids on Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 44(3), 504–526.

Topic 7: Community-based enterprise

Focus: This is the second of three topics focused on theories (or lenses) useful for understanding transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity. The topic of community-based enterprise will explore the question: What does it mean for a community to act entrepreneurially? This topic will provide students with an overview of the determinants, characteristics, and consequences of community-led, owned and controlled enterprises, especially those that are rooted in a community's culture, natural as well as social capital. The similarities between community-based enterprises and other models (e.g. cooperative, village-based) will also be examined.

Essential reading:

Peredo, A.M., & Chrisman, J.J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309–328.

Lan, H., Zhu, Y., Ness, D., Xing, K. & Schneider, K. (2014) The role and characteristics of social entrepreneurs in contemporary rural cooperative development in China: case studies of rural social entrepreneurship, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 20:3, 379-400.

Teaching case:

Yu, H. & Arjalies, D.L. (2019). *Norlha: Scaling Up Sustainable Luxury on the Tibetan Plateau*. Ivey Publishing.

Extended reading:

Gümüşay, A.A. (2015). Entrepreneurship from an Islamic Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130: 199–208.

Hota, P., Mitra, S., & Qureshi, I. (2019). Adopting Bricolage to Overcome Resource Constraints: The Case of Social Enterprises in Rural India. *Management and Organization Review*, 15(2), 371-402.

Mackeever, E., Jack, S. & Anderson, A. (2015). Embedded entrepreneurship in the creative re-construction of place. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1): 50-65.

Peredo, A.M., Haugh, H.M. & McLean, M. (2017). Common property: Uncommon forms of prosocial organizing. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(5): 565-582.

Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.

Salafsky, N., Cauley, H., Balachander, G., Cordes, B., Parks, J., Margoluis, C., Bhatt, S., Encarnacion, C., Russell, D. & Margoluis, R. (2001), A Systematic Test of an Enterprise Strategy for Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 15: 1585-1595.

Somerville, P. & McElwee, G. (2011) Situating community enterprise: A theoretical exploration, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23:5-6, 317-330.

Topic 8: Effectuation

Focus: This is the third of three topics focused on theories (or lenses) useful for understanding transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity. Effectuation is a relatively new yet powerful theory of entrepreneurship that addresses the question: How do entrepreneurs navigate uncertainty? Rather than promote the idea of causal thinking (planning), effectuation advances new thinking about entrepreneurial logic, and in turn, market creation. In this topic, students will learn about the distinction between causal and effectual reasoning, the core ideas underpinning effectuation, and implications for non-profit and for-profit enterprises. Students will be challenged to consider effectual reasoning in relation to transformative entrepreneurship and prosperity through an effectuation case study.

Essential reading:

Akemu, O., Whiteman, G. & Kennedy, S. (2016). Social enterprise emergence from social movement activism: The Fairphone Case. *Journal of Management Studies* 53(1): 89-124.

Sarasvathy, S. (2006). What makes entrepreneurs entrepreneurial?
<https://www.effectuation.org/sites/default/files/documents/what-makes-entrepreneurs-entrepreneurial-sarasvathy.pdf>

Sarasvathy, S. (2011). What is effectuation?
<https://www.effectuation.org/sites/default/files/documents/effectuation-3-pager.pdf>

Teaching case:

Akemu, O., Whiteman, G. & Yue, T. (2015). Fairphone: Organising for Sustained Social Impact.

Extended reading:

Berends, H., Jelinek, M., Reymen, I. & Stultiëns, R. (2014), Product Innovation Processes in Small Firms. *J Prod Innov Manag*, 31: 616-635.

Daniel, E.M., Domenico, M.D., & Sharma, S. (2015). Effectuation and home-based online business entrepreneurs. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(8), 799–823.

Johannisson, B. (2018) Disclosing everyday practices constituting social entrepreneuring – a case of necessity effectuation, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30:3-4, 390-406.

Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.

Yusuf, J.-E. (Wie), & Sloan, M. F. (2015). Effectual Processes in Nonprofit Start-Ups and Social Entrepreneurship: An Illustrated Discussion of a Novel Decision-Making Approach. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(4), 417–435.

Verreynne, M., Miles, M.P. & Harris, C. (2013). A short note on entrepreneurship as method: a social enterprise perspective. *International Entrepreneurship & Management Journal*, 9: 113–128.

Topic 9: Extreme contexts and the limits of transformative enterprise

Focus: In this class, students will explore the potential of transformative entrepreneurship to provoke positive societal and environmental changes in extreme contexts. The focus of this topic is not simply to explore 'what works'; rather, it is to gain a deeper understanding of how context and contextual embeddedness may influence the shape, trajectory and ultimate survival of transformative entrepreneurship. It is also intended to challenge students to think about the limits of transformative enterprise. Students will be expected to draw upon the knowledge gained from prior topics and readings to consider what sort of policies (support), practices (enterprise models), interventions or institutions are required to support entrepreneurship in extreme contexts, and also which theories or lenses are most useful.

Essential reading:

Alvi, F.H., Prasad, A. & Segarra, P. (2017). The political embeddedness of entrepreneurship in extreme contexts: The case of the West Bank. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Khoury, T. A., & Prasad, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship amid concurrent institutional constraints in less developed countries. *Business and Society*, 55(7), 934–969.

Blog:

Abdelnour, S. July 8, 2011. [Building Juba: on bricks, markets and inclusive development.](#) *Africa@LSE*.

Extended reading:

Abdelnour, S. et al. (2008). [Examining Enterprise Capacity: A Participatory Social Assessment in Darfur and Southern Sudan.](#) Toronto: Centre for Refugee Studies, York University.

Atari, D.O., Abdelnour, S., McKague, K. & Wager, R. (2010) [Technical, Vocational, and Entrepreneurial Capacities in Southern Sudan: Assessment and Opportunities.](#) Toronto: Centre for Refugee Studies, York University & Plan International.

Branzei, O. & Abdelnour, S. (2010). Another day, another dollar: Enterprise resilience under terrorism in developing countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(5), 804–882.

Desai, S. (2011) A Tale of Entrepreneurship in Two Iraqi Cities, *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 24(2): 283-292.

Hällgren, M., Rouleau, L. & de Rond, M. (2018). A Matter of Life or Death: How Extreme Context Research Matters for Management and Organization Studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12: 111–153.

Joseph, J., Katsos, J.E. & Daher, M. (2020) Local Business, Local Peace? Intergroup and Economic Dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Mair J., Martí I., Ventresca M. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 819-850.

Sharp, Z. (2020). Manipulating Structure in Institutional Complexity Scenarios: The Case of Strategic Planning in Nonprofits. *Business & Society*.

Webb, J. W., Khoury, T. A., & Hitt, M. A. (2020). The Influence of Formal and Informal Institutional Voids on Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 44(3), 504–526.

Topic 10: Understanding value, measuring impact (SA)

Focus: In the final session, students will discuss and examine different approaches to assessing social value and the societal impact of transformative entrepreneurship and innovation. In addition to discussing mainstream approaches, students will be challenged to reflect on and conceive of their own approach to understanding value and measuring impact. Importantly, students will also consider the role of context, and in particular the degree to which understanding value and measuring should be contextually and temporally dependent, or even flexible to changing circumstances.

Essential reading:

Bagnoli, L. & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring performance in social enterprises. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 149-165.

Ebrahim, A., & Rangan, K. (2013). What impact: A framework for measuring the scale and scope of social performance. *California Management Review*, 56(3), 118–141.

Mulgan, G. 2010. Measuring social value. *Stanford social innovation review*, 8(3): 38–43.

Extended reading:

Abdelnour, S. & Pemberton-Pigott, C. 2018. For Cook and Climate: Certify Cookstoves in their Contexts of Use. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 44: 196-198.

Clemens, M.A. & Demombynes, G., 2011. When does rigorous impact evaluation make a difference? The case of the Millennium Villages. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 3(3): 305-339.

Grieco, C., Michelini, L., & Iasevoli, G. (2015). Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(6), 1173–1193.

McLoughlin, J., Kaminski, J., Sodagar, B., Khan, S., Harris, R., Arnaudo, G. & Mc Brearty, S. (2009) A strategic approach to social impact measurement of social enterprises: The SIMPLE methodology. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 5(2): 154-178.

Millar, R. & Hall, K. (2013) Social Return on Investment (SROI) and Performance Measurement, *Public Management Review*, 15(6): 923-941.

Nicholls, J. 2007. *Why Measuring and Communicating Social Value can help Social Enterprise become More Competitive*, London: Cabinet Office.

Rotheroe, N. and Richards, A. (2007), Social return on investment and social enterprise: transparent accountability for sustainable development. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 3(1): 31-48.

Ryan, P.R. & Lyne, I. (2008) Social enterprise and the measurement of social value: methodological issues with the calculation and application of the social return on investment, *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, 2:3: 223-237.

Sakarya, S., Bodur, M., Yildirim-Öktem, Ö. & Selekler-Göksen, N. Social alliances: Business and social enterprise collaboration for social transformation, *Journal of Business Research*, 65(12): 1710-1720.

Wheeler, D., McKague, K., Thomson, J., Davies, R., Medalye, J. & Prada, M. (2005) Creating Sustainable Local Enterprise Networks, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1): 33-40.